

Material contained in this publication is in the public domain and may be reproduced, fully or partially, without permission of the Federal Government. Source credit is requested but not required. Permission is required only to reproduce any copyrighted material contained herein.

This material will be made available to sensory impaired individuals upon request.  
TDD\* phone: 1-800-326-2577

\*Telecommunications Device for the Deaf.

# Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor

Covering the Period July 1995 - September 1996

U.S. Department of Labor  
Alexis M. Herman, Secretary

Employment and Training Administration  
Raymond J. Uhalde, Acting Assistant Secretary of Labor

Office of Policy and Research  
Gerard F. Fiala, Administrator

# Contents

Page

**Transmittal Letter of the Secretary of Labor** .....

**Abbreviation and Acronym List** .....

## **Chapter 1—Program Activities**

**Introduction** .....

One-Stop Career Center Systems and Labor Market Information Initiatives .....

    One-Stop Career Center Systems .....

    America’s Labor Market Information System .....

Improving the Nation’s Employment and Training System .....

Skill Standards and Certification .....

    National Skill Standards Board .....

    Demonstration Programs .....

    Business/Trade Association Initiative .....

    National Youth Apprenticeship Program .....

    WorkPlus .....

    Information Dissemination .....

School-To-Work Opportunities .....

Other Project Highlights .....

    What is Working in Employment and Training .....

        Conference on Building a Reemployment System .....

        Publication on “What is Working” .....

    Serving Dislocated Workers: The Enterprise Project .....

    Promoting Customer Choice for Dislocated Workers .....

    Training Survey .....

    Study of Job Skills and High Performance .....

Special JTPA Initiatives .....

    National Dialogue on Improving Job Training Services .....

    Emergency Grants .....

        Flood Relief .....

        Earthquake Aid .....

        Oklahoma City Bombing .....

**Job Training Partnership Act Programs** .....

    JTPA Overview .....

        Technical Assistance and Training .....

        Dialogue on the Disadvantaged .....

Adult Programs, Title II-A .....	
Background .....	
Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities .....	
Year-Round Services for Youth, Title II-C .....	
Background .....	
Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities .....	
Summer Youth Programs, Title II-B .....	
Background .....	
Highlights of Calendar Year 1994 and 1995 Activities .....	
Dislocated Worker Programs, Title III .....	
Background .....	
PY 1993 National Reserve Projects and Special Initiatives .....	
National Reserve Projects .....	
Special Initiatives .....	
PY 1994 National Reserve Projects and Special Initiatives .....	
National Reserve Projects .....	
Special Initiatives .....	
PY 1993 and 1994 Program Results and Participant Characteristics .....	
Performance Standards .....	
Response to Special Dislocations in PY 1993 and 1994 .....	
Defense-Related Dislocations .....	
Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance .....	
National Programs, Title IV .....	
Overview .....	
Indian and Native American Programs .....	
Background .....	
Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities .....	
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program .....	
Background .....	
Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities .....	
Job Corps .....	
Background .....	
Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities .....	
Pilot and Demonstration Programs .....	
School-To-Work Transition and Youth-Related Projects .....	
National Youth Apprenticeship in the Customer Service Industry .....	
Union-Based School-To-Work Mentoring Project .....	
High School Career Academies Demonstration .....	
Transition to Work Demonstrations for Disabled Youth Using a Natural Supports Model .....	
Project FocusHOPE .....	
At-Risk Youth School-To-Work Pilot Project .....	
Preparing Out-of-School Youth for a Career Path Project .....	
Quantum Opportunities Project .....	

- Youth Year-Round Training Demonstrations .....
- Out-of-School Pilot Projects .....
- Youth Fair Chance Program .....
- Addressing the Labor Market Needs of Women .....
- Glass Ceiling Demonstration .....
- Nontraditional Employment for Women .....
- Improving Programs and Coordination .....
- Job Training 2000 Projects .....
- Evaluation of the Job Training 2000 One-Stop Career  
    Centers Demonstration .....
- Partnership Programs .....
- Improving Worker Skills .....
- The National Job Analysis Study .....
- Increasing Organizational Capacity to Provide  
    Workplace Literacy Services .....
- Workplace Literacy Test Implementation  
    Pilot Project .....
- New Directions: African Americans in a Diversifying  
    Nation Project. ....
- Helping Immigrants Succeed in the Labor Market .....
- Immigration Demonstration Projects .....
- Helping People With Disabilities to Succeed in the Labor Market .....
- Programs for People With Disabilities .....

**Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program .....**

**Apprenticeship .....**

- Background .....
- Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities .....
- Special FY 1994 and 1995 Initiatives .....
- STEP-UP Program .....
- Center for Advanced Journeymen Education .....
- International Union of Operating Engineers .....
- United Automobile Workers of America Skilled Trades  
    Apprenticeship Preparation Program .....
- Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations and the  
    Diversity in Apprenticeship Grants .....
- Federal-State Registered Apprenticeship Liaison Committee .....
- School-To-Work .....
- Education and Performance Apprenticeship Standards .....
- Construction Craft Skills Training Program .....
- Federal Committee on Apprenticeship .....

**Senior Community Service Employment Program .....**

- Background .....
- Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities .....

**Employment Service** .....

- Labor Exchange and Other Activities .....
- Labor Exchange .....
- Employment Service Revitalization Initiative .....
- America’s Job Bank .....
- Reemployment Services .....
- Employers’ National Job Service Council .....
- Targeted Jobs Tax Credit .....
- Occupational Information Network .....
- Help for Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers .....
- Foreign Labor Certification .....
- Permanent Labor Certification .....
- H-2B Labor Certification .....
- H-2A Temporary Labor Certification .....
- H-1A Nurses .....
- H-1B Specialty (Professional) Workers .....
- F-1 Students .....
- D-1 Crewmembers .....

**Unemployment Insurance Program** .....

- Background .....
- Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities .....
- Reemployment Demonstration Projects .....
- Self-Employment Demonstration Projects .....
- Work Search Demonstration Project .....
- Job Search Assistance Demonstration Projects .....
- The Unemployment Insurance Performance System .....
- The Performance Measurement Review (PMR) .....
- The Revenue Quality Control (RQC) Initiative .....
- Benefits Quality Control .....

**Trade Adjustment Assistance for Workers** .....

- Background .....
- Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities .....

**NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance** .....

- Background .....
- Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities .....

**Incumbent Worker Training** .....

- Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities .....

**Labor Surplus Areas Program** .....

- Background .....

Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities .....	
<b>National Commission for Employment Policy .....</b>	
Background .....	
Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities .....	
<b>National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee .....</b>	
Background .....	
Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities .....	
Support for State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees .....	
Occupational Information Support System .....	
Career Information Delivery .....	
Career Development Activities .....	

## **Chapter 2—Research and Evaluation Findings**

<b>Introduction .....</b>	
---------------------------	--

### **I. Labor Market Studies of Specific Groups .....**

Help for Farmers and Ranchers .....	
Overview .....	
Background: The Farm Crisis .....	
Past Efforts to Help Farmers and Ranchers .....	
Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration Projects .....	
Iowa .....	
Minnesota .....	
North Dakota .....	
South Dakota .....	
Enrollment Patterns and Participant Characteristics .....	
Services and Outcomes .....	
Study Conclusions and Recommendations .....	
Providing Training and Employment Services for Farmers and Ranchers .....	
Overview .....	
How Farmers Differ From Other Clients .....	
The Increase in Farmer Dislocation .....	
Start-Up Activities .....	
Assessing the Need for Services .....	
Determining the Characteristics and Needs of Potential Clients .....	
Identifying Funding Sources .....	
Developing Networks .....	
Recruiting, Training, and Supervising Staff .....	
Addressing the Special Needs of Farmers and Ranchers .....	
Outreach Efforts .....	
Tailoring Services to Farmers and Intake/Enrollment Efforts .....	

Case Management .....	
Assessment and Service Planning .....	
Job Search and Placement Assistance .....	
Retraining and Supportive Services .....	
Suggestions for State JTPA Officials .....	
Evaluating Programs for Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers .....	
Overview .....	
Conceptual Framework and Quality of Training Model .....	
Characteristics of the Eligible Population and Program Participants .....	
Grantee Service Strategies and Operations .....	
Training Services .....	
Pre-Training Services .....	
Classroom Training .....	
Basic Skills Classroom Training .....	
Vocational Classroom Training .....	
Relationships Between Vocational and Basic Skills Classroom Training .....	
On-the-Job Training .....	
Supportive Services .....	
Placement Services and Outcomes .....	
Placement Services .....	
Indirect Placements .....	
Direct Placements .....	
Services Received and Outcomes .....	
Factors Influencing Program Design and Outcomes .....	
Recommendations .....	
Job Training for the Homeless .....	
Overview .....	
Program Background .....	
Participant Characteristics .....	
Program Design, Implementation, Services, and Coordination .....	
Initial Services .....	
Case Management .....	
Education and Training Services .....	
Job Development, Placement, and Postplacement .....	
Housing Services .....	
Supportive Services .....	
Coordination and Linkages .....	
Program and Participant Outcomes .....	
Site-Level Analysis .....	
Participant-Level Analysis .....	
Findings, Implications, and Recommendations .....	
Helping Youth With Disabilities Move From School To Work .....	

Overview .....	
The Demonstration Projects .....	
California .....	
Maryland .....	
Massachusetts .....	
Minnesota .....	
New Hampshire .....	
Oregon .....	
Support Services and Coordination .....	
Accomplishments .....	
Project Costs .....	
Barriers and Challenges .....	
Capacity-Building, Continuity of Services, and Systems Change .....	
Future Directions .....	
Integrating Training and Employment Services for Immigrants .....	
Overview .....	
Service Strategy, Goals, and Objectives .....	
Evaluation Methodology .....	
Project Services .....	
Project Implementation .....	
Linkages and Coordination .....	
Outcomes .....	
Client Characteristics .....	
Project Effectiveness .....	
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	
Helping Immigrants Succeed in the Labor Market .....	
Overview .....	
Client Demographics .....	
Recruitment, Targeting, and Eligibility .....	
Assessment .....	
Curriculum Development .....	
Instruction and Other Services .....	
Project Summary .....	
Overcoming Poverty in the United States .....	
Overview .....	
Major Articles .....	
<b>II. Meeting the Needs of Dislocated Workers .....</b>	
Services for Dislocated Workers .....	
Overview .....	
Early Intervention Services .....	
Services to Develop Reemployment Plans: Assessment,	

Career Exploration, and Service Planning .....	
Services to Develop Reemployment Plans: Supportive Services and Case Management .....	
Basic Readjustment Services: Job Search Training and Assistance .....	
Basic Readjustment Services: Crisis Adjustment, Job Readiness, and Relocation Services .....	
Retraining Services: Classroom Training in Basic Skills .....	
Retraining Services: Classroom Training in Occupational Skills .....	
Retraining Services: On-the-Job Training .....	
Organizational Issues .....	
Easing Job Loss in the Defense Industry .....	
Overview .....	
Study Methodology .....	
The Dislocation Aversion Approach .....	
The Worker Mobility Approach .....	
The Community Planning Approach .....	
Preventing Layoffs from Defense Firms .....	
Assisting Dislocated Defense Workers .....	
Community Planning Projects .....	
Conclusions .....	
Helping Dislocated Workers to Become Entrepreneurs .....	
Overview .....	
The Job Creation Demonstration .....	
A Review of Job Creation Efforts .....	
The EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration Projects .....	
BEST Program .....	
Muskegon Economic Growth Alliance (MEGA) Job Creation Demonstration Program .....	
Friends of the Children of Mississippi Project .....	
Project Excel .....	
Project New Ventures .....	
The Center for Practical Solutions .....	
Service Models and Implementation Issues .....	
Analysis of Participant-Level Data .....	
Job Creation in Ongoing EDWAA Programs .....	
Conclusions and Policy Recommendations .....	
Helping Dislocated Workers Through Early Intervention .....	
Overview .....	
The Worker-Profiling and Reemployment Services System .....	
How the Worker-Profiling and Reemployment Services System Works .....	
Research Results .....	
Legislation .....	
Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System .....	

Technical Assistance .....	
Accelerating Dislocated Workers' Return to Employment .....	
Overview .....	
The New Jersey UI Reemployment Demonstration Project .....	
The "Job Search Assistance Only" Group .....	
The "Job Search Assistance Plus Training or Relocation" Group .....	
The "Job Search Assistance Plus Reemployment Bonus" Group .....	
Summary of the Initial and First Followup Evaluation Findings .....	
Findings from the Second Followup Study .....	
Impact on UI Receipt and Employment and Earnings .....	
Impacts of Training .....	
Targeting of Services .....	
Benefit-Cost Analysis .....	
Policy Analysis and Considerations .....	
<b>III. Building Tomorrow's Workforce .....</b>	
Skill Standards in the Secondary Labor Market .....	
Overview .....	
School-To-Work Policy and Current Initiatives .....	
Youth in the Secondary Labor Market .....	
Work Experience and Skill Development .....	
Recommendations and Suggested Initiatives .....	
Policy Recommendations .....	
Suggested Initiatives .....	
Community-Centered Strategies .....	
National Initiatives .....	
Research Initiatives .....	
Using Skill Standards to Improve the Nation's Workforce .....	
Overview .....	
The Emergence of Skill Standards .....	
Building a Skill Standards System .....	
Historical Foundation .....	
Education- and Industry-Driven Skill Standards .....	
Lessons from Other Countries .....	
Related Activities .....	
The Ideal Skill Standards System .....	
Key Tasks of the National Skill Standards Board .....	
Helping Students Move From School To Work .....	
Overview .....	
The Demonstration Projects .....	
Boston Private Industry Council .....	
Craftsmanship 2000 .....	

Gwinnett Youth Apprenticeship	.....
Illinois State Board of Education	.....
Manufacturing Technology Partnership	.....
MechTech, Inc.	.....
Middle Georgia Aerospace	.....
OaklandWorks	.....
Pennsylvania Youth Apprenticeship Program	.....
Scripps Ranch High School	.....
Sears/Davea	.....
Seminole County/Siemens	.....
Toledo Private Industry Council	.....
Workforce LA Youth Academies	.....
Program Participation	.....
Meeting Student Expectations	.....
School-Based Learning	.....
Work-Based Learning	.....
Integrating School and Work	.....
Program Partnerships	.....
Resources Used in Program Planning and Implementation	.....
Study Conclusions	.....

**IV. Helping the Nation’s Unemployed** .....

The Washington State Self-Employment Demonstration	.....
Overview	.....
The SEED Demonstration	.....
Implementation Results	.....
Self-Employment Impacts	.....
Wage and Salary Employment Impacts	.....
Impacts on Total Employment and Earnings	.....
Impacts Using Administrative Data	.....
Indirect Impacts on Job Creation and Job Satisfaction	.....
Conclusions	.....

From Unemployment To Self-Employment: Interim Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration	.....
Overview	.....
The Demonstration Projects	.....
Experimental and Operational Designs	.....
Massachusetts	.....
Washington	.....
Data Sources	.....
Demonstration Implementation	.....
Employment and Earnings	.....
Impacts on Job Creation and UI Outcomes	.....
Implementation Summary	.....

Conclusions .....	
From Unemployment to Self-Employment: Final Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration .....	
Overview .....	
Findings .....	
<b>V. Program Development and Improvement .....</b>	
Alternative Unemployment Insurance Base Periods .....	
Overview .....	
The Alternative Base Period .....	
Conclusions .....	
Increasing the Federal Taxable Wage Base for Unemployment Insurance .....	
Overview .....	
Federal and State Taxable Wage Bases .....	
Rationale for Raising the Federal Taxable Wage Base .....	
Study Methodology .....	
Study Findings .....	
Macroeconomic Estimates .....	
Universe Data .....	
Sample Data .....	
Extended Unemployment Insurance Benefit Triggers .....	
Overview .....	
Historical Use of Triggers .....	
Study Methodology .....	
Study Findings .....	
<b>Annotated Bibliography of Research and Evaluation Reports Completed During Program Years 1985-94 .....</b>	
<b>Statistical Appendix .....</b>	

Transmittal Letter of the Secretary of Labor  
ETA To Produce Camera-Ready Copy and Insert Here

## **Acknowledgements**

This edition of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* was written under the direction of the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration (ETA), Office of Policy Research. It was prepared under contract No. K-5548-5-00-80-30 by the Landini Group: Michael Landini and Frances Oliver. The project manager for the contract was Mary Vines.

The major components of ETA contributed material and valuable assistance. The text was reviewed by appropriate agencies within the Department and by the Office of Management and Budget.

## Abbreviation and Acronym List

The following are abbreviations and acronyms used throughout this edition and recent editions of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*. (<sup>c</sup> = acronym used in this (current) edition; <sup>r</sup> = used in recent edition(s); <sup>b</sup> = used in both current and recent editions.)

ACRS	Asian Counseling and Referral Service <sup>(c)</sup>
AES	American Enterprise Systems <sup>(c)</sup>
AFDC	Aid to Families with Dependent Children <sup>(b)</sup>
ALMIS	America's Labor Market Information System <sup>(c)</sup>
AMS	Agricultural Mediation Service <sup>(c)</sup>
AODA	Alcohol and Other Drugs of Addiction <sup>(r)</sup>
AWW	Average Weekly Wage <sup>(c)</sup>
BAG	Basic Assistance Grant <sup>(r)</sup>
BAT	Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training <sup>(b)</sup>
BLS	Bureau of Labor Statistics <sup>(b)</sup>
BQC	Benefits Quality Control <sup>(b)</sup>
CAETA	Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance <sup>(r)</sup>
CASAS	Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System <sup>(c)</sup>
CBO	Community-Based Organization <sup>(c)</sup>
CDC	Community Development Corporation <sup>(c)</sup>
CDTI	Career Development Training Institute <sup>(c)</sup>
CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act <sup>(b)</sup>
CIDS	Career Information Delivery System <sup>(b)</sup>
CMI	Computer-Managed Instruction <sup>(r)</sup>
CPS	Center for Practical Solutions <sup>(c)</sup>
CY	Calendar Year <sup>(b)</sup>
DCA	Defense Conversion Adjustment <sup>(c)</sup>
DCAP	Defense Conversion Adjustment Program <sup>(b)</sup>
DDP	Defense Diversification Program <sup>(b)</sup>
DOD	U.S. Department of Defense <sup>(c)</sup>
DOT	<i>Dictionary of Occupational Titles</i> <sup>(b)</sup>
DUA	Disaster Unemployment Assistance <sup>(b)</sup>
EB	Extended Benefits <sup>(b)</sup>
Ecr	European Community <sup>(r)</sup>
EDWAA	Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance <sup>(b)</sup>
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity <sup>(b)</sup>
EER	Entered Employment Rate <sup>(c)</sup>
ENJSC	Employers' National Job Service Council <sup>(b)</sup>
ES	Employment Service <sup>(b)</sup>
ESA	Employment Standards Administration <sup>(r)</sup>
ESOP	Employee Stock Ownership Plan <sup>(c)</sup>
ETA	Employment and Training Administration <sup>(b)</sup>
EUC	Emergency Unemployment Compensation <sup>(b)</sup>
FCA	Federal Committee on Apprenticeship <sup>(b)</sup>

FCM	Friends of Children of Mississippi <sup>(c)</sup>
FUTA	Federal Unemployment Tax Act <sup>(c)</sup>
FY	Fiscal Year <sup>(b)</sup>
GATB	General Aptitude Test Battery <sup>(c)</sup>
GED	General Educational Development (also General Equivalency Degree) <sup>(b)</sup>
GM	General Motors <sup>(c)</sup>
GRASP	Greater Atlanta Small Business Project <sup>(c)</sup>
GSA	General Services Administration <sup>(r)</sup>
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services <sup>(r)</sup>
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development <sup>(b)</sup>
IAM	International Association of Machinists <sup>(c)</sup>
ICESA	Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies <sup>(c)</sup>
IDP	Immigrant Training Demonstration Project <sup>(c)</sup>
IEP	Individualized Education Plan <sup>(c)</sup>
IG	Inspector General <sup>(r)</sup>
IJB	Interstate Job Bank <sup>(r)</sup>
INA	Indian and Native American <sup>(b)</sup>
INRA	Immigration Nursing Relief Act <sup>(b)</sup>
INS	Immigration and Naturalization Service <sup>(r)</sup>
IRI	Integrated Resources Institute <sup>(c)</sup>
ITP	Individual Transition Plan <sup>(c)</sup>
IUR	Insured Unemployment Rate <sup>(c)</sup>
JOBS	Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program <sup>(b)</sup>
JSA	Job Search Assistance <sup>(c)</sup>
JSEC	Job Service Employer Committee <sup>(c)</sup>
JTHDP	Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program <sup>(b)</sup>
JTLS	Job Training Longitudinal Survey <sup>(r)</sup>
JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act <sup>(b)</sup>
JTQS	Job Training Quarterly Survey <sup>(r)</sup>
LEDC	Local Economic Development Corporation <sup>(c)</sup>
LMI	Labor Market Information <sup>(c)</sup>
MEGA	Muskegon Economic Growth Alliance <sup>(c)</sup>
MIS	Management Information System <sup>(c)</sup>
MSFW	Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker <sup>(c)</sup>
MTP	Manufacturing Technology Partnership <sup>(c)</sup>
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement <sup>(b)</sup>
NASTAD	National Association of State and Territorial Apprenticeship Directors <sup>(r)</sup>
NAWS	National Agricultural Workers Survey <sup>(c)</sup>
NCEP	National Commission for Employment Policy <sup>(b)</sup>
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology <sup>(b)</sup>
NJAS	National Job Analysis Study <sup>(c)</sup>
NJTC	New Jobs Tax Credit <sup>(c)</sup>
NOICC	National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee <sup>(b)</sup>
NSSB	National Skill Standards Board <sup>(c)</sup>

NSW	National Supported Work <sup>(r)</sup>
NTIS	National Technical Information Service <sup>(b)</sup>
NWAC	National Workforce Assistance Collaborative <sup>(c)</sup>
OIG	Office of the Inspector General <sup>(c)</sup>
OIS	Occupational Information System <sup>(r)</sup>
OJT	On-the-job training <sup>(b)</sup>
OLMID	Occupational Labor Market Information Database <sup>(c)</sup>
OMB	Office of Management and Budget <sup>(c)</sup>
OTI'	Office of Treatment Improvement (HHS) <sup>(r)</sup>
P&D	Pilot and Demonstration <sup>(r)</sup>
Pir	Program Improvement <sup>(r)</sup>
PIC	Private Industry Council <sup>(b)</sup>
P.L.	Public Law <sup>(b)</sup>
PMR	Performance Measurement Review <sup>(b)</sup>
PSID	Panel Survey of Income Dynamics <sup>(b)</sup>
PTS	Participant Tracking System <sup>(c)</sup>
PY	Program Year <sup>(b)</sup>
PYAP	Pennsylvania Youth Apprenticeship Program <sup>(c)</sup>
QA	Quality Appraisal <sup>(c)</sup>
QC	Quality Control <sup>(b)</sup>
RQC	Revenue Quality Control <sup>(b)</sup>
SCANS	Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills <sup>(b)</sup>
SCDB	Single Client Data Base <sup>(r)</sup>
SCSEP	Senior Community Service Employment Program <sup>(b)</sup>
SDA	Service Delivery Area <sup>(b)</sup>
SDSUF	San Diego State University Foundation <sup>(c)</sup>
SEID	Self-Employment Initiative Demonstration <sup>(c)</sup>
SESA	State Employment Security Agency <sup>(b)</sup>
SFSUF	San Francisco State University Foundation <sup>(c)</sup>
SJTCC	State Job Training Coordinating Council <sup>(b)</sup>
SOICC	State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee <sup>(b)</sup>
SSA	Substate Area <sup>(c)</sup>
SSO	Supportive Services Only <sup>(c)</sup>
SST	Social Skills Training <sup>(r)</sup>
STEP	Summer Training and Education Program <sup>(r)</sup>
STI	State Training Inventory <sup>(b)</sup>
SYETP	Summer Youth Employment and Training Program <sup>(b)</sup>
TAA	Trade Adjustment Assistance <sup>(b)</sup>
TAR	Training Achievement Record <sup>(r)</sup>
TJTC	Targeted Jobs Tax Credit <sup>(b)</sup>
TRA	Trade Readjustment Allowance <sup>(b)</sup>
TRSS	Training-Related Supportive Services <sup>(c)</sup>
TTRC	Training Technology Resource Center <sup>(c)</sup>
TUR	Total Unemployment Rate <sup>(c)</sup>
UAW	United Automobile Workers <sup>(c)</sup>
UCFE	Unemployment Compensation for Federal Civilian

	Employees <sup>(b)</sup>
UCX .....	Unemployment Compensation for Ex–servicemembers <sup>(b)</sup>
UI .....	Unemployment Insurance <sup>(b)</sup>
UIASA .....	Unemployment Insurance Automation Support Account <sup>(b)</sup>
UIS .....	Unemployment Insurance Service <sup>(c)</sup>
VJSST .....	Volunteer Job Specific Skills Training <sup>(c)</sup>
WARN .....	Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act <sup>(r)</sup>
WP/RS .....	Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services <sup>(c)</sup>
YFC .....	Youth Fair Chance <sup>(b)</sup>
YOU .....	Youth Opportunities Unlimited <sup>(r)</sup>
YRTAP .....	Youth Research and Technical Assistance Project <sup>(c)</sup>

# CHAPTER 1

# PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

# PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

## INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the programs operated by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) during Program Years 1993 and 1994 (July 1993 through June 1995) and Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (October 1993 through September 1995).<sup>1</sup> ETA oversees the Nation's major job training, employment, and unemployment compensation programs.

In addition to its ongoing programs, during the *Report* period, the Department also created One-Stop Career Center systems, undertook efforts to improve labor market information systems, started technical assistance and training initiatives to enhance the skills of its own workforce, and worked toward passage of legislation on and implementation of skill standards and school-to-work programs.

This introductory section reviews these projects, highlights other initiatives of the *Report* period, and reports on special Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) activities.

The remainder of the chapter provides information about specific programs for which ETA is responsible: JTPA programs, Apprenticeship, the Senior Community

---

<sup>1</sup>The activities covered in Chapter 1 that operate on a program year (PY) basis are Job Training Partnership Act programs, the Senior Community Service Employment Program, some aspects of the Employment Service, the National Commission for Employment Policy, and the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee. All others operate on a fiscal year (FY) basis.

Service Employment Program, the Employment Service, Unemployment Insurance, Trade Adjustment Assistance, NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance, Incumbent Worker Training, and the Labor Surplus Areas Program. It also summarizes the activities of two independent Federal organizations responsible for employment-related activities—the National Commission for Employment Policy and the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee.

## **One-Stop Career Center Systems and Labor-Market Information Initiatives**

During the *Report* period, the Department further developed One-Stop Career Center Systems. In supporting the “one-stop” concept, the Department established a One-Stop/Labor Market Information team to help improve employment and training opportunities for the American public.

### **One-Stop Career Center Systems**

A common frustration among jobseekers and employers has been the difficulty of finding adequate information about available training and employment programs. Often, jobseekers must go from one place to another to receive needed information and services.

The Department took steps during the *Report* period to address this problem. It established One-Stop Career Centers—helping to ensure that U.S. workers have access to the education, training, and information they need to succeed in today’s demanding labor market. The Centers bring together an array of employment and training programs, turning them into an integrated service delivery system for jobseekers and employers alike.

Although One-Stop Centers may take many forms, they all offer the following services:

- Information on a full array of employment-related services, including

information about local education and training service providers.

- Assistance in filing initial claims for unemployment insurance and in evaluating eligibility for any job training and education programs, including availability of student financial aid.
- Preliminary assessment of skill levels, aptitudes, abilities, and support service needs (which may include individual and/or group counseling).
- Self-help information relating to career exploration and the skill requirements of various occupations; career planning information; job vacancy announcements and listings; job search (including resume writing) assistance; job recruitment, referral, and job placement services.

The One-Stop Career Center System is built on the following principles: (1) universality—accessibility to all job-seekers of a wide array of jobseeking and employment services; (2) customer choice—employers and jobseekers have choices in where and how they get information and services; (3) integration—a seamless approach which requires integration of programs and services at the State and local levels; and (4) performance driven, outcome-based measures—Career Centers must have clear expectations, such as job placements, and consequences for failing to meet them.

PY 1993 activities were devoted to research and development efforts in this area. A case study analysis was conducted of 10 Private Industry Council-sponsored Centers operating from June 1993 to December 1994.<sup>2</sup>

Several One-Stop Career Center Systems began operating in October 1994, as six States—Connecticut, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Texas, and Wisconsin—received grants totaling \$21.5 million for the One-Stop system and \$7 million for labor market information systems. In January 1995, the Department announced that three more States—Indiana, Minnesota, and Ohio—would receive over \$15 million for implementation activities. In addition, 19 States received \$4.9 million on October 1994

---

<sup>2</sup> For additional information, see “Job Training 2000 Projects” and “Evaluation of the Job Training 2000 One-Stop Career Centers Demonstration” under Pilot and Demonstration Programs in the JTPA section of this chapter.

for One-Stop Career Center planning and development, and 10 grants totaling \$3.7 million were awarded to local communities in recognition and support of their innovative work in making the One-Stop system a reality.

The Department expects to offer One-Stop system planning and development grants to all of the remaining States and territories.

### **America's Labor Market Information System (ALMIS)**

In order to ensure that current and future workers know about different labor markets and available job openings throughout the Nation, ETA and the Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) reviewed the available labor market information and systems in the United States. Begun in late PY 1993, the review was done in cooperation with the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies (ICESA), the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC)<sup>3</sup>, and others. It found significant gaps in the information available that would allow jobseekers, workers, employers, and others to fully understand local labor markets and make informed career decisions.

The LMI team then developed a series of recommendations to fill those gaps and to create a comprehensive system of State and local labor market information—known as America's Labor Market Information System.

In PY 1994, to further the team's recommendations, the Department:

- Provided grants to all States to build their LMI capacity and to create a set of core products and services.
- Supported the creation of research and development consortia to provide the intellectual and research base for core products and services in the future and to

---

<sup>3</sup>The National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) is an independent Federal interagency committee authorized by JTPA and the Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. More information about NOICC may be found in the last section of this chapter.

transfer best practices from State to State. The research topics and lead States are: (1) Wage Records as an LMI Tool (Maryland); (2) Short-term Forecasts (Illinois); (3) Long-term Projections (Nevada); (4) Standard Wage Information (Rhode Island and Alaska); (5) LMI Institute (South Carolina); (6) Employer Database (Maine); and (7) Consumer Reports (Texas).

□ Supported the creation/expansion of a job/talent bank network. Investments are being made in three types of improvements for the current labor exchange operated by the Employment Service around the country: (1) making America's Job Bank and various State job banks accessible via the Internet and improving access and ease of search for these job banks; (2) creating, probably in partnership with the newspapers, electronically searchable want ads; and (3) creating a nationwide network of "talent banks."

□ Provided support for the LMI infrastructure within the "One-Stop" implementation States, primarily to build the delivery technology to make information available to the One-Stop customers (both those in the Centers and those in remote locations).

The One-Stop/LMI team is building a framework within which States and local entities have the flexibility to design One-Stop Centers that are customized to their particular needs, while incorporating four broad principles that characterize the National system: universal access, customer choice, integration of services, and outcome-based standards of performance.

## **Improving the Nation's Employment and Training System**

During the *Report* period, the Department emphasized staff training within the employment and training system, recognizing the importance of building its own high-skilled workforce to deliver services for the Nation's jobseekers.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>The JTPA Amendments of 1992, which went into effect at the beginning of PY 1993, created a national training and technical assistance initiative. Intended to focus

The emergence of the One-Stop Career Center systems, restructuring of services to dislocated workers, welfare reform, and the new strategies for helping youth make the transition from school to work placed new demands on agencies, managers, and professionals who administer and provide employment and training services. Further demands on staff are expected as Congress revisits the roles and responsibilities of the national workforce development system.

The Department is working with its National, State, and local partners to build a learning network to help them effectively respond to the changing requirements of the workforce development system and its customers.

Among the activities initiated as part of the training and technical assistance effort during the *Report* period were the following.

- A Panel of Experts, including 34 National, State, and local partners from all major sectors of the employment and training system, was convened to guide and oversee training and technical assistance efforts. Among the programs and initiatives represented are JTPA Titles II and III, the Enterprise Council, the Employment Service, One-Stop Centers, and Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) initiatives.
- A survey of staff was conducted to identify training, technical assistance, and other needs of frontline staff.
- Partners are working together to define the core skills, knowledge, and abilities needed by training and employment staff in order to identify common functions and to develop training curricula in related subject areas. Partners are also working together to identify and validate program models, training, and other resources.
- Two of the Department's regional offices are piloting peer-to-peer projects that will help build a framework and design tools that professionals in the system can

---

primarily on Title II-A activities, the initiative has since expanded to become an integrated, coordinated, systemwide effort. (See the JTPA section of this Chapter for more information about the amendments.)

use to help each other.

- Two other regional offices have joined together to develop quality improvement tools and techniques to help local and State agencies implement systems that enhance customer satisfaction and continuously improve service quality.

- Ten States are developing or improving cross-agency training delivery systems, innovative and replicable program models, and broadly applicable training products.

- State Training Institutes are working with the Department to enhance State and local staff development training design and delivery and to bring their knowledge and expertise into developing a National training and technical assistance strategy.

- Training sessions, materials, and tools are being delivered to address technical assistance needs in various program areas.

- New technology is being used to electronically share information and transfer learning, including the use of an Electronic Service Center and World-Wide Web.

(See the JTPA section of this Chapter for additional information on technical assistance and training efforts and “challenge grants” awarded by the Department.)

## **Skill Standards and Certification**

Since the early 1990s, the Department has worked to develop a national system of voluntary skill standards and certification. This voluntary system was designed to increase the return on public and private investments in education and training by: (1) improving the match between skills needed in the workplace and the skills imparted through education and training; (2) enhancing economic competitiveness; (3) increasing productivity; and (4) facilitating the transition of American business to high performance work organizations.

During the *Report* period, the Department continued its efforts in this area by overseeing the operation of the National Skill Standards Board, funding and providing technical assistance to several new demonstration projects, and by supporting a

number of related activities which are described below.

## **National Skill Standards Board**

In March 1994, Congress passed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act which established a national framework of voluntary skill standards to be administered by a National Skill Standards Board. The Board identifies broad clusters of major occupations that involve one or more industries, and endorses standards, assessment, maintenance, and certification systems. The legislation also requires the Board to work closely with the National Education Standards and Improvement Council to coordinate the development of skill standards with the development of voluntary national content standards.

The Board is composed of 28 members. Twelve are selected by the President, six are selected by the Speaker of the House (based on recommendations by both Majority and Minority Leaders), and six are selected by the President pro tempore of the Senate (also based on recommendations by the Majority and Minority Leaders). Four ex-officio, nonvoting members (the Secretaries of Labor, Education, and Commerce and the Chair of the National Education Standards and Improvement Council) are also represented. Voting members include:

- Eight business persons nominated by business and trade associations;
- Eight organized labor persons nominated by recognized national labor federations;
- Two human resource professionals to be “neutral agents;” and
- Six persons, with at least one from each of the following groups: educational institutions (including vocational education); community-based organizations; State and local governments; and nongovernmental civil rights organizations.

In PY 1994, 27 of the 28 Board members and the executive director were appointed. The Board met in April and June of 1995. Topics discussed ranged from

Wisconsin's youth apprenticeship activities to foreign experience with skill standards systems.

## **Demonstration Programs**

In an effort to build on its previous workforce development efforts, the Department funded six demonstration projects in late PY 1992 and developed a team of individuals from different sections of ETA to work with the projects and advance the idea of voluntary national skill standards. An additional 16 projects were funded by the U.S. Department of Education.

The grants were issued to six trade associations or combined industry association foundations to: (1) convene a coalition of industry partners; (2) select occupational areas for standards development; and (3) to develop and implement voluntary industry skill standards and certification systems. These projects were operated by the American Electronics Association; the Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education; the National Electrical Contractors Association; the National Tooling and Machining Association; the National Retail Federation; and the Uniform and Textile Service Association.

Each project demonstrated an approach for developing, implementing, and gaining industry acceptance for skill standards and certification in the United States. Seven phases were suggested for each project:

- Establish a coalition of industry partners;
- Identify occupations that are appropriate for skill standards development;
- Develop and validate skills standards within industries for these occupations;
- Identify appropriate training delivery mechanisms and processes;
- Develop and validate assessments to demonstrate mastery of skill standards;
- Establish certification to recognize the achievement of skill standards; and
- Establish implementation and marketing strategies for the adoption of skill standards.

The Department's skill standards team worked with several contractors who provided technical assistance to the projects and to the Department through written material and two meetings for the project directors.

To provide technical assistance to the projects, the Institute for Educational Leadership organized a roundtable discussion on assessment and credentialing at the Department in March 1994. Several guiding principles for an ideal assessment system were identified. These include:

- The system should be standards-based;
- It should be jointly developed by industry representatives and educators;
- It should include a variety of assessment tasks;
- The system should have performance-based assessments;
- It should include technical quality as a primary consideration; and
- The system should include equity and legal defensibility.

Participants developed a preferred definition of skill standards.<sup>5</sup> The roundtable also addressed ways to categorize the different areas of skills and knowledge to be assessed—including the preferred model of knowledge, occupational skills, basic skills, and cross-functional skills; the importance of conducting a needs analysis among the stakeholder groups to determine how to encourage their participation in the programs; and the development of plans to establish viability and financing requirements.

In PY 1993, the projects focused on the first four phases listed above. In PY 1994, five of the projects released their standards.

### **Business/Trade Association Initiative**

In promoting the adoption of high-performance workplaces, the Department's

---

<sup>5</sup>That definition is: "A competency unit which includes a description of work for which the standard applies; a listing of the essential knowledge and skills that are critical to the work segment; a listing of the essential tools and equipment that are critical to the work segment, if applicable; and the criteria used to measure competency in performing the work segment."

Office of the American Workplace's Business/Trade Association Initiative formed partnership agreements with three Skill Standards Pilot Projects—the American Electronics Association; the Council of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education; and the National Retail Federation. The agreements outline a number of initiatives that will further the understanding and dissemination of high-performance concepts to diverse industry audiences.

### **National Youth Apprenticeship Program**

The National Retail Federation and the Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education are sharing their skill standards experience with McDonald's Corporation for a program designed to help shape the skills and competencies of young people entering the consumer service industry.

The program, known as the National Youth Apprenticeship Program, will implement a comprehensive career development training system in business management at participating schools and the McDonald's Corporation. The Department's Employment and Training Administration is providing \$300,000 for the effort, which will feature comprehensive preemployment training, ongoing employee training, and a performance/skill standards and certification system that establishes career paths within McDonald's and other participating retail corporations.

The funding is being used for a national advisory group, refinement of youth apprenticeship and student mentoring efforts, development of a workplace skills certificate, program development for at-risk youth, project evaluation, and information dissemination.

### **WorkPlus**

During the *Report* period, the Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education, the National Retail Federation, and the National Grocers Association agreed to work with a new program known as "WorkPlus" in an effort to pilot test the application

of their standards through a portable “Preliminary National Service Credential.” Public/Private Ventures, a Philadelphia-based organization, is pilot testing the new education and training program designed to better meet the needs of both employers and young workers.

WorkPlus is intended to increase the productivity of entry-level hospitality, food service, and retail workers by taking into consideration the natural tendency of young workers to explore occupations by changing jobs frequently. It rotates participants after several months to another job, sometimes with different employers, thus offering young workers a variety of experiences, while allowing them to build credentials for additional skills.

### **Information Dissemination**

The Department's Training Technology Resource Center (TTRC) worked on ways to allow businesses and educators to have electronic access to information about skill standards. TTRC manages databases on such workforce development issues as workplace reorganization, exemplary training programs, emerging training technologies, and related policy issues. Housed in ETA, TTRC manages an on-line information system that serves as a central repository on workforce development issues.<sup>6</sup>

### **School-To-Work Opportunities**

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-239), enacted in May 1994 and jointly administered by the Departments of Education and Labor, paves the way for a new approach to learning in America. Through this Act, States and localities are building school-to-work systems that prepare young people for further education and careers in high-skill, high-wage jobs.

---

<sup>6</sup>For additional information, call (800) 488-0901.

The School-to-Work initiative is based on the concept that education for all students can be made more relevant and useful to future careers and lifelong learning. Students apply what they learn to real life, real work situations.

Developed with the input of business, education, labor, and community-based organizations that have a strong interest in how students prepare for the workplace of the next century, the effort to create a national school-to-work system contains three fundamental elements:

- *Work-based learning.* Employers provide structured learning experiences for students that develop broad, transferable skills. Work-based learning provides students with opportunities to study complex subject matter and obtain workplace skills in a hands-on “real life” environment.
- *School-based learning.* School-to-Work programs restructure the educational experience so that students learn rigorous academics through career applications. Teachers work closely with employers to develop broad-based curricula that help students understand and expand on the lessons of their work experience. Students develop projects and work in teams, much like the modern workplace.
- *Connecting activities.* Connecting activities ensure the coordination of the work-and school-based learning components of a School-to-Work system. Activities may include matching students with the work-based learning opportunities of employers, linking participants with other community services necessary to assure a successful transition from school to work, and increasing opportunities for minorities, women, and people with disabilities.

While the School-to-Work Opportunities Act was being considered in Congress, the Administration used existing Federal authority and funds to begin the initiative and further State and local school-to-work partnerships nationwide. In early 1994, all 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia received State Development Grants to design plans for implementing comprehensive statewide School-to-Work Opportunities systems.

In July 1994, eight States received Implementation Grants totaling \$43 million to

put in place or expand their school-to-work opportunities systems. Subject to appropriations, the grants are renewable for five years. In addition, 15 local school-to-work partnerships were funded competitively for approximately \$10 million in August 1994. In November 1994, 21 partnerships in urban and rural, high-poverty areas received competitive grants for local school-to-work opportunities initiatives totaling \$10 million. In June 1995, nine School-to-Work Opportunities Grants for Indian Youth were awarded to partnerships including schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Also, development grants were awarded to the seven insular territories with PY 95 funds.

In December 1994, the President and 18 chief executive officers of major corporations announced the creation of the National Employer Leadership Council. Members of the Council help implement school-to-work programs throughout their companies and encourage suppliers and other companies to create their own school-to-work programs. Members of large and small businesses are represented on the Council.

In January 1995, the Departments of Labor and Education jointly opened the National School-to-Work Opportunities Office. The Office worked with the States to develop a Glossary of Terms to ensure that data used for evaluating programs funded by the Departments are comparable. The Office also worked with States to develop and refine an initial set of performance measures to determine States' progress in establishing high-quality school-to-work opportunity systems.

In June of 1995, the National School-to-Work Learning and Information Center was established. The Center is housed in, and managed by, the National School-to-Work Office. The main tasks of the Learning Center are to provide technical assistance and to disseminate information to School-to-Work grantees as well as the general public. One of the unique features of the Center is the establishment of technical assistance "lines of credit" for State Implementation Grantees. This mechanism allows States to select from a bank of certified technical assistance providers and use their line of credit to finance the services. These experts are assisting States to refine key aspects of system-building, such as curriculum development and creating career majors.

A National School-to-Work Advisory Board was established in 1995 to examine what is working and what is not working in school-to-work. It also provides advice on national policy directions in the school-to-work area. The Board, appointed early in PY 1995, is also evaluating the effectiveness of the Federal Government's investments in furthering the School-To-Work Opportunity System. The 40-member board had its first meeting in March 1996.

The Department also developed a marketing plan for School-to-Work late in PY 1994. The plan included a series of print and electronic advertisements. A television special, entitled "JOBS: The Class of 2000" was developed through a grant with a Pittsburgh-based PBS station. The show is scheduled to air in September 1996. A Speaker's Kit, which includes speaking tips, model speeches on school-to-work, and appropriate overheads, was produced and made available to selected employer, labor, and education representatives. These "School-to-Work Ambassadors" raise public awareness about the benefits of school-to-work systems. A media guide, completed in the fall of 1995, helps local organizations get their school-to-work initiatives featured in the news.

A range of technical assistance conferences, involving all grantees at the State and local levels, were held in the *Report* period. The conferences allowed participants to share promising practices and to discuss the effectiveness of various policies. Meetings were also held with employer, labor, and community organization stakeholders to solicit their views and to share information. "Bidders conferences" for partnerships interested in applying for upcoming 1995 School-to-Work Opportunities Grants were planned for the fall of 1995.

In PY 1995, 19 additional State Implementation grants in the amount of \$74 million were awarded. During the same period, 37 Local Partnership Grants in the amount of \$20 million were awarded. Up to 35 Urban/Rural Opportunities Grants in the amount of \$17 million will also be awarded in PY 1995.

## **Other Project Highlights**

During the *Report* period, the Department undertook a number of initiatives to improve the employment and training system. It held a conference and published a study on what works best in job training. The Department also initiated the Enterprise Project to promote quality management of dislocated worker programs, awarded a grant to promote customer choice for dislocated workers, conducted a survey on employer-provided training, and undertook a nationwide assessment of skills required for the high-performance workplace.

### **What is Working in Employment and Training**

The Department engaged in a number of activities to determine the most effective ways of serving the Nation's jobseekers. Focusing on what works best in employment and training programs, the Department held a national workforce conference in 1994 and issued a comprehensive review of literature on the topic in 1995.

**Conference on Building a Reemployment System.** The Secretary of Labor served as panel moderator at a day-long conference on "Building the Reemployment System: What's Working," held in the District of Columbia in February 1994. Over 300 business, community, and labor leaders, together with elected officials, consumers, and employment and training experts, gathered to learn what works best in helping unemployed and dislocated workers move back into the workforce. The President served as a panelist in one session, along with program operators and participants. Representatives from successful training programs in 13 cities presented their experiences to attendees.<sup>7</sup> Each of the programs encompassed at least one of several features, such as customer focus, universal access, one-stop delivery, comprehensive

---

<sup>7</sup>The cities were: Detroit, Michigan.; Sunnyvale and San Jose, California; Louisville, Kentucky; Bangor, Maine; Seattle, Washington; San Antonio, Texas; Minneapolis, Minnesota; Englewood, Colorado; New York, New York; Boston, Massachusetts; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Davenport, Iowa.

services, innovative use of technology, and training linked to jobs.<sup>8</sup>

**Publication on “What is Working.”** In January 1995, the Department released a report entitled: *What’s Working (and What’s Not): A Review of Evidence of the Economic Impacts of Employment and Training Programs* . A comprehensive review of the literature on the results of education and training efforts, the report includes the following:

- There is now overwhelming evidence that long-term postsecondary training produces positive impacts for those who need new skills.
- Short-term training, especially for disadvantaged youth, has a mixed record of success.
- Government training for disadvantaged adults produces positive impacts and is often a cost-effective investment for society. However, training alone is often not sufficient to lift disadvantaged adults out of poverty.
- The government’s major long-term training program for disadvantaged youth—the Job Corps—appears to produce benefits for participants and society.
- Job search assistance has produced positive impacts for most of the populations for whom it has been tried, and is a highly cost-effective investment for government.

### **Serving Dislocated Workers: The Enterprise Project**

In PY 1993, the Department initiated a major effort to improve customer service and satisfaction in dislocated worker programs. A “national customer satisfaction

---

<sup>8</sup>These elements were the key features of the Administration’s workforce security initiative, the Reemployment Act of 1994. Designed to make the national employment system more accessible and responsive to all Americans seeking new or better jobs, the legislation was presented to Congress in March 1994. The Department provided staff work on the legislation, which focused on increased choice, training and employment system integration, providing market-driven training programs, and accountability.

survey,” completed in December 1993, revealed that 57 percent of the dislocated workers who received services under JTPA's Title III rated the program as “extremely” or “quite helpful.”

As part of this effort, the Department began the “Enterprise Project” to promote and enhance the quality of all dislocated worker programs. The “Enterprise” is a network of organizations that emphasize high-quality, customer-focused services, using successful process management techniques from the private sector.

During the *Report* period, the Enterprise Council was appointed to serve as the focal point for system-wide improvements. The Council—a group of local, State and Federal officials broadly representative of the job training system—determined that if a job training organization is to be accepted as an Enterprise member, it must meet the following standards:

- Achieve a rating of 75 percent on a standard customer satisfaction survey administered by an independent research firm;
- Achieve superior performance as measured by an 80 percent entered employment rate in substate formula programs, and meet or exceed the employment standard for Governor's reserve and national discretionary projects; and
- Demonstrate a commitment to continuous improvement through responses to questions in ten critical quality management dimensions.

Over 200 dislocated worker organizations indicated their commitment to learning more about customer satisfaction and quality systems. The Department provided training to these organizations to help them qualify for Enterprise Membership.

In PY 1994, dislocated worker organizations from around the country took part in a three-step application process to become Enterprise Members. Organizations selected for membership attended "The Enterprise Launch" conference, held in Washington, D.C. in July 1995, where they received training from nationally recognized experts on quality management in both the public and private sectors.

## **Promoting Customer Choice for Dislocated Workers**

In March 1995, the Department awarded California \$18 million—the largest single dislocated worker grant ever—to help nearly 5,000 southern California aerospace workers who lost their jobs. The grant marked the first time dislocated workers anywhere in the United States could have access to training and reemployment services through a voucher system. Instead of being eligible for service in only one location, workers used the vouchers as training tickets at any of the 14 Service Delivery Areas in and around Los Angeles. Introducing the element of customer choice, the grant ensured that workers had easy access to job placement services, career counseling, and if necessary, skills training needed to find another job.

## **Training Survey**

The “1993 Survey of Employer-Provided Training” was conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for ETA. Results showed that most employers make some type of formal training available to their employees, but many offer training that is unrelated to specific job skills, such as general orientation or safety training. Less than half of all U.S. employers offer their workers formal job skills training to improve productivity and increase wages.

As defined by BLS, formal training has a structured format and a defined curriculum, and may be conducted by supervisors, company training centers, businesses, schools, associations, or others. It may include classroom work, seminars, lectures, workshops and audio-visual presentations. The survey measured six types of formal training—orientation sessions, safety and health instruction, apprenticeship training, basic skills training (reading and math), job skills training, and workplace-related training.

## **Study of Job Skills and High Performance**

In December 1994, the Department began the first nationwide assessment of skills required for the “high-performance workplace”<sup>9</sup> by surveying approximately 18,000 employees in the country's largest and fastest growing occupations.

The National Job Analysis Study assessed both generic skills (which cut across occupational and industry lines) and those which directly relate to high-performance workplaces. The 164 occupations reviewed employ approximately 92 million workers across the country. The study is intended to help educators and trainers as they redefine skill requirements for occupations, set skill standards, develop training programs, and design school curricula linking education to the world of work. The study is designed to help employers and employees make the transition to high-performance workplaces and enable industries to set world-class skill standards.

## **Special JTPA Initiatives**

Along with implementing changes called for by the JTPA Reform Amendments that went into effect at the beginning of this *Report* period, the Department engaged in a number of special JTPA initiatives to improve programs and to respond to a series of national emergencies.

### **National Dialogue on Improving Job Training Services**

The Department sponsored a nationwide series of meetings to explore ways to improve and strengthen job training programs for economically disadvantaged citizens. Fifteen small group discussions and five “town hall” meetings were held in June and

---

<sup>9</sup>High performance workplaces invest heavily in training and continuous learning, equip workers with the education and skills they need to affect products and services, and encourage workers to become problem solvers, self-managers, and entrepreneurs.

July 1994. The events gave Department officials and others an opportunity to learn from program participants, program graduates, employers, program operators, policymakers, labor representatives, and community leaders involved in JTPA and other human service programs.

## **Emergency Grants**

JTPA funds were used by the Federal Government to respond to a number of emergencies during the *Report* period.

**Flood Relief.** In PY 1993, eight Midwest States—Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Nebraska—received funding to create jobs for workers displaced by massive flooding and to help with flood recovery in the summer of 1993. Similar funding was awarded to the States of Georgia (in 1994) and California (in 1995) for their flood recovery efforts.

**Earthquake Aid.** California received funding in January 1994 to help its residents recover from the devastation suffered by the earthquake that struck the Los Angeles area. The funding provided temporary jobs to dislocated workers and helped support clean-up and recovery efforts.

**Oklahoma City Bombing.** In May 1995, the Department provided an emergency grant to create temporary jobs to help clean up and restore public facilities and lands damaged in the bombing of the Oklahoma City Federal Building. Workers hired under the grant participated in recovery efforts provided by organizations such as the Oklahoma County Office of Emergency Management, American Red Cross, and the Salvation Army.

## **JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT PROGRAMS**

### **JTPA Overview**

Since the Job Training Partnership Act's implementation in 1983, its programs have prepared millions of economically disadvantaged adults and youth, workers who have lost their jobs because of plant closings or mass layoffs, and special populations, such as Native Americans and migrant workers, to obtain the training and other help needed to succeed in the labor market.

Under JTPA, businesses, educators, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, welfare agencies, community-based organizations, economic development agencies, and local Employment Service offices work together to identify current and future workforce needs, ensure that quality training is provided for eligible clients, and help place clients in private sector jobs.<sup>10</sup> For the most part, JTPA programs are managed by State and local governments, although some programs authorized under Title IV are funded directly by the Department of Labor and administered by local organizations.

The Department's role in the JTPA system includes setting broad program policy, allocating funds to the States, prescribing standards for the program's overall performance, monitoring and auditing State and local activities to ensure program and fiscal integrity, providing technical assistance to policymakers and program operators, evaluating the effectiveness of JTPA programs, supporting training and employment-

---

<sup>10</sup> Job training services under Titles II-A, II-B, and II-C are delivered through the following administrative structures: (1) State Job Training Coordinating Councils (SJTCCs) which provide advice to Governors on training activities and recommend the designation of Service Delivery Areas (the geographical boundaries for administering JTPA services). Governors appoint members to the Councils who represent business, State legislatures, State agencies, local government, educational agencies, labor, community-based organizations, and the general public; (2) Private Industry Councils (PICs), which are established by local elected officials in each Service Delivery Area to guide and oversee the development and operation of job training programs. PIC membership generally includes representatives from business, educational agencies, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, welfare agencies, community-based organizations, economic development agencies, and the Employment Service. In order to ensure that JTPA clients are trained for jobs that currently exist and that will continue to exist in the years ahead, most PIC members represent business and industry within a particular Service Delivery Area. The PIC chairperson is also a local business representative.

related research and demonstration projects, and directly administering some programs that serve special population groups.

A number of important changes took place in the training and employment field during Program Years 1993 and 1994.

First, in response to the JTPA Amendments of 1992 (P.L. 102-367), program managers and operators further concentrated their efforts on serving “hard-to-serve” clients—individuals who face serious and multiple barriers to employment.<sup>11</sup>

Second, the “one-stop” career center concept was developed, refined, implemented, and studied<sup>12</sup> in an effort to better meet the needs of a diverse set of clients—from individuals looking for new jobs and workers seeking to enter or reenter the labor market to clients seeking to upgrade their existing skills.

Third, the Department continued its efforts to restructure services to “dislocated” workers (individuals who have lost their jobs because of plant closures or major layoffs) because their skills may be not be adequate for today’s jobs.<sup>13</sup> Also during the period,

---

<sup>11</sup>The Amendments were signed on September 7, 1992 and took effect July 1, 1993. They target JTPA programs to those seriously in need or at risk of failure in the labor market; improve the quality of JTPA services through participant assessment and the development of individual service strategies; institute new, rigorous fiscal and procurement controls in order to strengthen program accountability; establish a separate year-round youth program (Title II-C); create a new national capacity-building and replication program to improve program quality and the skills of staff who administer and deliver JTPA services; and authorize the creation of State Human Resource Investment Councils to help Governors plan and oversee coherent statewide systems of vocational education and training.

<sup>12</sup>For more information about One-Stop Career Center Systems, see Dale W. Berry and Mona A. Feldman, *Evaluation of One-Stop Career Center Demonstration Projects* (Arlington, Va.: TvT Associates, 1995) and Mona A. Feldman and Dale W. Berry, *A Guide for Planning and Operating One-Stop Career Centers* (Arlington, Va.: TvT Associates, 1995). These two publications are summarized in Chapter 2 of this Report.

<sup>13</sup>For information about initiatives that serve dislocated workers, see David Drury, Stephen Walsh, and Marlene Strong, *Evaluation of the EDWAA Job Creation*

the Department developed new strategies to help young people and worked to build the capacity of the Nation's training and employment system to deliver quality JTPA services.

The Department's efforts to better meet the training and employment needs of economically disadvantaged individuals are briefly highlighted below.

### **Technical Assistance and Training**

One of the many changes brought about by the JTPA Amendments was the creation of a national initiative to improve the quality of JTPA programs by upgrading the skills of staff who design, manage, and deliver JTPA services.

Throughout Program Years 1993 and 1994, the Department was engaged in a multi-tiered, highly collaborative technical assistance and training effort which emphasized new training curricula, and encouraged the sharing of best practices

---

*Demonstration* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates, 1994) and Katherine Dickinson, et al., *A Guide to Well-Developed Services For Dislocated Workers* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates; Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates; and Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, 1994). These two publications are summarized in Chapter 2 of this *Report*. In addition to the EDWAA job creation demonstration, the Department of Labor designed and implemented a new initiative aimed at easing the transition to new employment of individuals who have been adversely affected by cutbacks in defense spending. The National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 allocated \$150 million to the Department of Labor to operate the Defense Conversion Adjustment (DCA) Program, which is administered under Section 325 of Title III of JTPA. Twelve DCA demonstration grants were awarded in November 1992 (with a total of about \$5 million in funding) and seven additional grants (with a total of about \$3.4 million in funding) were awarded in November 1993. These projects were funded to design and implement innovative approaches that were not otherwise found in standard JTPA Title III or defense conversion activities supported by other funding sources. For more information about the DCA demonstration effort, see Mary G. Visher and Deborah Kogan, *Evaluation of the Defense Conversion Adjustment Demonstration: Interim Report on Implementation* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates, 1994) which is summarized in Chapter 2 of this *Report*.

throughout the JTPA system. In support of these efforts, the Department awarded ten “challenge grants” to further support projects that featured innovative training techniques and effective program models.<sup>14</sup>

The technical assistance and training effort also encouraged the development of quality systems, tools, and techniques to measure program improvement. The Department provided numerous learning opportunities during the *Report* period (conferences, training seminars, and technical assistance guides), and introduced and promoted new technologies (e.g., computer-based learning and communication resources) to better share program information.

---

<sup>14</sup>The grant recipients were as follows: (1) Indiana received \$125,000 to assess existing staff competencies, develop a database of staff competencies, establish learning objectives to improve staff competencies, and to train “peer” trainers to help local agencies meet their training needs; (2) Maryland received \$125,000 to support an effort of the Maryland Institute for Employment and Training Professionals to develop curricula for 13 separate courses and seminars for frontline training and employment staff in the field of program planning and design; (3) Massachusetts received \$125,000 to conduct a statewide needs assessment for frontline staff and to manage a strategy that includes interagency mentoring and training. Regional resource libraries will also be established for use by training and employment agency staff; (4) Michigan received \$125,000 to create an interagency capacity-building team to oversee the development of new staff training curricula based on customer feedback from employers and job seekers; (5) Missouri received \$125,000 for the Missouri Training Institute to develop a professional certificate program as part of a five-year staff training and technical assistance program. The Missouri grant also supports the development of new training delivery techniques, new training curricula based on generic task analysis, and the development of techniques for measuring the effectiveness of staff training; (6) Montana received \$115,000 to develop a State Interagency Capacity Building System; (7) New York received \$73,680 to provide team-building training to the interagency staff at two One-Stop Service Centers; (8) Oregon received \$125,000 to develop materials and deliver training on the role of labor market information in career decision-making; (9) South Carolina received \$106,920 to produce CD-ROM-based training modules on improved career decision making skills, to purchase equipment needed to establish interactive teleconferencing capabilities in eight local Job Service offices, and to develop customer feedback techniques; and (10) Vermont received \$95,622 to hire a training coordinator and to develop a computer-based training system.

## Dialogue on the Disadvantaged

During PY 1994, the Department carried out a system-wide dialogue to examine new directions that would lead to improved job training and employment preparation for economically disadvantaged individuals—the majority of JTPA clients. Discussions were held with JTPA partners at 15 locations across the country. These partners included program administrators, operators and staff, JTPA clients and prospective clients, employers, local elected officials, community leaders, and citizens with an interest in training and employment services and workforce preparation.

The dialogue was designed to help achieve a broad consensus among JTPA system partners on goals, overall strategy, and next steps for improving programs and services for economically disadvantaged individuals.

Through the numerous discussions, the Department learned that participants considered programs serving the economically disadvantaged to be essential, that the JTPA system could be improved, and that there were effective models around the country that met the needs of JTPA participants and local businesses.

Based on these discussions, the Department created an action agenda which was integrated with its existing goals and work plans. The Department's major objectives were to:

- Improve the connection between training and work;
- Better meet the needs of JTPA clients—both employers and participants;
- Streamline program administration;
- Improve the quality of client information and client access to such information;
- Strengthen linkages among the various programs and services;
- Build system and staff capacity; and
- Provide early and comprehensive training, education, employment, and other interventions that meet the needs of disadvantaged youth.

## Adult Programs, Title II-A

---

As a result of the JTPA Amendments of 1992, services for out-of-school youth, which were formerly provided under Title II-A, were offered under a new Title II-C beginning in PY 1993. Because the data on the number and characteristics of Title II-A participants in this section of the *Report* refer to *adults* only (22 years old and older), they are not necessarily comparable to prior year data (which included youth now served under the new Title II-C).

Likewise, Title II-A expenditures for PY 1993 and PY 1994 appear considerably less than previous years. Because the JTPA amendments authorized a new Title II-C for year-round services for youth (who were formerly served under Title II-A), a significant amount of funds that had been used in Title II-A to serve youth before 1993 was shifted in PY 1993 and subsequent years to the new Title II-C. Title II-C expenditures for PY 1993 were slightly less than \$554,000,000.

### Background

Title II-A is JTPA's basic program for economically disadvantaged adults, and other adults who face significant employment barriers.

Eligibility is limited to individuals ages 22 and older who have, or are a member of a family that has, a total family income that, in relation to family size, was less than the higher of either: (1) the official poverty line as defined by the Office of Management and Budget; or (2) 70 percent of the lower living standard income level.

At least 65 percent of Title II-A participants must fall into one or more of the

following “hard-to-serve” categories <sup>15</sup>: (1) people who are deficient in basic skills; (2) school dropouts; (3) people who receive cash welfare payments<sup>16</sup>; (4) offenders; (5) people with disabilities; or (6) homeless individuals.

Title II-A participants may receive direct training and training-related and supportive services. Direct services may include basic skills training (including remedial education, literacy training, and English-as-a-second language instruction); institutional skill training; on-the-job training; skill level and service needs assessment; job and career counseling; case management services; education-to-work transition services; programs that combine workplace training and related instruction; work experience; advanced career training combining on-the-job training and institutional training; training programs operated by labor organizations or private sector employers; skill upgrading and retraining; bilingual training; entrepreneurial training; vocational exploration; work habit development programs that help people obtain and retain jobs; instruction or services to obtain a certificate of high school equivalency; preapprenticeship programs; on-site, industry-specific training; customized training in cases where an employer will give jobs to those who successfully complete training; and advanced learning technology for education, job preparation, and skills training.

Training-related and supportive services authorized under Title II-A include:

- Help in finding a job;
- Outreach activities that help people find out about education and training services and work experience programs that help women obtain nontraditional jobs;
- Dissemination of information about training programs to employers;
- Development of job openings for training program participants and activities to obtain job placements for program participants;

---

<sup>15</sup>Up to 10 percent of Title II-A participants do not have to be economically disadvantaged if they fall into one or more of the six categories.

<sup>16</sup>Including participants in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills program.

- Programs coordinated with other Federal employment-related activities;
- Other services (e.g., transportation, health care, financial assistance, drug and alcohol abuse counseling, special services and materials for people with disabilities, child care, meals, temporary shelter, job coaches, and financial counseling);
- Limited needs-based payments; and
- Certain followup services for people placed in unsubsidized jobs.

Using a formula stipulated in the JTPA legislation, the Department allocates funds to States (Governors), which, in turn, allocate funds to Service Delivery Areas. Private Industry Councils (PICs)—one in each SDA—oversee local programs and determine which local organizations will receive funds to operate Title II-A programs.

### **Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities**

In PY 1993, expenditures for Title II-A totaled \$809,931,638 which provided services to 355,656 adult Title II-A participants.<sup>17</sup> PY 1994 expenditures totaled \$787,444,137, which provided services to 370,130 participants.<sup>18</sup>

The “cost per entered employment” declined slightly during the report period. In PY 1994, the “cost per entered employment” for II-A participants was \$7,282; in PY 1993, it was \$7,303.

The average wage for clients when they were placed in jobs (known as the

---

<sup>17</sup>For both years, excludes II-A participants enrolled under special State set-asides. These set-asides represent 22 percent of total funding and are used for: (1) coordination with State education programs (eight percent of total funds); (2) incentive grants for programs exceeding performance standards or technical assistance for programs that fail to meet standards (six percent); (3) training programs for older workers (three percent); (4) State administrative responsibilities, including support for the State Job Training Coordinating Council (five percent).

<sup>18</sup>Data on Title II-A funding and the number of participants served by State are included in the “E Table” series in Statistical Appendix of this *Report*.

“average wage at placement”) rose from \$6.86 in PY 1993 to \$7.09 in PY 1994.

Changes in participant characteristics were noted in both PY 1993 and 1994. For example, the percentage of females in the program continued to rise. In PY 1993, 64 percent of Title II-A participants were female. In PY 1994, women made up 67 percent of II-A participants.

The percentage of adult participants receiving welfare was 37 percent in PY 1993. This figure included participants receiving food stamps and general assistance, as well as those receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children. For PY 1994, the percentage of welfare recipients was 39 percent.

The percent share of participants with disabilities was 14 percent in PY 1993 and eight percent in PY 1994.

An important feature of JTPA programs continues to be the development and subsequent use of national standards for measuring program performance. These standards, determined by the Secretary of Labor, and adjusted by the States, require that a certain percentage of participants obtain employment after training, receive a certain level of earnings, and work a certain number of weeks after they are placed in jobs.

Chart 1 shows the PY 1993 and 1994 performance standards and program performance for followup employment rates for Title II-A participants and participants who were welfare recipients at the time of program enrollment. As the chart indicates, the PY 1993 and PY 1994 followup employment rate performance standard was 59 percent. Actual performance, at 62 percent in PY 1993 and 63 percent in PY 1994, exceeded the standard.

The PY 1993 and PY 1994 followup employment rate standard for adult participants who were welfare recipients at the time of enrollment was 47 percent. The standard was exceeded by almost seven percentage points in PY 1993 and by almost eight percentage points in PY 1994.

The PY 1993 and PY 1994 weekly earnings at followup standard was \$245. Actual performance, at \$246 in PY 1993 and \$284 in PY 1994, exceeded the standard.

The PY 1993 and PY 1994 followup adult welfare weekly earnings standard for

participants who were welfare recipients at the time of enrollment was \$223. The standard was exceeded by \$34 in PY 1993 and by \$44 in PY 1994.

Selected participant outcomes for Title II-A for program years 1993 and 1994 are shown in Table 1. (Numbers differ significantly from prior year totals because PY 1993 was the first year in which youth—who were formerly served under Title II-A—were served under the new Title II-C.)

Table 2 shows selected characteristics for Title II-A adult terminées for PY 1991 through 1994.

**Table 1. JTPA Title II-A Selected Participant Outcomes,  
PY 1993 and PY 1994**

Outcome	Program Year	
	1993	1994
Total SDA participants <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	355,656	370,130
Total terminations . . . . .	226,011	237,470
Entered employment . . . . .	109,830	106,689
Entered employment rate . . . . .	62%	63%
Cost per entered employment . . . . .	\$7,303	\$7,282
Average hourly wage . . . . .	\$6.86	\$7.09

<sup>a</sup>Excludes II-A participants enrolled under special State set-asides. These set-asides represent 22 percent of total funding and are used for: (1) coordination with State education programs (eight percent of total funds); (2) incentive grants for programs exceeding performance standards or technical assistance for programs that fail to meet standards (six percent); (3) training programs for older workers (three percent); (4) State administrative responsibilities, including support for the State Job Training Coordinating Council (five percent).

Note: Prior to PY 1993, Title II-A served both disadvantaged youth and adults. Because PY 1993 was the first year for the newly established Title II-C which provides year-round services for youth, data in the table reflect only *adult* Title II-A terminees.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table 2. JTPA Title II-A Selected Terminee Characteristics  
(Percent Distribution), PY 1991 - PY 1994**

Characteristic	Program Year			
	1991	1992	1993	1994
Female .....	58	59	64	67
Male .....	42	41	36	33
Age 55 and over .....	3	3	2	2
Black .....	29	30	31	31
Hispanic origin .....	13	15	13	14
White .....	54	52	53	52
Welfare recipient .....	33	33	37	39
Disabled individual .....	10	10	14	8
.....				
Homeless .....	2	2	4	2

Note: Prior to PY 1993, Title II-A served both disadvantaged youth and adults. Because PY 1993 was the first year for the newly established Title II-C which provides year-round services for youth, data in the table for PY 1991 and PY 1992 reflect only *adult* Title II-A terminees during those two years.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

## **Year-Round Services for Youth, Title II-C**

### **Background**

As a result of the JTPA Amendments of 1992, services provided for out-of-school youth were made into a separate program under Title II-C of the Act. PY 1993 was the first year that the Title II-C program operated under separate authority.

The purpose of Title II-C is to improve the long-term employability of youth by: (1) enhancing their basic educational, occupational, and citizenship skills; (2) increasing their employment and earnings; (3) encouraging school completion or enrollment in supplementary or alternative school programs; (4) reducing their dependency on welfare; and (5) addressing problems that impair their ability to make a successful transition from school to work, apprenticeship, the military, or postsecondary education and training.

The JTPA legislation provides for services to economically disadvantaged young people 16 through 21 years of age<sup>19</sup> who are in school; hard-to-serve youth who are in

---

<sup>19</sup>Most Title II-C programs provide services to youth ages 16 through 21, although 14- and 15-year-old in-school youth may participate if local plans allow for their inclusion in the program.

school;<sup>20</sup> out-of-school youth;<sup>21</sup> hard-to-serve out-of-school youth;<sup>22</sup> and young people who do not meet the above requirements but who face other barriers to employment.<sup>23</sup>

Services under Title II-C are provided year-round and, as appropriate, services are made available to participants on a multiyear basis. Upon entry into Title II-C programs, participants' basic skills, occupational skills, prior work experience, employability, interests, aptitudes, and supportive service needs are assessed and a service strategy is developed which identifies employment goals, objectives, and appropriate services.

Job training and employment services provided under Title II-C may include: basic skills training with a workplace context and integrated with occupational skills testing; tutoring and study skills training; alternative high school services; instruction leading to high school completion or the equivalent; mentoring; limited internships in the private sector; training and education combined with community and youth service

---

<sup>20</sup>Within this category, at least 65 percent of participants must be youth who are deficient in basic skills, have educational attainment that is one or more grade levels below the grade level appropriate for their age, are pregnant or parenting, have a disability (which may include a learning disability), are homeless or who have run away from home, or are offenders.

<sup>21</sup>At least half of Title II-C program participants must be out of school.

<sup>22</sup>Within this category, at least 65 percent of participants must be youth who lack basic skills, are school dropouts, are pregnant or parenting, have a disability (which may include a learning disability), are homeless or who have run away from home, or are offenders.

<sup>23</sup>Up to 10 percent of the participants in Title II-C programs in each Service Delivery Area do not have to meet these criteria if they face certain barriers to employment or have limited English language proficiency, are alcoholics, or are drug addicts.

opportunities in public agencies, nonprofit agencies, and other appropriate agencies, institutions, and organizations, including Youth Corps programs; entry-level employment experience; school-to-work transition services; school-to-postsecondary education transition services; school-to-apprenticeship transition services; preemployment and work maturity skills training; and support services (e.g., drug and alcohol abuse counseling and referral, and limited needs-based payments).

### **Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities**

During PY 1993, the Title II-C program enrolled 280,275 individuals.<sup>24</sup> A total of 264,968 participants were enrolled in PY 1994.

PY 1993 expenditures for Title II-C totaled \$540.9 million, while PY 1994 expenditures were \$547.9 million.

As was the case for adult participants under Title II-A, the youth enrolled in the Title II-C program exhibited greater needs, and therefore required higher levels of supportive services and more intensive training strategies. As a result, the cost per positive termination, which was \$4,445 in PY 1993, increased to \$4,723 in PY 1994.

In PY 1993, school dropouts comprised 39 percent of all Title II-C participants. For PY 1994, the percentage of participants who were school dropouts was 33. In PY 1993, 35 percent of Title II-C participants were welfare recipients, while in PY 1994, 31 percent received welfare benefits.

---

<sup>24</sup>Title II-C expenditures are from the JTPA Semiannual Status Report. Title II-C participant data are from the JTPA Annual Status Report. Data on Title II-C funding and the number of participants served by State are included in the "E Table" series in the Statistical Appendix of this *Report*.

In PY 1993, 10 percent of the program's participants were offenders, while 11 percent were offenders in PY 1994. In PY 1993, 55 percent of participants were female, while 56 percent were female in PY 1994.

For PY 1993, the Title II-C performance standard for "youth employability enhancement rate" was 40 percent. It was greatly exceeded, with actual performance of 53 percent. For PY 1994, this standard remained at 40 percent and actual performance was 54 percent.

The other standard for Title II-C, the "youth entered employment rate" was met in PY 1993. For 1993, the standard was 41 percent, while actual performance was 44 percent. For PY 1994, this standard remained at 41 percent and actual performance was 44 percent.

Title II-C participant outcomes for PY 1991 through 1994 are shown in Table 3, and Table 4 shows selected characteristics of year-round youth program terminees.

**Table 3. JTPA Year-Round Youth Programs:  
Participant Outcomes, PY 1991 - PY 1994**

Outcome	Program Year			
	1991 <sup>a</sup>	1992 <sup>a</sup>	1993	1994
Entered employment rate . . . . .	42%	40%	41%	44%
Average weeks of participation . . . . .	29	29	36	36
Attained enhancement in two skill areas (percent) . . . . .	INA	INA	33%	36%
Remained/returned to school (percent)	14%	17%	18%	17%
Completed major level of education (percent) . . . . .	6%	7%	13%	14%
Cost per positive termination . . . . .	\$3,423	\$3,423	\$4,445	\$4,723

<sup>a</sup>Operated under Title II-A in PY 1991 and PY 1992.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table 4. JTPA Year-Round Youth Programs: Selected Terminee Characteristics  
(Percent Distribution), PY 1991 - PY 1994**

Outcome	Program Year			
	1991 <sup>a</sup>	1992 <sup>a</sup>	1993	1994
Female .....	53	53	55	56
Male .....	47	47	45	44
Age 14-15 .....	16	18	16	14
Black .....	35	36	35	35
Hispanic origin .....	19	21	20	20
White .....	43	40	41	41
Welfare recipient .....	26	27	35	31
Disabled individual .....	15	15	17	14
.....				

<sup>a</sup>Operated under Title II-A in PY 1991 and PY 1992.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

## **Summer Youth Programs, Title II-B**

### **Background**

The summer jobs program targets economically disadvantaged young people ages 14-21. Major activities under the program include work experience, academic enrichment,<sup>25</sup> and work-based learning. Personal and employment counseling may also be provided. Participants work in a wide variety of public sector jobs, including city/county government offices, libraries, hospitals, laboratories, parks, day care, and elder care operations.

### **Highlights of Calendar Year 1994 and 1995 Activities**

The Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (SYETP) provided jobs, education, and training for 568,326 participants<sup>26</sup> in the summer of 1994 and for 495,288 participants in the summer of 1995.

In the summer of 1994, 235,017 Title II-B participants were involved in educational activities, while 249,115 were involved in these activities in the summer of

---

<sup>25</sup>Academic enrichment activities are designed to enhance the reading and math skills of the participants during the summer months.

<sup>26</sup>This *Report* discusses Title II-B program activities for Calendar Years 1994 and 1995 because funds for it were included in JTPA appropriations for Program Years 1993 and 1994. The source of statistics on these programs is the JTPA Summer Youth Performance Report. Detailed statistical information for Title II-B programs is shown in the "E Table" series in the Statistical Appendix of this *Report*.

1995. Also in the summer of 1994, 28,523 youth were enrolled in private sector employment experience activities; in the summer of 1995, 28,875 young people were enrolled in these activities.

## **Dislocated Worker Programs, Title III**

### **Background**

During PY 1993, Title III programs<sup>27</sup> provided services to 306,000 individuals who lost their jobs for such reasons as mass layoffs or plant closures and were unlikely to return to their previous industries or occupations. About 410,000 individuals received Title III services during the following program year.<sup>28</sup>

Title III funds are used by State and local program operators as well as other eligible grantees to provide retraining, basic readjustment, and supportive services for dislocated workers. Services include assessment, job search assistance, job development, and needs-related payments.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>Title III programs are sometimes called EDWAA programs, referring to the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance (EDWAA) Act which amended JTPA Title III in 1988 and became effective July 1989.

<sup>28</sup>Specific State funds and numbers of participants for Title III programs are shown in the "E Table" series in the Statistical Appendix of this *Report*.

<sup>29</sup>During the *Report* period, the findings of a study of a special EDWAA job creation demonstration were released by the Department. Initiated in June 1991, the demonstration was designed to explore the effectiveness of Community Development

Eighty percent of the Title III annual appropriation is allotted to States. Up to 40 percent of each State's allotment must be used by the Governor for overall administration of the JTPA dislocated worker system, for providing rapid response services to workers dislocated by plant closures and substantial layoffs, and, where funds are still available, for regular dislocated worker activities. Upon the Governor's approval of the substate areas plans, the remainder (not less than 60 percent) of a State's allotment must be distributed to substate areas to provide retraining and other services at the local level.

The other 20 percent of the Title III appropriation is retained in the Secretary's National Reserve Account for discretionary projects serving workers affected by plant closings and mass layoffs, projects in areas of special need (including emergency response to natural disasters), technical assistance and training, and exemplary and demonstration programs. Discretionary funds are awarded in response to applications that Governors and other eligible applicants may submit at any time throughout a program year and may be spent during the two following program years.

In PY 1993, approximately \$414 million was allotted by formula to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. About \$894 million was allotted the following program year.

---

Corporations (CDCs) and similar organizations in expanding opportunities for dislocated workers through entrepreneurial training and by establishing linkages with local economic development activities. For details about the job-creation demonstration, see David Drury, Stephen Walsh, and Marlene Strong, *Evaluation of the EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates, 1994) which is summarized in Chapter 2 of this *Report*. As a followup to the study, a guidebook for EDWAA practitioners was also produced. See Katherine Dickinson, et al., *A Guide to Well-Developed Services For Dislocated Workers* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates; Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates; and Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, 1994) which is also summarized in Chapter 2 of this *Report*.

## **PY 1993 National Reserve Projects and Special Initiatives**

**National Reserve Projects.** In PY 1993, \$178 million was awarded for national reserve projects in 27 States and Guam. Many of these projects focused on the needs of communities and workers affected by natural disasters. In response to floods in the Nation's midwest, \$10 million was awarded to nine States, followed by an additional \$54 million from a Special Disaster Supplemental Appropriation. An Emergency Supplemental Appropriation of \$28 million was also awarded in response to needs brought about by an earthquake in Southern California.

Also in PY 1993, discretionary funds were targeted to help timber workers in Oregon, Washington, and Northern California. Over \$9 million was awarded to these three States for timber-related dislocated worker projects during the year.

**Special Initiatives.** During the same year, the Department initiated a major effort to improve customer service and customer satisfaction in dislocated worker programs. As part of this effort, the first "national customer satisfaction survey" was completed in December 1993. The survey revealed that 57 percent of the dislocated workers who received services under Title III rated the program as "extremely" or "quite helpful." The survey results were shared with program designers and operators throughout the JTPA system.

During the same program year, in a series of seven Regional Partnership meetings, over 1,200 representatives of Federal, State, and local Title III programs met to discuss ways to improve services to dislocated workers. Over 200 State and local program operators volunteered to participate in locally designed innovative projects to measure and improve customer satisfaction. Program operators also volunteered to

share their project experience with individuals and organizations throughout the JTPA Title III system.

### **PY 1994 National Reserve Projects and Special Initiatives**

**National Reserve Projects.** In PY 1994, \$167 million was awarded for national reserve projects in 29 States. In response to floods in the Nation's southeast and west, over \$20 million was awarded to four States. Two States with substantial layoffs in the aerospace industry received \$22 million to provide readjustment and retraining services to dislocated workers.

Also in PY 1994, discretionary funds were targeted to assist timber workers in Washington, Oregon, Montana, and California. Over \$19 million was awarded to these four States for timber-related dislocated worker projects during the year.

**Special Initiatives.** During the same year, the Department awarded over \$21 million for 37 demonstration grants nationwide. Eleven projects are developing better ways help laid-off workers find jobs; 13 are providing retraining opportunities to health workers who may lose their jobs; and 13 others are testing the feasibility of providing funds or "career management accounts" to dislocated workers for self selection and payment of training courses and other services.

Also in PY 1994, in continuance of the Department's commitment to improve customer service and increase customer satisfaction, the Enterprise Council was formed. This partnership of local, State, and Federal representatives promotes customer-focused quality improvements in the employment and training system. To begin this effort, the Council established standards to gauge the quality of dislocated worker programs. Members selected for the Enterprise Council must meet three standards: customer satisfaction, superior performance, and continuous improvement.

By the end of PY 1994, 103 charter members were prepared for induction into the Enterprise Council.

### **PY 1993 and 1994 Program Results and Participant Characteristics**

Of the 165,000 dislocated workers who received services and left the program during PY 1993, 68 percent obtained a job at an average hourly wage of \$9.40. This compares to 193,000 individuals who left the program in PY 1994, 71 percent of whom obtained jobs at an average hourly wage of \$10.00.

In PY 1993, 69 percent of the dislocated workers who left the program were employed 13 weeks later, while 71 percent of program terminees in PY 1994 were employed 13 weeks later. On average, participants stayed in the program for 39 weeks in PY 1993, and for 34 weeks in PY 1994.

Table 5 shows PY 1993 and 1994 data for selected Title III participant characteristics.

**Table 5. JTPA Title III Selected Terminee Characteristics  
(Percent Distribution), PY 1993 and PY 1994**

Characteristic	Program Year	
	1993	1994
<b>Sex:</b>		
Male .....	55	54
Female .....	45	46
<b>Age:</b>		
29 years and under .....	19	18
30-54 years .....	73	73
55 years and over .....	8	9
<b>Education:</b>		
Less than high school .....	11	10
High school graduate .....	50	49
Post high school attendee .....	40	41
College graduate and above .....	13	15
<b>Race:</b>		
White (not Hispanic) .....	73	72
Black (not Hispanic) .....	15	16
Hispanic .....	8	8
Alaskan/American Indian .....	1	1
Asian/Pacific Islander .....	3	3
Unemployment Insurance claimant .....	62	59
Individual with a disability .....	8	3
Veteran .....	17	17

Note: All data reflect characteristics/activities of terminees. Some data do not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Source: Worker Adjustment Annual Program Report, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

## **Performance Standards**

The national standard for the entered employment rate for Title III was 64 percent for PY 1993. The standard for PY 1994 and PY 1995 was 67 percent. Governors were encouraged to set an average wage at placement standard for dislocated worker programs.

## **Response to Special Dislocations in PY 1993 and 1994**

The Title III program also includes authorization for services targeted to defense workers and workers who are adversely affected by the Clean Air Act.

**Defense-Related Dislocations.** Under a memorandum of agreement, funds were transferred from the Department of Defense to the Department of Labor to operate the Defense Conversion Adjustment Program (DCAP) and the Defense Diversification Program (DDP). Both of these initiatives are Title III discretionary grant programs specifically targeted to defense-related layoffs.

During PY 1993, the Department awarded \$100 million for 43 defense-related training and assistance projects.

A total of \$205 million in defense funds was fully obligated for projects by the end of the first quarter of PY 1994 and a total of 35,305 dislocated workers were served in both programs by the end of PY 1994.

In PY 1993, as part of the DCAP effort, the Department also awarded \$3.4 million for seven demonstration projects to test innovative ways of helping workers dislocated due to reductions in military spending and base closures. The projects focused on four areas: 1) averting layoffs; (2) increasing worker mobility; (3) community

planning; and (4) locally initiated projects.<sup>30</sup>

The 1993 Base Closure and Realignment Commission report identified dozens of military installations that would be closed or realigned during the next five years. In response to the report, the Departments of Defense and Labor cooperated to create special teams that visited military sites listed in the report where major dislocations were expected to take place. The teams provided information on programs available to help employees, including information about the availability of DCAP and DDP funds.

**Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance.** The Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance program is designed to target funds to areas experiencing major dislocations caused by compliance with the Clean Air Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-549). A total of \$26 million was appropriated and obligated by the end of PY 1993, and 1,741 participants were served by the end of PY 1994.

## **National Programs, Title IV**

### **Overview**

Title IV authorizes the Job Corps and other Department-administered programs that serve Indians and Native Americans, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, and veterans. Title IV also authorizes the National Commission for Employment Policy (NCEP), the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC), federally administered technical assistance efforts, labor market information activities, research and evaluation, and pilot and demonstration programs.

---

<sup>30</sup>For more information about the DCAP, see Mary G. Visher and Deborah Kogan, *Evaluation of the Defense Conversion Adjustment Demonstration: Interim Report on Implementation* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates, 1994) which is summarized in Chapter 2 of this *Report*.

Four categories of Title IV activities are described in this section of the *Report*. These are programs for Indians and Native Americans, programs for migrant and seasonal farmworkers, the Job Corps, and pilot and demonstration programs.<sup>31</sup>

## **Indian and Native American Programs**

**Background.** To train and secure employment for eligible individuals in productive jobs, Indian and Native American (INA) programs offer job training, job referrals, counseling, and other employment-related services, such as child care, transportation, and training allowances. Those eligible for the program include Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts, Hawaiians, and other persons of Native American descent who are economically disadvantaged, unemployed, or underemployed.

INA programs differ somewhat from Title II and III programs in that they are administered at the national level by the Department, rather than by Service Delivery Areas.

**Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities.** In PY 1994, total expenditures of \$60.1 million provided support to 182 program grantees which served a total of 24,425 Native American participants in all 50 States and the District of Columbia. The grantees included Indian tribes, other Native American communities, and various related organizations.

---

<sup>31</sup>The activities of NCEP and NOICC are described at the end of this chapter. Veterans' services, administered by the Department of Labor's Office of the Assistant Secretary for Veterans' Employment and Training, are reviewed in the Secretary's annual report on veterans' activities. These programs are targeted to veterans with service-connected disabilities, veterans of the Vietnam era, and veterans recently separated from military service.

Approximately 50.2 percent of the 19,383 participants who left the program in PY 1994 were placed in jobs and another 32 percent attained an “employability enhancement,” indicating that they returned to school, entered another training program, completed a major level of education, completed a worksite training objective, or attained basic or occupational skills proficiency. Of those who completed the program in PY 1994, 46.4 percent were male, 30.1 percent were 21 years of age or younger, and 20.5 percent were high school dropouts.

In PY 1993, total expenditures of \$59.1 million provided support to 183 program grantees which served a total of 24,924 Native American participants in all 50 States and the District of Columbia. Approximately 52 percent of the PY 1993 participants who left the program were placed in jobs and another 32 percent obtained an “employability enhancement.” Of those who completed the program in PY 1993, 47 percent were male, 29 percent were 21 years of age or younger, and 21 percent were high school dropouts.

As in previous years, the Department continued to encourage grantees to coordinate their activities with those of other human resource programs.

In addition to programs authorized under JTPA Title IV-A, INA grantees also received JTPA Title II-B funds to operate summer programs for Native American Youth. Approximately 9,900 Native American youth participated in such programs in the summer of 1995, at a cost of \$13.5 million.

In the summer of 1994, about 10,500 Native American youth participated in summer programs at a cost of \$11.7 million. (This compares with 11,191 Native American youth who participated in the summer of 1993 at a cost of \$16 million.)

Performance measures for INA programs are designed to encourage the

development of particular skills as well as employment goals. The three measures for INA programs are entered employment rate, positive termination rate, and employability enhancement rate. During the *Report* period, grantees were required to meet two of the three standards. The specific performance standards levels are individually determined for each grantee using a statistical model and are objective and equitable. Adjustments are made to each grantee's standards to reflect comparative differences in the participants served and in local labor market conditions, such as the unemployment rate, percent of the workforce in manufacturing, and whether the population is urban or rural.

## **Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Programs**

### **Background.** Title IV

of JTPA also authorizes training and employment programs for migrant and seasonal farmworkers to help address chronic unemployment, underemployment, and substandard living conditions among members of this group.

For the most part, services are designed to help migrant and seasonal farmworkers who seek alternative job opportunities to secure stable employment at an income above the poverty level and to improve the living standard of those who remain in the agricultural labor market. Participants must be economically disadvantaged. Like Indian and Native American programs, the migrant and seasonal farmworker program is administered at the national level by the Department.

The Department allocates funds to organizations in almost all States<sup>32</sup> based on

---

<sup>32</sup>Alaska and Rhode Island, as well as the District of Columbia are not included because of their small farmworker populations.

the number of farmworkers in each State using census data and more current Immigration and Naturalization Service data. Grants are awarded to public or private nonprofit organizations<sup>33</sup> that understand the problems of migrant and seasonal farmworkers, are familiar with the area to be served, and have previously demonstrated the capability to effectively administer a diversified employability development program for this population. These organizations must compete for refunding.

**Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities.** In PY 1994, regular farmworker employment and training activities served 46,310 persons with expenditures of \$77 million. This is a decrease in the number of participants from the 47,547 individuals who received services the previous program year, and expenditures of \$73.9 million.

During PY 1994, there were 52 migrant and seasonal farmworker projects in 48 States and Puerto Rico. A total of 46,310 participants received some type of service and left the program during the year. In PY 1993, there were 53 projects in 48 States and Puerto Rico. Over 37,275 participants received services and left the program during the year.

A total of 20,938 of the individuals who completed the program in PY 1994 received some type of supportive services assistance (including child care, medical services, or emergency housing) and another 8,615 received job skills training which led to successful unsubsidized employment. The remaining individuals either left the program before significant intervention by the grantees or they received some job search assistance. In PY 1993, 21,812 of the program's terminees received some type of supportive service and another 9,191 received job skills training which led to unsubsidized employment.

---

<sup>33</sup>Most of the grants are awarded to private nonprofit organizations.

In PY 1994, of those placed in jobs, 37 percent were women and 76 percent were school dropouts. The average annual income of participants before entering the program in PY 1994 was \$3,720.

In PY 1993, 36 percent of those placed in jobs were women and 72 percent were school dropouts. Also in PY 1993, the average annual income of participants prior to entering the program was \$4,140.

For both years, classroom and on-the-job training continued to be the main employment strategies used by farmworker program grantees.

The Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker program, like the Indian and Native American Program, serves a “harder-to-serve” population. The performance measures developed for this program are intended to reflect basic educational and occupational skills development and to enhance the employability of migrants and seasonal farmworkers. The two performance measures for the program are “entered employment rate” and “average wage at placement.” They are set for each grantee based on local conditions (e.g., unemployment, transportation, number of barriers to employment, etc.). All grantees met their performance standards during PY 1994.

## **Job Corps**

**Background.** Job Corps is a major national training and employment program administered by the Department to address the multiple barriers to employment faced by severely disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16 and 24. Its residential aspect distinguishes it from other training and employment programs and enables it to provide a comprehensive array of services in one setting 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Established in 1964 under the Economic Opportunity Act, the program provides

eligible youth with a comprehensive mix of services including:

- Entry diagnostic testing and regular progress reviews;
- Occupational exploration and “world of work” training;
- A comprehensive basic academic education program which includes reading, math, General Equivalency Degree (GED), health education, parenting, introduction to computers, and driver’s education;
- Competency-based vocational education;
- Social skills training;
- Counseling, health care, and related support services;
- Work experience;
- Meals, lodging, and clothing; and
- Postprogram placement and support.

**Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities.** One hundred and ten Job Corps centers in 46 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico served approximately 200,000 students, including 125,000 new trainees, during Program Years 1993 and 1994. Job Corps expenditures totaled \$991 million in PY 1994 and \$932 million in PY 1993.

- ***Enrollee Characteristics and Outcomes.*** Approximately 80 percent of students enrolled in Program Years 1993 and 1994 were high school dropouts. The average reading level at the time of enrollment was eighth grade. Over 70 percent of the students had never held a full-time job. Approximately 70 percent were minority youth, and 60 percent were male. The average length of enrollment was 7.5 months. Outcomes for all Job Corps trainees for PY 1993 and 1994 are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6. Outcomes for Job Corps Terminees, PY 1993 and 1994**

Outcome	Program Year	
	1993	1994
<b>Education and Training:</b>		
Reading gains by grade levels . . . . .	1.2	1.8
Math gains by grade levels . . . . .	1.8	2.1
Vocational completion . . . . .	36%	43%
<b>Placement:</b>		
Entered employment . . . . .	54%	63%
Enrolled in education . . . . .	10%	10%
Total terminees placed . . . . .	64%	73%
Average job placement wage . . . . .	\$5.40	\$5.64

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

□ **Special Job Corps Initiatives.** During PY 1993 and 1994, Job Corps implemented a number of management initiatives in response to issues raised by the Office of the Inspector General and the Congress. A new code of conduct with zero tolerance for drugs and violence was implemented at all Job Corps centers on May 1, 1995. This policy includes a provision which results in immediate expulsion of any Job Corps student committing a serious offense such as possession of a gun or weapon, sexual assault, any arrest for a felony on or off center grounds, as well as possession or sale of any illegal drug.

The new code of conduct also requires that students have a drug test when they first arrive at the Job Corps center. Students who test positive are retested prior to the end of a 30-day probationary enrollment period; those who still test positive are terminated from the program. After the

probationary period, students are retested if they are suspected of illegal drug use; those who test positive are terminated immediately.

Other management initiatives taken during the *Report* period focused on the development of procedures for strengthening the applicant selection process. Revised policies call for closer scrutiny of an applicant's background in determining eligibility and a stronger focus on selecting applicants with the commitment and motivation to benefit from enrollment. Also during the period, the Department addressed problems relating to poor performing centers. Enrollment of new students was stopped at three centers where it was determined that center management was not providing a safe and secure environment. Thirteen center contracts were terminated and operators changed. One center was closed. In addition, the procurement process for selecting center operators was revised to provide increased weight for past performance. Training was conducted for management staff at 11 poor performing centers, and intensive on-site technical assistance by teams of experts was initiated at two centers.

□ **Longitudinal Study.** A new longitudinal study was implemented in PY 1993. The study is comparing the experiences of Job Corps students with a control group to provide information on the difference Job Corps makes in the lives of students. It is also comparing the benefits of program participation to program costs. Followup interviews will be conducted with both the student and control groups over a period of several years. Initial study results will be available in 1997.

□ **Performance Standards.** Job Corps has established performance standards for center operators, placement contractors, and outreach/admissions contractors. Center standards include student math and reading gains, GED attainment rates, vocational completion rates, and placement rates.

Placement contractor standards include overall placement rates, job training match placement rates, and starting wages.

Outreach/admissions contractor standards include arrival, retention, and placement rates.

## **Pilot and Demonstration Programs**

Pilot and Demonstration (P&D) programs, authorized under Part D of Title IV, are designed to test innovative approaches and strategies for enhancing the employability skills of people who face particular labor force barriers. They are administered at the national level by the Department. A major goal of the P&D programs is State and local level adoption or replication of the successful approaches and models that result from P&D initiatives.

Funded at approximately \$34.9 million in PY 1993 and \$35.8 million in PY 1994, the projects reflected the goals, interests, and concerns of the Department of Labor in a number of key areas.

Many of the projects addressed the needs of the Nation's at-risk youth. Many of the youth-related projects, such as the National Youth Apprenticeship in the Customer Service Industry project, the Union-Based School-to-Work Mentoring project, the High School Career Academies Demonstration, the Transition to Work Demonstrations for Disabled Youth, and Project FocusHOPE, were designed to help students make a successful transition from the classroom to the labor market.

Several other youth initiatives were supported by the Department to ensure that young people—who might otherwise lack the skills and abilities to succeed in today's competitive labor market—have access to the quality training and education necessary to ensure their future success as wage earners.

Two P&D efforts conducted during the *Report* period, the Glass Ceiling Demonstration, and the Non-Traditional Employment for Women Initiative, which were funded through mid-1996, were designed to help women overcome barriers that may prevent them from achieving their full potential in the workplace.

Several efforts were also supported during the period to improve both the services provided by and the coordination of existing programs. These include the Job

Training 2000 projects/One-Stop Career Centers initiative, which coordinates the delivery of needed services, often locating them in a single facility; the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Project, which coordinates efforts of JTPA and numerous other service providers; and the Partnership Programs initiative, which increases the involvement in JTPA of several national organizations, such as the National Urban League, Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc., the National Alliance of Business, and others.

Four P&D efforts responded to the need to improve the skills of American workers. These included the National Job Analysis Study, the Initiative to Increase Capacity to Provide Workplace Literacy Services, the Workplace Literacy Test effort, and the initiative to develop basic financial training for employee stock ownership.

Because immigrants continue to make up an increasing percentage of the Nation's labor force, four separate immigration demonstration projects were conducted during the period. These projects focused on innovative ways to provide quality training and employment services, targeted to various immigrant population groups, to ensure that they quickly become productive members of the work force.

Finally, the Department continued its efforts to help individuals with disabilities receive the services necessary to enable them to compete equitably in both the private and public sectors.

P&D projects which operated during Program Years 1993 and 1994 are summarized below. They are also listed, along with their periods of performance and funding levels, in Table 7.

**Table 7. Pilot and Demonstration Projects Conducted During  
PY 1993-1994**

Pilot and Demonstration Project	Period of Performance	Funding
National Youth Apprenticeship in the Customer Service Industry. . . . .	Dec. 1, 1994 - March 1, 1998	\$294,000
Union-Based School-To-Work Mentoring Project . . . . .	March 17, 1995 - March 16, 1996	\$150,000
High School Career Academies Demonstration . . . . .	June 29, 1993 - June 30, 1996	\$600,000
Transition to Work Demonstrations for Disabled Youth . . . . .	Oct. 1, 1993 - Oct. 1, 1994	\$750,000
Project FocusHOPE . . . . .	June 28, 1994 - June 30, 1996	\$1.2 million
At-Risk Youth Pilot Project . . . . .	June 30, 1994 - June 30, 1995	\$208,400
Preparing Out-of-School Youth for a Career Path . . . . .	Jan. 31, 1994 - July 31, 1995	\$25,000
Quantum Opportunities Project . . . . .	June 28, 1995 - June 27, 1996	\$200,000
Year-Round Youth Training Demonstrations. . . . .	Sept. 30, 1993 - Sept. 30, 1995	\$2.6 million
Out of School Youth Pilot Projects (four projects). . . . .	June 30, 1994 - June 30, 1995	\$832,000

**Table 7. Pilot and Demonstration Projects Conducted During  
PY 1993-1994 (continued)**

Pilot and Demonstration Project	Period of Performance	Funding
Glass Ceiling Demonstration . . . . .	June 16, 1994 - June 16, 1996	\$200,000
Non-Traditional Employment for Women . . . . .	July 23, 1992 - July 22, 1996	\$6 million
Job Training 2000 Projects . . . . .	Oct. 1992 - Dec. 1994	\$1.7 million
Evaluation of the Job Training 2000 One-Stop Career Centers Demonstration . . . . .	June 28, 1993 - Dec. 27, 1994	\$200,000
Partnership Programs . . . . .	July 1993 - June 1995	\$18.9 million
National Job Analysis Study . . . . .	June 1992 - June 1997	\$1.4 million
Increasing Capacity to Provide Workplace Literacy Services . . . . .	July 1994 - June 1995	\$25,000
Workplace Literacy Test . . . . .	July 1, 1993 - June 30, 1996	\$1.6 million

**Table 7. Pilot and Demonstration Projects Conducted During  
PY 1993-1994 (continued)**

Pilot and Demonstration Project	Period of Performance	Funding
New Directions: African Americans in a Diversifying Nation . . . . .	April 18, 1995 - Oct. 18, 1996	\$50,000
Immigration Demonstration Projects (four projects) . . . . .	June 30, 1992 - Oct. 31, 1994	\$1.1 million
Programs for People With Disabilities . . . . .	July 1993 - June 1995	\$8,345,600

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

## ***School-To-Work Transition and Youth-Related Projects***

**National Youth Apprenticeship in the Customer Service Industry.** Funded at \$294,085 and operating from December 1994 to March 1998, this project, conducted by Northern Illinois University, implements youth apprenticeship and related training programs for a comprehensive career development training system in business management at schools and the McDonald Corporation. The project is a joint venture between the University and the McDonald Corporation in cooperation with States, foundations, and schools in four demonstration sites. It provides up to four years of business management training, beginning with the junior year in high school and ending after two years of postsecondary education. The program model features performance/skill standards and a certification system that establishes career paths within McDonald's.

**Union-Based School-to-Work Mentoring Project.** Operating from March 17, 1995 through March 16, 1996, this project linked secondary school students and workers with a wide range of occupations. It also identified specific skills and behaviors that constitute an organized set of workplace competencies. It was funded at \$150,000.

**High School Career Academies Demonstration.** Funded at \$600,000 for the period June 29, 1993 through June 30, 1996, the High School Career Academies demonstration is testing a school restructuring and school-to-work transition model that provides an intensive three- to four-year education experience for 2,500 to 3,000 at-risk youth in 14 locations. The model integrates academic and occupational instruction. It features intensive involvement by employers in a school-within-a-school setting. A small cluster of students within a school take most of their classes together and are taught by a team of teachers who remain with them throughout their four years.

**Transition to Work Demonstrations for Disabled Youth Using a Natural Supports Model.** Funded at \$750,000 for the period October 1, 1993 through October 1, 1994, the Department sponsored a joint effort with the Department of Health and Human Services to develop innovative school-to-work transition programs for youth with moderate to severe disabilities. The programs emphasized “natural” support systems in which on-the-job assistance was provided through co-workers rather than through external “job coaches.” This differed from traditional supported employment activities which had generally been available to individuals with moderate to severe disabilities.<sup>34</sup> The initiative also attempted to expand opportunities for competitive, compensated employment for program participants.<sup>35</sup>

**Project FocusHOPE.** FocusHOPE is a multi-year demonstration conducted by the Center for Advanced Technologies (CAT) in Detroit. The CAT is a national project with participation from different Federal agencies, including the Departments of Labor, Defense, Commerce, and Education. The Center provides world-class training in

---

<sup>34</sup>Supported employment is premised on the belief that many persons who are placed in sheltered workshops or who are considered unable to benefit from rehabilitation services can perform substantial work in regular work sites if given the necessary long-term support. Three basic models of supported employment have been developed. In the “individual placement” model, individuals with severe disabilities are placed in a job in which their immediate coworkers are generally persons without disabilities. In this model, a job coach helps the individual learn the job. In the “enclave” model, two or more persons with severe disabilities are placed in close proximity in a specified part of the work environment. Supervision is often provided by a job coach not directly hired by the business. In the “work crew” model, two or more individuals with disabilities are transported to an employment site for special tasks. After completing their work, they are transported to another site. A job coach often accompanies each crew.

<sup>35</sup>An evaluation of this demonstration effort was completed during the *Report* period. See Rima Azzam, Ronald Conley, and Arthur Mitchell, *Evaluation of Transition to Work Demonstration Projects Using a Natural Supports Model* (Washington, D.C.: Pelavin Research Institute, 1995) which is summarized in Chapter 2 of this publication.

advanced manufacturing engineer technologies. Total private and public sector funding for the Center has exceeded \$90 million since its inception. The CAT student population served by the Department of Labor grant is composed largely of minority and disadvantaged individuals who have completed a seven-week school-to-work transition program. They move into a one-year precision manufacturing program and into training for higher-demand occupations in flexible manufacturing at the CAT.

The DOL-sponsored demonstration, covering the period June 28, 1994 through June 30, 1996, was funded at \$1.2 million (\$600,000 each year), and focused on the first two years of participation in the CAT six-year program. Grant funds were used primarily for instruction, candidate training stipends, and administration. At the conclusion of the demonstration, trainees have acquired certifiable manufacturing skills and academic credits.

**At-Risk Youth School-to-Work Pilot Project.** Funded at \$208,434 for the period, June 30, 1994 through June 30, 1995, the project combined classroom and work-based learning for approximately 35 youth in Boston. Job opportunities for the participants were assessed through the Boston PIC's school-to-work program. Participants spent 10-15 hours per week on the job and 20 hours in related classroom instruction. They were placed in entry-level, career oriented, paid work experiences<sup>36</sup> in the areas of health and hospitals, financial services, utilities, communication, and environmental services.

**Preparing Out-of-School Youth for a Career Path Project.** Funded at \$25,000 and operating from January 31, 1994 through July 31, 1995, the project drew on the expertise of the research, business, and education communities to create

---

<sup>36</sup>Participants were paid a small salary (either by the employer or by the pilot project) for the work-based learning portion of their program experience.

comprehensive strategies for a career path model to be used by organizations operating programs for out-of-school and other at-risk youth.

**Quantum Opportunities Project.** During the period June 28, 1995 through June 27, 1996, funding of \$200,000 was allocated to replicate and evaluate a successful model program directed specifically toward at-risk youth entering the ninth grade. The objectives of the project were to enable participants to complete high school and to improve their rate of entering and succeeding in postsecondary education. Five sites were funded.

**Youth Year-Round Training Demonstrations.** These demonstration efforts, conducted in several States, linked summer and regular school academic and work experience programs to ensure that the learning acquired by students was reinforced throughout the year. They operated from September 30, 1993 through September 30, 1995, and were funded as follows: \$532,686 for several counties in Kentucky; \$550,000 for Dade County, Florida; \$550,000 for the City and County of Santa Fe (New Mexico); \$416,415 for portions of two counties in Texas; and \$550,000 for the City of Los Angeles.

**Out-of-School Pilot Projects.** Four out-of-school pilot projects were conducted from June 30, 1994 through June 30, 1995. One of the projects, "SUCCESS," operated in Sacramento and was funded at \$300,000. It was designed to help determine better ways of providing effective employment and training services to economically disadvantaged, 16-21 year-old, out-of-school youth. The county office of education, the Urban League, the local PIC, and the Sacramento County Assessment Network formed a partnership to provide education, employment, and incentives to help the project's participants. In addition to school-based and work-based learning directed at career and life skills development, the project provided mentors and support services which included child care and family counseling.

The second project, funded at \$299,986, was in Monroe, Va. It developed, demonstrated, and disseminated the findings from an innovative job training and placement program for disadvantaged out-of-school youth with disabilities. In partnership with a JTPA local SDA, a Job Corps Center, and local rehabilitation and special education professionals, a model was tested that enabled disadvantaged youth with disabilities between the ages of 18 and 21 to obtain employment in the occupations of their choice.

A third project, still ongoing in Boston, was funded at \$104,217. Building on an alternative high school diploma/GED program for at-risk and out-of-school students, it has developed a basic school-to-work program. Students have been trained in life skills such as budgeting money, preparing income tax forms, resolving conflicts at work, etc. Additionally, students were engaged in rigorous work-based curriculum projects which combined classroom academics with work site activities. These activities were made possible by the Boston Private Industry Council and the Boston School System.

The fourth project, funded at \$127,414, was located in Jensen Beach, Florida. It provided employment and training services to out-of-school youth who lacked the basic skills needed to function in today's job market. Services were provided by the Treasure Coast Private Industry Council, which operated the FUTURE LINK job club to prepare economically disadvantaged youth who dropped out of school or who graduated with insufficient basic skills to succeed in even moderately demanding employment situations.

**Youth Fair Chance Program.** The JTPA amendments of 1992 authorized the Secretary of Labor to award up to 25 Youth Fair Chance (YFC) projects, conduct an evaluation of the program, and to provide technical assistance at a total of \$50 million.

The YFC concept is a community-based initiative that targets money directly into areas where youth problems are greatest—areas of high poverty. The initiative provides

a variety of services and harnesses the cooperation and involvement of other service providers to focus on such youth problems as dropping out of school, teen pregnancy, drug and gang involvement, employment and training, lack of sports and recreation, family support, child development, and health. The initiative is developing a “new” comprehensive system that addresses the needs of all youth in the community. It is hoped that by creating systemic change, changes will be made in the way services are provided to all youth beyond the availability of Federal funds for this effort.

This initiative addresses the needs of youth and young adults between 14-30 years of age who reside in rural and urban communities. It saturates small neighborhoods or communities with populations of not more than 25,000, having the highest concentration of poverty based on the latest Bureau of the Census estimates; migrant or seasonal farmworker communities; native Alaskan villages; or Indian reservations.

The YFC design includes two components—one to serve in-school youth and another to serve out-of-school youth and young adults. The in-school component is a school-to-work program to transform high schools and improve the education, training, and employment opportunities of youth. The school-to-work program is consistent with the School-to-Work Opportunities legislation and the Goals 2000 Act. It contains three main components: (1) work-based learning; (2) school-based learning; and (3) connecting activities such as student-employer matching, providing technical assistance and services to employers and others in designing work-based learning components and counseling and case management services, providing a broad range of assistance to students, and collecting and analyzing information about post-program outcomes.

The out-of-school programs are comprised of community centers for continuing education and training. Centers provide remedial education, GED preparation, occupational training, English-as-a-second-language classes, job search assistance, support services, and recreation and sports programs.

A number of the grantees provide job guarantees for youth meeting prior school attendance and performance standards. To be eligible for a guaranteed job, youth must be between 16-19 years of age and must make a commitment to continue and complete high school. Wage subsidies of up to 50 percent are provided by some of the grantees. The duration of such employment is limited to one year and youth are not to exceed 15 hours of work per week during the school year.

Community residents, businesses, schools, etc. are directly involved in the program through the Community Advisory Board and the school-to-work partnership which directs the activities of all program components.

Seventeen grants, totaling \$66 million, were awarded in July 1994, providing funds for 18 months. Additional resources totaling \$25 million were added to the grants in July 1995 and grants were extended through December 1997.

The target communities are located in neighborhoods in: Seattle, Washington; Indianapolis, Indiana; Tehlequah, Oklahoma; Douglas, Arizona; Baltimore, Maryland; Denver, Colorado; Los Angeles (two sites), California; Fresno, California; Memphis, Tennessee; Cleveland, Texas; Fort Worth, Texas; Racine, Wisconsin; New Haven, Connecticut; New York, New York; Cleveland, Ohio; and Hazard, Kentucky.

The Tehlequah grant is operated by the Cherokee Nation. The Cleveland, Texas grant focuses on migrant and seasonal farmworkers who reside in Edingburg, Texas. One of the Los Angeles grants focuses on former gang members. Grant awards to rural areas are Douglas and Hazard.

The program has been operating since July 1, 1994. During the initial 18 months of operation, over 22,000 youth and young adults received services.

***Addressing the Labor  
Market Needs of Women***

**Glass Ceiling Demonstration.** Funded at \$200,000 for the period June 16, 1994 through June 16, 1996, the demonstration is developing a model of instruction and mentoring that will help women overcome the gender barrier (known as the “glass ceiling”) which inhibits their climb to the highest levels of industry and government. Program components include a two-day orientation for participating fellows, a series of meetings and conferences, at least 14 days spent by each fellow under the instruction of a successful female mentor at the mentor’s workplace, a week of study at Harvard University, speaking and written presentations by fellows, and a mandatory postprogram element.

**Non-Traditional Employment for Women.** The Nontraditional Employment for Women (NEW) Act amended JTPA to encourage a broader range of training and job placement activities for women. In supporting the Act, the Department’s Employment and Training Administration and its Women’s Bureau work together to help bring about nontraditional training and employment opportunities for women through the JTPA system. They also help guide the institutionalization of nontraditional training through grants made to States to further efforts that support the NEW Act. Funding for this effort is \$6 million (\$1.5 million for each of four years from July 23, 1992 through July 22, 1996).

***Improving Programs  
and Coordination***

**Job Training 2000 Projects.** From October 1992 to December 1994, \$1.7 million was awarded to 10 PICs in nine States to conduct a demonstration that tested

models for local skill centers that integrated the delivery of employment and training services. The purpose of the projects was to assure the quality of job skill training programs, to explore the efficacy of using vouchers to facilitate increased choice in the selection of vocational training, and to expand the authority of PICs in providing program oversight. (See the following for a discussion of the evaluation effort for the demonstrations.)

### **Evaluation of the Job Training 2000 One-Stop Career Centers**

**Demonstration.** A case study analysis of 10 PIC-sponsored One-Stop Career Center sites in nine States was conducted from June 1993 through December 1994. The sites demonstrated PIC leadership in integrating the services of the Employment Service, JTPA, and Job Opportunities and Basic Skills/welfare programs to increase accessibility of services to individuals seeking new jobs, labor market information, or to upgrade their work skills. Other objectives that were evaluated included the demonstration of quality assurance of training programs and the exploration of the use of training vouchers. Funded at \$200,000, the evaluation effort yielded a final report and “how to” guide for planning and implementing One-Stop Career Centers.<sup>37</sup>

**Partnership Programs.** As in previous years, pilot and demonstration efforts included “partnership programs” designed to increase the involvement in JTPA of several national business, labor, and community-based organizations that represent broad constituencies. These organizations can promote JTPA training and cooperation within their own organizations and with the private sector and local government. Six

---

<sup>37</sup>See Dale W. Berry and Mona A. Feldman, *Evaluation of One-Stop Career Center Demonstration Projects* (Arlington, Va.: TvT Associates, 1995) and Dale W. Berry and Mona A. Feldman, *A Guide for Planning and Operating One-Stop Career Centers* (Arlington, Va.: TvT Associates, 1995) which are summarized in Chapter 2 of this publication.

organizations in this category were funded during Program Years 1993 and 1994. These were the National Urban League, Inc.; SER-Jobs for Progress, Inc.; Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc.; the National Alliance of Business; the Human Resources Development Institute of the AFL-CIO; and the National Council of La Raza.

### ***Improving Worker Skills***

**The National Job Analysis Study.** Part of a major research effort to assess the skill levels of the American workforce, the National Job Analysis Study (NJAS) focuses on the development of assessment measures of the workforce competencies and skills needed for job success in high-performance work settings. The study is jointly administered by the Department of Labor in cooperation with the Department of Education, and the Office of Personnel Management. Through a \$1.4 million contract with American College Testing, the NJAS will explore the appropriate competencies and skills, and provide information to businesses and workers undergoing the transformation to high-performance workplaces and to industries that are setting world-class standards.

**Increasing Organizational Capacity to Provide Workplace Literacy Services.** A total of \$25,000 was provided to Literacy Volunteers of America (LVA) to increase the organizational capacity of its affiliate organizations throughout the country to provide workplace literacy services to individuals with low reading levels. Funded from July 1994 through June 1995, LVA convened focus groups, produced and disseminated a Resource Guide, provided technical assistance to affiliates, and produced a three-year action plan to expand services.

**Workplace Literacy Test Implementation Pilot Project.** Funded at \$1.6 million for the period July 1, 1993 through June 30, 1996, the Workplace Literacy Test

Pilot Project is designed to administer a newly created instrument for assessing workplace literacy skills. About 130 sites are participating in the project. Included are job training sites, adult education programs, vocational education programs, community colleges, correctional institutions, summer youth programs, and job assistance programs. The test is being used to: (1) determine individuals' needs for participation in job and literacy training programs; (2) meet the Federal reporting requirement for "reading skills grade level" as required under certain programs; (3) enhance job training counseling and employment guidance; and (4) evaluate training programs by assessing the learning gains of individual trainees while they are in job training and literacy programs.

**New Directions: African Americans in a Diversifying Nation Project.** During the *Report* period, the Department contributed \$50,000 out of a total budget of \$764,000 for this project. It was funded in cooperation with the National Policy Association (formerly known as the National Planning Association) and the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies. The Department's portion of funds covers staff time devoted to employment and training issues, consultant/writers, advisory committee meetings, and appropriate proportionate shares of public forums, publications, office, and other expenses. The Department's support covers the period April 18, 1995 through October 18, 1996.

***Helping Immigrants  
Succeed in the Labor Market***

**Immigration Demonstration Projects.** Four immigration demonstration projects were conducted during the *Report* period. The first project, funded at \$301,190 for the period June 30, 1992 through October 31, 1994, supported efforts of the Jewish Vocational Service, a major provider of training and employment services to refugees in the Greater Boston area. It offered two skill training programs to address the special

employability needs of immigrants residing in the 43 cities and towns comprising the Boston-area SDA. The contractor provided data entry and computer-aided drafting training and featured bilingual/bicultural employment counseling, vocationally specific English-as-a-second language instruction, regular counseling and support services, job development and placement, and postplacement followup services.

The second project, conducted during the same time frame and funded at \$315,000, was jointly operated by the Wayne County PIC, the Arab Community Center for Economic and Social Services, and the Arab-American and Chaldean Council. It provided a comprehensive program of training and employment services to Arab-American immigrants in the Balance of Wayne County, Michigan. Key features of the program were English-as-a-second language training, mentoring, and case management.

The third project, also conducted during the same time frame, and funded at \$315,000, was operated by the San Diego Consortium and PIC and its partner, SER/Jobs for Progress, Inc. It provided a program of integrated services to 140 immigrants, primarily Latinos in the San Diego area. Services included case management, English-as-a-second language training, and basic education using a computer assisted program covering 23 basic subjects.

The fourth project, funded at \$315,000 and operating from September 1, 1992 through November 30, 1994, was managed by the Seattle-King County (Washington State) PIC in collaboration with two community-based organizations. It served both Asian and Hispanic immigrants and offered an array of services and instruction.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup>An evaluation of this demonstration was conducted during the *Report* period. See Vicki Asakura and David Snedeker, *Immigration Demonstration Grant Final Evaluation Report* (Seattle, Wash.: Seattle-King County Private Industry Council, 1995) which is summarized in Chapter 2 of this publication.

## ***Helping People With Disabilities Succeed in the Labor Market***

**Programs for People With Disabilities.** Pilot and demonstration programs served approximately 6,800 people with disabilities in PY 1994 and about 6,900 received services in PY 1993. The general purpose of these projects is to increase the number and quality of job opportunities for individuals with disabilities and to empower them to integrate more fully into society.

The projects offer special outreach services, tailored training, job development, and job placement assistance. Grantees operate national programs which, in many instances, are linked to local rehabilitation agencies and programs. In both PY 1993 and 1994, programs were operated by nine national organizations with expertise in working with people with disabilities, with total funding each year of \$4,172,815. These organizations were Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., Association for Retarded Citizens, Electronic Industries Foundation, Epilepsy Foundation of America, Mainstream, Inc., Marriott Foundation for People With Disabilities, American Rehabilitation Association, National Federation of the Blind, and International Association of Machinists (IAM Cares).

### **JOB TRAINING FOR THE HOMELESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM**

The Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program (JTHDP) is the first comprehensive nationwide Federal effort specifically designed to train homeless people and to place them in jobs.<sup>39</sup> The Department is authorized to plan, implement, and

---

<sup>39</sup>For additional information based on JTHDP evaluations, see Lawrence N. Bailis, Margaret Blasinsky, Stephanie Chestnutt, and Mark Tecco, *Job Training for the Homeless: Report on Demonstration's First Year* (Rockville, Md.: R.O.W. Sciences,

evaluate JTHDP under Section 731 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-77).

Since beginning operations in October 1988, organizations receiving demonstration grants designed and implemented innovative and replicable approaches for serving this population group. During the *Report* period, the emphasis was shifted from developing knowledge about how best to help homeless clients obtain jobs to building the capacity of mainstream JTPA programs (through partnerships formed with existing grantees) to promote enhanced capability for serving homeless individuals. During the period September 1994 through November 1995, funding of \$7.3 million enabled the project to focus on this new effort. (Grantees continued to provide case management, housing, supportive services, job training, and placement services for homeless clients.)

## **APPRENTICESHIP**

### **Background**

In FY 1995, registered apprenticeship programs employed and trained over 354,800 U.S. workers in the skilled trades. This was an increase from just over 325,700 workers in FY 1994. The apprenticeship system, which combines structured on-the-job training with related theoretical instruction (usually in a classroom environment) has long been recognized as an effective method for preparing people to enter and succeed in a variety of skilled and higher-paid occupations.

---

Inc., 1991) and John W. Trutko, et al., *Employment and Training for America's Homeless: Report on the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program* (Arlington, Va.: James Bell Associates, Inc., 1993).

The Federal role in apprenticeship is defined by the National Apprenticeship Act of 1937 (Public Law 75-308), which is known as the Fitzgerald Act. Through the Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT), the Federal Government establishes and promotes the adoption of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices. BAT does not directly operate apprenticeship programs. Rather, it registers apprenticeship programs and apprentices and provides assistance to employers, organized labor, and open shops to help plan and promote quality apprenticeship programs.

Employers or groups of employers and unions design, organize, manage, and finance apprenticeship training under the standards developed and registered with BAT or BAT-recognized State Apprenticeship Agencies. They also select apprentices who are trained to meet certain predetermined occupational standards.

In 27 States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico, programs are registered by State Apprenticeship Agencies or Councils which are recognized by the Secretary of Labor. Most State agencies receive policy guidance from apprenticeship councils composed of employers, labor groups, and public representatives.

BAT provides apprenticeship services in all States, and registers programs and apprentices in 23 States where there is no State Apprenticeship Agency or Council.

### **Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities**

Table 8 shows selected apprenticeship program data for Fiscal Years 1991 through 1995.

In FY 1995, 273,160 civilian apprentices received training in 33,916 civilian apprenticeship programs registered with BAT or State Apprenticeship Agencies. About 24.5 percent of these apprentices were minorities and 8.5 percent were women. In FY 1994, 247,958 civilian apprentices received training in over 34,000 civilian apprenticeship programs. About 24 percent were minorities and eight percent were women.

An additional 81,684 uniformed military apprentices in FY 1995 and 77,754 in FY 1994 were registered in 17 programs. About 33 percent of these military apprentices were minorities in both years; 7.5 percent were women in FY 1995, and seven percent were women in FY 1994.

At the end of FY 1995, the Department recognized 835 apprenticeable occupations, including eight new ones, which were Inspector Metal Fabricating; Computer Operator; Dispatcher, Service; Multi-Story Window/Building Exterior Cleaner; Tool Programmer, Numerical Control; Control Equipment Electrician-Technician; Guard, Security; and Tuckpointer, Cleaner, and Caulker.

This compares with 828 apprenticeable occupations recognized at the end of FY 1994. Apprenticeable occupations recognized during FY 1994 were: Teacher Aide 1; Plastic Process Technician; Construction Craft Laborer; and Facilities Locator.

Promoting equal opportunity in apprenticeship has been an important function of the Department. Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) in apprenticeship is pursued through promotion and technical assistance efforts and compliance reviews.

**Table 8. Selected Apprenticeship Program Data for  
Fiscal Years 1991 - 1995**

Item	Fiscal Years <sup>a</sup>				
	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Total number of civilian apprentices receiving training <sup>b</sup> . .	291,035	265,156	220,159	247,958	273,160
Percent minority . . . . .	22.5	22.2	22.7	24.0	24.5
Percent women . . . . .	7.1	7.6	7.6	8.0	8.5
Number of civilian apprenticeship programs . . . . .	42,000	41,000	36,000	34,035	33,916
Number of military apprentices . . . . .	45,000	64,000	69,952	77,754	81,684
Percent minority . . . . .	35.6	34.0	34.0	33.0	33.3
Percent women . . . . .	6.7	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.5
Number of reviews conducted:					
EEO compliance reviews . . . . .	1,700	1,200	1,800	1,290	NA
On-site quality reviews . . . . .	2,000	1,200	1,500	1,025	NA
Number of apprenticeship actions:					
New registrations . . . . .	99,500	63,000	79,000	110,785	94,112
Completions . . . . .	40,000	41,000	44,000	44,322	NA

<sup>a</sup>End of fiscal year data.

<sup>b</sup>Data for Fiscal Years 1991-1993 have been adjusted from previous editions of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* to reflect end of fiscal year enrollment.

Note: NA = Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

## Special FY 1994 and 1995 Initiatives

Major apprenticeship activities conducted or supported during the *Report* period include the STEP-UP program, the Center for Advanced Journeymen Education, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the United Automobile Workers (UAW) of America Skilled Trades Apprenticeship Preparation Program, the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act, Diversity in Apprenticeship grants, the Federal-State Registered Apprenticeship Liaison Committee, School-to-Work initiatives, the development of Education and Performance Apprenticeship Standards, the Construction Craft Skills Training program, and the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship.

**STEP-UP Program.** With technical assistance from BAT and the U.S. Department of Justice, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development created the STEP-UP program in FY 1994 to provide employment, job training, and career opportunities to public and Indian housing residents and other low-income persons. STEP-UP operates as a first step (one-year maximum) in a longer employment and training curriculum. It was developed as a component of the National Apprenticeship and Training Standards which is sponsored by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO).<sup>40</sup> There are 17 occupations in the NAHRO apprenticeship standards. Since the program's inception, the STEP-UP component has been incorporated in the apprenticeship standards of 19 public housing authorities.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>The standards developed by NAHRO were approved and registered by the BAT. They are used as guidelines for housing authorities and other organizations that wish to include the STEP-UP component in their registered apprenticeship programs.

<sup>41</sup>These STEP-UP public housing authorities are in: Huntsville, Alabama; Chandler, Nogales, and Phoenix, Arizona; Ft. Lauderdale, Florida; Chicago and Joliet,

**Center for Advanced Journeymen Education (Iowa Journeyworker Demonstration).** The purpose of this demonstration is to identify contemporary skill standards for mature journeymen in the construction industry served by the Central Iowa Labor Council. The demonstration is also developing and testing a curriculum geared to improving their skills.

**International Union of Operating Engineers.** Throughout FY 1994 and 1995, this BAT-supported effort—administered by the International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE)—trained participants in heavy equipment operation, maintenance, and repair. The project emphasized recruiting and training women for employment in nontraditional (heavy equipment) occupations. Apprenticeship participation is approximately 33 percent minorities and 18 percent female.<sup>42</sup>

**United Automobile Workers (UAW) of America Skilled Trades Apprenticeship Preparation Program.** In PY 1994, BAT and the Office of Policy and Research entered into an agreement with the UAW to develop and implement, on a pilot basis, an Apprenticeship Preparation Project<sup>43</sup> for recruiting, orienting, and training

---

Illinois; Baltimore, Maryland; Detroit, Michigan; St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minnesota; Albany, Cohoes, Schenectady, Troy, and Watervliet, New York; Dallas, Texas; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Huntington, West Virginia.

<sup>42</sup>IUOE owns 62 training sites located in the following States: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. A training site is also located in the District of Columbia.

<sup>43</sup>The grantee partners include the Center for Occupational Research (CORD) of Waco, Texas; the Labor Employment and Training Corporation of Bell, California; and the UAW Skilled Trades Department of Detroit, Michigan.

apprentices. The project provides services to minority and female workers. It will help UAW production workers make the transition into skilled trades and support Federal and State initiatives aimed at improving School-to-Work Opportunities for youth and young adults.

**Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations (WANTO) Act and the Diversity in Apprenticeship (DIA) Grants.** In FY 1995, women and minorities seeking to enter and move up in apprenticeship and nontraditional occupations benefitted from \$1.5 million awarded in technical assistance grants to community-based organizations. In this effort, the Department's two-fold objectives were to expand skilled employment and to create greater economic parity for working women and minorities.

Under WANTO, in FY 1995, three organizations received grants to provide technical assistance to employers and labor unions to expand the employment of women in apprenticeable and other nontraditional occupations in the private sector.<sup>44</sup> During FY 1994, the Department awarded six technical assistance grants totaling \$750,000 to community-based organizations<sup>45</sup> to help employers and labor unions expand skilled employment opportunities for working women. BAT and the

---

<sup>44</sup>The organizations that received grants under WANTO during FY 1995 were: The Home Builders Institute, Washington, D.C. for a nationwide program; the International Masonry Institute, Washington, D.C. for programs in Atlantic City, Chicago, Seattle, and the New England Region; and La Raza, Washington, D.C. for programs in Tucson, Arizona and Albuquerque, New Mexico.

<sup>45</sup>In FY 1994, WANTO grants were awarded to the Chicago Women in Trades, Chicago; Tradeswomen of Purpose/Women in Nontraditional Work, Inc., Philadelphia; Women's Resource Center, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Women Unlimited, Augusta, Maine; Wider Opportunities for Women, Washington, D.C.; and the Young Women's Christian (YWCA) Association of Greater Memphis/Women in Trades, Memphis, Tennessee.

Department's Women's Bureau jointly administer the WANTO grants.

Through the DIA grants for FY 1995, three community-based organizations provided technical assistance to employers and labor unions to encourage recruitment, selection, training, and retention of minorities in higher-skilled apprenticeable occupations.<sup>46</sup>

**Federal-State Registered Apprenticeship Liaison Committee.** One of the primary objectives of this committee is to build a strong Federal-State partnership for registered apprenticeship. Throughout the *Report* period, the Federal-State Registered Apprenticeship Liaison Committee continued to help improve communications and facilitate information sharing by conducting meetings and conferences, organizing regional and State planning and strategy sessions, and by establishing subcommittees to undertake a cost/benefit study of apprenticeship. In FY 1995, bi-regional sessions were held for BAT and State Apprenticeship Council (SAC) staff in various SAC States to develop and implement BAT/State annual plans.

**School-To-Work.** During FY 1995, staff members from local, State, and regional offices and the national office participated in implementing the School-To-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 by providing technical expertise, grant development assistance, statewide system development guidance, regional/tri-regional assistance, and regional and national office review teams.

**Education and Performance Apprenticeship Standards.** During FY 1995, BAT States and State Apprenticeship Councils continued to expand apprenticeship

---

<sup>46</sup>In FY 1995, the DIA grants were awarded to the following community-based organizations: the Minneapolis Urban League; the Long Island Women's Equal Opportunity Council, New York; and the Preparation Recruitment Employment Program (PREP), Inc., Ohio.

training and improve both the on-the-job training and related instruction components.

One initiative undertaken during the year was the establishment of an 80 percent core of competencies in the curriculum and work process schedules. Under the guidance of the Wisconsin State Apprenticeship Council, several of the newly established 14 State trade committees<sup>47</sup> are now using the “Developing a Curriculum” (DACUM) process in reviewing the related instruction for their trades. Other committees are also using the Wisconsin Apprenticeship model for expansion into new trade areas such as professional truck drivers and construction craft laborers. These committees have developed State standards for the trades through a partnership of industry, organized labor, the vocational education system, and State and Federal Government apprenticeship agencies.

In South Carolina, the BAT State office developed and registered apprenticeship training standards which several associations plan to use as a model for the uniform implementation of School-to-Work initiatives in the State. The standards can also be used to develop curriculum in grades K-14. One of South Carolina’s largest employers in the construction industry is a partner in this initiative and will use the standards as a tool to require apprenticeship training of all its employees, including related subcontractors, suppliers, and draftsmen who design the projects.

**Construction Craft Skills Training Program.** In PY 1993, the Department awarded \$360,330 to the Home Builders Institute to support the Construction Craft Skills Training Program. Operated by affiliated State and local associations of the National Association of Home Builders,<sup>48</sup> the program provided preapprenticeship

---

<sup>47</sup>State Committees exist in construction, manufacturing, and service industries.

<sup>48</sup>The Home Builders Institute is the training component of the National Association of Home Builders, which has a membership of 120,000 homebuilders. The association is involved with more than 800 affiliated State and local associations and

classroom and on-the-job training for economically disadvantaged individuals and displaced workers, with trainees entering registered apprenticeship programs. During PY 1993<sup>49</sup>, 253 individuals were trained, and 190 were placed in craft-related jobs. Eleven percent of the trainees were women. The grant expired in September 1994.

**Federal Committee on Apprenticeship<sup>50</sup> (FCA).** Reestablished in December 1993, the FCA advises the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training on ways to improve and expand the registered apprenticeship system. The Committee makes recommendations regarding: (1) policies on legislation and regulations affecting apprenticeship; (2) program responsibilities in the apprenticeship and journeyworker training areas; and (3) the most effective role of the apprenticeship training system in meeting future skilled worker training needs. The Committee's 21 members represent employers, organized labor, educators, the public, and four ex-officio members.<sup>51</sup>

## **SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM**

---

chapters.

<sup>49</sup>Data for the Construction Craft Skills Training Program are calculated on a program year basis.

<sup>50</sup>Section 2 of the National Apprenticeship Act of 1937 authorizes the appointment of national advisory committees.

<sup>51</sup>The four ex-officio members of the FCA are the president of the National Association of State and Territorial Apprenticeship Directors, the president of the National Association of Governmental Labor Officials (both of the members have voting rights), a representative of the U.S. Department of Education, and the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training.

## **Background**

Program Year 1994 marked the 29th year of the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) which is authorized in Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (P.L. 102-375). SCSEP finances the creation of part-time community service jobs for low-income individuals who are at least 55 years old, have poor employment prospects, and are unemployed.

Participants work at government agencies, nonprofit organizations, schools, and hospitals. SCSEP also provides nutrition programs, recreation, health and home care, and transportation services.

## **Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities**

PY 1994 SCSEP allocations totaled \$410.5 million, an increase of \$14.4 million over the PY 1993 allocation of \$396.1 million. Of this amount, \$320.2 million was provided to national sponsors and \$90.3 million was made available to State agencies in PY 1994. In PY 1993, approximately \$308 million was provided to national sponsors and approximately \$87 million to the State agencies.

SCSEP served 102,000 participants in part-time subsidized jobs in PY 1994 and over 100,000 participants in PY 1993.

In both years, consistent with policy direction provided by the Department to help older workers find unsubsidized employment, almost 30 percent of the individuals who were authorized to enroll were placed in unsubsidized jobs. Also for both years, the percentage of funds used for program administration continued to be below the

legislative limits.<sup>52</sup>

During the *Report* period, SCSEP sponsors continued to improve the geographical distribution of program resources in an effort to ensure that all eligible individuals have the same opportunity to participate in the program.

Characteristics of SCSEP participants for PY 1988 through 1994 are shown in Table 9.

As Chart 2 indicates, the percentage of participants who are 70 years old or older has been growing steadily over the past several years.

---

<sup>52</sup>The legislative limit for program administration is 15 percent of Federal funds. In PY 1993, approximately 12.5 percent of all Federal costs for the program were administrative costs, while in PY 1994, the figure was 12.1 percent.

**Table 9. Selected Characteristics of Senior Community Service Employment Program Participants, PY 1988 through PY 1994**

Characteristic	Program Year						
	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Sex:							
..... Male	27.9	29.7	29.2	28.7	28.9	28.9	28.2
..... Female	72.1	70.3	70.8	71.3	71.1	71.1	71.8
Age:							
..... 50-69 years	18.9	18.5	17.4	17.4	17.1	18.5	18.8
..... 60-64 years	24.5	27.3	26.1	25.4	25.0	24.8	24.5
..... 65-69 years	24.5	26.4	26.7	26.3	26.2	25.6	24.8
..... 70-74 years	19.2	16.3	17.3	18.1	18.7	18.6	19.0
..... 75 years and over	13.0	11.5	12.5	12.7	12.9	12.5	12.9
Ethnic group:							
..... White <sup>a</sup>	59.4	63.3	62.3	62.2	61.3	61.4	60.9
..... Black <sup>a</sup>	24.3	23.3	23.9	23.8	23.9	23.8	23.6
..... Hispanic	10.0	8.8	9.0	9.1	9.4	9.5	9.9
..... Indian/Alaskan	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7
..... Asian/Pacific Islander	4.3	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.8
Veteran	13.1	13.4	13.3	13.2	13.5	13.5	13.0
Education:							
..... 8th grade and under	20.4	27.4	26.4	25.1	24.3	22.5	21.3
..... 9th-11th grade	19.4	21.4	21.6	21.3	20.6	20.3	19.7
..... High school	38.1	34.2	34.8	35.4	36.1	37.3	37.8
..... 1-3 years of college	15.2	12.3	12.4	13.0	13.5	14.0	14.8

..... 4 years of college	4.7	4.8	5.1	5.6	5.9	6.3
6.9						
Family income below the poverty level .....	79.9	80.9	80.2	78.7	79.0	79.9
						79.5

---

<sup>a</sup>Not Hispanic.

Note: Numbers may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

---

---

## History of SCSEP

The SCSEP evolved from a pilot program which was established in the mid-1960s under Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act. The original program was known as Operation Mainstream. Administrative responsibility for Operation Mainstream was transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Labor in 1967.

“Green Thumb” was the first Operation Mainstream project. Initiated in 1965, it was administered by a nonprofit organization for rural workers and affiliated with the National Farmers’ Union. In its early years, most of Mainstream’s participants were 55 years old or older.

Mainstream services have remained essentially the same since the program’s inception. It was originally designed as a work experience program, with skill training, basic education, counseling and other supportive services available to supplement work experience. Participants often worked in community beautification and improvement projects which were operated by public and private nonprofit agencies. For the most part, these projects were concentrated in small communities and rural areas where there were few resources available for such activities and where job opportunities of any kind were often scarce. Because of the nature of the work, projects were generally seasonal and were curtailed during the winter months.

By the late 1960s (Fiscal Years 1967 and 1968), there were about 200 different Mainstream projects operating throughout the country, serving approximately 24,000 participants each year.

During the project’s early years, the median educational level of the participants was less than eighth grade. Thirty percent of the project’s enrollees were welfare recipients, and about one fifth had been unemployed for over a year.

In 1968, contracts of about \$1 million each were awarded to the National Council on Aging and the National Council of Senior Citizens to establish new demonstrations which were known as Older American Community Service Programs. In 1969, the American Association of Retired Persons was added to the list of national organizations that received Federal funds to provide various services to older individuals.

In the early 1970s, the U.S. Forest Service was authorized to initiate Operation Mainstream projects. The program was given a legislative basis under the Older Americans Act. In addition, a few States and territories received funds in 1976 to operate Mainstream projects.

Three national organizations representing various minority groups received funding in the late 1970s. These were the National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, the Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores, and the National Urban League.

Funding for the initiative increased to \$367 million by the end of the 1980s. The funding increase enabled the inclusion of two additional national minority sponsors—the National Pacific/Asian Resource Center on Aging, and the National Indian Council on Aging.

Today, the program is operated in 50 States and territories and by 10 national sponsor organizations. Most States operate the program through their own agencies, although Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Montana, and South Dakota have assigned administrative responsibility for operating their programs to one or more of the national sponsor organizations.



## **EMPLOYMENT SERVICE**

During the *Report* period, the Employment Service (ES) conducted a variety of labor exchange activities; developed a comprehensive workforce investment strategy that included labor exchange revitalization, reemployment services, and technology initiatives; administered the Foreign Labor Certification program; and conducted a number of related activities. These efforts are described below.

### **Labor Exchange and Other Activities**

#### **Labor Exchange**

In PY 1994, 18,809,900 people registered with local ES offices and received a wide variety of employment-related services. In PY 1993, over 20 million individuals registered with ES offices. As in previous years, jobseekers were interviewed and, based on their experience, education, training, and aptitudes, they were assigned one or more occupational codes to help match their job skills with reemployment services and employers' job orders.

In PY 1994, 40.7 percent of these jobseekers were eligible unemployment compensation claimants, 43.8 percent were women, and 15.6 percent were economically disadvantaged. In PY 1993, these figures were 47 percent, 43 percent, and 17 percent, respectively.

In PY 1994, local ES offices referred over 8.2 million jobseekers to interviews with employers, who listed over 6.6 million job openings with the ES. This compares to over eight million jobseekers and some 6.4 million job openings in PY 1993. In both

years, 2.7 million persons were placed in jobs (representing 32.6 percent of those referred to employers in PY 1994 and 34 percent in PY 1993).

ES offices referred about 405,200 individuals to training and provided about 676,300 with employment-related counseling during PY 1994. This compares with about 363,000 individuals who were referred to training and over 629,000 who received employment-related counseling during the previous program year.

Table 10 shows selected characteristics of ES clients and the services they received during Program Years 1993 and 1994.

**Table 10. Selected Characteristics of Employment Service Clients and Services Received, Program Years 1993 and 1994**

Program Year	Item	Program Year		
		1993	1994	
	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total	Number
Total Applicants	20,195,000	100.0	18,809,900	100.0
Customers served:				
..... Economically disadvantaged	3,425,600	17.0	2,943,700	15.6
..... Veterans	2,572,100	12.7	2,299,200	12.2
..... Eligible UI claimants	9,236,000	45.7	7,662,100	40.7
..... Migrant and seasonal farmworkers	215,800	1.1	191,400	1.0

Youth . . . . .	3,181,500	15.8	2,979,900	15.8
55 years old and older . . . . .	1,384,500	6.9	1,219,400	6.5
Services received:				
Referred to employment . . . . .	8,094,600	40.1	8,217,700	43.7
Entered employment . . . . .	3,308,200	16.4	3,357,200	17.9
Placed in jobs . . . . .	2,734,300	13.5	2,681,800	14.3
Counseled . . . . .	629,900	3.1	676,300	3.6
Tested . . . . .	716,500	3.5	458,200	2.4
Referred to skills training . . . . .	363,800	1.8	405,200	2.2
Placed in training . . . . .	102,900	0.5	102,900	0.5
Job search activities . . . . .	3,219,900	15.9	4,014,500	21.3
Received some reportable . . . . . service	1,827,000		58.6	1,990,300
63.7				

---

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

---

Employment Service expenditures totaled \$825 million in PY 1994 and \$824 million in PY 1993.

During the *Report* period, the Department formed a multidisciplinary work team made up of labor exchange, training, and income support experts. The team, formed to improve the labor exchange and reemployment prospects of jobseekers, created a workforce investment strategy which included the development of State One-Stop Career Center systems.<sup>53</sup> As the workforce investment strategy proceeded, a series of consultation papers were issued by the Department to solicit advice from the Federal-State employment security and training systems.

---

<sup>53</sup>The One-Stop Career Center system consolidates the delivery of State employment and training services. One-Stop Career Center systems provide effective customer-oriented employment and training services for jobseekers and employers. This means easy access to the services that workers need to find first jobs, new, or better jobs, and that employers need to build a high-quality labor force.

As a result of this effort, the Administration introduced the Reemployment Act in Congress in March 1994 to provide for a comprehensive workforce strategy. While the 103rd Congress adjourned without taking action on the Act, the Department began to invest in One-Stop system-building efforts across the country.

### **Employment Service Revitalization Initiative**

In February 1994, at the request of the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, the ES “Revitalization” initiative began with the formation of a special work group. The work group consisted of representatives from the Department of Labor, the Interstate Conference for Employment Security Agencies (ICESA), State Employment Security Agencies (SESAs), and public unions (i.e., the Service Employees International Union, the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, and the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security). Under the leadership of the Department’s United States Employment Service (USES), the group was responsible for devising and implementing both a short- and long-term strategy for increasing the value of the ES to workers, job seekers, and employers. The strategies were also designed to promote an increased sense of job fulfillment among ES employees.

Throughout the *Report* period, the work group met monthly and held bimonthly teleconferences which resulted in the preparation of the following long-term vision statement: “The ES is the Nation’s recognized leader in providing efficient labor exchange services and a universal gateway to workforce development resources by professional, empowered employees.”

The work group also developed a short-term “ES Revitalization Work Plan” which focused on continuous quality improvements in services to ES customers. The

plan serves as a guide for each SESA which can tailor ES revitalization efforts to fit its own needs.

The ES Revitalization Work Plan was presented at the ICESA annual conference in September 1994. At the conference, the national customer service annual awards program was initiated. The program recognizes SESA programs and ES workers for outstanding performance.<sup>54</sup> SESAs in nine States received national customer service awards for innovation in customer service, collaboration for improved service, leading tools and technology, and professional development/capacity building. In late 1994, the work group was expanded to include a representative from the Employers' National Job Service Council.

In October 1994, in an effort to obtain technical support for the revitalization initiative, the USES, in consultation with ICESA, entered into "Cooperative Agreements" with Iowa, Texas, West Virginia, Maryland, Rhode Island, and Ohio to provide technical support in the following areas: (1) staff training and capacity building; (2) leadership activities; (3) best practices, model clearinghouses; (4) local office as a resource center; (5) customer satisfaction and input; and (6) best practices in job matching. These agreements produced specific information that was used in the revitalization effort.

The ES Revitalization Work Plan was transmitted to the SESAs in October 1994. SESAs were requested to submit copies of their individual revitalization work plans which were subsequently summarized in two publications prepared by USES.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup>The annual customer service recognition program was a recommendation made by the ES Revitalization work group.

<sup>55</sup>These were: "State Employment Service Revitalization Plan Summaries" and "Highlights: State Employment Service Revitalization Plans" (Washington, D.C.: United States Employment Service, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training

In furthering the ES revitalization effort, the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training requested an independent assessment of the ES during the *Report* period. The assessment included a review of ES as a corporate enterprise rather than a Federal program administered by the States. It also included an evaluation of ES “assets” and “liabilities” to provide the work group with an aggregate picture of the ES as a national service business.

Completed in December 1994, the study pointed out that ES operates with a “self-correcting mechanism” in which the Federal/State system has the ability to identify problems, meet and engage in constructive dialogue to solve problems, to debate alternative solutions, to agree upon a course of action, and to implement business plans that address identified problems.

### **America’s Job Bank**

In November 1993, the Secretary of Labor redesignated the Interstate Job Bank as America’s Job Bank. America’s Job Bank helps employers fill jobs that could not be filled locally. Employers may list their unfilled job openings in America’s Job Bank either directly or through State ES agencies.

Job Bank listings are distributed electronically to all States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. State ES agencies include America’s Job Bank in automated self-service systems in local offices, at information kiosks, and through partnership agreements with libraries, schools, and other places where the

---

Administration, May 1995).

public can access Job Bank listings.<sup>56</sup>

In PY 1994, SESAs listed about 710,000 job openings in the Job Bank. In PY 1993, SESAs listed about 455,000 job openings in America's Job Bank to extend the advertisement of job openings on behalf of employers and to help people find jobs in other states. More than one-quarter of the job vacancies were in professional and managerial occupations and another quarter were in clerical, sales, and service occupations. Chart 3 shows the number of job listings with America's Job Bank (and formerly, the Interstate Job Bank) since 1991.

## **Reemployment Services**

The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System is an early intervention approach that helps individuals who seek unemployment insurance (UI) to speed their return to productive employment. It consists of two components: (1) a set of criteria—a “profile”—that can be used to identify UI claimants who are likely to exhaust their benefits before they find a new job; and (2) various reemployment services for these individuals. States and employment security agencies are required to “profile” all unemployment compensation claimants to determine their likelihood of exhausting benefits. These individuals, as a condition of continued receipt of benefits, are referred to reemployment services such as job search assistance training.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>The Job Bank listings are also provided to military transition offices at more than 300 U.S. military bases around the world.

<sup>57</sup>The first legislation that called for profiling was Section 4 of Public Law 103-6. It called for the Secretary of Labor to establish a worker profiling program. State participation was voluntary. The FY 1994 Federal budget included \$9 million to establish such a program and another \$9 million was requested for FY 1995. Public Law 103-6 was later superseded by Section 4 of Public Law 103-152 which amended the Social Security Act. It added a new subsection requiring State agencies that

A recent Department-sponsored study revealed that the early referral of long-term UI claimants to reemployment services speeds up their return to new jobs.<sup>58</sup> During the *Report* period, ES, in conjunction with the UI Service (UIS) and the Department's office responsible for administering Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act (EDWAA) programs, issued policy and operating instructions to States to implement the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services initiative.

In PY 1994, ES, UIS and EDWAA selected five prototype States<sup>59</sup> to pioneer worker profiling techniques and reemployment services to speed the return of long-term unemployed UI claimants to new jobs. Funds were awarded to the prototype States and 20 "first wave" States to develop profiling models and to strengthen the provision of reemployment services by both ES and training service providers.

### **Employers' National Job Service Council**

Throughout PY 1993 and 1994, the Department continued to fund the Employers' National Job Service Council (ENJSC), a volunteer organization of

---

administer UI laws to establish and use a system of profiling all new claimants for regular compensation.

<sup>58</sup>See *The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System: Legislation, Implementation Process and Research Findings* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service, 1994), which is summarized in Chapter 2 of this publication.

<sup>59</sup>The States selected were Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Oregon.

approximately 100,000 employers who work with ES through 1,100 local Job Service Employer Committees (JSECs). ENJSC helps ES improve its labor exchange system and inform employers of America's Job Bank and other related programs. It also helps employers understand the processes for hiring and training special groups of workers, including individuals who are economically disadvantaged, youth who are at-risk of dropping out of school or not succeeding in the labor market, veterans, and disabled persons.

### **Targeted Jobs Tax Credit**

Authorization for the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit (TJTC), which was first authorized by the Revenue Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-600), and subsequently reauthorized several times,<sup>60</sup> expired December 31, 1994.

TJTC provided tax credits to employers who hired individuals with significant barriers to employment from nine specific target groups.<sup>61</sup> In most cases, employers

---

<sup>60</sup>Its final reauthorization came under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

<sup>61</sup>These groups were people with disabilities who were referred to employers from the vocational rehabilitation programs of either a State or the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs; youth ages 18-22 from economically disadvantaged families; youth ages 16-19 from economically disadvantaged families who participated in qualified cooperative education programs; economically disadvantaged youth 16 to 17 years old on the hiring date, who had not previously worked for the employer, and were hired for a summer job; economically disadvantaged Vietnam-era veterans; recipients of Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI); recipients of State and local general assistance payments for at least 30 days; economically disadvantaged ex-convicts who were hired no later than five years after their date of release from prison or the date of conviction (whichever was more recent); and recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) who were eligible for AFDC benefits on the hiring date and had received it for 90 days immediately before being hired.

who hired qualified individuals could claim a tax credit of 40 percent of the first \$6,000 of the employee's first-year wages, for a maximum credit of \$2,400. In cases where employers hired economically disadvantaged youth, they could claim a credit of 40 percent of the youth's wages up to \$3,000, for a maximum credit of \$1,200.

Individuals from the designated target groups received *vouchers* which indicated to prospective employers that, if hired, the employer would be eligible for the tax credit. Employers who hired individuals who had the vouchers could then obtain *certifications* from State Employment Security Agencies (SESAs). The certifications would later be used by the employers to document their eligibility to receive the tax credit. While most of the vouchers were issued by the SESAs, qualified cooperative education programs, local welfare offices, and local offices of the Department of Veterans' Affairs were also authorized to issue vouchers. (Certifications, however, were issued only by the SESAs.)

In August 1994, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) issued a report of an audit of the TJTC program in selected States. The OIG concluded that TJTC was not an effective and economical means of helping target group members obtain jobs; mostly because employers would have hired these individuals anyway. The Administration did not request an extension of the program.

During Calendar Year 1994, 591,632 TJTC vouchers and 391,896 certifications were issued. During Calendar Year 1993, 379,427 vouchers and 272,763 certifications were issued.<sup>62</sup>

## **Occupational Information Network**

---

<sup>62</sup>Because TJTC was a tax-related program, data were provided on a calendar year basis.

Throughout the *Report* period, the Department continued to replace the 60-year-old publication, the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT)* and the system that produces it with a new, computerized database known as the Occupational Information Network (O\*NET). The O\*NET collects, analyzes, organizes, publishes, and disseminates scientifically verified worker skills and job requirement information.

The O\*NET will be as a major component of a new national labor market information system. In support of the O\*NET's database, the Department plans to combine the Occupational Analysis Field Centers with the Assessment Research and Development Centers.

The Assessment Research and Development Centers are located in Sacramento, California; Salt Lake City, Utah; Detroit, Michigan; Raleigh, North Carolina; and Brooklyn, New York. Staff are employed by their respective State employment security offices except for the Sacramento office, which is staffed by a private sector company. Under cooperative agreements with Department, the Centers worked in PY 1994 on the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) improvement final report, the abilities profiler, and the revision of the occupational interest inventory.

During the same period, the Occupational Analysis Field Centers, under grants from the Department, worked with the O\*NET prototype developer to convert existing *DOT* data to the new O\*NET content model and assisted with data collection. These field centers are located in Boston, Massachusetts; Salt Lake City, Utah; Detroit, Michigan; Raleigh, North Carolina; and St. Louis, Missouri. Staff are employed by their respective State employment security offices.

In addition to serving as an occupational information database, the O\*NET system will serve as a framework for the Department's assessment research and development activities.

During the *Report* period, the O\*NET system undertook a series of initiatives to improve the technical validity and reliability of existing assessment tools (such as the GATB and the “occupational interest inventory”).

The O\*NET database and assessment tools will serve ES offices, one-stop career centers, and other workforce development initiatives such as school-to-work transition programs, activities centered around developing skill standards for various occupations, America’s Labor Market Information System, the Job Corps, and EDWAA programs.

### **Help for Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers**

The H-2A Temporary Labor Certification program (which is described in more detail later in this section) enables agricultural employers who anticipate a shortage of domestic workers to bring nonimmigrant aliens into the country to perform agricultural labor (or services of a temporary or seasonal nature) *only if U.S. workers are not available*. In this regard, during the *Report* period, the National Monitor Advocate<sup>63</sup> worked closely with the Department’s Division of Foreign Labor Certifications to enhance the recruitment of U.S. farmworkers as required by the H-2A program. This was accomplished by publicizing jobs with farmworker organizations and the media.

In addition, the migrant rest center in Ohio received \$36,000 in additional funds during the period to develop automated job information to be made available to migrant workers on their way to employment in the midwest.

---

<sup>63</sup>The National Monitor Advocate, along with regional and State Monitor Advocates, oversees and promotes employment services for farmworkers.

Also during the period, several States tested innovative programs to help migrant and seasonal farmworkers. One such program in New York State established Job Service Employer Committees to address the unique situation, problems, and information needs of agricultural workers. Regional office staff helped the committees obtain current information on Federal regulatory requirements.

## **Foreign Labor Certification**

Alien labor certification programs ensure that the admission of aliens to work in this country on a permanent or temporary basis does not adversely affect the job opportunities, wages, and working conditions of U.S. workers. With few exceptions, foreign labor programs are jointly administered by the Department of Labor and the State Employment Security Agencies. These programs are summarized below.

**Permanent Labor Certification.** Aliens seeking to immigrate to the United States to work must obtain an offer of permanent, full-time employment from an employer in the United States. The alien cannot be admitted as a permanent resident unless, among other things, the employer obtains a labor certification from the Department acknowledging that qualified U.S. workers are not able, willing, or available for the employment offered to the alien and that the wages and working conditions offered to the alien will not adversely affect those of similarly employed U.S. workers.

The labor certification process requires the employer to recruit U.S. workers at prevailing wages and working conditions through the State Employment Service, by advertising, posting notice of the job opportunity, and by other appropriate means. A regional Labor Department certifying officer makes a decision to grant or deny the labor certification based on the results of the employer's recruitment efforts and compliance with the Department's regulations.

In an effort to further ensure that the entry of foreign workers does not depress the wages of U.S. workers, in FY 1995 the Department provided special funding for all States to hire a prevailing wage specialist. In addition, during FY 1995 a prevailing wage task force, made up of national, regional, and State wage rate experts was formed. The team will support the prevailing wage responsibilities of the States, including: (1) providing technical assistance and training to State staff; (2) examining current prevailing wage practices; and (3) identifying current wage surveys which meet certain standards.

Also in FY 1995 Federal and State ES staff continued to improve the alien labor certification process. The goal of the initiative was to reduce the resources needed for alien labor certification, to simplify the process, improve customer service, and increase the use of technology in this effort.

The Department also held two national conferences in FY 1995 which were attended by national, State, and regional ES staff and experts in the immigration field. Attendees discussed prevailing wages, advertising, and other recruitment methods used to attract U.S. workers, State and Federal roles in alien labor certification, litigation and legal issues, and consistency in interpreting policies.

In FY 1995, the Department received 35,509 applications from employers to allow foreign workers to fill permanent jobs; 26,044 of these applications were approved. In FY 1994, the Department received 27,287 employer applications and 24,721 were approved.

**H-2B Labor Certification.** Under the H-2B nonimmigrant visa classification, aliens may come temporarily to the United States to perform nonagricultural work. The process for obtaining an H-2B labor certification is very similar to that required for permanent labor certification, although it is not as extensive or time consuming. The

labor certification may be issued for a period of up to one year; renewable for a maximum of three years, and the job must be temporary (i.e., a one-time occurrence, a seasonal need, a peak workload need, or an intermittent need).

In FY 1995 the Department received 2,153 applications from employers requesting certification for temporary nonagricultural job opportunities. In FY 1994, 2,234 applications were received.

**H-2A Temporary Labor Certification.** The H-2A temporary agricultural program provides a way for agricultural employers who anticipate a shortage of domestic workers to bring nonimmigrant aliens to the U.S to perform temporary or seasonal agricultural labor or services. Before the Immigration and Naturalization Service can consider an employer's petition for such workers, the employer must file an application with the Department stating that there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified, and available, and that the employment of aliens will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed U.S. workers.

The statute and Department regulations provide for numerous worker protections and employer requirements with respect to wages and working conditions of workers in this program that do not apply to nonagricultural programs. The Department's Employment Standards Administration enforces the provisions of H-2A worker contracts. In both Calendar Years 1994 and 1993, the Department received approximately 3,000 applications requesting certification to fill approximately 18,000 job openings with temporary agricultural foreign workers.

In both FY 1994 and FY 1995, funds from JTPA's Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker (Section 402) program<sup>64</sup> were made available through State and

---

<sup>64</sup>See the description of the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers program in this Chapter. Also see Marlene Strong and Ron D'Amico, *Evaluation of the JTPA Title IV*

community agencies in Florida to help workers travel to agricultural jobs in other States.

**H-1A Nurses.** The Immigration Nursing Relief Act (INRA) of 1989 established a new H-1A nonimmigrant classification for registered nurses for a five-year period. In order for a health care facility to access and employ foreign nurses under INRA, the facility must take “timely and significant” steps to develop, recruit, and retain U.S. registered nurses in order to reduce dependence on nonimmigrant alien nurses, while simultaneously ensuring the protection of their wages and working conditions. There must be no strike or lockout at the place of employment. H-1A “attestations”<sup>65</sup> are filed with and processed by regional offices in Boston, Chicago, Dallas, and Seattle. As required by law, records are maintained for public disclosure in the Department’s national office.

In FY 1994, 1,709 H-1A attestations were received, of which, the Department approved 1,424. The program expired September 1, 1995.

**H-1B Specialty (Professional) Workers.** Employers who intend to temporarily employ alien workers in professional occupations or as fashion models must file labor condition applications with the Department stating that they will pay the appropriate wage rate to the alien, that they have notified the bargaining representative or otherwise posted notice of their intent to employ alien workers, and that there is no strike or lockout at the place of employment. Aggrieved parties may file complaints with the Department regarding misrepresentation or failure to comply with the statements

---

*Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program* (Oakland and Menlo Park, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994) which is summarized in Chapter 2 of this publication.

<sup>65</sup>Attestations are statements by health care facilities that timely and significant steps have been taken to develop, recruit, and retain U.S. registered nurses and that there are no strike or lock-out activities.

attested to in the application.

Where the complaint is successful, the Employment Standards Administration may assess penalties (usually a fine called a civil monetary penalty) and the employer may be barred from filing petitions for permanent and temporary workers for at least one year. H-1B applications may be approved for periods of up to three years, and can be extended for three more—the maximum allowable period of stay in the United States under H-1B status.

The statute limits the number of aliens that may be admitted to the United States on H-1B visas to 65,000 per year. The Department amended its regulations on December 20, 1994, by publishing a final rule to increase protections for U.S. workers and codify policy positions developed through the operation of the program. However, there has been much criticism that employers still do not need to test the labor market for available and qualified U.S. workers, nor is there a prohibition on hiring foreign workers when U.S. workers are laid off from the same firm.

The Department received 117,345 H-1B labor condition applications<sup>66</sup> in FY 1995 and 97,166 applications in FY 1994.

In FY 1994, the top five occupations requested were physical and occupational therapists, computer occupations, college/university faculty, physicians/surgeons, and accountants/auditors. (The physical and occupational therapists category and the computer occupations category accounted for 74 percent of all requests in FY 1994.)

**F-1 Students.** Under the F-1 program, foreign students may work for employers

---

<sup>66</sup>Since the statutory Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) limit is 65,000 per year admitted to the United States, employers are requesting that the Department approve more attestations than the number for which will eventually be issued visas.

who have filed attestations with the Department. Students may work off-campus after the first year of study for no more than 20 hours per week, and full-time during vacation periods and between school terms. Attestations filed by the employer must state that they have recruited unsuccessfully for 60 days and that they will pay the appropriate wage rate to F-1 students and similarly employed workers. Employers may be disqualified from hiring foreign students if the Department finds misrepresentation or noncompliance with the attestation. This pilot program for off-campus employment of foreign students is scheduled to expire on September 30, 1996.

In FY 1995, the Department received 976 F-1 student attestations and approved 559. In FY 1994, 1,735 student attestations were received and 905 were approved.

**D-1 Crewmembers.** Performance of longshore work at U.S. ports by D-1 crewmembers on foreign vessels is prohibited, with few exceptions.

One such exception requires an employer to file an attestation with the Department stating that it is the prevailing practice for the activity at that port, that there is no strike or lockout at the place of employment, and that notice has been given to U.S. workers or their representatives. Violations may produce penalties of up to \$5,000 for each alien crewmember wrongfully performing longshore work, and would bar vessels owned or chartered by the employer from entering all U.S. ports for up to one year.

Another exception applies to longshore work to be performed in Alaska. The regulations governing the Alaska exception were published in the *Federal Register* on January 19, 1995.

In FY 1995, the Department received 34 such attestations for the performance of longshore work at U.S ports in the State of Alaska, and approved 33. In FY 1994, nine attestations were received and nine were approved.

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM

### Background

The Federal-State unemployment insurance (UI) system provides cash payments directly to unemployed persons who were engaged in work covered by State UI laws, lost their jobs through no fault of their own, and are looking for new employment. It covers about 110 million workers—virtually all persons working for salaries and wages in the Nation.

The UI program was established under the tax credit and grant incentives enacted in the original Social Security Act of 1935. The system is financed primarily through State taxes paid by employers on the wages of their covered workers, although three States also collect small taxes from employees. Funds collected are held for the States in the Unemployment Trust Fund in the U.S. Treasury.

State agencies take applications for and administer the UI program. Regular benefits (cash payments to laid-off workers) are payable for up to 26 weeks in most States, and extended benefits (EB) are payable in individual States when “triggered on” by periods of high unemployment in a State. EB payments increase a claimant’s benefit entitlement by half of their entitlement to regular benefits, for a combined total of up to 39 weeks. The EB program is funded on a shared basis—half from State funds and half from Federal funds.

From time to time, in periods of national economic recession, when all States are affected by high and sustained unemployment, federally funded programs of

supplemental benefits have been adopted. There were two such programs during the 1970s, one during the early 1980s, and the Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) program which was effective from November 1991 through April 1994.

As agents of the Federal Government, States also pay benefits to ex-service members with recent service in the Armed Forces, former civilian Federal employees, workers who lose their jobs as a result of the Nation's trade policies, and workers who lose their jobs as a result of a natural disaster and are otherwise ineligible for UI.

### **Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities**

Initial claims for regular UI benefits averaged 1.5 million per month in FY 1995—the same monthly average for FY 1994.

In FY 1995, approximately 7.9 million workers received benefits totaling \$21.0 billion under regular State UI programs. In FY 1994, about 8.2 million workers received benefits totaling \$21.7 billion under these State programs. Table 11 shows the number of beneficiaries and amount of benefits paid under all unemployment compensation programs in FY 1994 and FY 1995.

**Table 11. Unemployment Compensation Benefits Paid and Beneficiaries by Program, FY 1994 and 1995**

Program	Amount (In Millions)		Beneficiaries (In Thousands)	
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1994	FY 1995
Regular State Unemployment Benefits . . . . .	\$21,667	\$20,994	8,162	7,893
Federal-State Extended Benefits . . . . .	292	77	217	69
Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC) Benefits . . . . .	4,224	0	1,017	0
Unemployment Compensation for for Federal Employees (UCFE) <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	333	344	84	82
Unemployment Compensation for Ex-servicemembers (UCX) <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	398	319	103	84
Trade Readjustment Allowances <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	120.2	143.2	30,845	27,900
Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA) <sup>c</sup> . . . . .	76.3	15.2	31,942	13,246
<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>27,224.5</b>	<b>21,892.4</b>	<b>41,308<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>21,305<sup>d</sup></b>

<sup>a</sup>The UCFE program provides benefits to jobless former Federal employees, and the UCX program provides benefits to unemployed ex-servicemembers. Both programs are financed with Federal funds, with States-through agreements with the Secretary of Labor-determining benefit amounts, terms, and conditions of receipt.

<sup>b</sup>Trade readjustment allowances are provided to workers laid off by firms adversely affected by import competition. Claimants must exhaust eligibility for regular unemployment insurance and extended benefits before collecting trade readjustment allowances. (See the section on trade adjustment assistance in this chapter.)

<sup>c</sup>Disaster unemployment assistance aids workers made jobless by a major disaster as declared by the President. Benefit payments are funded out of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's appropriation. Individuals eligible for regular unemployment insurance benefits are not eligible for disaster unemployment assistance.

<sup>d</sup>To avoid duplication, extended benefit and trade readjustment allowance recipients are not included in the total.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

## **Reemployment Demonstration Projects**

During the *Report* period, the Department continued to conduct a series of demonstration projects that test innovative ways of using the UI system to help claimants who lose their jobs through major layoffs or plant closings. These “dislocated worker” initiatives are designed to:

- Identify UI recipients who meet the “profile” of a dislocated worker and refer these individuals to reemployment services early in their spell of unemployment;
- Test different reemployment service options that help targeted UI recipients become reemployed (either in a wage and salary job or through self-employment); and
- Create effective service delivery networks for dislocated UI recipients through improved program linkages among UI and other service providers, including the Employment Service, the EDWAA program, and economic development agencies.

Five States (Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, Washington, and Wisconsin) and the District of Columbia participated in such demonstration projects during the *Report* period. The various projects are briefly described below.

## **Self-Employment Demonstration Projects**

During the *Report* period, the Department continued to study the viability of self-employment as a reemployment option for a portion of the population of unemployed workers. The first impact evaluation of two UI self-employment demonstration projects in Washington State and Massachusetts was completed during the period. These projects had provided UI beneficiaries who were permanently laid off and were interested in self-employment with an array of services designed to help them start their

own microenterprises.<sup>67</sup>

The Washington demonstration, called the SEED Project, provided selected UI claimants with self-employment allowances in the form of lump-sum payments which could be used as business startup capital. These payments were equal to the remainder of the claimants' entitlement for UI benefits. The project also provided participants with a series of business training seminars, one-on-one business counseling and technical assistance, and regular meetings of a peer support group.

A total of 755 eligible UI recipients were randomly selected to receive these services while another 752 were assigned to a control group (which did not receive self-employment services but did receive other UI services). Of those individuals who received services, 450 received lump-sum payments averaging \$4,225 each to start microenterprises. Business starts were primarily in the areas of services and retail trade, with some small-scale manufacturing and construction businesses also started.

The Massachusetts demonstration, called the Enterprise Project, provided eligible UI recipients with biweekly self-employment allowance payments equal to their regular UI benefits to supplement their earnings while they were starting their new businesses. (Lump-sum payments were not offered in the Massachusetts project.) Like the Washington State project, Massachusetts participants received a series of business training workshops, one-on-one business counseling and technical assistance, and peer support.

Enrollments for the Enterprise Project ended in May 1993. Over the three years of project operations, 614 UI claimants were selected for the demonstration and another 608 were selected for a control group. Project participants received biweekly

---

<sup>67</sup>They were typically sole proprietorships with one or a few employees.

self-employment allowances of approximately \$530 to \$540 per person while working full-time on planning and operating their businesses. Nearly half of the Massachusetts participants started their own microenterprises, mostly in the services industry.

An evaluation report on the net impacts of the self-employment demonstration projects, based on followup data one and one-half years after enrollment in each project, was published during FY 1994.<sup>68</sup> The results from this report showed that self-employment assistance promoted rapid reemployment of participants who pursued this option (between two and four percent of the population of UI beneficiaries). Self-employment assistance significantly reduced project participants' initial duration of unemployment and increased their total employment (i.e., the combination of self-employment plus wage and salary employment) over the followup period.

Self-employment assistance also had an impact on job creation for participants, nearly doubling the number of business starts by participants (as compared to a randomly selected control group) in both Washington State and Massachusetts. Sixty-three percent of those businesses started by project participants in Washington State were still operating at the time of the followup survey; in Massachusetts, 77 percent of the participants who started a business through the project were still in business at the time of the survey. The authors of the study report concluded, "Given these results, we believe that self-employment programs like Washington State's SEED Demonstration and the Massachusetts Enterprise Project represent viable policy tools for promoting

---

<sup>68</sup>See Jacob M. Benus, et al., *Self-Employment Programs: A New Reemployment Strategy, Final Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration* (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994) which is summarized in Chapter 2 of this publication. See also Jacob M. Benus, Michelle L. Wood, and Neelima Grover, *Self-Employment as a Reemployment Option: Demonstration Results and National Legislation*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-3 (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994) which is also summarized in Chapter 2.

the rapid reemployment of UI claimants.”<sup>69</sup>

Based in part on the findings of this evaluation report, a provision allowing States to establish self-employment assistance programs as part of their UI programs was signed into law as part of Title V of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Implementation Act (P.L. 103-182).

### **Work Search Demonstration Project**

The area of work search represents a complex issue within the UI system. While one purpose of UI is to provide financial support to unemployed workers separated from jobs through no fault of their own, another important purpose is to promote the reemployment of UI recipients. In this regard, the UI system offers reemployment services and most States require that claimants make an active search for suitable work.

During the *Report* period, the Department conducted a demonstration project in Maryland to test the effects of alternative work search requirements on UI recipients' return to work. The demonstration drew on the findings of several previous studies, including the Washington Alternative Work Search Experiment. The project tested four variations on work search requirements for UI recipients: (1) no required work search contacts; (2) required work search requirements (two work search contacts) plus increased verification of those contacts; (3) regular work search requirements plus a job search workshop; and (4) an increased number of required work search contacts (four) with potential employers.

---

<sup>69</sup>Since contractors conducting research and evaluation projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, their findings do not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department.

The Maryland Work Search Demonstration began operations on a pilot test basis in one UI local office from March-June 1993. Full implementation of the demonstration project began in June 1993 in five sites covering seven local offices in Maryland. The demonstration completed enrolling participants in December 1994. Using UI data files, participants are being tracked for 12 months after enrollment.

### **Job Search Assistance Demonstration Projects**

Title II of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 required the Department to enter into agreements with three States to test the feasibility of providing intensive job search assistance programs for dislocated workers. These Job Search Assistance Demonstrations will use the UI program to rapidly identify UI recipients likely to exhaust their benefits before they find new jobs and to refer these individuals to job search assistance services early in their unemployment spell.

The project is designed to determine the feasibility of implementing different types of job search assistance programs. The Job Search Assistance (JSA) Demonstration is an experimental research effort which builds on the results of the New Jersey UI Demonstration Project.<sup>70</sup> The New Jersey demonstration showed that intensive job search assistance services can speed dislocated UI claimants' return to productive employment. The JSA demonstration expands on this knowledge by testing alternative service approaches to see which ones have the greatest impacts and are the most cost-effective.

---

<sup>70</sup>See Walter Corson and Joshua Haimson, *The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project: Six-Year Followup and Summary Report* (Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1994) which is summarized in Chapter 2 of this publication.

A comprehensive range of job search assistance services will be provided to targeted workers enrolled in the demonstration. These services include orientation, vocational testing, a workshop on job search skills, individual assessment and counseling, and followup assistance. Additional services may include intensive placement assistance, job clubs, and classroom or on-the-job training programs provided through the EDWAA program.<sup>71</sup>

Florida, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia were competitively selected to operate the Job Search Assistance Demonstration Projects. (Wisconsin later withdrew from the project.) The Florida demonstration, which began in November 1994, is operating in ten local sites. Enrollment of project participants in the District of Columbia began in February 1995 in one site.

## **The Unemployment Insurance Performance System**

In Fall 1993, the Unemployment Insurance Service began addressing the issue of improved UI operational performance. Although this issue had been under consideration for some time, two events prompted its immediate attention. These were the Administration's emphasis on improving the efficiency and customer-orientation of

---

<sup>71</sup>See the discussion of the EDWAA program under the JTPA section of this Chapter. For additional information about EDWAA activities, see Katherine P. Dickinson, Deborah J. Kogan, Kevin J. Rogers, and David Drury, *Study of the Implementation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act—Phase II: Responsiveness of Services* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates; Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates; and Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, 1993) which was summarized in the edition of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* which covered the period July 1992 through September 1993.

all governmental activities, and the Vice President's National Performance Review, which recommended that UI review its oversight system (looking especially at how it could refocus the UI Benefits Quality Control (BQC) program to make it improve UI benefit payment operations).<sup>72</sup>

The UIS' partner in this task has been a committee of senior SESA managers appointed by the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies (ICESA). This joint workgroup comprising the State representatives and Federal national and regional office staff met nearly once a month throughout much of the *Report* period.

The workgroup set three goals related to providing better services to UI claimants and employers. These were to: (1) develop the broad framework for State Employment Security Agency-Department of Labor working relationships and the roles for the partners; (2) develop a system through which the UI system can more readily enhance performance; and (3) apply the framework and performance enhancement principles in reconsidering the nature and focus of the BQC program.

By the end of FY 1994, the committee had developed and circulated for comment "Partnership Principles," which outlined how Federal and State officials and staff should work together to serve UI system customers. Five papers illustrating how these principles translate into complementary Federal and State roles in different areas were developed and an outline of a closed-loop management system for continuously enhancing operational performance was produced.

The committee completed the conceptual design of a "continuous improvement system" early in Calendar Year 1995. It envisions that States, in cooperation with the Department, will continuously track performance for a small set (approximately 10) of

---

<sup>72</sup>See the discussion of the Benefits Quality Control program at the end of the UI section of the *Report*.

key performance objectives.<sup>73</sup> Standard measures will be defined for these objectives and national standards and criteria will be set.

The committee identified another 35 to 40 other activities of central importance to the UI system. Although federally specified performance measures have been or will be developed for these activities, it is envisioned that States will set individualized planning targets for them. A complete description of the conceptual design was circulated to SESAs and various UI stakeholders at the end of FY 1995.

Having completed the conceptual design of the continuous improvement system, the committee addressed the BQC program. It completed work on a proposed redesign of the program at the end of FY 1995.

A single system for using UI performance measures to improve performance will affect all existing UI measurement systems and measurement initiatives. Three of the most important UI measurement systems are discussed below.

### **The Performance Measurement Review (PMR)**

Since 1988, UIS has been working on the PMR project to examine, evaluate, and improve the measures used to assess the timeliness and quality of State Employment Security Agencies' (SESAs) benefit payment performance activities. For the past 20 years, aspects of benefit payment performance have been measured by the

---

<sup>73</sup>The committee identified the following key performance objectives: timely first payments; timely nonmonetary adjudications; prompt appeals (lower authority); prompt appeals (higher authority); timely deposit to clearing account; timely transfer to trust fund; timely status determinations; quality adjudications; quality lower authority appeals; and quality status determinations.

Quality Appraisal (QA) system. For many QA measures, State performance is benchmarked against "Secretary's Standards and Desired Levels of Achievement." When a SESA fails to meet benchmarked performance levels, the SESA must submit a formal corrective action plan in order to receive its annual administrative grant.

QA, which was designed before automation and advanced electronic data handling made substantial changes in SESA operations, has not been responsive to the technological changes which have affected performance in various ways.

Three phases of activity have comprised PMR. In Phase I, UI program specialists and an expert panel evaluated the existing QA benefits measures. The evaluators suggested technical improvements to many of the measures, and developed alternatives for others, taking into account the role of automated processes in SESA performance.

In Phase II, UIS monitored a six-State, 15-month field test of the new performance measures to determine their operational feasibility. During the test, a contractor developed a system for validating the data underlying the new measures. All field test data were complete and available for analysis by the end of FY 1994.

As a result of the interpretation of field test data, participants' responses to the new reports, and their reports of costs for implementation, UIS made some changes in measures.

Now in Phase III, UIS is implementing the new measures, which have been cleared by the Office of Management and Budget. To facilitate electronic reporting of data for the new and revised measures, UIS is creating new and revising previous data entry screens. It is also revising the UI reporting handbook, ETA 401.

Also, UIS is writing new handbooks for evaluating the quality of nonmonetary

determinations and lower authority appeals, and is planning training for both SESA staff and regional office staff of the Department.

### **The Revenue Quality Control (RQC) Initiative**

In 1989, the UIS initiated the RQC initiative to examine, evaluate, and improve measures of tax processing performance. In FY 1993, States began implementing the new RQC-developed measures of timeliness, accuracy, and completeness. Their implementation activities continued throughout 1994 and 1995, with technical assistance from UIS staff. “Computed measures”—performance indicators of timeliness and completeness—were emphasized throughout 1994. The “ETA 581 Report,” which is the primary tax activity reporting instrument used by the Department, was extensively revised during the period to conform to the new indicators developed by RQC.

Two other related activities occurred during the period. First, the UIS conducted a three-State pilot test to develop an approach to validating the tax data on the “ETA 581 Report.” Secondly, a workgroup began revising how the timeliness of depositing funds to the clearing account is measured. This measure was pilot tested in FY 1995.

### **Benefits Quality Control**

Since 1987, the accuracy of benefit payments for the largest permanently authorized UI programs has been measured through the BQC program. It provides statistically sound estimates through carefully controlled verification of small samples of payments (about 800 per State on average). Special State staff operate the program; Federal regional and national office staff provide quality assurance. BQC estimates that the national weighted average overpayment rate during CY 1994 was 8.6 percent.

It was estimated to be 8.8 percent during CY 1993. The rate of measured underpayments (which includes only payments that were too small, not erroneously denied claims) has remained steady at about 0.9 percent of benefits paid.

The Performance Enhancement Committee proposed several changes to the BQC program. The major ones are: substantially reduced sample sizes; greater flexibility in how States may verify data on sampled cases; elimination of the requirement that States publicly release findings each year; and (after pilot testing) adding the measurement of the accuracy of decisions to deny claims.

## **TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS**

### **Background**

The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, Chapter 2 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-618) as amended, authorizes an array of reemployment services for workers who lose their jobs, experience a reduction in the number of hours of work, or receive reduced wages because of increased imports of articles which are like or directly competitive with those produced by the workers' firm.

Under the Act, workers whose job loss, or the threat of job loss, is the result of import competition, may file a petition for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) with the Department of Labor. The Department then conducts an investigation to determine if the worker separations from their firms are linked to import competition.

The requirements for certification of eligibility to apply for TAA are:

- A significant number or proportion of workers of the firm were totally or partially

separated from their jobs, or threatened with job loss;

□ Sales or production (or both) at the workers' firm decreased absolutely; and

□ Increases of imports of articles like or directly competitive with articles produced by the workers' firm have contributed importantly to worker separations and to decreased company sales or production.

Workers certified by the Secretary of Labor as eligible to apply for TAA may receive training in new occupational skills, a job search allowance when suitable employment is not available in their normal commuting area, a relocation allowance if they obtain permanent employment outside their commuting area, and weekly income support, known as a trade readjustment allowance (TRA).

Workers from a wide variety of industries have been certified under the TAA program. Since its inception in 1975, the seven industries with the largest concentration of certified workers have been automotive equipment, apparel and other finished products made from fabrics and similar materials, primary metal industries, leather and leather products, electrical and electronic machinery equipment and supplies, oil and gas production and services, and fabricated metal products.

## **Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities**

In FY 1995, 1,499 worker petitions were filed with Department's Office of Trade Adjustment Assistance, and the Department certified 1,195 positions, covering approximately 86,753 workers. During the year, 388 petitions were denied and 63 petitions were terminated. At the end of FY 1995, 148 petitions were being processed by the Department.

In FY 1994, 1,629 petitions were filed, and the Department certified 925 petitions, covering about 72,530 workers. During the same year, 582 petitions were denied and 28 were terminated. At the end of the year, 356 petitions were being processed by the Department.

In each year (FY 1995 and 1994), \$98.9 million in TAA funds were allocated to States for training, job search, and relocation allowances, and for administering TAA program services to certified workers. Table 12 shows TAA activity and services for Fiscal Years 1990-1995.

In FY 1995, State agencies paid \$142.9 million in TRA benefits to 24,058 certified workers, while in FY 1994, \$120.1 million was paid to 30,846 certified workers.

**Table 12. Trade Adjustment Assistance Program Activities,  
Fiscal Years 1990-1995**

Characteristic	Fiscal Year					
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Program services:						
..... Application for reemploy- ..... ment services	38,459	35,872	31,628	38,765	36,247	
43,438						
..... Placed directly in jobs by ..... the Employment Service	12,199	12,881	10,460	11,464	12,593	
11,620						
..... Entered training	18,057	20,093	18,582	19,467	26,484	
27,600						
..... Job searches <sup>a</sup>	565	525	594	802	671	
850						
..... Relocations <sup>a</sup>	1,245	759	751	2,063	2,306	
1,529						
..... State allocations (in ..... millions)	\$57.6	\$64.9	\$70.2	\$80.0	\$98.9	
\$97.8						
Trade Readjustment Allowances:						
..... Workers filing for TRA	42,704	45,099	34,836	44,896	45,059	
52,297						
..... Workers receiving first ..... TRA payments	19,545	25,221	8,727 <sup>b</sup>	9,575 <sup>b</sup>	30,846	
27,900						
..... Average weekly benefit ..... paid	\$164.09	\$168.72	\$163.16	\$157.00	\$181.26	
\$193.00						

<sup>a</sup>Number of workers who receive allowances to conduct job searches and to move to another area to obtain suitable employment.

<sup>b</sup>This number is significantly lower than previous and subsequent years because in order to be eligible for TRA, individuals must exhaust all other compensation. In FY 1992-1993, a large number of individuals were eligible for Emergency Unemployment Compensation which was available for 26 weeks.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

---

## NAFTA-TRANSITIONAL ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

### Background

In December 1993, Title V, Section 250 of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Implementation Act, P.L. 103-182, created the NAFTA-Transitional Adjustment Assistance program. The program became effective on January 1, 1994.<sup>74</sup>

The NAFTA program provides reemployment services and assistance to workers in companies affected by imports from Canada or Mexico, or by shifts in U.S. production to those countries. It covers workers in firms directly affected by trade with Canada and/or Mexico.

NAFTA-TAA combines the basic components of the EDWAA and the TAA programs by providing affected workers with both rapid and early response to the threat of unemployment and the opportunity to engage in long-term training while receiving income support.

In order to be certified as eligible to apply for NAFTA-TAA services and benefits, a significant number or proportion of workers of the affected firm must be totally or partially separated from their jobs or threatened with job loss *and* either: (1) sales or production (or both) at the workers' firm decreased absolutely and (2) increases of imports from Canada or Mexico of articles that are like or directly competitive with articles produced by the workers' firm have contributed importantly to worker

---

<sup>74</sup>The Trade Act of 1974 was amended to incorporate the NAFTA-TAA program as Subchapter D of Chapter 2, Title II of the Trade Act.

separations and to decreased company sales or production, *or* there has been a shift in production by the workers' firm or subdivision to Canada or Mexico of articles that are like or directly competitive with articles produced by the firm.

Chart 4 shows the steps involved in the NAFTA-TAA certification process. The certification process involves a partnership between the Department and the Governors of the States where the workers' firms are located. Petitions for NAFTA assistance are filed with the State agency designated by the Governor to investigate NAFTA cases. The State agency collects data and issues preliminary findings regarding the meeting of eligibility criteria within 10 days of the receipt of the petition. Once the State agency makes an affirmative preliminary finding, the Governor ensures that EDWAA rapid response services are provided to the eligible workers. Services provided include skills assessment as well as financial and personal counseling to help with job transition.

Within 30 days of receiving the State's preliminary finding, the Secretary of Labor issues a final determination of workers' eligibility to apply for NAFTA-TAA. Workers who are certified by the Secretary as eligible to apply for the NAFTA program are entitled to employment services such as:

- Career counseling;
- Job placement and support services;
- Training for employment in another job or career;
- Income support for up to 52 weeks after exhausting unemployment compensation when the worker is enrolled in training;
- A job search allowance; and
- A relocation allowance if the worker obtains permanent employment outside his/her commuting area.

While benefits under the NAFTA program closely parallel those provided under the TAA program, NAFTA requires that claimants *must* be enrolled in training to qualify for income support; waivers of the training requirement are not allowed for NAFTA

participants.

## **Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities**

From January 1, 1994 (the program's implementation date) through December 31, 1994 (CY 1994), NAFTA petitions were received for workers in 321 firms located in 41 States. During this time, final determinations were issued on 297 petitions, of which, 153 were certified. About 21,139 workers were eligible to apply for NAFTA-TAA program benefits as a result of the certifications.

From January 1 through December 31, 1995 (CY 1995), 425 NAFTA petitions were received for workers located in 43 States. During the year, final determinations were issued on 386 petitions, of which, 220 were certified. Approximately 31,993 workers were certified eligible to apply for NAFTA-TAA program benefits.

The largest concentration of NAFTA-TAA certified workers was engaged in employment related to the production of goods in the following industries: apparel; electronics (except computer); industrial machinery and computer equipment; agricultural production; medical and optical goods; lumber and wood products; paper and allied products; chemicals and allied products; and rubber and plastic products.

NAFTA-TAA program funds totaling \$8.5 million in FY 1994 and \$21.4 million in FY 1995 were allocated to States for training, job search, and relocation allowances, and for administering the NAFTA-TAA program services to certified workers. Table 13 provides data on NAFTA-TAA program activities and services for CY 1994 and 1995.

**Table 13. NAFTA-TAA Program Activities, CY 1994 and 1995**

Activity	Calendar Year	
	1994	1995
Program services:		
..... Application for reemployment services		2,139
4,827 .....		
..... Placed directly in jobs by the Employment		
..... Service/obtained employment		171
797 .....		
..... Entered training		949
2,124 .....		
..... Job searches <sup>a</sup>		3
58 .....		
..... Relocations <sup>a</sup>		6
104 .....		
..... State allocations <sup>b</sup> (in millions)		\$8.5
\$21.4 .....		
Trade Readjustment Allowances:		
..... Workers filing for TRA		1,659
3,382 .....		
..... Workers receiving first TRA payment		316
1,495 .....		
..... Average weekly benefit paid		\$197.04
\$203.62 .....		

<sup>a</sup>Number of workers who receive allowances to conduct job searches and to move to another area to obtain suitable employment.

<sup>b</sup>Funds allocated to

States for training, job search, and relocation allowances, and for the costs to States of administering NAFTA-TAA program services to certified workers. Data are for fiscal years.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.



## INCUMBENT WORKER TRAINING

### Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities

Throughout the *Report* period, the Department supported a number of activities that provided training and skills upgrading for currently employed workers.

In PY 1993 and 1994, the Departments of Labor and Commerce entered into interagency agreements to fund a number of special incumbent worker initiatives. One such initiative involved supporting the development of a human resources assessment tool.<sup>75</sup>

The assessment tool will enhance the capability of the Department of Commerce's National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) Manufacturing Extension Centers to assess the workforce skills development needs of small and mid-sized companies and their technology development needs.

Also, during the *Report* period, five supplier-manufacturer networks which link large manufacturing companies with their mutual suppliers received funding to identify common requirements for supplier firms' modernization and workforce development. The large firms help the small and mid-sized supplier companies obtain technologies

---

<sup>75</sup>The human resources assessment tool uses a combination of employee and manager interviews and written surveys to investigate a firm's human resources practices and determine opportunities for improvement. The assessment instrument is generally administered to companies by field agents of regional manufacturing extension centers. This nationwide network of Centers is funded through the Department of Commerce's National Institute of Standards and Technology. The Centers improve the competitiveness of small and mid-sized companies by providing technology deployment assistance.

and employee training resources to modernize and improve workers' skills.

The Department also supported efforts of the NIST Manufacturing Extension Centers to build their capacity to provide workforce development services to companies through partnership arrangements with educational and community-based organizations. The workforce development services include training for employees in small companies in such areas as team-building, quality improvement techniques, leadership, and basic skills training.

In addition to these initiatives, the Department established new partnerships and conducted several pilot and demonstration projects throughout PY 1993 and 1994. It continued to fund the American Association of Community Colleges to conduct a small business assistance training institute to share information on exemplary training programs for incumbent workers. The project was expanded to include a network of community college liaisons to help identify training needs of incumbent, dislocated, and entry-level workers in each State and to share resources among community colleges.

In addition, a workforce development database was established that includes information on the reemployment and training program capacities of community colleges throughout the country. The database will focus on customized courses developed for workers in small and mid-sized firms and courses and services for special client populations, such as participants in JTPA or Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) programs. The database is housed in the Department's Training Technology Resource Center.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup>The Department's Employment and Training Administration created the Training Technology Resource Center (TTRC) to function as an electronic information system to collect and disseminate information relating to workforce development. The TTRC offers information about America's labor market information system, emerging training and learning technologies, innovative workplace practices, JTPA, occupational skill standards, One-Stop Career Center Systems, and school-to-work transition initiatives. The system is accessible through modem and the Internet.

The Department also established the National Workforce Assistance Collaborative (NWAC) which is a partnership of the National Alliance of Business, the Council of Adult and Experiential Learning, the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy at Pennsylvania State University, the Maryland Center for Quality and Productivity, and the National Labor-Management Association. It is designed to improve worker skills and the performance of companies by working with networks of business service providers (e.g., community colleges, literacy assistance providers, and technology assistance providers) to create and disseminate workforce development tools and information.

The NWAC provides resources in the areas of employee training, workplace literacy, work restructuring, and labor-management relations. These resources are available from the National Alliance of Business, or through two electronic networks. The NWAC also sponsors an electronic forum for discussing workforce development issues and information (such as instructional materials, research and applications, and evaluation methods).

During the *Report* period, the Department funded two pilot workforce development projects with groups of small and mid-sized companies. One project was conducted in partnership with the Massachusetts Bay State Skills Corporation. It was designed to develop advanced skills training for workers in small machine shops in the Western Massachusetts Chapter of the National Tooling and Machining Association.

Another project provided funding to five networks of small and mid-sized companies, or "learning consortia." These consortia identified training needs that company members had in common and enabled the companies to cost-effectively access training resources or share company-developed resources.

## LABOR SURPLUS AREAS PROGRAM

### Background

Since the early 1950s, the Department has supported efforts to direct Government procurement funds into areas with the greatest economic need by designating jurisdictions that experience an unemployment rate 20 percent or more above the national average as “labor surplus areas.”<sup>77</sup> Employers located in these areas receive preference when they bid on Federal procurement contracts.

The Department issues a list of labor surplus areas annually and adds jurisdictions to the list throughout the year under an “exceptional circumstances” provision. This permits the addition of areas which did not meet the high unemployment criterion for the initial list, but subsequently experienced major disruptions in their local economies due to natural disasters, plant closings, major layoffs, or contract cancellations.

### Highlights of FY 1994 and 1995 Activities

The labor surplus areas in FY 1995 included jurisdictions that had a qualifying unemployment rate of 8.6 percent or higher during the period January 1992 through December 1993, while those in FY 1994 had a qualifying unemployment rate of 8.5

---

<sup>77</sup>The labor surplus areas program is authorized by P.L. 99-272, P.L. 96-302, and P.L. 95-89.

percent or higher during the period January 1991 through December 1992.

In FY 1995, 1,342 areas were initially designated and no areas were later added under the exceptional circumstances provision during the year.

In FY 1994, 1,521 areas were initially designated and 10 more were added during the year.<sup>78</sup>

The labor surplus areas and a complete description of their classification criteria, as well as updates, are published in *Area Trends in Employment and Unemployment*, a monthly publication prepared by the Department.

---

<sup>78</sup>The 10 areas added during the year were: Poughkeepsie City, Balance of Dutchess County, Ulster County, Wappinger Town, New York; Berkeley Township, Irvington Town, Orange City, Pemberton Township, New Jersey; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Hardeman, Tennessee.

## NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR EMPLOYMENT POLICY

---

The National Commission for Employment Policy (NCEP) was first authorized by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 and reauthorized in 1982 under JTPA. The Commission sponsored research on economic, workforce, training, and employment issues; responded to Congressional requests for information; held hearings and symposiums; developed policy recommendations, and advised the President and the Congress on a wide variety of training and employment concerns. NCEP funding for Program Year 1995 (July 1, 1995 - June 30, 1996) was withdrawn as part of the 1995 Rescissions Bill signed by the President on July 27, 1995. Commission activities ceased on September 30, 1995.

### **Background**

The National Commission for Employment policy examined broad questions of development, coordination, and administration of training and employment programs, and advised the President and the Congress on a variety of national training and employment issues.

The Commission's members were appointed by the President and were broadly representative of agriculture, business, labor, commerce, education, veterans' groups, State and local elected officials, community-based organizations, public assistance programs, and the public at large. Commissioners were uncompensated and served three-year, staggered terms. The President appointed one of the members as Chair.

To assist the Commissioners in their work, the Commission had a permanent staff of economists, program experts, and support personnel, whose expertise was supplemented as needed through personnel loan arrangements with universities, and Federal, State, and local government agencies.

### **Highlights of PY 1993**

## and 1994 Activities

During the *Report* period, the Commission responded to concerns in the Congress about the duplication of services and varied administrative structures of many of the Nation's federally funded training and employment programs. In response to this concern, the Commission published *Understanding Federal Training and Employment Programs* to enlighten the debate<sup>79</sup>. The publication contains descriptions of 55 federally funded programs administered by seven Federal agencies (the Departments of Labor, Education, Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, and Commerce) as well as information about their funding levels, participation rates, and administrative structures. It was widely distributed in early 1995 to legislators, policymakers, and program administrators at the Federal, State, and local levels.

The Commission also focused on broad economic concerns during Program Years 1993 and 1994 by publishing several studies comparing income changes over time. Two studies by the Commission's chief economist looked at income changes over two decades—the 1970s and 1980s—in order to help explain some of the “anger” emanating from workers who see their standards of living declining, while in many cases, working longer hours and being more productive. Using longitudinal data from the Michigan Panel Survey of Income Dynamics (PSID), NCEP found that—contrary to the views of many economists who use “snapshot” data from the Current Population Survey—job tenure is, in fact, declining. Moreover, changing employers, occupations, and/or industry, all have the effect of reducing earnings over time. Not surprisingly, those who have fared best and will continue to do well are managers or professionals with college degrees who have remained in a single occupation. Those who are falling behind in terms of earnings are individuals without college training and with few technical skills, who frequently change employers, occupations, and even industries

---

<sup>79</sup>Michael J. Landini, *Understanding Federal Training and Employment Programs* (Washington, D.C., National Commission for Employment Policy, 1995).

during the course of their working lives. (See *On Shaky Ground: Rising Fears About Incomes and Earnings and Declining Job Security and the Professionalization of Opportunity*.)

Looking beyond these broad findings, the Commission sponsored a number of other studies that looked more closely at wage inequality for African-Americans and other minorities; discussed how office automation and technology in general are affecting the number and kinds of jobs; reviewed Bureau of Labor Statistics data to determine where new jobs are emerging; reviewed local job creation strategies and Federal extension efforts to promote regional development; investigated how the unemployment insurance system serves part-time workers, especially women; looked into the relationship between employment and wages and macroeconomic policy tools; and evaluated the EDWAA-JTPA Title III dislocated workers' training program using the Commission's UI wage database.

The UI wage database, housed at Northern Illinois University, continued to be supported by the Commission during the *Report* period. Linking UI wage records and JTPA program files in a number of participating States, the database enabled the Commission and university scholars to examine how JTPA participants (especially young men and women, ex-offenders, AFDC recipients, Hispanics, and other specific groups) fared in terms of employment and earnings following training. Several studies using these data, including one on ex-offenders and another on young, female AFDC recipients who participated in JTPA programs, were completed during PY 1994.

Several education-related issues were explored through Commission-sponsored research. These included creative strategies for preventing school dropouts, the status of tutoring programs for at-risk students, and effective school-to-work transition activities.

Finally, in addition to research sponsored by NCEP alone, two other studies were published with the Department of Energy that focused on jobs created through environmental policies (*Environment and Jobs: The Employment Impact of Federal Environmental Investments and Promoting Growth and Job Creation Through Emerging Environmental Technologies*).

## NATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

### Background

The National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) is an independent Federal interagency committee authorized by JTPA and the Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. For 19 years, NOICC and its network of State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees (SOICCs) have developed methods to coordinate, integrate, and deliver occupational, educational, and labor market information that is collected by Federal and State agencies.

NOICC/SOICC activities are based on three integrated themes: (1) developing, delivering, and using occupational, labor market, and career information; (2) linking education and work through career development; and (3) providing training in developing, delivering, and using data for planning, guidance, and career development programs. The NOICC/SOICC network supports employment, training, and vocational and technical program planning at the State and local levels and career development and exploration by youth and adults. NOICC and SOICC initiatives support school-to-work transition teams and workforce investment strategies, such as One-Stop Career Centers, that help prepare the Nation's workers to meet the needs of employers both now and in the future.

NOICC members represent 10 Federal agencies and include officials of the Departments of Labor, Education, Commerce, Defense, and Agriculture. SOICC members represent vocational rehabilitation, employment security, job training, economic development, higher education, vocational and technical education, and other organizations involved in preparing workers to enter and succeed in the labor market.

## **Highlights of PY 1993 and 1994 Activities**

The NOICC/SOICC network is a customer-driven program that focuses on State and local information needs. Major initiatives for PY 1993 and 1994 are summarized below.

### **Support for State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees**

In both Program Years 1993 and 1994, NOICC allocated approximately \$6.9 million to State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees for basic State operations.<sup>80</sup> These funds (an average of \$123,000 per State) supported SOICC staff, State and local occupational information systems, and career information delivery. NOICC also allocated \$10,000 in PY 1993 and \$14,000 in PY 1994 in supplemental funds to each SOICC to support career development training of counselors, educators, and others to enable them to better support career planning and counseling needs of youth and adults.

### **Occupational Information Support System**

NOICC completed work on a new microcomputer occupational information system (Micro-OIS) and occupational labor market information database (OLMID) and released these systems in PY 1994. OLMID is serving as the key database to organize labor market information in all nine of the States that received funding to implement One-Stop Career Centers.<sup>81</sup> The Micro-OIS will be used in at least eight of these

---

<sup>80</sup>Includes Department of Education funds.

<sup>81</sup>One-Stop Career Centers consolidate the delivery of a variety of training and employment services regardless of their funding sources and the individual

States. It is designed to provide information to support program planning by JTPA, vocational-technical education, and other employment-related training programs, and to help meet many of the occupational needs of employers.

Because occupational projections are one of the most fundamental types of information needed to support workforce preparation efforts, during the *Report* period, NOICC sponsored a fourth round of training in the development of occupational and industry projections. Attended by staff from nearly every State, the training focused on keeping staff up to date in the latest projection techniques.

Also during the period, the NOICC-sponsored State Training Inventory (STI) database grew to include over 17,000 schools offering more than 215,000 education and training programs. STI provides State and multistate regional information on school offerings to support human resource and workforce development programs, including JTPA, school-to-work, and one-stop career centers.

### **Career Information Delivery**

During the period, automated statewide career information delivery systems (CIDS) were operating in nearly 19,000 sites in 47 States. The systems served over eight million customers. In recent years, greater emphasis has been placed in

---

agencies/programs traditionally involved in service delivery. They generally provide a single point of access to all services and clients can access services regardless of their reason for seeking the services.

Under Job Training 2000, the Department awarded grants of \$50,000 to each State in 1992 to plan services integration and One-Stop Career Center Systems. The following year, grants of approximately \$200,000 each were awarded to 10 Private Industry Councils (PICs) in nine States to plan and implement Job Training 2000 demonstration projects.

For more information about one-stop career centers, see Dale W. Berry and Mona A. Feldman, *Evaluation of One-Stop Career Center Demonstration Projects* (Arlington, Va.: TvT Associates, 1995) and Dale W. Berry and Mona A. Feldman, *A Guide for Planning and Operating One-Stop Career Centers* (Arlington, Va.: TvT Associates, 1995). These two studies are summarized in Chapter 2 of this publication.

expanding CIDS access to adults. NOICC supported a study and released a report on *The Use of Career Information Systems in State Employment Security Agencies* to encourage such expansion. Eight of the nine States that received One-Stop Career Center funds have used their statewide CIDS to provide career information to their customers. In addition, 48 States published career information in a tabloid newspaper format during the *Report* period. In PY 1994, over five million copies were published and distributed to schools and colleges; the Job Service; welfare, and vocational rehabilitation offices; JTPA service delivery sites; and libraries. In several States, career information tabloids were directly linked to classroom curricula and video presentations.

### **Career Development Activities**

Over 100,000 copies of the *Get a Life Career Development Portfolio*, designed for use at the elementary, mid- and high school levels, were distributed during PY 1993. In PY 1994, NOICC supplemented the publication with a personal career guide entitled *School-To-Work Transition Planner*, designed for use by students in the last two years of high school and/or the first two years of postsecondary education. It is especially useful for students in Tech Prep programs. NOICC also began testing a pilot version of an adult career planner called *Work Life* in PY 1994. The planner was tested with dislocated workers, veterans in employment transition, welfare recipients, and community college and university students.

The Career Development Training Institute (CDTI), established by NOICC through a special appropriation from the Congress, completed in PY 1994 the third and last year of its first grant. During PY 1993 and 1994, the CDTI completed its documentation of career development training activities, conducted two national teleconferences (one of which had more than 10,000 participants), developed a number of training programs related to school-to-work transition, and conducted “Improved Career Decision Making” and “Employee Career Development” train-the-trainer sessions for thousands of career development facilitators in schools, the Job Service,

JTPA, and vocational rehabilitation agencies. It also initiated a new training program called "Workforce in Transition," and published a number of studies and training materials. During the *Report* period, an estimated 40,000 individuals benefitted from career development capacity building activities provided through the CDTI and SOICCs.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup>Additional information about these activities can be obtained from the NOICC Status Report, June 30, 1994.

## **CHAPTER 2**

# **RESEARCH AND EVALUATION FINDINGS**

# RESEARCH AND EVALUATION FINDINGS

## INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarizes the findings of major research and evaluation projects completed in Program Years 1993 and 1994, which cover the period July 1993 through June 1995. The Employment and Training Administration provided full or partial funding for these projects.

The reports are grouped into five categories. The first category, Labor Market Studies of Specific Groups, presents summaries of seven studies that focus on specific population groups that need varying degrees of assistance in order to enter and succeed in the labor market. It also includes a summary of a national journal, sponsored by the Department, that discusses poverty and joblessness in the United States.

The second category, Meeting the Needs of Dislocated Workers, includes five summaries of programs that help workers who lose their jobs through mass layoffs or plant shutdowns.

The third category, Building Tomorrow's Workforce, provides an overview of three studies of programs that better prepare students to make the transition from school to work.

Summaries of three studies that investigated creative ways of speeding unemployment insurance recipients' return to work are presented under the fourth category, Helping the Nation's Unemployed.

The final category, Program Development and Improvement, includes three studies that focus on improving the nation's unemployment insurance system.

The projects discussed in this chapter were designed to look at specific aspects of a variety of issues of interest to the Department. Because many of these issues are complex, readers are cautioned that no single study can provide a complete picture of any particular subject area. Furthermore, the context in which a study is conducted often has an impact on the applicability of its findings.

Furthermore, the summaries are not intended to represent all of the information provided in the full study reports. More information can be found in the reports referenced in the footnotes. Because organizations undertaking research projects sponsored by the Department are encouraged to state their findings and express their judgments freely, all conclusions described in this section are those of the researchers and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Labor.

The annotated bibliography at the end of this chapter lists all reports covered in this and previous editions (dating to PY 1985) of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*. Information about how to obtain copies of the publications is provided in the bibliography's introduction.

## **I. LABOR MARKET STUDIES OF SPECIFIC GROUPS**

The studies summarized in this section of the *Report* focus on a number of special worker groups that are of concern to the Department. These groups include farmers and ranchers who have been forced to leave their farms, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, the homeless, people with disabilities, immigrants, and the nation's poor.

The first study report summarized in this section provides information about the Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration Project which was funded by the Department in July 1990 and implemented in Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. The projects operated for three and a half years and enrolled 1,550 participants. The project's two goals were to help financially stressed farmers keep their farms and to

help those who were forced to leave farming find alternative employment. The researchers concluded that the programs achieved a modest degree of success in finding off-farm employment for their participants.

As part of the demonstration effort, the Department supported the publication of a guidebook to help practitioners provide more effective services to dislocated farmers and ranchers. The guidebook discusses the unique situation faced by many farmers and provides information about ways to design training and employment services that can best help this special population group. It is the second report summarized in this section.

In addition to the problems faced by farmers and ranchers, the Department has long recognized that migrant and seasonal farmworkers face major challenges as they attempt to improve their long-term economic situation. Many of these individuals have few opportunities to move from seasonal farmwork into year-round jobs. They often live in inadequate housing, experience health problems, and experience a high incidence of injury. The third study report summarized in this section looks at the programs operated under Title IV, Section 402 of the Job Training Partnership Act that are designed to help this population group. These programs, administered directly by the Department, operate in 47 States and Puerto Rico. The investigation of Section 402 programs revealed that many were effectively serving the target population.

Because up to one million individuals may be homeless in the United States, Congress enacted the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act in 1987. Section 731 of the Act authorized the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program, which was designed to help practitioners and policymakers learn more about ways to help homeless people enter and succeed in the labor market. The fourth study report summarized in this section presents findings from a study of the demonstration. The researchers found that it is feasible to establish job training and employment programs to serve homeless people, although they must offer a wide array of services and form linkages with other service providers.

The fifth summary describes the findings of a study of a five-year demonstration that relies on supervisors, coworkers, family members, friends, and others to provide

the training and supervision needed to help people with disabilities obtain jobs and perform satisfactorily in those jobs. In 1992, the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services began supporting the demonstration to develop model school-to-work programs that use this “natural supports” approach. Projects are operating in six States with a total funding of \$1.5 million per year. A study of the early years of the demonstration revealed that almost all individuals with severe mental retardation or other developmental disabilities were capable of working in an employment setting with natural supports.

The sixth and seventh studies included in this section focus on demonstration programs that provided immigrants with training and other support necessary to speed their entry into the labor market. One of the studies focused on a 15-month project in the San Diego area that integrated education, training, employment, and social services in an effort to address the multiple barriers to economic integration which confront many legal immigrants. The project began in the summer of 1992 and enrolled 156 clients. Of these, 117 were placed in full-time employment.

The other immigration-related demonstration studied was conducted in the Seattle area and offered training in specific occupational areas to 54 participants. The researchers concluded that the project, which operated from September 1992 through November 1994, identified several strategies that can help limited English-speaking refugees and immigrants receive training and other assistance.

Finally, a national journal, sponsored by the Department, is summarized at the end of this section. The 10th edition of *Evaluation Forum* focuses on a number of issues that should be considered in crafting future anti-poverty policies.

## **HELP FOR FARMERS AND RANCHERS**

### **Overview**

Throughout its history, the Department of Labor has been concerned about

worker dislocation (workers who lose their jobs permanently because of plant closures, mass layoffs, increased foreign imports, economic shifts, etc.). Job loss due to economic conditions has been a chronic feature of American agriculture.

Although urbanization and agricultural consolidation resulted in the loss of over four million American farms over the past 60 years, until the 1980s much of the decline in farm employment had been voluntary—as operators of smaller and less efficient farms left to pursue more attractive nonfarm jobs.

During the 1980s, however, a significant number of individuals involved in farming lost their jobs involuntarily as farm operators, who borrowed heavily during the 1970s to expand their operations, found themselves financially overextended during the farm credit crisis of the 1980s.<sup>1</sup> Because many farm owners were forced to leave farming with enormous debts, the *impact* of this dislocation on these individuals, their workers, and their communities may have been more severe than in previous decades.

In response to this situation, the Department of Labor developed the Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration Project under the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance (EDWAA) Act.<sup>2</sup> Funds were made available to four States to develop innovative strategies to provide training and employment services for dislocated and at-risk farmers and ranchers, their spouses and dependents, and farmhands. The demonstration projects were: Farm/Works in Iowa, the Farm Project in Minnesota, the Farmer/Rancher Demonstration Project in North Dakota, and the Agricultural Community in Transition program in South Dakota. The projects operated from July 1, 1990 through September 30, 1993. Chart 5 shows the location of these

---

<sup>1</sup>The crisis was the result of a significant increase in farm debt which peaked at the beginning of the 1980s, combined with the weakening of export markets, the decline in commodity prices, and a corresponding decline in net farm income and land values. As a consequence, many farmers experienced high levels of debt and diminished earning opportunities. Many farmers were forced to give up their farms.

<sup>2</sup>The Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration was authorized by Congress under Section 324 of EDWAA in 1988.

projects.

An evaluation of the demonstration<sup>3</sup> revealed that the projects met recruitment goals, outreach efforts were important in enrolling participants, participants commonly reported severe financial distress, and two-thirds of the participants were engaged in off-farm employment after program termination.

The report outlines trends in farm dislocation (focusing on States with programs included in the demonstration), provides estimates of current and future numbers of farmers at risk of dislocation, discusses the history of training and employment programs for farmers over the past several decades, describes the demonstration projects, presents the results of an analysis of quantitative data produced for the study, provides an assessment of the effectiveness of the various training and employment strategies used in the demonstration, and offers conclusions and recommendations for the Department of Labor.

## **Background: The Farm Crisis**

The evaluation report notes that the 1970s had been characterized by a dramatic expansion of agricultural exports (brought about by worldwide food shortages and the declining value of the dollar). Prices for farm commodities rose appreciably and land values increased. Based on these developments, many farmers took advantage of low interest rates to expand production by investing in new machinery and expanding their land holdings.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Mary G. Visher, Stephen Walsh, and Ronald D'Amico, *Serving Dislocated Farmers: An Evaluation of the EDWAA Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration* (Oakland and Menlo Park, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994).

<sup>4</sup>According to the Bureau of the Census, the combined value of farm operators' real estate and non-real estate debt rose fourfold, from \$53 billion in 1970 to \$195 billion by 1981.

However, during the first half of the 1980s, expanded overseas production and U.S. economic policies that resulted in an increase in the value of the dollar compared to trading partners' currencies made U.S. agricultural products less attractive overseas—resulting in a decline in agricultural exports from 1981 to 1985. As the index of prices received declined while the index of prices paid climbed upward, Federal macroeconomic policies caused real interest rates to rise to unprecedented levels. These factors, combined with a sharp decrease in real estate values, made it difficult for farmers to meet their debt obligations and cash expenses of their farm operations. A number of farmers attempted to improve their financial position by reducing costs, increasing the value of sales by improving farm management to increase yields, restructuring liabilities, or liquidating some assets. In cases where these efforts were not successful, many farmers were forced to cease farming.

The report points out that although complete data on farm exits was not available, an analyses conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture suggested that between 200,000 and 300,000 individuals left farming over the period 1980-88.

The report also puts this situation in perspective by providing historical information about previous declines in the number of farms and individuals involved in farming. The researchers point out that although the number of farms in the United States had been declining since the 1930s, a significant portion of this decline was the result of a reallocation of labor out of farming and into sectors where financial returns were higher. For the most part, farmers of smaller and less efficient farms exited agriculture in favor of more attractive nonfarm employment. During the farm financial crisis of the 1980s, however, many farmers were squeezed out of the industry, rather than leaving voluntarily for better opportunities.

As these individuals left farming during the first half of the 1980s, many experienced few alternative employment opportunities, particularly in nonmetropolitan areas. Furthermore, occupations with the greatest growth in the 1980s required fairly well-developed technical skills, making the transition from a farm to an off-farm career more difficult. Given this trend, a large number of displaced and at-risk farmers were in need of readjustment and retraining services.

The report also provides information about future employment in agricultural occupations, noting that declines are expected to continue into the next century (see Table 14).

**Table 14. Actual 1988 and Projected 2000  
Employment in Select Agricultural Occupations**

Occupation	Total Employment (Thousands)			Employment Change, 1986-2000						
	Projected, Year 2000 1988	Number (Thousands)			Percent					
		Low	Med.	High	Low	Med.	High	Low	Med.	High
Farmers . . . . .	1,141	800	875	932	-341	-266	-209	-29.9	-23.3	-18.3
Farm Managers .	131	146	160	177	15	29	46	11.5	22.1	35.1
Farm Workers . . .	938	717	785	863	-221	-153	-75	-23.6	-16.3	-8.0

Source: *Outlook 2000* (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1990) as reported in *Serving Dislocated Farmers: An Evaluation of the EDWAA Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration*.

Note: Numbers are in thousands. Persons are classified based on their primary occupation.

## Past Efforts to Help Farmers and Ranchers

The report briefly reviews the history of Federal training and employment programs for individuals dislocated from agriculture, both prior to and under the Job

Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The researchers note that although agencies like the Farm Labor Service and its successor, the Rural Manpower Service, provided some services to rural areas as far back as the Great Depression, the programs were small and quite different from subsequent programs.

During the 1960s, the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act provided training and employment services on a national scale. Although these programs focused primarily on urban areas, some services to rural residents were pioneered. The authors point out that the enactment of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 did little to change the training and employment situation for farmers.

Throughout the 1980s, the Department of Labor provided some national discretionary funding to a variety of State and local programs for thousands of farmers and ranchers through discretionary JTPA Title III funding. For almost 10 years, these programs represented the Department's primary mechanism for addressing farm dislocation.

In addition to allowing the use of discretionary funds for farmers and ranchers, JTPA changed the way that previous training and employment programs operated by giving Governors considerable authority in interpreting the program's regulations. By 1986, 21 States had modified JTPA eligibility rules to better serve dislocated farmers and farmworkers. Amendments to the legislation in 1986 and subsequent regulations further expanded eligibility for JTPA Title III services to include self-employed persons who were in the process of going out of business. This definition further aided in providing assistance to farmers. The regulations also expanded eligibility to include family members working on farms.

In 1988, EDWAA changed the way States distributed funds to substate areas under JTPA Title III, adding farmer-rancher economic hardship criteria to States'

allocation formulas. Subsequent regulations further expanded eligibility to include workers on farms that were failing.

The EDWAA legislation also made possible the Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration—the first legislatively mandated employment and training program for persons leaving agriculture. The Department awarded initial grants to four States in July 1990 for this initiative.

## **Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration Projects**

The report provides profiles of the various demonstration sites in Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. These four demonstration projects operated for three and a half years and enrolled a total of 1,550 participants.

For each demonstration, the researchers describe the economic context in which the programs operated; provide an overview of the history, administration, goals, service delivery structure, and innovations of each program; discuss the integration and coordination of the demonstration projects with other programs; provide information about the target population and eligibility criteria; discuss outreach and recruitment efforts; outline the services provided to participants; summarize certain noteworthy features of the projects; and describe the program experience of selected participants. The researchers also point out that over the three and a half years of operations, the four demonstration projects had the opportunity to adjust their programs considerably—often in response to lower-than-expected enrollments. The projects were encouraged by the Department of Labor to experiment with their approaches to serving dislocated farmers and ranchers.

Chart 6 shows selected features of the demonstration efforts at the outset of each project. The major features of each demonstration are highlighted below as well

as any significant changes made as the projects evolved.

## Iowa

The EDWAA Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration, known locally as Farm/Works, operated in two of Iowa's sixteen substate areas (SSAs). The demonstration that operated in SSA #7, in the agriculturally rich northeastern part of the State, was headquartered in Waterloo/Cedar Rapids and covered a six-county area with a total population of about 210,000. The demonstration that operated in SSA #14 was based in Creston (a small town in the southcentral part of the State) and covered a seven-county area whose residents were generally poorer than those in SSA #7.

The Farm/Works demonstration had two goals: 1) to help financially stressed farmers keep their farms; and 2) to help those who were forced to leave farming to find alternative employment.

The model for Farm/Works was derived from a previous JTPA Title III discretionary grant-funded project for farmers which operated in both SSAs in the two years prior to the start up of the new program. Fundamental principles of Farm/Works were based on this previous Title III project and included:

- Strong, local (SSA) control of the program;
- Staff with farm backgrounds who were familiar with the community;
- Adequate time for counseling and rapport-building between staff and farmer participants; and
- Retention of the farm as a desirable and valid objective.

The demonstration was characterized by extensive counseling and assessment, generous support services, and many choices of occupational skills training (with a strong emphasis on long-term classroom training). Farmers whose operations seemed viable were also offered legal and financial services, farm

management courses, and off-farm employment to enhance their chances of keeping their farms. Job search assistance and placement, as well as on-the-job training services were also provided. The project featured strong case management, with each SSA employing a specialist with a farm background whose time was fully dedicated to the demonstration's clients.

The Farm/Works demonstration used the same eligibility criteria applicable to farmers and other self-employed individuals in the State's overall EDWAA program. It emphasized long-term training (funding allowed many participants to begin two-year training programs). Some participants were able to complete four-year programs that they began prior to the demonstration. Occupational training in a classroom environment was offered through community colleges, the State university, private colleges and other private training programs. Participants took courses in such occupations as nursing, welding, mechanics, and drafting. Only a few participants received on-the-job training.

Participants also received support services to cover certain training-related expenses, as well as medical, counseling, legal, and financial assistance.

The researchers point out that, with the award of a grant from the Secretary of Labor's reserve funds, the State will continue to serve at-risk dislocated farmers after the demonstration ends.

## **Minnesota**

Minnesota's Dislocated Farmers Project was designed and managed by staff of the Southwest Minnesota Private Industry Council (unlike the other demonstration projects, Minnesota's State EDWAA agency played a very minor role in designing and operating the program). Day-to-day operations fell under the jurisdiction of the substate area's three offices which were responsible for all local JTPA services. Each office integrated the demonstration project with existing services. Demonstration participants underwent the same assessment and were eligible for the same services as other JTPA clients.

The project differed from mainstream JTPA services in two ways. First, it targeted clients who were at risk of dislocation from the farm or ranch as well as those who were already dislocated. Second, two new outreach staff were added to recruit at-risk and dislocated farmers.

Minnesota's use of existing EDWAA staff and facilities allowed the State to build on existing coordination efforts. Long-standing cooperative agreements established by EDWAA gave participants access to numerous services and agencies, including the Job Service, community action programs, rehabilitation agencies, and other human service agencies. Demonstration staff also made new contacts with the Department of Agriculture's Farm Advocate Program, with farm management instructional programs at area technical colleges, and with local farm lenders.

Participants received assistance which included basic readjustment services, support services, relocation assistance, job development/placement, classroom training, on-the-job training, and entrepreneurial training. Classroom occupational training was a service priority, and most of the participants received this service through the Southwestern Technical College.

Minnesota provided entrepreneurial training as part of its project design and greatly improved this training in the demonstration's final year by working with a local foundation to introduce a loan fund to provide start-up capital to supplement entrepreneurial training. The researchers point out that this effort was particularly important because the scarcity of jobs in rural agricultural areas, combined with the wide range of skills that farmers often have, makes job creation through entrepreneurship an attractive option.

The researchers also note that in Minnesota, the end of the demonstration resulted in a decline in services to farmers. Dislocated farmers were still eligible for EDWAA services, but at-risk farmers could not be served and outreach activities were severely curtailed.

## **North Dakota**

North Dakota's Farmer/Rancher Demonstration Project recruited at-risk and dislocated farmers and ranchers (and their spouses, dependents, and farmhands) into what was essentially a traditional EDWAA program, with three main differences.

First, the demonstration aggressively recruited participants primarily by using Agricultural Mediation Service (AMS) negotiators as outreach workers.<sup>5</sup>

Second, the project was housed separately from local Job Service offices. (The project used two offices, each staffed by a team consisting of one Job Service employee and one AMS negotiator.) Third, the project promoted early intervention by targeting individuals who were at risk of farm dislocation.

Eligible participants included farmers and ranchers, their spouses, their adult children who worked full-time on the farm, and farmhands. Applicants had to be employed on a financially at-risk farm.

Most participants received an initial assessment, and a service plan was developed during their first office visit. (Enrollees underwent the same assessment process as other Job Service participants.)

Unlike the mainstream EDWAA program, Job Service staff designed the demonstration to include a case management component. A Job Service staff member, assigned to the demonstration, worked with participants throughout their program experience to inform them about available services, and help them develop a service plan. The staff member remained available to work with the client throughout the entire program experience.

Participants were eligible to receive basic skills training, as well as a range of occupational retraining courses. They enrolled in courses at State colleges and universities, community colleges, and a number of proprietary technical schools. Several participants enrolled in technical schools outside of the State for specific training programs. Although the demonstration encouraged long-term training, on-the-job training was also available (mainly for participants who required more immediate

---

<sup>5</sup>The Agricultural Mediation Service is a division of the State Department of Agriculture.

employment). Many on-the-job training opportunities arose from demonstration project staff contacts with employers, and most of the contacts led to full-time, unsubsidized employment. Participants who sought to improve their existing farm operations were offered farm management training.

The study report points out that North Dakota's demonstration project began in two small, independent offices, but eventually expanded to cover the entire State. This change had the effect of diminishing services to farmers and ranches, while increasing overall enrollment. The researchers also found that as the demonstration ended, staff planned to use the lessons learned to better serve farmers and ranchers under the existing JTPA system. Coordination efforts between the Job Service and the Agricultural Mediation Service that were initiated during the demonstration were expected to continue after the demonstration ended.

## **South Dakota**

South Dakota, a single substate area State, was the only grantee to provide services to farmers statewide. The demonstration was known as the Agricultural Community in Transition (ACT) program and was managed by the State EDWAA coordinator. Service delivery was provided through one of the 19 Job Service offices located throughout the State and through 10 Career Learning Centers (private, nonprofit JTPA service providers).

The program model was based on a previous program, known as Rural Renaissance, an employment and training program for farmers who experienced difficulty during the mid-1980s.

The ACT program was originally designed with the premise that participants could be recruited, enrolled, served, and placed by using existing institutions and staff. However, one year after the demonstration began, it had enrolled few participants. As a result, additional staff were hired exclusively for the ACT program and enrollment increased significantly later in the demonstration.

In addition to targeting farmers who had already lost their farms, ACT recruited farmers who were at-risk of farm loss and who needed help if they were to keep their farms. These individuals were referred to Adult Farm/Ranch Business Management Courses.

The researchers pointed out that, at the local level, relations between the two key agencies, the Career Learning Centers and the Job Service, were somewhat weak, and outreach and coordination efforts were not as effective as they might have been.

Eligibility criteria for the program were relatively liberal; clients did not need to show proof that their businesses were actually failing. The program offered a full array of EDWAA services, including assessment, counseling, legal services, support services, basic readjustment services, classroom occupational skills training, on-the-job training, and job placement.

The Career Learning Centers specialized in providing basic readjustment services which included assessment, vocational counseling, preemployment training, referrals to training, short-term clerical "brush-up" courses, and some job placements. ACT clients, however, did not receive referrals for financial, legal, or mental health counseling. In some areas of the State, job search assistance was provided by Career Learning Center staff, and, in other areas, through Job Service Offices.

Occupational skills training was available through one of the four vocational-technical colleges in the State or through private training facilities. Long-term training was not heavily used by ACT or other JTPA clients. After January 1992, the ACT program referred eligible farmers to the South Dakota Division of Vocational Education's Adult Farm Ranch Business Management Program which focused on helping farmers use computers to manage their operations.

The researchers found that after improving upon its original plans by hiring specialized outreach staff, South Dakota returned to its predemonstration arrangements for serving farmers and ranchers at the end of the formal demonstration. Although farmers and ranchers would continue to be served, they might not be served any differently than they would have been before the demonstration.

## **Enrollment Patterns and Participant Characteristics**

The study report points out that all of the demonstration projects experienced some difficulty in recruiting farmers and ranchers into training and employment programs, primarily because these individuals were often reluctant to enter into government-funded programs. Also, a significant portion of the population group was hesitant to admit that their farms were failing. For these and other reasons, the demonstration projects were slow to build up their caseloads (although Iowa moved quicker than the other sites, primarily because it had recent experience serving farmers under a previous discretionary grant).

By the end of the demonstration, South Dakota, Iowa, and Minnesota had enrolled approximately 350 participants each. North Dakota enrolled over 500 individuals.

In reviewing participant characteristics, the researchers found that they were dislocated farmers and ranchers or those at risk of dislocation, their family members, and their employees. About one-half of the participants were farmers, one-quarter were spouses of farmers, and about six percent were other family members. Nine percent of the participants were hired farm hands who were adversely affected by farm failures. About nine percent of the participants indicated that they or their spouses had already left farming at least six months before enrollment.

Almost all of the participants in the four States were white, non-Hispanics. Most had attained at least a high school education, and about half had attended some postsecondary education. On average, participants were relatively young; in each program, three-quarters of the participants were under age 45. Relatively few were age 55 or older. Table 15 shows selected demographic characteristics of the demonstration participants.

**Table 15. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Demonstration Participants (Percent)**

Characteristic	Overall	Iowa	Minnesota	North Dakota	South Dakota
<b>Race/ethnicity:</b>					
White (non-Hispanic) . . . . .	99.3	99.7	100.0	98.8	98.7
Other . . . . .	0.7	0.3	0.0	1.2	1.3
<b>Education:</b>					
Current high school student . .	NA	2.4	0.9	0.0	NA
Dropout . . . . .	NA	3.0	4.6	7.4	NA
High school graduate . . . . .	NA	50.3	42.1	46.4	NA
Some postsecondary . . . . .	NA	44.3	52.4	46.2	NA
<b>Basic skills proficiency:</b>					
Has limited English-speaking proficiency . . . . .	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0
Reads below the seventh grade level . . . . .	4.1	1.2	1.2	4.8	8.8
<b>Respondent is:</b>					
Single parent . . . . .	3.7	4.2	5.2	3.0	2.8
Parent in a two-parent household . . . . .	NA	NA	63.1	NA	81.1
Another family member . . . . .	NA	NA	17.1	NA	4.1
Independent individual . . . . .	NA	NA	14.6	NA	12.0
Number of cases . . . . .	1,476	332	328	498	318

Note: Data were provided for all participants from the States' Management Information System (MIS). Iowa and North Dakota did not provide information on their participants' family status, beyond indicating whether the respondent was a single head of household.

Source: *Serving Dislocated Farmers: An Evaluation of the EDWAA Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration.*

The report also reviews preprogram income and finances, noting that overall,

about 30 percent of the participants reported a total net family income that was less than zero, and another 30 percent had incomes of less than \$10,000. In about 60 percent of the cases, one or both household heads were employed off-farm in the year before enrollment. Seventeen percent of the participants reported that they had been unemployed at least 15 of the 26 weeks prior to program enrollment.

In comparing the characteristics of the demonstration participants with EDWAA participants in general, the researchers found that, for the most part, their characteristics were similar.

## **Services and Outcomes**

The report describes the types of services received by participants, highlights the differences in service priorities across the demonstration projects, and provides information about the shorter-term and longer-term outcomes obtained by trainees.

The following are some of the findings.

Regarding services received and provided, the researchers found:

- About 80 percent of the participants received retraining of some kind, with rates of retraining especially high in Minnesota and South Dakota and lowest (but still above 70 percent) in North Dakota.
- Retraining usually took the form of occupational classroom training, which was completed by over one-half of all persons served. Only small numbers completed basic skills training, and only about 15 percent completed on-the-job training.
- The duration of participation varied widely. About 21 percent received services for no more than three months; another 22 percent received services from three months to six months; 26 percent received services from six months to one year; and the remaining 31 percent received services for longer than one year.
- Expenditures per participant varied widely. They were lowest in South Dakota (at \$1,700), intermediate in North Dakota (about \$3,000), and highest in Iowa and Minnesota (about \$3,700).

- Iowa allocated more of its expenditures for basic readjustment assistance (slightly less than one-third of its funds) than any other program (reflecting lengthy recruitment and counseling). Iowa also spent more than any other program on supportive services (about 16 percent of its total funds). Consequently, it spent a smaller proportion of its funds on retraining (about 37 percent). Minnesota and South Dakota spent over 70 percent of their funds on retraining. North Dakota's expenditures were intermediate between these extremes, with 60 percent of its dollars allocated for retraining and 20 percent allocated for basic readjustment services.
- Only about half of those who were already dislocated received retraining, and their duration of participation was among the briefest. By contrast, almost 90 percent of dependents of farmers received retraining, and they participated for almost one year, on average.
- Compared to formula-funded EDWAA clients served by the SSAs, all programs except North Dakota were more likely to provide demonstration participants with retraining and to serve them for longer periods of time. In North Dakota, demonstration participants were about as likely to receive retraining as other EDWAA clients. In all programs, per participant expenditures were appreciably larger in serving demonstration participants than formula-funded clients.

Regarding short-term outcomes, the researchers found:

- About two-thirds of participants were still living on a farm just after termination and about one-half were still farming.
- Many participants (about 80 percent in Iowa and smaller numbers elsewhere) were working off-farm three months after termination. Those who left farming were much more likely to have off-farm jobs than those who were still farming.

□ Those who were employed were working in a wide variety of jobs and their earnings were usually fairly modest. After three months, 25.9 percent had weekly earnings of \$200 or less; 32.8 percent had weekly earnings between \$201 and \$300; 25.9 percent had weekly earnings between \$301 and \$400; and 15.5 percent had weekly earnings of over \$400. After three months of employment, 55.2 percent had fringe benefits that included health insurance for “self only.” Just over 40 percent had health insurance for their families; 32.8 percent had retirement benefits; and 59.7 percent had paid vacation or sick leave.

□ Participants who were employed off-farm before enrollment were more likely to be employed off-farm at program termination, with 66 percent of those employed off-farm before enrollment still employed off-farm three months after program termination.

□ For those who left farming, hourly wages increased by an average of \$2.00 per hour in Iowa, \$1.50 per hour in Minnesota, \$.90 in South Dakota, and about \$.30 in North Dakota.

Regarding long-term outcomes, the researchers found:

□ Although one-half of the participants were still farming shortly after program termination, only one-third were still farming one year later. (Thus, displacement from farming was, in many cases, forestalled only temporarily.)

□ Among the one-third of participants who were still farming over one year after program termination, 43.6 percent reported that the financial condition of their farm was better than it had been a year ago (suggesting that their farms may have rebounded from their earlier difficulties).

□ Rates of off-farm employment did not increase over this period. However, among those employed off-farm both shortly after termination and one year later, earnings and access to fringe benefits appeared to have increased modestly. Fifteen months after termination, 22.4 percent of the participants who left farming reported weekly earnings of over \$400, compared to 15.5 percent who earned over \$400 per week three months after program termination. Also, at 15 months after termination, 68.7 percent reported that they had health insurance for themselves, compared to only 55.2 percent who reported “self only” health insurance three months after termination.

## **Study Conclusions and Recommendations**

Following a brief discussion on effective strategies used to reach and serve farmers, the study report provided a number of conclusions and several policy recommendations. These are listed below.

**Conclusion #1.** While there may be periods and places where the rates of decline in the agricultural sector slow down or accelerate, the displacement of farmers and ranchers has become a chronic feature of the American economy. Periodically, however, catastrophic events such as a drought, flood, or sharp market changes temporarily worsen conditions for farmers, placing an unusually high number of them at risk.

**Related Policy Implication.** Rural SSAs should be encouraged to include farmers in their dislocated worker caseloads, and SSAs can learn to meet the employment and training needs of farmers. Technical assistance should be provided to SSAs to help with this effort. Discretionary funds appear to be an appropriate and effective mechanism for responding to unusual needs but they should not be used to address normal rates of decline in the farming sector.

**Conclusion #2.** Assessing the need for employment and training services in a local area is technically very difficult, and can exceed the capacities of local programs.

Nonetheless, good estimates of the numbers of farmers likely to enroll in programs is a critical element of successful program design.

**Related Policy Implication.** Technical assistance should be provided to SSAs to aid in the estimation of the number of potential farmer participants. State-level JTPA offices can also support this activity. SSAs should be encouraged to contact agricultural organizations for help in estimating levels of need.

**Conclusion #3.** Farmers, for a variety of reasons, are often difficult to reach and reluctant to accept assistance. However, through the use of aggressive, intensive outreach methods, the programs were able to achieve and even surpass their enrollment goals, serving a relatively high proportion of eligible farmers in their areas.

**Related Policy Implication.** Aggressive outreach is a necessity for enrolling farmers into JTPA programs. SSAs designing services to help farmers should be strongly encouraged to hire or train specialized outreach staff to recruit farmers.

**Conclusion #4.** While allowances should be made to acknowledge the unusual efforts needed to enroll farmers, excessive resources devoted to this activity do not pay off, either in the number of farmers enrolled, or in employment-related outcomes.

**Related Policy Implication.** Although SSAs should be encouraged to concentrate resources on outreach, this should not occur at the expense of more substantial services, such as retraining.

**Conclusion #5.** All four programs eventually prioritized enrolling at-risk farmers rather than dislocated farmers. Many project staff began to see their mission as saving as many farms as possible. Frequently, JTPA funds were used to forestall farm dislocation, rather than to provide an opportunity for farmers to achieve economic self-sufficiency through off-farm employment.

**Related Policy Implication.** In funding future programs for farmers and ranchers, the Department of Labor may wish to clarify program goals, eligibility guidelines, and activities that are allowable and appropriate.

**Conclusion #6.** Those programs that succeeded in building strong ties with organizations that serve or regularly come into contact with the farming population reported many payoffs, including enhanced outreach and expanded services to

participants.

**Related Policy Implication.** While coordination and cooperative linkages with community organizations benefit all JTPA participants, for SSAs serving farmers, such linkages are essential. Local programs may need assistance in identifying and establishing contacts with organizations, especially those with close ties to the agricultural community.

**Conclusion #7.** Once enrolled, farmers often prove to be model participants, availing themselves of the full range of services and faithfully attending counseling sessions, classes, or on-the-job training. Negative terminations were rare.

**Related Policy Implication.** The type and intensity of retraining services as delivered through mainstream EDWAA programs appear to be at least as appropriate for farmers as they are for other dislocated workers.

**Conclusion #8.** The close, personal, and ongoing relationships between clients and staff that were a hallmark of the demonstration were the most often-mentioned factors underlying project successes.

**Related Policy Implication.** The case management model, which has been shown to be highly effective for delivering employment and training services to dislocated workers and the economically disadvantaged in general, should be strongly encouraged for programs serving farmers.

**Conclusion #9.** The programs achieved a modest degree of success in finding off-farm employment for the participants. While participation in the programs led to an increase in the percentage of participants who increased their nonfarm employment, the rate of increase is lower than the rate achieved by nonfarm EDWAA participants, and many participants who entered the program as at-risk farmers were still farming a year after termination, without supplemental income.

**Related Policy Implication.** SSAs should target services to those farmers who are reasonably motivated to leave farming as their primary livelihood and/or to increase off-farm employment. Also, job placement activities can be enhanced by encouraging self-employment. SSAs should explore opportunities for linking up with rural development activities in their areas. Finally, relocation assistance should be actively

encouraged for those participants who are unable to find jobs in their local areas.

## **PROVIDING TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES FOR FARMERS AND RANCHERS**

### **Overview**

As part of its evaluation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance (EDWAA) Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration,<sup>6</sup> the Department of Labor supported the development and publication of a guidebook to help practitioners provide effective services for dislocated farmers and ranchers.<sup>7</sup>

The guidebook describes why farmers require certain types of services; provides information about how to initiate programs and identify services for this special group; discusses ways to design services that are responsive to the special characteristics, circumstances, and values of farmers and ranchers; and offers suggestions for State JTPA officials about how they can support local efforts to serve farmers under EDWAA. The publication also contains a resource list for practitioners which provides program contacts, and lists the titles of various reports and other publications that supply information about worker dislocation and services to farmers.

---

<sup>6</sup>Mary G. Visher, Stephen Walsh, and Ronald D'Amico, *Serving Dislocated Farmers: An Evaluation of the EDWAA Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration* (Oakland and Menlo Park, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994). Highlights of this publication are included in this chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

<sup>7</sup>Liz Wiegardt and Phyllis Weinstock, *From the Farm to the Job Market: A Guide to Employment and Training Services for Farmers and Ranchers* (Oakland and Menlo Park, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994).

## How Farmers Differ From Other Clients

The authors introduce the topic of farmer dislocation by providing information about how farmers differ from other clients. Differences noted include:

- They often do not have a clear layoff date (the process of losing a farm or ranch may take many years);
- Because job loss happens individually (rather than in large groups), farmers and ranchers are not made aware of available services through traditional “rapid response” activities;
- Farmers and ranchers generally do not receive unemployment benefits, severance packages, and options to continue health insurance;
- They have little or no possibility of being recalled or transferred and there is no option to retire;
- Losing a farm or ranch often means losing a whole way of life;
- Because both spouses often have made their living working on the farm, and sometimes their grown children have as well, the loss of a farm or ranch often affects entire families;
- In many cases, all of their resources have been spent trying to save their farms; and
- They may be faced with ongoing complex legal conditions, such as bankruptcy or foreclosure.

The authors also point out that farmers and ranchers face a variety of challenges to becoming reemployed that differ from other dislocated workers because they often live in geographically remote, sparsely populated areas; face a local rural economy with few reemployment opportunities; lack specialized skills; experience intense grief over the loss of their farm or ranch; have pressing needs for immediate income; and often have difficulty qualifying for financial assistance for retraining.

## **The Increase in Farmer Dislocation**

The increase in farmer dislocation resulted from the farm crisis of the 1980s, in which lenders often restructured farm debt by providing loans with high yearly payments or large payments due at the end of the loan term. Depressed commodity prices and adverse weather conditions also contributed to an increase in farm failures.

In describing which farmers most need services, the authors point out that the middle-sized farms (those with between \$10,000 and \$100,000 in yearly sales) often lack sufficient capital to ride out periods of financial stress—they are large enough to require a full-time work commitment from farmers and ranchers, but fail to provide a large enough income to sustain the operation through difficult financial circumstances. Operators of smaller farms, on the other hand, sometimes known as “hobby farms” or “rural residences” may have enough off-farm income during periods of economic stress to sustain farm activities. Large farms are not as affected by economic conditions. As Chart 7 indicates, 37 percent of all farms in the United States are middle-sized farms.

## **Start-Up Activities**

The guidebook offers a number of preliminary activities that may be undertaken to initiate services that are responsive to local needs. These include:

- Assessing the extent of farm and ranch dislocation in a specific area;
- Determining the characteristics and needs of potential farmer and rancher clients;
- Identifying possible funding sources;
- Building networks with other organizations involved with farmers and ranchers; and
- Recruiting, training, and supervising staff.

## **Assessing the Need for Services**

The authors point out that before designing programs and providing services, it is important to estimate the extent of farm dislocation in the local community. The guidebook offers examples of ways to generate rough estimates of the extent of farm dislocation by:

- Gathering and analyzing statistics from local lenders about the number of agricultural loans that are past due;
- Reviewing reports from experts, such as agricultural economists at State universities or the State Department of Agriculture, about the extent of farm dislocation statewide and within a local area; and
- Taking note of the number of calls received from rural “hotlines,” particularly calls about farm financial concerns.

Several examples of ways that have been used to estimate and document the need for services for farmers are provided in the guidebook.

## **Determining the Characteristics and Needs of Potential Clients**

The guidebook describes the differences between methods used to determine the needs and characteristics of workers who have lost their jobs through mass layoffs and plant closings and dislocated farmers and ranchers, noting that the formal surveys used to obtain information about large groups of laid-off workers are not necessarily appropriate for farmers. Rather, more informal ways of gathering information about this particular client group need to be used, including:

- Forming task forces made up of farmers and others in the community who come in contact with farmers;
- Identifying and interviewing former farmers who have established new careers off the farm; and
- If resources are available, surveying at-risk and dislocated farmers to help to

determine the extent of need, the characteristics of potential clients, and the demand for specific services.

## **Identifying Funding Sources**

The guidebook offers advice and provides examples of ways to find funds to establish and operate programs for dislocated farmers. The authors briefly discuss the use of JTPA Title II-A funds and funds that may be available through the EDWAA program. The limitations of using these funding sources are noted.

The publication points out that since the farm crisis of the 1980s, the JTPA Title III National Reserve Account has been a primary source of funding for training and employment programs serving farmers. These funds, however, generally support short-term projects. Examples of some National Reserve Account projects are provided. The authors also note that some States have used their JTPA Title III State discretionary funds either to support special projects targeted toward farmers and ranchers or to supplement formula funds for substate areas that experience significant farm dislocation.

Examples of the use of various State funding sources and nongovernmental funds are also provided.

## **Developing Networks**

The guidebook also provides helpful advice on ways to build connections among community organizations at a variety of levels. The authors suggest that these networks are important because they can: 1) help assess the need for services, 2) help design services, 3) serve as a source of referrals to programs for farmers; 4) provide services beyond the scope of a particular program; and 5) develop a coordinated response to the larger issue of rural decline. The authors list a number of individuals and organizations that should be a part of such a network. These include employers in the community, various training providers, lending institutions, human service agencies,

farmer and rancher organizations, churches, and agencies that directly serve financially distressed farmers.

Strategies for network building include establishing task forces made up of concerned individuals in a particular community who have a strong interest in the issues that relate to farm dislocation, who bring valuable resources such as knowledge, skills, and contacts, and who are affiliated with organizations that can be of assistance. The importance of personal networking by both program administrators and case managers with their counterparts in other organizations is also discussed.

### **Recruiting, Training, and Supervising Staff**

The guidebook also provides several tips on how to find, hire, and train appropriate field staff. Suggestions such as hiring people with farm backgrounds, finding individuals with good listening skills, and who have good self-management skills are offered. Field staff should also be willing to work flexible hours and spend a lot of time traveling. Recruitment strategies, necessary qualifications, and training efforts are briefly highlighted. The authors discuss several issues related to managing field staff. They also provide an overview of the office support necessary for field staff.

### **Addressing the Special Needs of Farmers and Ranchers**

The guidebook's third chapter describes several ways to design employment and training services that are responsive to the special characteristics, circumstances, and values of farmers and ranchers. The authors describe the adjustments that need to be made to basic training and employment programs in an effort to better serve this special population group. Of special concern are the services (outreach, assessment, case management, and supportive services) that bring clients into the program and subsequently provide the support that enables them to successfully participate in core

activities such as job search assistance and classroom training. Following are several specific activities described in the publication.

## **Outreach Efforts**

The authors note that one of the most challenging aspects of setting up programs for farmers and ranchers is the establishment of an effective outreach strategy. Because many farmers and ranchers are unlikely to seek aid in times of difficult circumstances, it is important that program managers seek out this special group, gain their trust, and convince them that there is help available.

One of the keys to a successful outreach effort is the hiring of specialized staff to conduct this activity. The authors point out that many of the most successful programs place a high priority on hiring individuals with farming backgrounds to perform outreach and intake tasks. In this regard, the guidebook offers several helpful tips from experienced outreach workers. These include:

- Meeting with potential clients on several occasions;
- Reaching out to individuals rather than to groups (because farmers and ranchers become dislocated one at a time, rather than through mass layoffs and because they are unlikely to discuss their difficulties in a group setting);
- Conducting farm visits to provide program information directly to the target group;
- Ensuring that dislocated farmers and ranchers know who to call if they need additional help;
- Reaching out to both men and women in the farm family;
- Dressing and conversing appropriately for the farm population when performing farm visits; and
- Avoiding the use of lengthy enrollment forms or complex information handouts during initial visits.

Because making potential clients aware of available assistance is one of the most important aspects of program operations, the guidebook also offers several tips

for outreach workers that can help them to take advantage of the media and personal networking efforts to reach dislocated farmers. Examples of effective newspaper advertisements and press releases are provided, along with tips for appropriate personal networking initiatives.

### **Tailoring Services to Farmers and Intake/Enrollment Efforts**

Another important aspect of successful farmer and rancher programs is the way in which the service process is tailored to the particular population group. The guidebook highlights a number of issues for program managers to consider in designing initial “preparation for training or job search” services. These are:

- Services need to be provided by someone with whom farmers are comfortable (i.e., staff need to have farm backgrounds or at least have extensive knowledge of the characteristics, circumstances, and values of farmers).

- Services need to be provided in a place where farmers will be at ease because farmers typically are more reluctant than most other training and employment clients to go to a JTPA office. Services, therefore, need to be provided on the farm or at least in an office that does not have “government assistance” connotations; and

- Services need to be provided in a way that feels comfortable to farmers (unlike other dislocated workers, who are often laid-off in rather large numbers and may derive support from participating in services as a group, farmers may not feel comfortable in such a setting).

The authors discuss these special considerations in detail, providing information about the timing and preferable location of intake and enrollment efforts. They also emphasize the need to work with as many members of the family as possible. Other strategies include setting up flexible schedules to discuss programs with farmers, and making paperwork as “user-friendly” as possible.

## Case Management

Another important feature of successful farmer/rancher programs is the case management approach to service delivery. In addition to providing examples of successful case management efforts, the authors highlight many of the most important features of effective case management strategies. They suggest that:

- One staff person should be assigned to each participating farmer to serve as the main point of contact throughout the farmer's participation in the program. The case manager should directly deliver many services such as assessment, counseling, and job search assistance, and coordinate all other needed services, providing referrals as needed. The case manager should also regularly check the client's progress.
- Because services need to be highly individualized, case managers should ensure that all services are tailored to the client's needs and interests (programs should be designed to fit the farmer rather than having the farmer fit the program);
- The case manager should form a trusting personal relationship with the client—contact should be frequent and should take place on the farm as often as possible; and
- Caseloads should be smaller than for most other employment and training clients (20 to 30 clients is a desirable level).

In describing variations in the design of case management services, the authors note that it is important to vary caseloads based on client needs. Disruptions in staff continuity should be minimized, and a team approach to case management may be appropriate. The authors also note that experienced case managers know that services for farmers cannot be provided on a standard nine-to-five schedule. Because many case managers spend several days a week visiting clients on their farms, it is helpful for them to maintain some regular office hours so that clients know when they can be reached.

The authors also stress the importance of confidentiality because farmers and ranchers often place a particularly high value on their privacy. Several tips are provided to help case managers maintain client confidentiality.

## **Assessment and Service Planning**

Because services need to be tailored specifically for farmers and ranchers, assessment and service planning are important aspects of program operations. The authors note that while the basic approach is similar to those carried out for other dislocated workers, some special considerations arise in making the process both comfortable and useful for farmers. Components of assessment and service planning may include:

- Informal assessment of farm status, need for supportive services, and interests;
- Assessment of vocational skills and basic skills;
- Exploration of career preferences and values; and
- Development of a service plan.

The authors suggest that in tailoring assessment and service planning to farmers and ranchers, outreach workers and case managers should:

- Conduct as much of the assessment process as possible at the farm, through informal conversations, before proceeding to formal or group testing;
- Match the choice of tests to the individual, and explain to the farmer which tests are most appropriate;
- Conduct a thorough assessment of transferable skills;
- Use the assessment process to build confidence and self-esteem;
- Keep the farmer actively involved in service planning; and
- Be prepared to accommodate a farmer's special situation.

## **Job Search and Placement Assistance**

The guidebook suggests that typically, job search assistance services do not need to differ from the way they are provided to dislocated workers in order to be responsive to the needs of farmers and ranchers. However, a few considerations are noted that can make these activities most useful for this population group. The publication includes tips about tailoring basic readjustment services to farmers and ranchers and offers suggestions about the best ways to develop effective resumes for farmers. The need for relocation assistance is also discussed.

## **Retraining and Supportive Services**

The authors note that while some dislocated farmers seek job placements after receiving counseling and job search assistance only, most find that they need to be retrained in order to obtain jobs with adequate wages and opportunities for advancement. The publication highlights each type of retraining (classroom occupational training, on-the-job training, entrepreneurial training, and basic skills training) by describing its utility for farmers and discussing considerations that are relevant in tailoring the service to meet the needs of farmers. The publication also highlights the experiences of a few farmers and ranchers who received various retraining services.

Because distressed farmers and ranchers are more likely to successfully complete training and find jobs if they and their families receive a range of supportive services during their program experience, the authors discuss the complex set of financial, legal, medical, and mental health problems that may interfere with training and job search efforts. They point out that dislocated farmers and ranchers have unique needs for supportive services because:

- Unlike some other dislocated workers, farmers do not have the resources to support themselves during retraining (i.e., unemployment insurance,

continuation of medical benefits, and severance packages);

- Farmers rarely receive government benefits such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children, food stamps, and Pell Grants because they are reluctant to apply for them or because they have assets (such as land) that disqualify them from receiving these services;
- Often, by the time they enroll in a training program, farmers have no funds left on which to live;
- Because most farmers and ranchers live in remote rural areas, transportation expenses for classroom training can be prohibitive;
- Farmers and their families may need medical services; and
- Many farmers may also need mental health services in order to move ahead with retraining or a job search.

The authors suggest that program operators often find that funds available for supportive services are scarce, relative to the level of need. Several suggestions are provided in the publication for ways to stretch scarce resources to deliver supportive services.

## **Suggestions for State JTPA Officials**

Although the guidebook is directed toward practitioners, the authors briefly examine several areas in which State JTPA programs can support local efforts to serve farmers and ranchers under EDWAA. These suggestions include prioritizing services to farmers and ranchers as a statewide goal, providing technical assistance and training to this particular group, clarifying rules and regulations as they relate to serving farmers and ranchers, facilitating access to special funding sources, fostering coordination by helping to establish good working relationships with other State agencies that serve this population group, and monitoring the progress of local EDWAA programs to ensure that farmers have been recruited into these programs.

# EVALUATING PROGRAMS FOR MIGRANT AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS

## Overview

Estimates included in the Report of the Commission on Agricultural Workers (1992) place the number of individuals who performed any hired farmwork during the year at about 2.5 million persons (including domestic workers, legally admitted foreign nationals, and undocumented foreign workers).

It is widely recognized that many workers who rely primarily on agricultural employment for their livelihood experience chronic deprivation and are afforded few opportunities for improving their employment situation. Housing for these workers often fails to satisfy even the most basic requirements for sanitation. Furthermore, the physical health of migrant and seasonal farmworkers is often poor, due to the lack of regular medical care, a high incidence of injury, and numerous other factors.

Because many migrant and seasonal farmworkers are employed only a small percentage of the year, their chances for economic improvement are few. Department of Commerce estimates show, for example, that about one-third of hired farmworkers work less than 25 days during the year and another 20 percent work fewer than 150 days. Consequently, although weekly earnings during peak harvest periods may seem adequate, *annual* earnings of most migrant and seasonal farmworkers are quite meager. The National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS)<sup>8</sup> found that although the pay of this group amounted to about \$4.85 per hour during 1990, average earnings for the year from farm and nonfarm work were only between \$5,000 to \$7,170. Equally important, migrant and seasonal farmworkers typically do not receive employer-provided benefits such as medical insurance or paid vacation, and coverage by

---

<sup>8</sup>The National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS) was designed to provide information on the impact of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act on farmwork.

Unemployment Insurance and Workers' Compensation varies throughout the country.

All of these conditions make the task of providing effective training and employment programs for eligible workers quite challenging. These individuals often face considerable barriers to obtaining nonagricultural employment. These obstacles include low levels of education, poor English skills, poor health, inferior housing, and few assets to sustain them through a period of retraining. Compounding the problem is the fact that these workers may have only limited or no experience outside of agriculture, and consequently lack job skills that make them competitive in the labor market.

Department of Labor efforts to help this population group began as early as 1971 with the National Migrant Labor Program which was authorized under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Special provisions for establishing services for migrant and seasonal farmworkers continued under Title III of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.

The current training and employment program for this group of workers is authorized under Title IV, Section 402, of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). It is administered nationally by the Department of Labor. In Program Year (PY) 1992 (July 1, 1992 through June 30, 1993), services were provided through 53 programs, with one program providing services in each of 47 States, five serving California, and one serving Puerto Rico.<sup>9</sup> Most of the grants to operate programs for these individuals were awarded to community-based organizations (CBOs), which are nonprofit organizations providing services to groups in need. Some CBOs operate programs in several States under separate grants. Several other grants are operated by agencies of State governments.

Researchers conducting an evaluation of the JTPA Title IV Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker (MSFW) program were impressed with the dedication of program operators and found that many programs were effectively serving the target

---

<sup>9</sup>There were no programs operating in Alaska, Rhode Island, or the District of Columbia.

population.<sup>10</sup>

The evaluation report provides an overview of the working and living conditions of migrant and seasonal farmworkers in the United States; describes the Federal Government's response to the situation; outlines the evaluation's objectives, timelines, and study components; presents a conceptual framework and quality of training model which was developed for the study; describes the sampling design used to determine which program sites would be included in the study; discusses the characteristics of individuals who were eligible to participate in the program and the characteristics of actual participants; reviews the services provided to participants (including pretraining, classroom training, on-the-job training, supportive services, and placement services and outcomes); notes factors that influenced program design; and offers several recommendations based on the study's findings. The report also includes a glossary of terms associated with MSFW programs, and provides a list of references and other technical information.

## **Conceptual Framework and Quality of Training Model**

The activities of the study (including site visits) were guided by a conceptual framework and a model of quality training. The conceptual framework—developed during the study's design phase—takes into account various federal, State, and local factors that affect service delivery, and ultimately, outcomes attained by program participants. The framework provided a system-level picture of the Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker program (see Chart 8) . The researchers used these system-level factors to guide their first round of program site visits and their subsequent evaluation efforts.

---

<sup>10</sup>Marlene Strong and Ron D'Amico, *Evaluation of the JTPA Title IV Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program* (Oakland and Menlo Park, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994).

In addition, a generic client-level model of quality training, developed during a previous study<sup>11</sup> and modified to be more specific to the MSFW program, was also used as a guide in evaluating many components of the program. Quality training criteria were developed for the following areas of program design and operations:

- *Client recruitment, selection, and assignment to services.* A program should have a clear understanding of its eligible population and know the needs of the subset of the eligible population it elects to serve. Its program design should be flexible and change as the needs of the eligible population change. Outreach and recruitment practices and assessment procedures should be tailored to the needs of the eligible population and should be sufficient to match applicants to available training options (or refer them to alternative services if the program cannot serve them). Assessment results should be used to develop a service plan and employment goals appropriate for each applicant.
- *Program design and management.* Programs should have designed their available services to meet the needs of the eligible population. The training provided should also meet the needs of employers in the local labor market, and be aimed at year-round, stable jobs. Training should be provided in a way that is sensitive to the needs of MSFW clients, including being of sufficient intensity to increase their employment potential. Programs should also maintain oversight of training activities in order to monitor service quality.
- *Provision of training.* The actual training activities should have clear objectives, enroll appropriate participants, and meet the needs of prospective employers. In addition, they should follow effective methods of service delivery, which means they should have a logical sequence and

---

<sup>11</sup>See, Deborah Kogan et al., *Improving the Quality of Training Under JTPA: Summary of Findings* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and SRI International, 1990).

job-relevant content, be matched to the learners' level, stress "training for transfer" and active learning, spend class time effectively, include systematic evaluation of student progress, coordinate occupational skills training with basic skills remediation and needed supportive services, link well with job development/job placement activities, and respond to the cultural and language barriers of MSFW participants.

□ *Job placement policies and practices.* Programs should have clear placement goals for each participant and adequate activities to attain these goals. In making placements, they should take into account both employer needs and client skills and goals. Job placements should be at the highest level appropriate to clients' levels of employability, and should emphasize quality outcomes, including stable, year-round employment, at least the minimum wage, safe working conditions, and opportunities for advancement.

Chart 9 shows the client-level model of quality training used for the study.

The research team used several data sources to assess how well the program was meeting the quality training criteria that had been developed. Information was obtained from two rounds of site visits to 18 programs, and data were extracted and reviewed from a sample of six terminée case files at each program in an effort to obtain information about how observed service strategies actually worked for particular clients. Client-level databases obtained from a nonrandom sample<sup>12</sup> of programs were also

---

<sup>12</sup>At the State level, the 51 MSFW programs in the sampling pool were divided into three equal-sized (17 programs each) strata based on their PY 1991 allocations ("small" consisted of programs with allocations of less than \$770,000; "medium" consisted of programs with allocations of at least \$770,000 but no more than \$1,320,000; and "large" consisted of programs with PY 1991 allocations in excess of \$1,320,000). The programs were also divided into two strata based on the percent of terminees who were migrants from among all those who received employment or training services. (This dimension was chosen because it was hypothesized that the service designs for highly mobile migrant workers would differ from those for the more stable seasonal population.) A cross-tabulation of the strata defined by

used to help the researchers examine the characteristics of clients who obtained quality jobs and better understand the kinds of service strategies that led to these outcomes.

## **Characteristics of the Eligible Population and Program Participants**

After describing the methodology used to determine the location of program sites to be visited (noting that research staff conducted two rounds of site visits to 18 of the 53 program sites—one visit during each of the two years of the study), the report focuses on a description of the characteristics of eligible individuals and program participants. The researchers chose the National Agricultural Workers Survey and the Agricultural Work Force Survey to estimate the characteristics of the population eligible for MSFW program services. Details about the surveys are briefly discussed in the study report and their relative strengths and weaknesses are described.

In reviewing survey data about the eligible population, the researchers determined that eligible individuals represent an extremely disadvantaged population with very low levels of education, severe English language deficiencies, and primarily racial and ethnic minority groups. The researchers also point out that the population group served by MSFW programs has one of the most severe educational and basic skills deficiencies of any group served in the JTPA system.

## **Grantee Service Strategies and Operations**

### **Training Services**

The researchers describe the range of services funded under Section 402

---

allocation and percent of migrants produced a six-cell table. Programs were chosen randomly from within each of the six cells.

MSFW grants and discuss the variations in service emphasis and mix that were observed in the sampled programs. These are highlighted below.

- The number of participants who received only supportive services actually exceeded the number who received training and employment services. In Program Year 1991, for example, 57 percent of all terminees nationally received only supportive services, while 43 percent received training and employment services. The researchers point out that the “supportive services only” category typically consisted of vouchers or in-kind assistance for families who needed food, transportation, or housing assistance. The amounts of this assistance were generally quite small (about \$50 per family).
- Classroom training and on-the-job training were the main forms of skills training available to participants. Classroom training generally took the form of basic skills training or vocational skills training, although there were a few programs that combined these into an integrated set.
- Basic skills classroom training was generally aimed at improving the language and mathematics skills of participants, and/or helping them to obtain an educational credential, usually the General Educational Development (GED) diploma. Other kinds of basic skills training included Adult Basic Education classes.
- It was not easy to meet farmworkers’ needs for vocational skills classroom training. The type of training varied both from State-to-State and within grantee service areas. Although all grantees could refer participants to existing public and private training institutions for vocational classroom training, these institutions were not evenly distributed throughout the country (mostly concentrated in urban areas).
- On-the-job training offered several advantages for migrant and seasonal farmworkers. It provided them with immediate income (which many of these individuals, who were heads of households, needed) and the skills learned had clear job relevance. It was also well suited to spread-out rural areas because, in cases where there were few classroom training venues, it was helpful to look to

employers themselves to provide training to participants who live nearby. In addition, the MSFW grantees often had more flexibility in matching participants to on-the-job training positions than in connecting them to appropriate classroom training. Training could begin whenever there was a job opening, rather than waiting for the beginning of a semester or school year. Disadvantages of on-the-job training were also noted. In particular, the skills learned may be relevant to only one employer (rather than skills that can be applied more broadly in future jobs). Also, because employers may have little knowledge of how to train employees, the training may be of low quality.

□ The relative emphasis on classroom versus on-the-job training changed over time. The study report points out that in Program Year 1990, half of the programs in the sample placed a greater emphasis on classroom training in their service designs, and half emphasized on-the-job training. In Program Year 1991, however, there was an increase in the number of MSFW programs emphasizing classroom training. Several factors may have accounted for this shift, including the Department's increased emphasis on reaching harder-to-serve individuals and the desire to provide long-term training services designed to help participants obtain higher-wage jobs.

□ Work experience and tryout employment were used less often by the sample programs than classroom and on-the-job training. However, for a small portion of the programs sampled in the study, work experience formed a significant part of their service design. Four of the 18 programs included in the study enrolled 10 percent or more of their trainees in work experience or tryout employment, which was above the national median.

□ Most of the MSFW program participants received training assistance (orientation to the world of work, job related counseling and testing, vocational exploration, or job development and placement).

In addition to describing the range and mix of services provided to participants, the study report also provides insight into the selection and use of various organizations and institutions to provide services to program participants. It also presents information

about the use of non-Section 402 funding and the coordination of other funds to help migrant and seasonal farmworkers.

Regarding decisions about who would provide services to MSFW participants, the researchers found that very few of the sampled programs used service providers to provide administrative or upfront services (e.g., recruitment, assessment, and counseling). Rather, they generally use their own staff for these functions. The researchers point out that this differs considerably from the practice of Service Delivery Areas in the JTPA Title II program.

Every program in the study sample used existing service providers for training on a individual-referral basis. That is, program staff would often pay tuition for MSFW participants to attend existing vocational training in the community. In addition, several programs had worked with local vocational-technical schools to develop short-term training courses that met the needs of participants for vocational training (thus, taking advantage of the existing vocational training infrastructure in their communities).

In investigating the extent to which MSFW grantees supplemented their JTPA Section 402 grants with other funds, site visit staff collected information about overall organizational budgets and information about how program funds were spent. The researchers found that, in six of the 18 sample programs studied, no other resources beyond the MSFW funding were used to supplement program operations (although some in-kind resources were used). Eight of the 18 sample programs had a moderate amount of resources other than the Section 402 grant, representing about 15 percent of their total budget. Four of the programs had a substantial amount of resources (equal to 50 percent or more of their overall budgets) to supplement their Section 402 grants. The sources of these outside funds varied from State to State, with the most common sources of non-Section 402 funds coming from education and human services agencies. Most of these additional funds were used to provide supportive services for MSFW participants while they were in training.

In reviewing how well MSFW programs and activities were coordinated with programs operated by other agencies, the researchers found that all of the programs studied engaged in interagency coordination of some kind, primarily in order to enhance

the resources that they could offer their clients, and, in some cases, in order to contribute to the improvement of policies and programs for farmworkers across the State or region. For most of the grantees, coordination was closest and most effective with other agencies in their “cultural network” (i.e., with agencies whose main mission was to serve Hispanics or farmworkers). Coordination between the sample programs and local JTPA Title II-A and II-B agencies was generally weak. The researchers also point out that long-standing relationships with State employment agencies were a key part of several programs’ coordination activities.

### **PreTraining Services**

Before training can begin or other services can be provided, MSFW programs must recruit and enroll eligible participants and assess their needs. The research study report describes the variation in the client mix across the sampled programs and provides information about targeting decisions that give rise to the variation. The study also assessed the consistency between targeting, outreach and recruitment strategies, service capabilities, and client needs.

The researchers found that assessment practices varied among the sampled programs. In the case of basic skills assessment, the emphasis on formal assessment varied widely. This variation was attributed to differences in clientele and service design among the programs. Programs that served a more homogeneous clientele and that offered limited training options tended to rely less on formal testing. Programs that used service providers for training tended to test some, but not extensively, preferring to leave most assessment to the better-trained service provider personnel. Finally, programs that served a diverse clientele and/or offered a variety of training options used the greatest amount of formal testing. Overall, programs had reduced the number of basic skills tests that they administered to clients to an average of one or two.

Other findings related to pre-training services are highlighted below.

- For vocational skills, emphasis on formal assessment had been reduced significantly. All programs included in the study group conducted informal

interviews to assess vocational skills and only a few also administered formal tests.

- All programs in the study group used an employability development plan to develop, document, and monitor client services, although they varied in the degree of vocational exploration, service options, and alleviation of barriers provided to each client. Programs also tended to rely heavily on client input in determining career goals.
- Availability of service options and attention to performance standards were cited as reasons for the variation in the amount of support that programs provided to clients to help them overcome barriers to training. In many programs, clients with significant barriers tended to be placed in on-the-job training or directly into jobs. Some program staff noted that this was the case for clients who lacked the ability, time, or financial resources to remain in classroom training. The researchers point out that efforts to address these barriers, such as provision of tailored training and counseling, stipends, and supportive services are increasing, but more are needed.
- Researchers found an increasing trend toward one-on-one approaches or one-on-one combined with team approaches to case management. Program staff found that intense, personal interaction with clients was necessary to keep them in training. As this trend continued, program managers realized the need for formally trained staff, and several programs had changed or were contemplating changing staff qualifications.

## **Classroom Training**

All of the programs in the study group offered some basic skills classroom training, and, with the exception of one program, all offered some vocational classroom training.

The researchers examined various aspects of these two forms of training. The study report provides a description of each type of classroom training, offers information

about the types of organizations providing the training, discusses the intensity and duration of instruction, notes the types of clients who received each kind of classroom training, and briefly discusses the quality of instruction. The report also includes information about the mix of vocational and basic skills classroom training provided to MSFW participants.

## **Basic Skills Classroom Training**

The researchers point out that MSFW programs need to ameliorate clients' basic skills deficiencies if they are to significantly and permanently improve their ability to compete in the mainstream labor market. Although all of the sampled programs considered basic skills upgrading important, the researchers found that the programs' demonstrated level of commitment to remediation varied considerably.

Several programs used basic skills remediation only to prepare clients for vocational training, and many more placed a greater emphasis on providing prevocational training (e.g., English as a Second Language, Adult Basic Education, and General Educational Development preparation) over providing remediation for its own sake. Other grantees, however, placed more emphasis on remediation of basic skills without vocational training, believing that improvement in this area alone could often improve clients' employability.

In an effort to meet the needs of harder-to-serve individuals and provide quality training, the programs studied appeared to struggle to find the right balance between basic skills remediation and vocational training. Highlights of the review of basic skills classroom training provided in the study sites are shown below.

- Although a variety of basic skills training was available in many programs, there were some gaps. Four programs in the study group had no English-as-a-Second Language training available, and for the remaining programs, it was not uniformly available at all field offices or for participants who wanted it as a stand-alone service.
- Another gap was the availability of Adult Basic Education or General

Educational Development courses tailored to the farmworker population. Programs that offered in-house instruction tailored this instruction to the needs of migrant and seasonal farmworkers. However, when participants were referred to programs in the community, they seldom found intensive instruction or bilingual teachers. The researchers suggest that because a significant number of farmworkers could benefit from both basic and vocational skills instruction, such tailoring could mean the difference between program completion and dropping out.

□ Skills centers offering integrated training (addressing clients' needs for both basic skills remediation and vocational skills training) are one way to meet the needs of MSFW program participants, although they are not appropriate for all areas.

### **Vocational Classroom Training**

The researchers point out that although it has the greatest potential to advance the well-being of farmworkers and their families, vocational classroom training is also the most difficult and challenging service to provide. The barriers to providing this form of training are many and hard to overcome. These challenges include low levels of basic skills among the farmworker population; the lack of providers able to supply quality training tailored to the target population's needs; the relative high expense of this service compared to either basic skills training or on-the-job training, the higher risk in terms of both cost and placement rates (when compared to on-the-job training as a vocational training option); the difficulty that clients have supporting themselves during lengthy training programs; and the need to provide costly relocation assistance to migrant workers interested in vocational classroom training.

The study report notes that in spite of these barriers, vocational classroom training provides the best opportunity for farmworkers to find permanent nonagricultural jobs that will improve their socioeconomic position. Highlights of the review of this form of training are listed below.

- It is difficult to provide vocational classroom to the farmworker population. While the researchers found that the quality of vocational classroom training was quite high, it was not available and accessible to many MSFW program participants.
- The availability of different types of vocational classroom training varied. For instance, within service areas, rural areas were less well served than urban areas, and in-house programs, while very accessible to those with poor basic skills, offered training in only a limited number of occupational areas.
- While programs that served many better-educated, literate seasonal workers with vocational classroom training were appropriate, the cost of such training may have limited the amount of funds available for basic skills instruction for migrant farmers with limited English-speaking ability.
- The researchers suggest that a greater emphasis should be placed on increasing the availability of vocational classroom training when making planning decisions.

### **Relationships Between Vocational and Basic Skills Classroom Training**

Because the need of farmworkers for both basic skills and vocational skills training is an issue that cuts across both major sections of the study report, the researchers examined ways in which the sampled programs addressed both of these needs. In identifying the appropriate mix of basic and vocational skills required to help migrant and seasonal farmworkers, the researchers suggest that programs should: (1) *tailor* basic skills training and vocational classroom training classes to the specific needs of farmworkers; and (2) *integrate* basic skills training and vocational classroom training in the training and curricula available to farmworkers. Table 16 shows the distribution of the sample programs studied with respect to the level in which programs are integrated and tailored to the specific needs of farmworkers.

**Table 16. Format of Classroom Training in the Sample Programs**

Level of Integration	Basic Skills Training and Vocational Classroom Training Tailored	Basic Skills Training Tailored, Vocational Classroom Training Not Tailored	Neither Basic Skills Training Nor Vocational Classroom Training Tailored
Fully integrated . . . . .	4	--	--
Partially integrated . . . . .	--	2	1
Not integrated . . . . .	--	7	4

Source: *Evaluation of the JTPA Title IV Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program.*

The researchers point out that tailoring classes to the farmworker population is a particularly important factor in providing quality classroom training, and that key features of this tailoring include: instructors who are bilingual and/or familiar with the cultural experiences of farmworkers, class schedules compressed into short time periods in response to farmworkers' urgent need to begin full-time jobs, and curricula matched to farmworkers' skill levels.

The study also suggests that integration of basic skills and vocational skills training is an important factor in providing quality training, and there are two dimensions regarding this integration. The first is the integration of training packages, in which clients are given the opportunity to pursue both basic skills training and vocational classroom training, either concurrently or consecutively, rather than being tracked into one or the other. The second dimension relates to the actual curriculum content. An integrated English-as-a Second Language class, for example, might use exercises based on vocabulary and situations specific to occupations for which participants were

being trained. Classes integrated on this dimension usually involved concurrent basic skills and vocational training.

In looking at the relationships between vocational and basic skills classroom training, the study report describes the MSFW programs in terms of those that: (1) operated tailored and integrated basic and vocational training; (2) operated partially integrated programs; (3) operated nonintegrated programs with tailored basic skills training; and (4) operated programs with no integration and no tailoring. The researches concluded that although most programs will be unable to achieve both tailoring *and* integration, some degree of either tailoring or integration can, and should be, achieved in most programs.

## **On-The-Job Training**

On-the-job training (OJT) is an alternative to vocational classroom training that offers the advantage of providing immediate income to participants. It is also job relevant and uses an active (“learning by doing”) approach. Participants immediately apply their newly learned skills to the job.

The researchers point out that to be effective, the match of participants to employers must be carefully conducted so that participants receive training in new skills. In addition, quality training must be provided, and the skills that employers provide should be transferable to other occupational contexts. Furthermore, OJT should provide participants with access to jobs that they would not have obtained otherwise.

The study report describes how the programs studied delivered OJT services, offers an evaluation of the quality of training provided through OJT, and identifies factors that enhance OJT quality. Highlights of the OJT investigation, are shown below.

- The responsiveness of OJT matched to the participants' skills and needs varied considerably across the 56 OJT positions reviewed.
- Ten OJTs were highly responsive to participants' needs and provided wages of more than \$5 per hour with benefits. In addition, in most instances, participants had multiple, often serious barriers to employment and were provided with additional training prior to or concurrent with OJT to alleviate those barriers.
- Nine OJTs were also responsive to participants' needs, offering wages with benefits to participants with low skills and little nonagricultural work experience. They were of appropriate duration to impart the skills that participants needed which were also transferable from one occupation to the next. The jobs were stable and promoted long-term employment.
- In 17 cases, OJTs were marginally responsive. Although the positions typically provided participants with immediate employment, they were not necessarily responsive to all of their needs. Wages tended to be low, and none provided benefits. The skills imparted in these OJTs were often low, and some participants with severe basic skills deficiencies received no remediation.
- Twenty OJTs were inappropriate. The positions were largely unresponsive to participants' needs. They included eight OJTs in which participants were laid off during or shortly after permanent job placement.
- While no specific program characteristics were exclusively identified as promoting OJT responsiveness, some general trends were observed. For example, many of the marginal and unresponsive OJTs occurred at programs that placed a high emphasis on OJT in their service design. In addition, most of the OJTs provided through group OJT contracts were also marginal or unresponsive. These two trends underscore the importance of providing appropriate matches between participants and employers and the need for greater monitoring and oversight of OJT conducted through group arrangements or with employers used repeatedly for OJT.

## Supportive Services

The study report notes that MSFW programs offer two types of supportive services: (1) support for training (which includes both training-related supportive services (TRSS) and stipends for training; and (2) supportive services only (SSO). These two components have similar service content but different target populations and purposes.

The researchers found that a barrier to successful completion of training for many farmworkers is their inability to meet basic needs for food, shelter, medical care, and transportation while in training. All of the programs studied made an effort to provide a variety of stipends and training-related supportive services, or referred clients elsewhere for these services. Regarding the provision of supportive services only, the researchers suggest that this component is used to respond to the most severe needs of clients who were not willing or able to participate in training. They note that this is a logical role for programs to play because of their unique accessibility to migrant and seasonal farmworkers, who have few, if any, other sources of support in times of emergency. However, unlike support for training, the SSO component was not linked to employment and training, and had no clearly defined goals other than to temporarily alleviate hardship in order to allow farmworkers to continue in agricultural employment.

The report provides insight into these two types of services by providing an overall discussion of support provided for training, reviewing eligibility for and types of training, discussing funding of support for training, describing how training-related supportive services were assessed, reviewing eligibility for and types of supportive services only, providing information about the extent to which programs emphasized integration of supportive services only, and discussing the role of supportive services only in MSFW programs. Highlights of the review of supportive services, are shown below.

- Programs vary in their use of non-Section 402 funds. In some programs, non-Section 402 funds are a significant source of funding for both kinds of supportive services, but are used in large part as a substitute rather than a supplement to Section 402 supportive service funds, thus freeing Section 402 funds for training.
- Although SSO is not immediately related to the programs' employment and training mission, it provides humanitarian aid that is valuable. Both SSO and support for training can contribute to employment and training goals in different ways. SSO can enhance outreach to hard-to-serve migrants who might benefit from training in the future, and training-related supportive services and stipends can make it possible for these and other workers to actually enroll in and complete intensive classroom training.
- Given the limited resources available, it is important that all types of supportive services and stipends be carefully targeted and efficiently delivered to ensure that they serve those most in need and are integrated with larger program goals and priorities.

## **Placement Services and Outcomes**

The study report presents information about the placement services provided to participants. It then discusses outcomes experienced by MSFW participants, drawing on both qualitative site visit data as well as several quantitative data sources developed for the study.<sup>13</sup>

### **Placement Services**

---

<sup>13</sup>These quantitative data sources were a client-level database from nine of the programs visited for the study and information obtained through case file reviews at all 18 programs visited.

Job placement services can be divided into two groups: indirect placements, which provide services for clients who have completed training programs, and direct placements, which provide services to clients who are “job ready,” and thus do not need additional services.

**Indirect Placements.** Two approaches for indirect placements were used in the study sites. In one approach, the goal was simply to match the client with an employer; in the other, the client developed job search skills as part of the job placement process.

All of the programs studied provided one-on-one job placement counseling for those who completed a training program. In half of the programs, counseling consisted mainly of the counselor providing job leads to the client and, when needed, advice on personal grooming, job protocols, and resume writing. In these programs, the counseling was oriented towards getting a specific job. In two of these programs, clients in classroom training were placed in jobs by the classroom training service provider. In the remaining half of the programs, in addition to one-on-one counseling, clients received job search skills training. Four of the programs featured special sessions or workshops that focused on job search skills. Other programs incorporated job related skills into their in-house classroom training curricula.

The researchers found that even after training, clients often had lower levels of qualifications than other workers. Therefore, job developers usually focused on obtaining entry-level jobs for program participants.

**Direct Placements.** The sample programs varied in their emphasis on direct placements. Six programs, rarely, if ever, placed participants directly (in most cases, job-ready clients were referred to local Job Service offices). Five programs did not promote direct placements (although they claimed that five to 15 percent of their placements were direct). Seven programs claimed that a substantial proportion (15-33

percent) of their placements were direct. In these programs, “training assistance only” was perceived as an important service component.

The researchers also found that followup practices for both indirect and direct placements services varied. Some program operators viewed followup initiatives after job placement as purely an administrative matter which was necessary to collect information for reporting purposes. Others used followup contacts to provide additional services to participants.

### **Services Received and Outcomes**

Noting that a national client-level data base had not yet been developed for MSFW programs, information about the types of clients receiving various services, the kinds of outcomes achieved by various types of clients, and the effect on outcomes of various services was obtained by reviewing data from nine of the 18 sample programs in the study (for a total of 4,426 individual cases of Program Year 1991 terminees).

The study report provides information about the characteristics of clients who terminated after receiving different types of service. Some highlights this section are noted below:

- Women were more likely to receive classroom training than on-the-job training, while men were more evenly divided between the two services.
- A substantial portion of men (40 percent) obtained classroom training.
- Migrant farmworkers were more likely to receive classroom training than seasonal farmworkers (probably due to their increased need for language training).
- The vast majority of participants who were students received classroom training, while more high school graduates received work experience.
- Blacks and other nonwhite minorities had higher-than-average participation in

work experience and training assistance, and were least likely to receive on-the-job training. (This was probably because blacks and other minorities were not evenly distributed through the research sample.)

- Hispanic terminees were more likely to receive OJT than any other group.
- The younger the participants, the more likely they were to receive classroom training.
- Participants with limited English-speaking ability were about as likely to receive classroom training as those without limitations.
- Fifty-nine percent of the clients were placed in a job and 17 percent obtained an employability enhancement. The 24 percent who received another termination were most likely individuals who dropped out of training.
- Males were more likely to obtain a job than females.
- Seasonal workers were more likely to obtain a job than migrants.
- Among ethnic groups, whites were the most likely to be employed and blacks the least likely. Hispanic participants had the highest employability enhancement rate, most likely reflecting their higher participation in language training, and the lowest negative termination rate.
- Participants of prime working age (22-44) were the group most likely to be employed at termination.
- Regarding wages at termination, males received a higher average hourly wage than females (\$5.30 versus \$4.95). White males received the highest average wage among males (\$5.87) and Hispanic males received the lowest (\$5.15). Among females, Hispanic women received the lowest wage (\$4.78), and a few “other” minority females received the highest (\$6.45).
- Seasonal workers averaged about \$.40 more per hour than migrants and high school graduates made more than high school dropouts (\$5.37 versus \$5.09).
- Terminees from on-the-job training were more likely to be employed at termination, although they earned a lower average wage.
- Terminees from on-the-job training were more likely to retain their jobs at

followup and were more likely to have benefits.

The researchers also used multiple regression equations to examine the relationship between services and outcomes, while holding client characteristics constant. Their analysis provided information about the likelihood of placement and wage levels for various client characteristics and services received.

The study also investigated the impact of employability enhancements (entered non-Section 402 training, returned to full-time school, completed an additional level of education, completed worksite training objectives, or obtained a basic skills or occupational skills proficiency) on program design and reviewed the characteristics of clients who received various employability enhancements. Table 17 summarizes the type of enhancement obtained, by client characteristics.

## **Factors Influencing Program Design and Outcomes**

The study report reviews several ways in which Federal policies, State and local level factors, and program resources shaped service design, the operation of classroom training and on-the-job training, coordination and resource leveraging, and the use of supportive services.

Among the Federal policies and practices examined were the effect of performance standards, eligibility guidelines, cost category and funding limits, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, and the provision of technical assistance from the Federal Government.

**Table 17. Type of Enhancement by Client Characteristics  
(Percent)**

Characteristic	Entered Non- Section 402 Training	Returned to School	Completed Level of Education	Completed Worksite Objectives	Basic Skills/ Occupational Skills Pro- ficiency
Total .....	3	11	13	22	52
Female .....	3	11	13	21	53
Male .....	3	13	16	28	40
Migrant .....	1	20	9	19	51
Seasonal Farmworker .....	4	5	15	24	52
Dropouts .....	1	3	12	20	64
Students .....	0	83	1	1	16
Graduates .....	5	1	17	30	47
White .....	5	1	27	21	47
Black .....	4	6	20	32	38
Hispanic .....	2	15	8	17	59
Other .....	2	0	13	42	43
Under 16 years old .....	0	93	0	4	4
16-21 years old .....	4	23	19	15	39
22-44 years old .....	2	2	12	31	53
45 years old and over .....	1	0	3	30	66
Limited English .....	1	3	3	17	77
Not Limited English .....	3	13	17	24	43

Source: *Evaluation of the JTPA Title IV Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Program.*



State and local environmental factors reviewed included the effects of the agricultural context (i.e., the number and characteristics of farmworkers and the duration and timing of periods of peak demand for farm labor, variations in race, ethnic origin, and participant characteristics throughout various geographical areas, limited English-speaking ability, etc.), and the effects of the nonagricultural context (i.e., cyclical economic factors, population density, urban versus rural concentration of clients, and the extent and type of training providers and nonagricultural employers in MSFW service areas). The review of the effect of program resources included the size of the Section 402 allocation across programs studied, and multistate versus single-State grantees. Some findings based on the investigation of the above factors are noted below.

- Although it was difficult to disentangle specific effects of Federal policies in designating grantees and allocation levels, all programs admitted that funds met only a fraction of the need. The overall funding level was usually felt as more of a constraint than limitations of various cost categories.
- State and local environments influenced program service designs and operations, often in ways that were difficult to predict. Client characteristics varied from region to region and within regions (and sometimes within service areas). Client flows could be disrupted by unexpected events such as natural disasters or shifts in weather patterns. Programs in different areas also operated in different social and economic environments, which influenced the kinds of programs they designed, the training available, and the eventual outcomes for their clients.
- Because programs operate in different environments, no one program design is appropriate for the country as a whole. Thoughtful planning that considers and addresses the needs of the particular eligible population in light of the constraints of the social and economic environment is needed.

## Recommendations

The study report presents a number of recommendations for actions that could be taken at the local and Federal levels to further improve the MSFW program. These recommendations are summarized below.

- MSFW program resources for employment and training services should be further focused on the hard-to-serve.
- Programs should institute specialized recruitment techniques to reach migrant and hard-to-serve seasonal farmworkers.
- Programs should use their supportive services-only components as recruitment devices for employment and training services.
- Programs should offer a range of basic skills training, preferably in-house or otherwise tailored.
- Programs should make available vocational classroom training that is tailored to the needs of farmworkers.
- Programs should improve their on-the-job training practices by more carefully matching clients to available positions, ensuring that reimbursements are used for extraordinary training costs, and monitoring better the quality of training.
- The Department of Labor should consider raising or eliminating the current 15 percent cost limit on supportive services only, thus giving programs more freedom to respond to fluctuating needs. It should also consider whether full-fledged eligibility determination, including documentation of work history and income, is necessary for services with low value (e.g., under \$50).
- Programs should reserve the bulk of supportive services-only funds for migrants away from their homes, and emphasize connections to existing community resources for seasonal workers.
- Support for training should be sufficient to allow MSFW clients to maintain themselves through training.

- Programs that contract with providers for services should increase their oversight to ensure that the needs of farmworkers are being met.
- Programs should examine their staff qualifications to determine whether the needs of farmworkers are being met. The Department should continue to encourage and support capacity-building activities that improve the qualifications of existing staff.
- Departmental capacity building and technical assistance efforts should be expanded to enhance the quality of all facets of the Section 402 program design and operations.
- Further clarification needs to be provided to MSFW programs about the purposes of employability enhancements.
- The Department of Labor should provide further clarification about whether it will monitor programs based on the performance relative to standards or relative to their plans.
- A system whereby eligibility determination can be transferred across Section 402 programs should be facilitated by the Department of Labor.

## **JOB TRAINING FOR THE HOMELESS**

### **Overview**

A study conducted by the Urban Institute estimated that more than one million individuals were homeless in the United States at some time during 1987, and that their number grew rapidly between 1983 and 1987.<sup>14</sup> Several factors are contributing to changes in the size and characteristics of the homeless population. These include: economic restructuring, which has led to job loss and changing skill requirements; a

---

<sup>14</sup>M. Burt and B. Cohen, *America's Homeless: Number, Characteristics, and Programs that Serve Them* (Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, July 1989).

lack of affordable housing; more restrictive eligibility requirements for welfare and disability benefits; the deinstitutionalization and lack of mental health care services for mentally ill persons; and the recent economic recession.

In response to the increase in the number of homeless people throughout the Nation, Congress enacted the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77) in 1987. The legislation provides for emergency shelter, food, health care, mental health care, housing, education, job training, and other community services for the nation's homeless. Section 731 of the McKinney Act authorized the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program (JTHDP). Under this Section, the Department of Labor was authorized to plan, implement, and evaluate a job training demonstration program for homeless individuals.<sup>15</sup> The demonstration was designed to provide information and direction for future training efforts for homeless people.

Two supporting goals were to: (1) gain information on how to provide effective employment and training services for homeless individuals; and (2) learn how States, local public agencies, private nonprofit organizations, and private businesses can develop effective systems of coordination to address the causes of homelessness and meet the needs of these individuals.

A study of JTHDP, which assessed its ability to provide effective employment and training services to this target population, revealed that it is feasible to establish programs at the local level to serve a significant minority of the homeless population, although these programs must offer a wide array of services and form linkages with other service providers.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>Recent information about the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program is presented in Chapter 1 of this volume.

<sup>16</sup>John W. Trutko et al., *Employment and Training For America's Homeless: Report on the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program* (Washington,

The study report presents an overview of JTHDP's history; provides information about participant characteristics (including a description of key subpopulations served by the program and a comparisons between the JTHDP participant population and the JTPA population); discusses program design and implementation efforts as well as services provided and service coordination; presents program and participant outcomes; and offers several findings, conclusions, and implications. It also contains a lengthy appendix which includes synopses of JTHDP projects.

## **Program Background**

The study report notes that JTHDP is the first comprehensive nationwide Federal program specifically designed to train homeless individuals and place them in jobs. Local projects, which received funds directly from the Department of Labor, may serve the full spectrum of the homeless population or emphasize assistance to subgroups within the general homeless population, such as supported work for mentally ill persons, families with children, single men, single women, or youth.

Grantees were encouraged to collaborate with other Federal, State, and local programs serving homeless individuals. Although projects were given wide latitude in how to structure their service delivery, they were required to provide or arrange for the following services:

- Outreach, intake, and enrollment;
- Case management and counseling;
- Assessment and employability development planning;
- Necessary alcohol and other drug abuse assessment and counseling with

---

D.C.: James Bell Associates, Inc., 1994).

- referral as appropriate to outpatient and/or inpatient treatment;
- Other supportive services (e.g., child care, transportation, mental health assessment/counseling/referral to treatment, other health care services, motivational skills training, and life skills training);
  - Job training services, including remedial education and basic skills/literacy instruction; job search assistance and job preparatory training; job counseling; vocational and occupational skills training; work experience; and on-the-job training;
  - Job development and placement services;
  - Postplacement followup and support services (e.g., additional job placement services, training after placement, self-help support groups, and mentoring); and
  - Housing services (e.g., emergency housing assistance, assessment of housing needs, referrals to appropriate housing alternatives, and development of strategies to address gaps in the supply of housing for participants).

Although the projects differed in their approach to providing services for the homeless, a generalized “logic model” was developed in 1989 to help local project operators and those responsible for monitoring and evaluating project implementation and outcomes. As Chart 10 illustrates, the logic model incorporates: (1) a “traditional” sequence of employment and training services; (2) a wide range of supportive services; and (3) case management which ties services to participant needs.

JTHDP was implemented in three phases. Beginning in September 1988, the Department of Labor awarded a total of \$7.7 million to 32 local grantees to begin the demonstration, test its feasibility, help shape the direction of its subsequent phases, and develop a methodology for program evaluation. This “exploratory” phase lasted 12 months (September 1988 through August 1989).<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>For findings from an evaluation of the exploratory phase, see Lawrence N. Bailis, Margaret Blasinsky, Stephanie Chesnutt, and Mark Tecco, *Job Training for the*

Two phases followed, which are termed “Phase I” and “Phase II” by the researchers. Phase I was an extension of the exploratory phase from September 1989 through April 1991. During this period, the Department provided \$17 million to fund 45 projects. These projects were selected through a competition from nearly 300 candidate sites (15 of these projects had been funded under the exploratory phase). Phase II was the result of an initiative (implemented in May 1991) to place greater emphasis on enrolling adults, provide comprehensive supportive services, increase job placement and retention, and provide transitional housing during training and permanent housing after job placement.

Table 18 provides an overview of JTHDP implementation experience and outcomes, by phase.

---

*Homeless: Report on Demonstration's First Year* (Rockville, Md.: R.O.W. Sciences, Inc., 1991). Highlights of this first-year study can be found in the 1994 edition of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

**Table 18. Overview of JTHDP Implementation Experience and Outcomes, by Phase**

Characteristic/ Outcome	Exploratory	Phase I	Phase II	Total
Duration . . . . .	Sept. 1988- Aug. 1989	Sept. 1989- April 1991	May 1991- April 1992	Sept 1988- April 1992
Funding (in millions) . . . . .	\$7.7	\$17.0	\$8.5	\$33.2
Project sites . . . . .	32	45	20	62
Number of participants . . . . .	7,396	13,920	6,740	28,056
Number trained . . . . .	4,600	10,629	4,980	20,209
Number placed in employment . . . . .	2,435	4,676	2,351	9,462
Number of housing upgrades . . . . .	1,993	4,935	2,847	9,775
Percent of participants placed in jobs . . . . .	33%	34%	35%	34%
Percent of participants placed in jobs who were employed at 13 weeks . . . . .	40%	43%	53%	44%

Note: There were 62 sites that participated during part or all of the three phases. During Phase I, 15 of 32 exploratory sites were re-funded. In Phase II, 20 of the Phase I sites were refunded. The Tucson Indian Center was added as a grantee in September 1991 (bringing the total number of JTHDP sites to 63); however, it was not included in the analysis because results from the first year of operation were not yet available.

Source: Quarterly reports submitted to the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration by JTHDP sites as reported in *Employment and Training For America's Homeless: Report on the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program*.

The study report provides a State-by-State listing of JTHDP projects funded during Phase I and Phase II.

## **Participant Characteristics**

JTHDP was designed to respond to the diversity of the homeless population by serving a wide spectrum of homeless individuals. A few sites targeted services to homeless individuals with mental illness or chemical dependency. Some sites also targeted battered women or families.

Combining statistical information from Phase I and Phase II, the research report provides an overview of the basic characteristics of JTHDP participants, including their demographic characteristics, education and employment histories, reasons for homelessness, and housing situation prior to JTHDP participation. Characteristics of several homeless subgroups are also provided, along with a comparison of JTHDP participant characteristics with the general homeless population, and with the Job Training Partnership Act Title II-A participants.<sup>18</sup> Highlights of this analysis follow.

- Participants ranged in age from 14 to 79; the average age was 32. Fifty-one percent were between 22 and 34 years of age, and 36 percent were between 35 and 54 years of age.
- Sixty-five percent were male and 35 percent were female. The higher proportion of males reflected the generally higher proportion of men within the

---

<sup>18</sup>The analyses were based on participant-based data collected by JTHDP sites and entered into a management information system. JTHDP sites participated in this system voluntarily. Data were available on 71 percent of the 20,660 participants served during Phase I and Phase II.

homeless population in the United States and the greater availability of income support for women with children through the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program.

- Fifty-two percent of the participants were black; 38 percent were white. Other racial and ethnic groups included persons of Hispanic origin (seven percent), American Indians and Alaskan Natives (two percent), and Asian/Pacific Islanders (less than one percent).
- Sixty-one percent of the participants were single *and* never married at the time they entered the program; only about 10 percent were married. About 40 percent had dependent children.
- Sixty-four percent had completed high school, and 22 percent had completed one or more years of college.
- Almost all participants (99 percent) had been employed at some time prior to their entrance into the program, although only 11 percent were employed at the time of intake.
- Two-thirds of the participants had no public- or private-sector health insurance; about 30 percent received health insurance through government-sponsored programs.
- Half of the participants spent the night before they applied for services in a shelter, and nine percent were living on the street (about 20 percent indicated they had stayed with a friend or relative, and 13 percent lived in transitional housing<sup>19</sup> facilities). Most of the participants had recently become homeless prior to entry, although 27 percent had been homeless for more than six months, and four percent had been homeless for more than four years prior to program entry.

---

<sup>19</sup>Transitional housing is short-term housing for homeless persons (including halfway houses for recovering alcoholics, chemically dependent individuals, and/or ex-offenders) that permits limited length of residency (usually up to 24 months) or housing (including halfway houses) for the mentally, emotionally, or physically disabled that includes supportive services, some degree of supervision, and subsidized rent.

- When asked to identify factors that contributed to their homelessness, 53 percent noted job loss or lack of work, 38 percent were unable to pay rent, 28 percent lacked affordable housing, and 15 percent had been evicted. Also, fourteen percent cited personal crises, including divorce or termination of a personal relationship; seven percent noted other disabling conditions including mental illness; and four percent noted a physical disability as the reason for their homelessness. Other problems, including family illness (three percent), termination of public assistance (four percent), loss of housing due to sale or conversion (two percent), or runaway/transient, (one percent) were also cited.<sup>20</sup>
- About 11 percent of the participants were identified as being mentally ill.
- The largest identifiable participant subgroup, unmarried males, accounted for 59 percent of the participants. Of these, 28 percent were veterans, about one-fourth had children, 24 percent received State or local general assistance, and 74 percent lacked health insurance.
- About one-fourth of the participants were part of an entire family that was homeless. Seventy-four percent of these individuals were under 35 years of age and 82 percent were female.

Because it is difficult to estimate the size and composition of the Nation's homeless population, the researchers developed a national probability-based sample of 1,704 homeless adults who used either soup kitchens or shelters in cities with populations of 100,000 or more during a seven-day period to identify differences between the characteristics of the individuals who were served through the program and the homeless population in general. Substantial differences were found. Although men constituted a majority of both groups (81 percent of the shelter and meal program users were men compared to 65 percent of JTHDP participants), program participants were generally younger, somewhat more likely to be black, and better educated. In

---

<sup>20</sup>Categories are not mutually exclusive. Because participants may cite several reasons for their homelessness, percentages do not add to 100 percent.

addition, users of soup kitchens and shelters in the sample had been homeless an average of 39 months (with 21 percent having been homeless for less than four months). Participants in JTHDP, on the other hand, had been homeless for an average of only nine months, with 61 percent having been homeless less than four months.

In comparing the characteristics of the JTHDP population with adult JTPA participants, the researchers found that their characteristics were much more like those of the homeless individuals served under JTPA rather than the characteristics of the general homeless population.

## **Program Design, Implementation, Services, and Coordination**

Programs that serve the homeless often face individuals with multiple barriers to attaining economic self-sufficiency. Service mix and delivery strategies, the sequence of training, and coordination with other service providers, are important aspects of program design and implementation for this population group. The research report describes and assesses services and coordination strategies employed by the JTHDP sites to meet the diverse employment and training needs of homeless individuals.

In the area of program design, the report notes that JTHDP grantees represented a wide range of organizations, including JTPA Service Delivery Areas, mental health organizations, shelters, agencies operated under city governments, community action committees, and education agencies. These organizations used a variety of approaches in their attempt to help homeless individuals attain economic self-sufficiency. Although numerous approaches were found in the investigation of the various program sites, certain design elements were common to most Phase I and Phase II projects. These were:

- Extensive case management (a client-centered, goal-oriented process for

assessing clients' service needs and helping them to obtain those services by promoting participant self-sufficiency, self-determination, and guided self-help), as the means through which program services were tailored to meet individual client needs;

- Availability of remedial and basic skills training;
- Provision of vocational/occupational skills training;
- Availability of a wide variety of supportive services;
- Provision of placement and post-placement services, with a growing emphasis on post-placement services as a key to job retention, housing retention, and long-term stability;
- Availability of shelter placements, transitional housing placements, and assistance in securing permanent housing, with increasingly formal housing linkages during Phase II; and
- Extensive coordination with community agencies—sometimes on an agency-by-agency basis and sometimes through coordinated, community-wide systems of linkages—with an increasing tendency toward the latter approach in Phase II sites.

The researchers also point out that several sites modified their programs as they gained experience in serving homeless individuals. Examples of these changes included more systematic outreach strategies (e.g., regularly scheduled visits to shelters and referrals from other homeless-serving agencies), the use of more reliable and valid assessment tools and practices (especially as they relate to mental health and chemical dependence problems), and a shift from sequential service delivery systems to systems that were more tailored to participant needs.

In the area of program services, the research report points out that in addition to basic training and employment activities, JTHDP sites supplemented their services to include case management, housing services, and supportive services. The study report provides findings in six key areas related to program services: (1) initial services

(outreach, intake, and assessment); (2) case management; (3) education and training services; (4) job development, placement, and postplacement services; (5) housing services; and (6) supportive services. Highlights of each of these areas are provided below.

## **Initial Services**

Traditional outreach efforts (recruiting interested persons, identifying appropriate clients, and assessing training and service needs) were challenging because of the transiency of homeless people and their often tenuous ties with community agencies. Approaches used to find this special population group included word of mouth, posters, weekly trips to soup kitchens and shelters, and linkages with halfway houses. As programs became more established, they developed more extensive referral networks with homeless-serving agencies. As programs matured, many reported deemphasizing individual client outreach in favor of outreach activities aimed at agencies that had frequent contact with homeless people.

All sites used a standardized intake process, and most used some form of standardized assessment procedure which usually included tests of vocational aptitude or preference, education and basic skill levels, and mental or physical health. By Phase II, at least half of the sites had intensified their assessment of drug and alcohol use through interviews, meetings with substance abuse counselors, and/or formal assessment instruments.

## **Case Management**

All 20 Phase II sites and all but one of the 45 Phase I sites used some form of case management, although local definitions of case management varied widely.

There was general agreement that case management systems hinged upon participants having a single case plan (Employability Development Plan) and that trust-building and coordination among involved staff and agencies were critical when participants had more than one case manager. By Phase II, in most sites, case managers were maintaining regular contact with their participants at least weekly or bi-weekly. The average caseload during Phase II ranged from 15 to 30 active cases per manager.

### **Education and Training Services**

Although all sites provided remedial education and basic skills/literacy training, relatively few participants expressed a preference for such training. Most of the participants were interested in moving as quickly as possible to secure a job. Sites used a combination of direct service and referral to make educational services more available, and some sites made educational services a prerequisite for skills training and encouraged all high school dropouts to obtain their General Equivalency Degree.

The most frequently requested and used training services were job search assistance, job preparatory training, and job counseling. Vocational and occupational skills training included both short- and longer-term training and typically incorporated classroom and “hands-on” training. Program participants usually preferred short-term training.

Work experience was used by eight of the Phase II sites, most often for special population subgroups such as participants recovering from substance abuse and mental illness.

### **Job Development, Placement, and Postplacement**

Almost half of the Phase II sites designated one or more staff members to work primarily on job development and placement, and encouraged participants who had obtained jobs, upon termination from the program, to attend postplacement support groups. Some Phase II sites directed their efforts toward identifying higher quality job placements as a way to increase retention, while other sites continued their financial support services for participants who began working or tied housing upgrades to continued employment of postprogram participants.

In 15 of the Phase II sites, case managers or job counselors maintained contact with employed participants periodically for 13 weeks after they were placed in jobs.

## **Housing Services**

Housing services provided by the JTHDP sites included operating shelters, transitional housing, or group homes; referrals to providers of such housing; housing counseling and home management skills training; financial assistance with move-in expenses or rent; mediation with landlords; and involvement in affordable housing development within local communities.

Phase II programs placed a much greater emphasis on housing services than did Phase I programs (to some extent, this was because of a greater emphasis placed on this service by the Department of Labor). Encouraged by a memorandum of understanding between the Department of Labor and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), eight Phase II sites developed formal agreements, and eight others developed informal agreements with their local HUD offices to help provide housing for program participants.

Phase II was also characterized by an increase in the number of sites that hired housing coordinators or arranged for housing expertise to be available to case managers and participants.

## **Supportive Services**

Providing homeless individuals with quality training and employment services required the provision of a flexible array of supportive services. These services were provided not only through the use of JTHDP funds, but through other Federal or private funds as well. Sites also used cooperative agreements, referral networks, and other strategies to meet participant needs.

Transportation was the most commonly provided support service. In addition, over three-quarters of the projects in both phases offered training or counseling aimed at increasing participant self-esteem, chemical dependence counseling or treatment, and health care. During both phases, about three-fourths of the sites provided clothing, and about half provided tools, work equipment, and special work clothing. About 60 percent offered hygiene products and services.

About 70 percent of the sites in both phases offered or arranged for child care. Some sites made available other supportive services such as mental health counseling, telephone services or voice mail, help in obtaining drivers' licenses and other identification, and vocational rehabilitation services. Most sites provided some degree of life skills training, often emphasizing money management.

## **Coordination and Linkages**

The research report discusses the importance of coordination and linkages

among various programs that can help homeless individuals, describes the scope and characteristics of JTHDP linkages, and reviews the barriers to service coordination that occurred in some program sites. Highlights of the findings are noted below.

- The Department of Labor requirement that sites establish housing intervention strategies strengthened housing linkages for some of the projects that were operated by job training agencies. (A number of projects had discerned this need early on and moved to develop them in Phase I.)
- Although there was great variety among the sites in the intensity and types of services provided through linkages with other organizations, all Phase I and Phase II sites established linkages. In both phases of the program, the most common types of services provided through linkages with other agencies were supportive services and housing. About 90 percent of the sites during both phases provided some training services through linkages with other service providers. At least 11 of these arrangements involved Private Industry Councils or the JTPA Service Delivery Area.
- Barriers to service coordination generally involved legal requirements, administrative arrangements, and other factors such as “turf” or personality issues. Administrative barriers included difficulty in working with staff from other agencies, local implications of the Department of Labor/Housing and Urban Development memorandum of understanding (some housing agencies were not aware of the document and some were not able to negotiate agreements with JTHDP grantees because of federal and local requirements that gave priority to specific groups of homeless individuals), the amount of time required to plan and implement coordination, high staff turnover, and lack of political support from local elected officials and other community leaders.

## **Program and Participant Outcomes**

The study report analyzes program outcomes based on aggregate site-level

data, and provides a more in-depth analysis of outcomes based on participant-level data (analyzing outcomes by type of client and type of obstacles faced in gaining employment).

### **Site-Level Analysis**

Over the two and a half year period of Phases I and II, the program served 20,660 homeless individuals.<sup>21</sup> As Chart 11 shows, of those served, 76 percent (15,609 participants) received at least one training service<sup>22</sup>; 34 percent (7,027 participants) obtained jobs; and 38 percent (7,782 participants) obtained upgraded housing. Of the 7,027 participants who obtained employment, 46 percent (3,232 participants) were still employed 13 weeks after their initial job placement.

Participants who received training services received an average of about nine weeks of these services during both phases.

The average hourly wage at placement was \$5.09 for the two phases combined.

Three occupational categories accounted for 70 percent of job placements

---

<sup>21</sup>Because grantees collected limited participant-level data during the exploratory phase, only Phase I and II data were analyzed in the research report. Outcomes from the exploratory phase can be found in *Job Training for Homeless: Report on Demonstration's First Year*, which is summarized in the 1994 edition of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

<sup>22</sup>The remaining 24 percent did not receive training services, but did receive support, placement/postplacement, housing, and/or information and referral services.

during Phases I and II: service workers (37 percent); laborer positions<sup>23</sup> (21 percent); and office/clerical positions (13 percent). Most of these positions required low skill levels. Of the remaining six occupational categories, two—operatives (e.g., truck drivers and electronic assemblers) and sales positions—accounted for 14 percent of the placements. The moderate- to high-skilled jobs, including craft workers (e.g., electricians and plumbers), professionals, technicians, and officials/managers, accounted for the remaining 15 percent of placements. The occupational categories of participants are shown in Chart 12. The study report points out that the relatively high proportion of job placements in low-skilled positions appeared to be the result of low levels of skills that many homeless participants brought to the program and their urgent need to find a job.

The percentage of those placed in jobs, who were employed 13 weeks later, increased between Phase I (43 percent) and Phase II (53 percent). The researchers suggest that this was the result of experience gained during Phase I. Of those employed 13 weeks after program termination, the average hourly wage was \$6.47 (both phases combined).

There was an increase in the percentage of participants who upgraded their housing from Phase I (35 percent) to Phase II (42 percent), suggesting that the Department of Labor's emphasis during Phase II, on sites establishing strategies for their participants to secure transitional and permanent housing, had a positive impact.

The average training cost per participant for both phases of the program was \$1,342. There was virtually no change in the average training cost between Phase I and Phase II, and the average cost per job placement was \$2,982 for both phases combined.

---

<sup>23</sup>Defined as manual occupations generally not requiring specialized training (e.g., car washers and garage laborers).

## Participant-Level Analysis

In analyzing program outcomes based on participant-level data, the researchers note that, although data were available for only 71 percent of program participants, participant-level data closely matched site-level data on key outcome measures. Key findings of the participant-level analysis are highlighted below.

- Long-term homeless participants—a group that might have been considered relatively “hard-to-serve”—had a placement rate of 32 percent, which was only slightly below the 35 percent average for all participants.
- There were some notable differences in placement rates by participant characteristics. JTHDP participants were somewhat more likely to be placed if they were over 22 years of age, male, white, nondisabled veterans, more highly educated, employed at the time of intake to JTHDP, earned some wage income during the six months preceding intake, had private health insurance at the time of intake, lived in transitional housing rather than on the street at time of intake, and were homeless less than six months prior to intake.
- Mentally ill participants and participants who were homeless for at least six months or longer had the lowest placement rates among the subgroups profiled, although these placement rates were only slightly below the 35 percent average for all participants. (Some mentally ill participants were involved in “supported work.”)
- There were relatively minor differences in employment retention rates (the percentage of individuals placed who were employed 13 weeks later) across participant characteristics and subgroups, although participants were more likely to be employed 13 weeks after initial termination if they were female, had dependent children, were employed at the time of JTHDP intake, had private health insurance, Medicaid, or Medicare at the time of intake, lived in transitional housing at the time of intake rather than on the street, and were homeless one year or less prior to intake.

□ Twenty-six percent of program participants, during both phases combined, had secured permanent housing when last contacted by program staff. In comparison to their housing status at intake, participants were substantially less likely to be housed in shelters, less likely to be on the street, less likely to be living with friends or relatives, and more likely to be in transitional housing.

## **Findings, Implications, and Recommendations**

The study report presents several findings relating to the design of effective employment and training services for homeless individuals. These are:

- Employment and training programs can successfully serve a wide spectrum of the homeless population.
- A wide variety of public and private agencies can successfully establish and operate employment and training programs for homeless individuals.
- Programs for homeless persons must offer a wide array of services (including housing services), often requiring linkages with other service providers.
- Programs serving homeless individuals require comprehensive assessment and ongoing case management.
- Employment and training programs for homeless persons need to provide short-term job search/placement services.
- Long-term followup and support is needed to effectively serve homeless persons.
- JTHDP suggests that over one-third of homeless participants in a mature national employment and training program would be likely to secure jobs, and nearly half of those securing jobs would be likely to be employed 13 weeks later.
- JTHDP suggests that about 40 percent of homeless participants in a mature national employment and training program would be likely to upgrade their

housing, and about one-fourth would secure permanent housing.

□ Average training and placements costs for employment and training programs for the homeless are likely to vary substantially across sites depending upon the types of participants served and types of training provided.

Based on the study's findings, the researchers offer several implications, which are summarized below.

□ Implication #1. Access of America's homeless persons to employment and training services through JTPA Title II-A could be enhanced. Strategies that JTPA Service Delivery Areas should consider in order to increase the number of homeless individuals served and ensure effective service delivery include: expanding outreach and recruitment practices to include linkages with homeless-serving agencies; incorporating a housing intervention strategy into JTPA programs; expanding their current coordination arrangements to ensure that homeless participants have access to a wide range of support services; seeking State incentive grant set-asides to enhance their ability to meet the various needs of homeless people; and providing additional training to their staff and to their service providers on the needs of homeless people.

□ Implication #2. Encourage programs to use a long-term job retention and housing strategy. Some strategies available to strengthen retention and followup include: life skills and housing management skills training; regular postplacement contact of case managers with participants to identify and rectify problems early; mentoring programs; postplacement support groups at which attendance is encouraged; and continued referral to and provision of supportive services as needed during the followup period.

□ Implication #3. Extend the period for tracking employment and housing outcomes.

□ Implication #4. Encourage local housing authorities to target participants for transitional and permanent housing opportunities.

□ Implication #5. When funding permits, provide multi-year grants to successful

programs.

## **HELPING YOUTH WITH DISABILITIES MOVE FROM SCHOOL TO WORK**

### **Overview**

The number of individuals who receive public income support because they have a disability that prohibits them from succeeding in the labor market continues to increase. As a consequence, “supported employment” efforts for these individuals have grown in recent years.<sup>24</sup>

Based on reports from 42 States, it has been estimated that the number of

---

<sup>24</sup>Supported employment is premised on the belief that many persons who are traditionally in sheltered workshops or who are considered unable to benefit from rehabilitation services can perform substantial work in regular work sites if given the necessary long-term support. Three basic models of supported employment have been developed. In the “individual placement” model, individuals with severe disabilities are placed in a job in which their immediate coworkers are generally persons without disabilities. In this model, a job coach helps the individual learn the job. In the “enclave” model, two or more persons with severe disabilities are placed in close proximity in a specified part of the work environment. Supervision is often provided by a job coach not directly hired by the business. In the “work crew” model, two or more individuals with disabilities are transported to an employment site for special tasks. After completing their work, they are transported to another site. A job coach may often accompany each crew.

supported employment participants nationwide during in FY 1991 was slightly over 90,000—approximately 15,000 higher than the previous year and almost triple the number of participants in 1988. Most of these individuals had a primary diagnosis of mental retardation (62.8 percent) or mental illness (22.2 percent).

However, initial reports on the success of traditional supported employment practices have been mixed. Scattered information, mostly from a few sites, indicates that although supported employment using a job coach tends to substantially increase the earnings of workers with severe disabilities, the cost of this effort, when compared to sheltered workshops, tends to exceed the increase in participant earnings.

A new model for providing supported employment services for individuals with very severe disabilities evolved in the mid-1980s. Described as the “natural supports” model, it differs from previous models in that it was designed to rely on supervisors, co-workers, family members, friends, and other work-site and nonwork-site personnel to provide the training and supervision needed to help individuals with disabilities perform satisfactorily on their jobs.

Rather than using job coaches who train the employees and/or work with them until they are capable of doing the job on their own, the natural supports model uses “employment facilitators” to work with the employee’s supervisors, co-workers, company human resources staff, and other company personnel to show them how to train and supervise workers with disabilities. The facilitators also work with the families of persons with severe disabilities. They may also help other community resources (such as bus drivers) in assisting people with disabilities.

In 1992, the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services began supporting a five-year demonstration to develop model school-to-work transition programs that emphasize natural support systems and expand opportunities for competitive, compensated employment for youth with moderate to severe disabilities.

Total funding for the project is \$1.5 million per year (one-half provided by the Department of Labor and the other half provided by the Department of Health and Human Services). Projects are operating in six States.

The projects demonstrate techniques for combining educational services and vocational support to enable students with severe disabilities to make the transition from school to regular work. They make use of natural supports that are available for training and supporting *all* workers. Projects are successful if they achieve this objective and are adopted by schools, adult service providers, vocational rehabilitation agencies, and other organizations that have an influence on the transition of students with severe disabilities from school to work.

Several requirements are placed on the demonstration sites. These are noted below.

- They must combine two interacting activities—transition from school to work and employment in community-based regular job sites.
- They must target students with severe disabilities ages 13 to 25. Eighty percent of the funds must be used to help students 16 years of age and over.
- Individual Transition Plans (ITPs) must be developed for each student assisted by the project (these plans must be coordinated with the Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) which are required for students with disabilities and include plans to provide individuals with all benefits to which they are entitled).
- As part of the transition process, students with disabilities must be placed on a variety of naturally supported jobs in regular employment sites while in school.
- After leaving the school system, students must be placed in jobs using natural supports and maintain the job placement.
- Although the projects need not provide *all* supports required by students, they must combine the resources and expertise of a wide range of organizations (e.g., the school system, traditional adult service providers, the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program, JTPA services, vocational rehabilitation

agencies, employers, and others).

- Project accomplishments and procedures must be disseminated.

An evaluation of the early years of demonstration effort revealed that almost all individuals with severe mental retardation or other developmental disabilities were capable of working in an employment environment with natural supports.<sup>25</sup>

The study report discusses the background and purpose of the evaluation effort; describes the project sites, structures, goals, and expectations; provides information about support services and coordination; outlines the demonstration's accomplishments; discusses the project's costs; notes barriers and problems encountered; describes capacity-building efforts, the continuity of services, and changes to existing systems; and presents a number of findings and issues related to future directions of similar efforts. The publication's appendix provides additional information obtained through interviews at the various demonstration sites.

## **The Demonstration Projects**

Six projects, located in California, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Oregon are being funded. In two cases, awards were made solely to university-based organizations (New Hampshire and Oregon). In two other projects, awards were made to a consortium that includes both a university and a private nonprofit firm (California and Massachusetts). In the remaining two sites, grants were awarded to projects that involve private nonprofit organizations (Maryland and

---

<sup>25</sup>Rima Azzam, Ronald Conley, and Arthur Mitchell, *Evaluation of Transition to Work Demonstration Projects Using a Natural Supports Model* (Washington, D.C.: Pelavin Research Institute, 1995).

Minnesota). A brief overview of each of these projects follows.

## **California**

The natural supports project operated by the San Francisco State University Foundation of California (SFSUF) is located in the School of Special Education. Two major subcontractors are also involved; San Diego State University Foundation (SDSUF) and Integrated Resources Institute (IRI) in Orange County. IRI has extensive experience with natural supports. The project operates in San Francisco and San Diego.

In San Francisco, the project's three employees work closely with the transition coordinators of two local school districts, who are primarily responsible for finding jobs for students with severe disabilities. Project staff also work with four special education teachers in three high schools in San Francisco and with five adult service agencies in the area that support employment for persons with severe disabilities. Similar procedures have also been implemented in San Diego.

In addition to assisting students to work in naturally supported jobs, the project seeks to improve the community living and social skills of the students. Through student centered planning, the social networks of the students are reviewed and ideas for improvement (based on the students' interests) are examined.

## **Maryland**

The grant award in Maryland was made to a nonprofit job development and placement agency which serves as a facilitator rather than a provider of services. Staff include a peer advocacy facilitator, four employment facilitators, and a clerk. The

grantee subcontracts activities to an adult service agency. Two job developers were hired specifically for the project. The project expands existing partnerships that have been established by the grant recipient and a local public school system, the Montgomery County Private Industry Council, local advocacy groups, a foundation, employers, and adult service providers.

The primary goal of the Maryland project is to develop and implement a comprehensive system that promotes the successful school-to-adult life transition of 200 youth and young adults with moderate, severe, or multiple disabilities. The project emphasizes developing peer supports among school students (i.e., students without disabilities assist students with disabilities with their school work and in other ways to help them participate in the school environment).

## **Massachusetts**

The Institute for Community Inclusion, a joint venture of the University of Massachusetts at Boston and Children's Hospital Boston, was the primary grantee for the Massachusetts project. The Institute works with six school districts and matches each with an adult service provider.

Project staff work with the schools and the service providers to develop improved school-to-work transition procedures. They also develop community-based jobs with natural supports. Adult service provider staff train supervisors and co-workers.

Employers are contacted and offered training and other assistance to help them employ workers with disabilities using natural supports. This training generally involves educating the co-workers on how to modify and demonstrate work-related tasks and how to communicate with the new employees with severe disabilities. Project staff usually train adult service providers who, in turn, train employers and co-workers.

The Massachusetts project seeks to develop a comprehensive model to help students with disabilities make the transition from school to work and adult life using natural supports. The project is attempting to establish and refine a transition planning model using demonstration sites and a broad dissemination plan that includes training, technical assistance, outreach through conference presentations and publications, and the development of monographs and manuals that illustrate effective model procedures.

## **Minnesota**

A statewide nonprofit organization, the Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights, received grant funds in Minnesota. The organization provides workshops, individual advocacy assistance, and written information to individuals with disabilities and their families.

The Minnesota project focuses on promoting employment with natural supports at both individual and system levels. Three agencies with long histories of providing supported employment opportunities for adults with disabilities received a subcontract from the grant recipient to help develop career plans and supported employment with natural supports for project participants.

The adult service agencies provide services directly to project participants. They also provide technical assistance to school staff on career planning, job development, and job support. Each of the agencies hires job developers and job coaches to work directly with the school districts. Once a job developer has located and arranged a job for students, job coaches provide ongoing training and assistance to the school, co-workers, and employers until the natural supports are in place.

The Minnesota project identifies and demonstrates strategies that promote permanent competitive employment using natural supports for students in the process of making the transition from school to work. It also promotes work integration and job satisfaction, and increases the involvement of students and their families in developing employment opportunities with natural supports.

## **New Hampshire**

The University of New Hampshire was the grant recipient in this project, which operates in six areas in the State. In each of these areas, the project works with high school educators and local adult service providers to facilitate the use of natural supports. (Most of the project's resources are concentrated in one school district.)

The project also features subcontracts with adult service agencies and schools for additional support. Project staff work closely with the State vocational rehabilitation counselor at each site, and, in a few cases, with local mental health agencies.

Few direct services are provided. Rather, project staff provide technical assistance and training to schools, employers, and adult service providers on implementing the natural supports model.

The project attempts to change the school-to-work transition process used by schools for students with disabilities by developing a system of career planning and preparation that involves after school and weekend jobs along with access to vocational education classes for students with disabilities.

## **Oregon**

The University of Oregon's Specialized Training Program was awarded the

project grant in that State. Project staff serve primarily as facilitators and trainers. They work with businesses, schools, school districts, trade associations, and school-business partnerships to help them develop their capacity to implement a natural supports model. Staff focus on training school staff and employers rather than on students. The project emphasizes work place analysis in which project staff attempt to change the culture and attitudes of the work place and help co-workers learn how to provide training and other supports necessary for workers with severe disabilities.

Of all of the projects, the Oregon project has developed the least intrusive approach for helping students with disabilities make the transition to unsubsidized employment. It also focuses on students with the most severe disabilities.

## **Support Services and Coordination**

The study report describes the types of support services provided by the projects and discusses how the various organizations involved coordinate project components. School-based assistance, work-based assistance (e.g., job experience, job placement, and transition out of the school system), and various student support services (e.g., housing, the inclusion of students with severe disabilities in classes with nondisabled students, student and family counseling, and parent counseling) are discussed. The authors offer several conclusions based on their investigation of support services and program coordination. These include:

- Vocational rehabilitation agencies were not heavily involved in the vocational services provided to transition students in any of the projects except in New Hampshire, where the agency was the primary adult agency involved with the schools. All sites did, however, receive some vocational rehabilitation agency funding or vocational services.
- There was usually an effort to place students as clients of traditional adult agencies after leaving school.

- After students left school, they were generally accepted as clients by *either* vocational rehabilitation agencies *or* mental retardation/developmental disabilities agencies. They were generally not accepted by *both* agencies.
- In all sites, the school system was financially responsible for providing services to students with disabilities until the age of 22. (In most cases, traditional adult service agencies do not fund any services for students with disabilities until after they leave school.)
- Mental health agencies rarely provide financial support to project operations.
- The primary agencies involved in coordination efforts include schools, adult service providers, and vocational rehabilitation programs.
- In every site except Minnesota, project personnel frequently work directly with students with disabilities and their families in developing school programs and jobs. (This differed from the stated intent of the projects.)
- Project staff stated that families varied in the extent to which they collaborate with project personnel to help children with disabilities.
- Project staff indicated problems in coordinating activities with adult service providers.

## **Accomplishments**

The researchers point out that as designed, the demonstration projects were intended to enhance the postschool employment success of students with disabilities. This can be measured by analyzing their level of earnings, the degree of integration at the worksite (workers with severe disabilities working with nondisabled employees), the types of jobs obtained, and the level of worker satisfaction.

The study report describes the numbers and characteristics of individuals served by the demonstrations; outlines the procedures for selecting participants in the various

demonstration sites; provides information about hours of work and earnings; discusses how jobs for participants were found; describes why employers hired participants; discusses changes in attitudes of school personnel, parents, adult service providers, and employers that resulted from project efforts; and provides an overview of alternative models that could help individuals with severe disabilities.

In summarizing the demonstration's accomplishments, the researchers point out that:

- The six demonstration projects enrolled a total of about 335 individuals with disabilities (although a greater number of individuals may have participated in the demonstration).
- About four-fifths of the participants were 19 or over; about three-fifths were male. Almost all had mental retardation as a primary disability.
- The projects attempted to recruit participants with the most severe disabilities.
- Hours of work were somewhat less than expected for individuals who had left the school system; most of the participants worked less than half time.
- The most frequently used method for locating jobs for participants was by direct calls to potential employment sites. Most respondents interviewed for the evaluation felt that a more effective method of finding jobs for participants should be developed.
- School practices and the attitudes of school personnel changed markedly as a result of the activities of the six demonstration projects.
- Most employers indicated that they needed substantial upfront assistance when employing individuals with severe disabilities.

## **Project Costs**

The researchers point out that obtaining an accurate measure of the costs of the

projects using natural supports was difficult because of the multiple organizations involved (i.e., one would need an accounting of costs incurred by schools, adult service agencies, projects, employers, parents, and other organizations). However, the report points out that considerations that should be reviewed when analyzing costs include: (1) overall costs incurred as a result of the transition from school to work activities; (2) differences among costs for persons placed in jobs with natural supports; (3) the benefits of using natural supports versus the costs associated with this effort; and (4) variances in the ratio of benefits to costs among persons placed in jobs with natural supports.

The authors describe the importance of costs as a factor in evaluating program success, and offer the following conclusions:

- Some of the procedures (e.g., the student centered planning activity) developed through the projects resulted in some cost increase for school systems.
- There was mixed reaction of schools to increased costs; some were moving in the direction of enhanced services even before the projects, while others would adopt enhancements only if they were shown to be effective.
- Most parents reported little expense associated with the projects.
- Employers believed that costs incurred were relatively minor and were not a major consideration in their decision to hire and retain workers with disabilities.
- It is anticipated that costs will be lower in a naturally supported environment for many students and adults with severe disabilities than they would be in a more traditional work environment.
- It is unlikely that empirical data to fully validate observations about program costs will become available.

## **Barriers and Challenges**

The study report points out that if projects such as the transition to work demonstration effort are to fully succeed, they may need to overcome a number of potential barriers. These can be divided into two types. First, there are factors directly related to *individuals* which may present challenges in achieving program goals (e.g., behavior problems or language problems). Second, there may be challenges related to bringing about long-term system change (e.g., transportation problems or the reluctance of staff at existing organizations to change from known procedures to new ones). Some of these challenges are noted below.

- Inability to maintain gainful employment with natural supports.
- Locating suitable jobs for individuals with disabilities.
- Behavioral problems (i.e., a small number of participants may not fit well into the work environment because of threatening behavior, unwillingness to follow directions, etc.).
- Successfully placing individuals with multiple disabilities (e.g., the existence of physical as well as mental disabilities).
- Adult service provider funding issues (e.g., insufficient funds to support the level of services required, lack of incentives for adult providers to begin assisting students with disabilities until they leave the school system, etc.).
- Family reluctance to use natural supports for their children.
- Skepticism of some adult service providers regarding the natural support method.
- Transportation problems.
- Over dependence on job coaches.
- Work disincentives (i.e., the belief that a reduction in public support payments will occur as income rises).
- Employer and adult service agency staff turnover (making it necessary to reestablish natural supports).
- Other barriers such as language barriers, lack of career plans, certain family

problems, personal hygiene, personal maturity, lack of knowledge about how service systems work, and co-worker attitudes.

The study report also discusses several issues related to the requirement of a strong JTPA component that must be incorporated into the demonstration projects. State and local JTPA Service Delivery Areas, Private Industry Councils, and other JTPA organizations must participate in the project's initiatives. The authors note that there were substantial efforts made by the project sites to work with JTPA including participation in advisory panels, the use of JTPA funds to support employment of students with disabilities at all sites, and extensive discussions with JTPA staff at the local and State levels on methods of involving JTPA in the transition projects.

In general, however, JTPA programs were not seen as a major resource to the projects. Challenges associated with making better use of the JTPA program that were reported by project staff included:

- JTPA performance standards may have created disincentives for local JTPA programs to provide services to individuals whose earnings were expected to be very low.
- Excessive paperwork involved in working with the JTPA system and difficulties associated with ensuring that program participants were qualified as JTPA recipients.
- Differences in target populations.
- Limited availability of JTPA funds.
- Differences in procedures; JTPA service providers tended to attempt to employ groups of workers rather than individuals.
- A decreased need for JTPA services once participants obtained jobs and no longer needed wage subsidies.

The authors also point out that uncertainties regarding future funding for the project may have resulted in the loss of key personnel and the reduction of project

expansion plans and evaluation activities.

## **Capacity-Building, Continuity of Services, and Systems Change**

The study report points out that because the projects were not expected to continue indefinitely, their effectiveness must be measured by the extent to which the changes that they bring about among school systems, State and local mental retardation and developmental disability agencies, State and local mental health and other agencies, adult service providers, the vocational rehabilitation system, parents, employers, and others remain after the demonstration has ended. Based on the project's evaluation, the researchers found that:

- The projects had a significant impact on individuals in a limited number of firms, schools, and adult service providers.
- Although schools involved with the project made use of improved transition procedures that were stimulated by the project, these procedures had not yet been extended to all students in any one site.
- All of the project sites had an ongoing and long-standing commitment to serving individuals with severe disabilities and all sites (except Minnesota) had an ongoing and long-standing commitment to enabling persons with disabilities to obtain integrated employment using natural supports. Staff involved with the projects plan to use other grant funds and other sources of support to continue to work in this area once the original project funding ends.
- Each project has developed training materials and guidelines for program activities which will continue to be available to schools and to adult service providers.
- Although all of the projects worked closely with selected school sites and adult service providers, the lack of a systemwide policy commitment and the time and resource costs associated with transition procedures may adversely affect

capacity build up in the future.

□ Without the continued stimulus provided by the project in gaining support for changes in transition to work practices in school districts and with adult service providers, the gains that have been made by the project might not be fully maintained.

## **Future Directions**

Following are some of the more important conclusions drawn from the information gathered during the site visits and in materials reviewed for the project's evaluation.

□ Almost all persons with severe mental retardation or other developmental disabilities are capable of working in integrated employment with natural supports.

□ The jobs in which students were placed after leaving school often fell short of what should be achieved. Most jobs had few hours and, in a few cases, individuals were hired because of the willingness of the employer to perform a "public service" rather than based on the economic benefits to be received from hiring the individuals.

□ There are a number of obstacles associated with fully implementing a natural supports approach to providing jobs for persons with severe disabilities. These include difficulties in identifying appropriate jobs; inappropriate behavior on the part of some students with severe disabilities, challenges associated with multiple disabilities, certain funding procedures for some of the organizations involved, skepticism about the naturally supported employment model, transportation difficulties, staff turnover, work disincentives associated with public income support and health care financing, and lack of experience among some job developers or employment facilitators.

□ Services provided by vocational rehabilitation agencies, schools, adult service

providers, and various agencies must be coordinated in an effort to help students with severe disabilities make the transition from school to work.

The projects had an impact on the practices of schools and some adult service providers.

Because methods of improving educational procedures for individuals with severe disabilities and for enabling them to participate in meaningful employment are changing rapidly, the authors suggest that a number of questions need to be considered as these efforts progress. These are noted below.

- Is the use of natural supports a viable method for assisting individuals with severe disabilities to become employed?
- Should the use of natural supports for individuals with severe disabilities be significantly expanded?
- Should all students with severe disabilities be offered integrated employment with natural supports when they leave the school system?
- Should students with disabilities be offered the experience of working in a workshop?
- For students slated to move into employment with natural supports, should their initial vocational experiences always be based on jobs with natural supports?
- How can more and improved job opportunities with natural supports be made available to individuals with severe disabilities?
- How can funding arrangements with adult service providers and State vocational rehabilitation agencies be modified to encourage (or at least not discourage) the provision of natural supports?
- What changes need to be made in the school systems to encourage the use of natural supports?
- What changes need to be made by adult service providers to encourage the use of natural supports?

- How can greater coordination among the different agencies serving students with disabilities be achieved?
- How can transportation problems be reduced?
- How can work disincentives be reduced?
- How can parents be more involved in planning efforts to assist their children with disabilities?
- How can the JTPA program increase its role in the transition from school to work for students with severe disabilities?
- What evaluation strategies should be instituted?

## **INTEGRATING TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES FOR IMMIGRANTS**

### **Overview**

Immigrants comprise eight percent of the nation's workforce—about 15 million workers. Of these, about six million are of Hispanic origin. The Department of Labor continued its efforts to obtain information about the best ways to help immigrants become assimilated into the workforce by supporting the San Diego Immigrant Training Demonstration Project (IDP). The project targeted Latin American immigrants in North San Diego County and offered an integrated service model that addressed their needs for training, employment, English language skills, and supportive services.<sup>26</sup>

In July 1992, the Department of Labor awarded a 15-month grant to the San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council to conduct the IDP through September

---

<sup>26</sup>For additional information about recent efforts to help immigrants enter the labor force, see Vicki Asakura and David Snedeker, *Immigration Demonstration Grant Final Evaluation Report* (Seattle, Wash.: Seattle-King County Private Industry Council, 1995) which is summarized in this chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

1993. The grant was extended through October 1994. The project consisted of a system of integrated education, training, employment, and social services that attempted to address the multiple, interrelated barriers to full economic and social integration typically confronting legal immigrants. The project was based on a partnership between the San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council and SER/JOBS for Progress, Inc. It relied largely on SER's experience in providing similar services to the region's migrant farmworker and day laborer population, primarily in North San Diego County.

A study of the IDP revealed that from July 1992 through October 1994, 156 individuals were enrolled as project clients and that 117 participants were placed in full-time employment at an average wage of \$5.10 per hour. Furthermore, about 84 percent of these individuals were still employed 13 weeks after placement.<sup>27</sup>

The study report provides background information about the target population and the region in which the project operated; discusses the project's service strategy, goals, and objectives; describes the IDP's planned outcomes and performance standards; provides information about the evaluation's methodology and sources of data; discusses the services provided to participants; addresses issues related to project implementation; offers information about project linkages and coordination efforts; describes the project's outcomes; presents various characteristics of the clients served; discusses overall project effectiveness; and offers a number of conclusions and recommendations.

## **Service Strategy, Goals, and Objectives**

---

<sup>27</sup>*San Diego Immigrant Training Demonstration Project: Final Evaluation Report, 1992-1994* (San Diego, Calif.: San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council, 1995).

The immediate goal of the IDP demonstration was to help participants achieve functional English language skills, job skills, and career-track employment. Other objectives included increasing participants' basic functional skills, self-esteem, job retention and job-changing skills, and helping them to maintain safe housing. The various project goals and their supporting objectives are described in the report.

The system goal was to refine the San Diego model of integrated services to more effectively address the English language, training, and employment needs of the Latin American immigrant population. The service goal was to continue to provide the target population with training and placement opportunities that would help them successfully participate in the region's economy. The goal of the evaluation effort was to build local and national knowledge about which project services were the most effective in assisting immigrants of Hispanic origin.

The study report offers details of the project's planned outcomes and performance standards. As originally envisioned, the project expected to conduct recruitment efforts and orientation for a total of 620 individuals and provide intake and assessment services for 200 prospective participants. Program designers anticipated 130 job placements over a two-year period.

## **Evaluation Methodology**

All data and analysis for the project were based on information derived from the Consortium's management information system, case files, and interviews with IDP staff and clients. The evaluation effort attempted to determine if: (1) the type, form, frequency, and duration of project services contributed to clients' obtaining and maintaining stable employment and housing and achieving personal goals; (2) the implementation of the various project components occurred as planned; (3) the system of linkages and coordination available to the project's partners increased the resources

available to address the needs of recent immigrants; (4) project outcomes indicated that the IDP had achieved its goals; (5) clients were representative of the local immigrant population and if the target population was reached and served; (6) the IDP was cost-effective compared to other immigrant training and employment programs; and (7) conclusions could be drawn regarding the effectiveness of the IDP model.

## **Project Services**

The report describes the various project services which included coordination; outreach, intake, and orientation; assessment and enrollment; case management; job search assistance; job training; supportive services; job placement efforts; and followup and postplacement services.

Regarding coordination efforts, the author notes that coordination between the project partners did contribute to overall success of the IDP.

In the area of outreach, intake, and orientation, the report points out that by the project's second year, outreach became unnecessary and was no longer considered a goal (there was an adequate supply of clients). SER staff conducted weekly orientation sessions throughout the duration of the project, and enrollment efforts were such that clients were routinely turned away.

All prospective clients passed through a preliminary screening process to determine their motivation, physical and emotional capabilities, and willingness and ability to follow through on case plan objectives. Typical assessment instruments included a basic skills test, a preemployment survey, and an educational assessment. After enrollment, clients worked with a case manager to develop an individual service strategy and to obtain supportive services.

Case management represented the cornerstone of IDP services. Case managers served as counselors, brokers, liaisons, advocates, and role models. They provided clients with assessment, supportive services, sustained contact, and direction needed to achieve case plan goals. Case managers were also experienced in serving the immigrant population.

In the area of job search assistance, all clients were required to attend a one half-day job search assistance class upon enrollment. They received regular job counseling after enrollment.

Regarding job training, IDP enrollees were eligible to enroll in local JTPA training programs administered by the San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council, although it was rare for them to enter JTPA training because of their minimal English language skills and the length of the occupational training (IDP enrollees wanted to enter the workforce as soon as possible).

Case managers used information obtained from the initial interview and assessment to determine appropriate supportive services. These included referrals to emergency shelters or low-cost housing, food, clothing, haircuts or other hygiene considerations, transportation assistance, child care, tools, uniforms, medical and dental care, and help with obtaining identification or other documents.

In the area of job placement, the report notes that after two years, the demonstration had placed 117 enrollees in full-time employment at an average wage of \$5.10 per hour. Eighty-four percent of these individuals were still employed 13 weeks after placement. Nearly all placements were in manufacturing and service industry occupations. Major employers included a golf club manufacturer, an automotive parts producer, a garment manufacturer, and a precast concrete manufacturer.

Followup and postplacement services were provided to clients, although these

services were largely voluntary.

## **Project Implementation**

Although no major programmatic changes were made as the program entered its second year, staff refocused their efforts to ensure effective English-as-a-second language training. They also strengthened their ties with local employers. The report points out that the primary cause of attrition during the first year of the project was excessive enrollments, ineffective assessment procedures, and poor timing (a number of clients enrolled in the project only to return to their families for the Christmas holiday period).

The author also notes that the low placement wages achieved by the project were a reflection of the region's low prevailing wage structure.

## **Linkages and Coordination**

The demonstration relied on formal linkages with a variety of nonprofit organizations, city and county agencies, homeless shelters, training providers, and private sector employers to augment the housing, employment, and in-house services offered to IDP participants. Eight organizations are listed in the report as key linkages for the project.

## **Outcomes**

Planned versus actual outcomes for both years of the project are shown in Table

19. As the table shows, 156 participants were enrolled and 117 were placed in jobs.

**Table 19. Planned Versus Actual Outcomes for IDP Participants, 1992-94**

Outcome	Planned	Actual
Recruitment/Orientation . . . . .	620	722
Intake/Assessment . . . . .	200	253
Certification . . . . .	60	60
Enrollment . . . . .	160	156
Basic Skills/English-as-a-second language . . . . .	95	84
On-the-job training . . . . .	42	36
Tryout employment/VJSST <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	30	22
Direct placement . . . . .	58	59
Total placements . . . . .	130	117
13-Week followup . . . . .	63	98
Average hourly wage at placement <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	\$4.88	\$5.10
Average hourly wage at 13 weeks <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	\$5.50	\$5.18
Cost per participant <sup>c</sup> . . . . .	\$2,354	\$2,442
Cost per placement . . . . .	\$2,513	\$3,371

<sup>a</sup>Tryout employment was disallowed by the Department of Labor during the first year of the project. Volunteer Job Specific Skills Training (VJSST) was the component that combined one-half day of voluntary work at selected employers with one-half day of basic skill/English-as-a-second language training and supportive services. It was designed to address the needs of participants who lack the language skills and work experience required to obtain entry-level positions. It was abandoned in the second year of the project.

<sup>b</sup>Wage data are averages at placement and 13 weeks for on-the-job training, tryout employment, and direct placements.

<sup>c</sup>Based on a cumulative two-year expenditure of *federal grant funds only* of \$315,000.

Source: Nate Buggs, *San Diego Immigrant Training Demonstration Project: Final Evaluation Report, 1992-1994* (San Diego, Calif.: San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council, 1995).

## Client Characteristics

The study found that the typical IDP client at intake was 35 years old, an unattached Hispanic male, educated to the Mexican “primaria” level (roughly grades one - six), who had been unemployed a little more than six months during the year prior to enrollment. Additional client characteristics are noted below.

- A total of 84 enrollees were 30-44 years old and 54 were between the ages of 18-29.
- Enrollees included 96 men and 60 women.
- All clients were of Hispanic origin.
- There were no veterans among the project’s enrollees (although this is not surprising since they were recent immigrants).
- About 80 percent of all enrollees had not completed a high school education or equivalent. Twenty-one had high school degrees or higher.
- Less than one fourth of all enrollees were single heads of households with dependents.
- Seven participants were receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) at the time of their enrollment, 14 were receiving unemployment insurance, and three were receiving food stamps.
- Fifteen participants were homeless at the time of intake. Most participants lived either in multifamily apartments or in temporary shelters.
- Less than 10 percent of all enrollees were employed when they entered the program.
- At program intake, 146 of 156 project enrollees were limited English-speaking and 31 percent were assessed as basic skills deficient or possessing reading skills below the seventh grade level. About 37 percent lacked significant work history and six welfare recipients were long-term AFDC recipients.

## Project Effectiveness

The report describes how well the project achieved its objectives. This description is summarized below.

- The combination of IDP services (case management, basic skills and English-as-a-second language training, on-the-job training, and job search assistance) did help clients obtain jobs and housing.
- Most of the project's performance goals were achieved by the end of the second year, although not all project services were implemented as planned.
- The project's success in placing and retaining its enrollees proved that the target population, recent immigrants from Latin America, were highly motivated and ready to accept the responsibility of full-time employment. However, the same drive to work (fueled by economic necessity) prevented their continued participation in basic skills training or English-as-a-second language after they were placed in jobs.
- The project would not have been possible without the strong linkages among the partners, public agencies, businesses, and homeless service providers.
- The IDP model effectively prepared immigrant clients for work and helped them find entry-level jobs at reasonable wages.
- IDP clients were representative of the local recent immigration population.
- The project reached and served its targeted population.
- Effective client assessment, case management, supportive services, access to English-as-a-second language instruction at convenient hours, strong ties to employers, and coordination among partners were the most significant factors in determining the project's effectiveness.
- Inadequate planning, staff turnover, and the lack of access to additional publicly funded English-as-a-second language classes tended to undermine the

project's effectiveness.

□ The average cost of providing comprehensive training services to an IDP enrollee was just over \$2,000 (federal portion only); the average cost of placing an IDP enrollee in a job was \$2,692. By contrast, the average cost per placement for the Consortium's JTPA Title II-A adult programs was approximately \$4,500.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

Interviews with IDP participants confirmed that the shift in program emphasis to English-as-a-second language instruction in the program's second year was appropriate. All of the participants interviewed in 1994 cited access to this type of training as the primary reason for their participation (the promise of employment was a secondary motivation). Based on this finding and the anticipated increase in the number of immigrants in need of English language training, the author recommends that the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies increase funding for English language training.

## **HELPING IMMIGRANTS SUCCEED IN THE LABOR MARKET**

### **Overview**

As part of its ongoing efforts to test innovative ways to help certain segments of the population become prepared for, enter, and succeed in the workforce, the Department of Labor sponsored a project in Seattle that provided a small number of limited English speaking Hispanic and Asian immigrants with prevocational English-as-a-second language instruction, transitional English-as-a-second language instruction

linked with skills training, case management, support services, and job placement assistance.

The demonstration, a partnership between the Seattle-King PIC and two community based organizations (the Asian Counseling and Referral Services [ACRS] and El Centro de la Raza) operated from September 1992 through November 1994. It received \$315,000 in Department of Labor funds and provided services to 54 participants. During the first year, participants had the option of selecting skills training from four vocational areas—painting, carpentry, certified nursing assistant, and housekeeping. In the second year, skills training was offered only in the area of certified nursing assistant.

A report, based on a review of the demonstration's two-year activities, suggests that the project was successful and that the program design was effective in meeting the training and employment needs of limited English speaking refugees and immigrants.<sup>28</sup> The report summarizes the demographics of the individuals served by the project and their employability outcomes. It also discusses various findings regarding client recruitment, targeting, and eligibility; client assessment; curriculum development; instruction; and other services such as case management and support services.

## **Client Demographics**

More women than men were enrolled in the project. The study report notes that both agencies (ACRS and El Centro de la Raza) served participants with a similar mix

---

<sup>28</sup>Vicki Asakura and David Snedeker, *Immigration Demonstration Grant Final Evaluation Report* (Seattle, Wash.: Seattle-King County Private Industry Council, 1995).

of educational levels. Most of the participants were in the 25-45 age bracket and most were Asians or Hispanics, the two groups targeted by the demonstration.

Twenty-three of the participants were receiving public assistance when they enrolled in the project.

The report provides demographic information as it relates to performance outcomes, noting that of the 15 participants enrolled in the first year (phase 1) of the ACRS program, 13 were placed in jobs, with an average wage at placement of \$7.07. Ten of the 15 El Centro participants in phase 1 were placed in jobs, with an average wage at placement of \$6.58. In phase 2 (the program's second year) nine of the 13 participants enrolled in ACRS' program were placed in jobs, with an average wage at placement of \$6.78. During the same phase, 11 of the 13 El Centro participants were placed in jobs with an average wage at placement of \$6.69.

The report provides information about planned versus actual job placements, as well as placements by education, age, and public assistance status.

## **Recruitment, Targeting, and Eligibility**

The report points out that meeting eligibility and training criteria was sometimes a problem in the first year of the demonstration, and that better results were obtained during the project's second year. Applicants were identified by both organizations through word of mouth, referrals from other agencies, and from former students. In the second year, ACRS sent out 300 announcements to service providers, ethnic newspapers, and others, and made phone calls to generate referrals. Also during the second year, El Centro used a Spanish language radio program to obtain publicity about the program.

The report emphasizes that meeting and documenting income eligibility and immigration status were factors that screened out some potential Hispanic participants.

By the close of the first year, project staff had developed several recommendations that would improve the recruitment phase of future classes. These were:

- Defining and/or clarifying eligibility criteria at the beginning of the grant, particularly if it differs from existing programs;
- Expanding the assessment process and tools to screen prospective participants; and
- Allocating more time for outreach and recruitment prior to program startup.

In the second year of the program, staff suggested restructuring and broadening recruitment and assessment activities with consideration given to determining oral and written English abilities as well as math skills, age, health, physical ability, and income. Staff also suggested greater instructor involvement in the assessment and recruitment process. These changes were implemented in the second year.

## **Assessment**

The authors point out that assessment was a key element in designing and operating the project. The Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) was used to determine English language and basic skill levels. During phase 2, assessment efforts improved and included better assessment of language, basic skills (reading and math), physical ability, as well as interest and aptitude for training and employment in the field of certified nursing assistants.

The report emphasizes that, given the language and skill levels of the participants and the levels needed to reach the first year's occupational goals, success did not always seem feasible due to the limited duration of the program.

As a result of the first year experiences, project staff developed a number of recommendations related to improving the demonstration's assessment phase. Implemented in the second year of the project, these suggestions were:

- Instructors should be more involved in the assessment and the case managers need to be better informed about the skill training curriculum and expectations so that they could do a better job with the assessment;
- The initial assessment should be done before occupational tracks are chosen, and, if multiple occupational tracks are offered, students should receive an orientation to all occupational areas before they selected one area; and
- The assessment should include an appraisal of other job requirements such as physical abilities.

In the second year, both organizations used the CASAS reading, math, and listening tests as well as a physical screening questionnaire to determine suitability for training.

## **Curriculum Development**

The authors point out that the decision to offer training in four occupational areas proved to be somewhat for difficult for project staff to carry out and that the staff who developed the training curriculum were not involved in selecting the occupations for which training was to be provided. The curriculum developers later suggested that the project needed a mix of training options that would meet the needs of both the participants and the local labor market. The decision to focus on only one occupational area during the second phase (certified nursing assistant) eased these difficulties.

The report points out a number of approaches that were used to adapt curriculum to employer needs, particularly in the prevocational and job-specific English-as-a-second language classes. ACRS, for example, found that using actual work place texts, field trips, guest speakers, and video tapes helped in this area. In addition, during the project's second phase, staff made greater use of group work, tutoring, and computers. They divided the classroom into "stations" to respond to the needs of

students with different language levels and provided at least three months of intensive language training. Language instructors and skill training instructors also coordinated their efforts.

Innovations were also developed to adapt the training curriculum to meet the needs of limited-English-speaking participants.

## **Instruction and Other Services**

Project staff learned in the first year that some instructional approaches were more effective than others. Group work, tutoring, and integration of English-as-a-second language with job skills training were found to be the most effective teaching approaches.

Staff also found that “other services,” particularly case management and support services, were important in ensuring participant success. Because case management focuses on problem-solving and establishing connections with other services, it provided participants with needed support during each phase of their training.

The project also offered support services to a few participants. These included transportation and child care as well as supplementary English-as-a-second language and basic skills instruction at the Private Industry Council’s Learning Center.

## **Project Summary**

The report notes that many of the staff concerns and comments regarding the program centered around the selection process and limitations of the vocational skills

training options. Strategies that could be used to ensure success in similar efforts are noted in the study report. These include:

- English-as-a-second language/basic skills and skills training linked with transitional job/occupational specific English-as-a-second language instruction.
- Transitional occupational specific English-as-a-second language instruction offered prior to and concurrent with skills training.
- Postplacement English-as-a-second language services that provide additional support to participants once they are placed in the job.
- A certified nursing assistant practicum at one site to facilitate coordination and feedback with the training instructor.
- Sufficient funds for support services, including child care.
- A team teaching approach.
- A comprehensive assessment process involving a team of case managers and instructors.
- Regular coordination meetings with case managers and instructors as well as project management for sharing program information and curriculum materials, planning, problem-solving, and staff development.
- Sufficient lead time for program implementation, including timely notification of ongoing funding for continuity of staffing and services.

## **OVERCOMING POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES**

### **Overview**

The Department of Labor continued its efforts to stimulate interest in policy analysis, research, and program evaluation as useful tools for policymaking, planning, and improving social programs by publishing the 10th edition of *Evaluation Forum* in 1994.<sup>29</sup> *Evaluation Forum* is a national journal for program professionals in related human service fields: basic education, vocational education, employment and training, welfare, labor market and labor force change, and economic development.

## Major Articles

The 10th edition focuses on a number of important issues to be considered in determining the nature of future anti-poverty policies.

The publication sets the context with three articles that provide an overview of poverty in America: one on the nature of poverty in the 1990s, based on reports produced by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the U.S. General Accounting Office, the Children's Defense Fund, the Center for the Study of Social Policy, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Institute for Research on Poverty; one that presents a review of research on poverty and a number of conclusions about anti-poverty policy; and another summarizing and analyzing the positions of two policy experts on ameliorating the high level of American poverty.

An article describing the "underclass poor" reexamines inner-city ghetto poverty. This article presents a synthesis of research and expert opinion on underclass poverty, with particular attention paid to the impact of joblessness, income inequality, single

---

<sup>29</sup>Ann Bonar Blalock, Editor, *Evaluation Forum-American Poverty: The Role of Education, Training and Employment Strategies in the New Anti-Poverty Struggle* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1994).

parenthood, and cultural isolation.

Three articles deal with welfare system issues: one reconsiders the chronology of work/welfare approaches since the 1960s; another reviews and analyses a publication about the transition from welfare to work, including State work/welfare innovations that have contributed to the development of the national JOBS program; and another provides a perspective on the effectiveness of work/welfare programs.

In addressing issues related to the homeless poor, the publication presents three articles: one examines recent research on homelessness and its implications for social policy; another discusses the design and results of the National Commission for Employment Policy's study of JTPA's role in improving the employment opportunities of homeless people; and the third reviews the major findings of the Department's evaluation of the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program.

The 1994 edition of *Evaluation Forum* also includes a commentary by the Secretary of Labor on workforce policy as it relates to a macro-level context for developing anti-poverty policies and the text from interviews with two nationally recognized leaders in the field of anti-poverty policy.

Evaluation issues and activities related to poverty in America are also presented. These include a review of a book analyzing new trends in welfare policy in Western Europe; an evaluation of an innovative Washington State welfare reform project; a review of evaluations of new welfare reform models associated with the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills program and their implications for national welfare reform; and a discussion of current welfare reform positions accompanied by a commentary on potential problems with new welfare approaches.

The publication concludes with descriptions of selected Federal research in education, training, employment, and economic development conducted by various

Federal agencies, the Congress, and private research firms, and a brief listing of recent books, articles, and working papers on poverty issues.

## **II. MEETING THE NEEDS OF DISLOCATED WORKERS**

The summaries in the previous section exemplify the Department's continued concern for members of specific population groups who face multiple barriers to labor force participation.

Of equal concern is the widespread phenomenon of worker dislocation. These workers, who have lost their jobs because of mass layoffs or plant closings, generally have higher skills and longer work histories than members of the specific population groups served in programs noted in the previous section. However, because of their rather specific skills and attachment to specific industries, many of these workers are forced to find employment in different occupational areas, thus requiring varying degrees of training and supportive services.

Title III of JTPA authorizes employment-related services for dislocated workers through the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance (EDWAA) program. Services include basic readjustment, such as early intervention assistance, job search, job and career counseling, and relocation assistance; retraining; support services; and, in some cases, needs-related payments.

The first publication summarized in this section—*A Guide to Well-Developed Services for Dislocated Workers*—was produced as part of a study of EDWAA' implementation. It was published to help EDWAA practitioners share information about

strategies to help dislocated workers that have been developed through the program.

The second summary focuses on worker dislocation in the defense industry. Prompted by an anticipated 30 percent drop in defense spending between 1987 and 1997, researchers looked into the Defense Conversion Adjustment program, which is administered under Section 325 of JTPA. Twelve demonstration sites were funded in November 1992; seven additional grants were awarded in November 1993. The projects tested innovative approaches to helping dislocated defense workers that were not otherwise found in standard JTPA Title III or defense conversion activities supported by other funding sources. The researchers found that efforts to build closer linkages between economic development and worker retraining were among the more innovative aspects of the demonstration project designs.

The next summary focuses on efforts to help dislocated workers become entrepreneurs. Initiated in June 1991, the EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration was set up to explore the effectiveness of Community Development Corporations in expanding opportunities for dislocated workers through entrepreneurial training and linkages with local economic development activities. The demonstration achieved significant results from the self-employment training.

The fourth study was undertaken to see if dislocated workers could become reemployed faster if they received services early in their unemployment spell. Researchers investigated the effectiveness of the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System, which identifies unemployment insurance claimants who are likely to be dislocated workers and refers them to reemployment services early in their unemployment spell. The researchers found that a combination of early intervention and job search assistance resulted in a substantial cost savings to the Federal Government.

The final study included in this section also focuses on the extent to which

unemployment insurance claimants who might benefit from reemployment services could be identified early in their unemployment spells. The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project, which began in 1986, examined how such a reemployment program could be implemented. The researchers found that overall, the project reduced the amount of unemployment insurance benefits received.

## SERVICES FOR DISLOCATED WORKERS

### Overview

As part of a study of the implementation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act (EDWAA),<sup>30</sup> the Department of Labor sponsored a

---

<sup>30</sup>The Department of Labor sponsored a three-year study of EDWAA which was conducted by Social Policy Research Associates, Berkeley Planning Associates, and SRI International. For information about the implementation of the EDWAA legislation, see, Katherine P. Dickinson, Deborah J. Kogan, Kevin J. Rogers, and Mary Visser, *Study of the Implementation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Act* (Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, 1992). This study was summarized in the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* which covered the period PY 1991 and FY 1992. For information about the implementation of the EDWAA legislation at the State, substate, and service-provider levels, see, Katherine P. Dickinson, Deborah J. Kogan, Kevin J. Rogers, and David Drury, *Study of the Implementation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act—Phase II: Responsiveness of Services* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates; Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates; and Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, 1993). For information about how EDWAA programs were organized, the types of dislocated workers served, the services provided, and the outcomes achieved by dislocated workers, see, Katherine P. Dickinson, Suzanne D. Kreutzer, Deborah J. Kogan, and Richard W. West, *Study of the Implementation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act: Report on the Survey of EDWAA Substate Areas* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates, 1993). These two studies were also summarized in the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* which covered the period PY 1992 and FY 1993. For additional EDWAA information, see David Drury, Stephen Walsh, and Marlene Strong, *Evaluation of the EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates,

guidebook for EDWAA practitioners (including State and substate area policymakers, program planners, and service providers) to share information about effective strategies to help dislocated workers obtain new jobs under a variety of local conditions.<sup>31</sup>

The guidebook presents a framework that substate areas can use to determine how responsive their services are in meeting the needs of dislocated workers. It also provides examples of creative initiatives developed by substate areas in a variety of economic environments to address those needs.

The publication's introductory section briefly describes its purpose and objectives, the characteristics of dislocated workers, key components of early intervention strategies, options for delivering retraining services, and the methodology of the EDWAA study as it relates to how the publication was developed.

The remainder of the guidebook is organized by the types of services that dislocated workers need—early intervention services; services to develop reemployment plans (including assessment, career exploration, service planning, supportive services, and case management); basic readjustment services (including job search training and assistance and crisis adjustment, job readiness, and relocation services); and retraining services (including classroom training in basic skills, classroom training in occupational skills, and on-the-job training). A number of issues related to program organization and staffing are also discussed in the publication.

---

1994). This evaluation report is summarized in this chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

<sup>31</sup>Katherine Dickinson, et al., *A Guide to Well-Developed Services For Dislocated Workers* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates; Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates; and Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, 1994).

A variety of forms used to profile clients' interests, skills, and experience are included in the guidebook's appendix along with a sample goals statement, skills and support plan, educational plan, and other data-gathering and planning instruments.

## Early Intervention Services

The authors point out that programs for dislocated workers should help them adjust to their new circumstances and find new jobs by providing services *as soon as possible*. Thus, substate-level staff involved in rapid response and early intervention services must respond to a number of challenges. They need to:

- Learn about area layoffs;
- Obtain cooperation and input from employers and workers in developing services;
- Provide timely information about what opportunities are available in the current labor market and what resources are available to help affected workers (essential in helping dislocated workers develop reemployment plans);
- Link rapid response efforts to early recruitment into services (matching dislocated workers with needed services either before a layoff or as soon after as possible); and
- Provide experienced staff and a smooth transition to ongoing services.

The guidebook provides information about a number of strategies that respond to each of the above challenges. Examples of two successful early intervention strategies are also provided—one in an urban area with large-scale dislocations, and one in a rural area with smaller-scale layoffs.

Regarding the first challenge, three strategies are suggested that can be used by

substate staff to find out about local layoffs. These are:

- Informing employers about the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification (WARN) Act through direct mailings, toll-free numbers, and annual employer forums;
- Learning about layoffs by developing networks with employers or labor representatives (including Private Industry Council members, standing Labor-Management Committees, experienced contractors who provide retraining services for employers, “brokering” State or private resources to help employers access resources, and through other community sources such as State and local elected officials, State Job Training Coordinating Council members, Chambers of Commerce, etc.); and
- Learning about layoffs from other government agencies, especially the Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance systems, and economic development agencies.

Regarding the second challenge, obtaining cooperation and input from employers and workers in developing services, the guidebook suggests several methods that can be used to obtain needed cooperation. The authors also point out that the benefits of establishing close relationships with employers include identification of affected workers, obtaining information about the skills of these workers, obtaining on-site space and release time for worker orientation, the ability to provide on-site prelayoff services and financial assistance, and the ability to place affected workers in other jobs in the early stages of a layoff.

Meetings with employers can be particularly effective in obtaining their early cooperation in a layoff situation. Substate area staff should emphasize to the employer the benefits of cooperation with rapid response efforts (e.g., improving worker morale, increasing productivity, and reducing absenteeism). They should also inform employers about the flexibility of services available, and work to establish trust between the employer and various service providers.

Another key to successful early intervention is obtaining cooperation from unions or from worker representatives, thus ensuring greater acceptance of EDWAA services by the dislocated workers. Unions and worker representatives can also provide important information to program designers and operators about the affected workers (including their need for crisis assistance, basic skills remediation, and retraining). They can also help identify the workers' skills and help determine the transferability of those skills to other industries or occupations. Unions or worker representatives can also provide peer support. The guidebook discusses several strategies used by substate areas to involve unions or employee organizations in designing and delivering EDWAA services.

In addition to employer and union cooperation, input from affected workers themselves can be useful in planning early intervention services. The authors note that many substate areas conducted surveys of affected employees for this purpose. The publication also provides examples of how these surveys were used.

Regarding the third challenge, providing timely information about what opportunities are available in the current labor market and what resources may be available to help affected workers, the authors suggest that Labor-Management Committees can be useful in the early stages of layoffs because they may provide a vehicle for obtaining cooperation of both employers and worker representatives. The publication discusses the benefits of these committees and some of the problems that can arise in establishing them.

The guidebook notes that flexibility is the key in establishing these committees in plants that lack union representation. The authors point out that many nonunionized plants have some type of worker group in place that can identify appropriate individuals to represent the workers, and, in some cases, personnel staff can be asked to identify individuals who have good leadership and communication skills to represent workers.

In order to reduce the time required to establish these committees, the authors suggest that establishing standing Labor-Management Committees can often be helpful. Examples of different types of these Committees are provided.

Special assistance is needed by dislocated workers who are about to lose long-held jobs. Not only do they need timely information about the status of the labor market, they also need help in coping with job loss and an understanding of the type of help available to develop reemployment plans. The guidebook offers several suggestions:

- Offer comprehensive orientation sessions to provide information about a wide range of community assistance, what to expect from being laid off, experiences of former dislocated workers, local labor market opportunities, and names and addresses of relevant agencies to contact.
- Schedule multiple meetings in cases where a comprehensive orientation session might provide too much information for workers to absorb.
- Involve family members by inviting them to orientation sessions, providing child care at the sessions, and by establishing “spouse support groups.”
- Respond to smaller-scale layoffs by providing orientation sessions similar to those for larger layoffs, holding smaller, more limited sessions, or providing employers with orientation materials to distribute to workers.
- Respond to layoffs in cases where employers are not cooperating by obtaining information about potential dislocated workers from the unemployment insurance system or from unions and employee groups. In cases where employers will not allow on-site orientation meetings, workers can receive written materials, off-site orientations, or information by telephone or through the mail.

Regarding the fourth challenge, linking rapid response to early recruitment into services, the authors suggest that although rapid response mechanisms may be in

place, they may not always accomplish their intended goal of quickly linking workers to services because workers do not always take full advantage of these initiatives. The guidebook offers three strategies that substate areas might use to better accomplish this: (1) providing prelayoff services; (2) recruiting workers quickly into ongoing EDWAA services; and (3) linking workers to services with other agencies to help them cope with being laid off.

Examples of five strategies that substate areas have used to provide prelayoff services to dislocated workers are presented in the publication: (1) establishing on-site centers, generally staffed by EDWAA staff to tailor services to the needs of workers, to increase worker participation, and to provide peer support; (2) establishing off-site centers in cases where workers may resent the employer; (3) offering group workshops which may be more appropriate for smaller-scale layoffs or for layoffs with relatively little advance warning, and when offered off-site, do not require employer cooperation; (4) providing individual services, especially in cases of very small layoffs, to help workers begin developing reemployment plans prior to layoff; and (5) providing prelayoff retraining in cases of large-scale layoffs with adequate advance notice.

Also, because it may be difficult for many substate areas to link affected workers to their ongoing programs soon after layoff, several methods have been used by substate areas to help workers benefit from these ongoing services. Examples of these initiatives include conducting eligibility determination at the orientation meeting, issuing Certificates of Continuing Eligibility to workers who attend an orientation session, and enrolling clients directly into EDWAA at the orientation meeting. Substate staff can also followup with dislocated workers who attend orientation meetings to encourage them to apply for ongoing EDWAA services.

The authors point out that in an effort to help workers take advantage of the services provided by other agencies, many substate areas have had agency representatives make presentations at orientations and/or disseminate written materials

about the services available in the community. In addition, after enrolling clients in EDWAA, several substate areas frequently referred clients to other services as part of the service planning process.

In response to the final challenge, providing experienced staff, the guidebook discusses the importance of ensuring that experienced, well-qualified staff respond to layoffs and closures.

Although States are responsible for responding to large-scale layoffs under EDWAA, subsequent amendments to the legislation allowed States to contract with other entities, such as substate areas, to provide services. The advantages of State-led rapid response efforts are noted in the publication. They include consistency in conducting rapid response efforts, more rapid gain in staff experience (by responding to a greater number of layoffs), easier access to State resources and better coordination with other agencies, and increased employer cooperation at the State level. Advantages of substate-led rapid response include better linkages between rapid response activities and recruitment into services, more consistently available staff, and better knowledge of local conditions.

### **Services to Develop Reemployment Plans: Assessment, Career Exploration, and Service Planning**

In order to help dislocated workers develop appropriate reemployment plans, service providers must implement a responsive, client-centered approach to assessment and service planning. In this regard, the guidebook suggests that substate areas need to meet several challenges. They must:

- Develop assessment strategies that are appropriate for dislocated workers;
- Help dislocated workers to identify their career goals; and
- Help them to identify any barriers to achieving career goals.

Examples of initiatives that have helped dislocated workers develop reemployment plans are provided, as is a list of resources that can be useful in this regard.

In discussing appropriate assessment procedures, the guidebook points out that there are three important considerations. The first is assessment for “explicit purposes”—deciding what information is needed and how it will be used. By identifying the purposes of assessment, the substate area will be able to determine what needs to be assessed, when assessment should occur, and the best method for assessment. The authors note that assessment should not be used to screen clients *out* of a particular program and that it not only provides information, but it also affects the clients either negatively or positively. (If clients find the assessment process useful and interesting, it may increase their motivation and commitment to participate in services.)

The second consideration is “individualized” assessment. Because dislocated workers are so diverse in their previous backgrounds and skill levels, the amount and type of information each needs to make appropriate reemployment plans will vary based on their skill levels and educational background. Strategies used by substate area staff to individualize assessment include tailoring a specific set of assessment tools to each client, developing several sets of assessment tools to be used for different types of workers, and using additional assessment tools for workers who have less formal education.

The third consideration is the validity and reliability of the assessment procedure and tools. The guidebook suggests that in addition to formal paper-and-pencil or performance tests, self-reporting information from clients, observations of their behavior, and career-exploration exercises can be used to obtain information about clients’ needs, interests, and abilities. The authors note that staff should keep in mind that assessment procedures are only valid if they measure what they are intended to

measure and if they are consistent.

The publication provides information about several strategies that can be used to help determine the occupational interests, aptitudes, and transferable skills of dislocated workers. These include both formal tests and self-assessment exercises to determine occupational interests, values, and transferable skills. Examples of each of these are provided in the guidebook.

One-on-one interviews between clients and vocational counselors may also help in determining their interests, aptitudes, and skills. One advantage of this strategy is that it is highly individualized. On the other hand, these interviews may require more staff time (and thus, they may be more costly) and rely on the expertise and training of the interviewer.

In discussing the second challenge, the need to help dislocated workers to select appropriate career goals, the publication notes that virtually all substate areas provide clients with some career information as part of the service planning interview. Some areas have developed additional strategies to help dislocated workers explore careers and labor market opportunities. These include using automated career exploration systems such as the *Guide for Occupational Exploration* and the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*; requiring clients' to conduct their own research about labor market opportunities, and arranging for speakers or presentations about the labor market. Examples of these approaches are provided.

The guidebook also points out that once occupational interests and career goals are identified, it is important that staff look closely at clients' basic educational skills in order to determine if a lack of these skills will prevent them from achieving success. Considerations that are important in designing appropriate basic skill assessments include: (1) the level of formal education may not be a good indicator of whether basic skills remediation is required; (2) basic skills assessment procedures should be

individualized (using a test appropriate for many levels of basic skills proficiency, or using a range of assessment instruments may be helpful in this regard); and (3) basic skills testing should not be threatening to dislocated workers. Several examples of basic skills assessment mechanisms are provided in the guidebook.

Substate area staff must also be prepared to assess the need for a number of other services, such as basic readjustment services, supportive services, and the need for income while clients are looking for a new job.

To meet clients' needs for basic readjustment services (e.g., specialized job search assistance, stress management, and world-of-work training), some substate areas have developed formal assessment instruments. In other cases, observation of clients' behavior during counseling interviews or workshops may help to identify special needs. Asking clients about their needs and arranging for a specialist to help assess the need for special services can also be helpful.

Several procedures are noted in guidebook that can help staff identify various supportive service needs (e.g., physical requirements, environmental conditions, transportation, family problems, child care, etc.). These include the use of questionnaires to be filled out by clients before a service planning session, interview checklists used by counselors, and observation of clients during service planning sessions or during workshops.

Finally, assessing income needs is an important component in service planning. Substate areas that provide needs-related payments must systematically determine if clients need such assistance. The authors also suggest that in areas where these payments are not available, staff should help clients determine their eligibility for other types of assistance such as Pell grants or student loans.

In addressing the fourth challenge, the need to develop comprehensive service plans, the guidebook points out that this planning is the culmination of the assessment and career exploration process. The authors provide information in two important areas related to service plan development: (1) the content of service plans; and (2) balancing clients' preferences with their need for appropriate services.

The guidebook notes that substate areas with the most responsive client service plans have developed structured procedures to guide their development. These service plans contain several important components, including clear career goals; immediate and long-term career goals; services that address all potential barriers to employment; a sequence of service with estimated timetables for achieving intermediate milestones; a clear definition of the responsibilities of clients, counselors, case managers, service providers, and outside agencies; and provisions to update career goals and needed services as necessary.

Substate area staff must also balance dislocated workers' preferences for services while encouraging them to participate in appropriate services that will lead to stable employment with adequate wages. Strategies used to encourage acceptance of appropriate services include promoting active client involvement in service planning, counseling clients on the services needed to achieve stable employment in high-quality jobs, and providing for a gradual evolution of service plans as clients absorb new information about their career options and their related training requirements. The guidebook expands on each of these strategies and provides examples of successful assessment, career exploration, and service planning efforts.

A list of appropriate publications, assessment instruments, and career exploration materials is also provided.

## **Services to Develop Reemployment Plans: Supportive Services and Case Management**

In addition to assessment, career exploration, and service planning strategies, substate areas must also provide needed supportive services and develop effective case management strategies. The authors point out that substate areas face several challenges in this regard, including:

- Ensuring that participants have access to needed income support during participation;
- Providing participants with appropriate support services; and
- Assessing progress over time.

Each of these challenges is discussed in detail and specific examples of how they have been addressed at the substate level are provided.

In responding to the first challenge, the authors point out that helping dislocated workers focus on their income needs allows them to make informed decisions about program participation and reduces the likelihood that they will drop out before completing their training. The guidebook offers several strategies to address this issue, which may include providing needs-related payments or participation allowances using EDWAA funds; helping participants obtain income support from other programs such as Unemployment Insurance; trade readjustment allowances; State-funded benefits; student financial aid programs; and income support programs such as Food Stamps, public assistance grants, and JTPA Title II-A supportive service payments for workers who also qualify as economically disadvantaged. In addition to providing details about each of these strategies, examples of how some substate areas have developed income-support strategies are included in the guidebook.

Regarding the second challenge, providing participants with needed supportive services, the authors suggest that not only is it important to address the income needs of dislocated workers, other supportive services such as helping with expenses while they are receiving training (e.g., child care, tools, and uniforms), and personal or family

needs (e.g., health or dental health needs, emergency food or shelter, clothing, and assistance with personal crises such as legal problems or substance abuse) must also be provided. The authors suggest that it is important to identify the need for supportive services *before* the particular need interferes with the clients' progress toward completing retraining or readjustment services.

One disadvantage of providing a wide range of supportive services with EDWAA funds is that it may reduce the total amount of funds available for other services. Thus, some substate areas have established strong linkages with other public and private agencies that can provide additional services. These include charitable organizations for contributions of food, clothing, and emergency shelter, health and mental health providers, and sources of legal assistance.

At a minimum, substate staff should be prepared to inform clients of these services; ideally, they should be prepared to make specific service referrals based on individual participants' needs. The authors point out that this can be accomplished through active referrals to other agencies (and subsequently tracking client progress as they receive these supportive services) or by purchasing supportive services (using EDWAA funds) from other agencies when necessary. Examples of each of these strategies are provided in the publication.

Finally, the third challenge, assessing participants' progress over time, requires that substate staff be prepared to track participants' progress throughout their program experience and respond to problems that may endanger successful completion of basic readjustment or training services. In addition, case managers must assess clients' progress toward short- and long-term goals and provide them with ongoing encouragement and support. Factors that might affect the ability of case managers to perform all of these functions include large caseloads and certain client characteristics (e.g., clients with less formal education may need additional help securing services and some may need more support and encouragement during program participation).

The guidebook offers several examples of different organizational arrangements that substate areas have used to provide effective case management services. These include:

- Using case managers who specialize in either classroom training or job search activities. Once clients complete their training, they are handed over to managers with expertise in job search efforts. This system helps clients take advantage of case managers with concentrated areas of expertise.
- Using training providers to provide case management services and, in some cases, to provide placement services.
- Developing and using a case management “pool” which allows staff to share the responsibilities for all in-house services and to make in-person meetings with clients as convenient as possible.
- Using a team case management approach in which case management responsibilities for each client are shared by a team that reviews each client’s progress. Each team member can offer unique insight and experience to each case.

No matter which organizational arrangement is used, it must: (1) provide continuous case management services and ensure smooth transition from one service to another; (2) ensure that case managers are well-informed about participants’ attendance and performance in specific training or readjustment services; and (3) link ongoing case management to each participant’s written service plan and goals.

The guidebook discusses the various roles of the case manager, including tracking participant status through regular contacts with participants, assessing progress toward their goals, and continually providing encouragement and support. Examples of each of how each of these functions have been carried out in substate areas are provided.

## **Basic Readjustment Services: Job Search Training and Assistance**

Basic readjustment services discussed in the guidebook include job search training and assistance as well as crisis adjustment, job readiness, and relocation services.

The guidebook notes several challenges associated with providing job search training (the first four challenges listed below) and job search assistance (the last two challenges). These are:

- Providing dislocated workers with labor market information and training in job search methods;
- Making job search training and assistance available to all participants;
- Meeting the job search training needs of workers with different skill levels and work maturities;
- Linking job search training to job search assistance;
- Providing ongoing support for participants during job search; and
- Matching participants to jobs in keeping with their skills and previous wage levels.

The authors discuss several strategies for providing quality job search training based on the above challenges.

Regarding the first challenge, providing dislocated workers with labor market information and training in job search methods, the authors point out that the most commonly used strategies for providing this service are: (1) one-on-one assistance from a counselor or job developer; (2) stand-alone workshops (provided directly by EDWAA or through referral to the Employment Service); and (3) job search training as a component of more comprehensive workshops covering assessment, crisis adjustment,

or world-of-work skills. These approaches are discussed in detail and examples of each are provided.

Regarding the second challenge, making job search training and assistance available to all participants, the authors suggest that integrated workshops held at the assessment and service planning stage are especially well suited for this and are often mandatory for all participants. In addition, job search training can be provided to classroom training participants by requiring the inclusion of a job search component in occupational skills classes.

In describing strategies to meet the needs of workers with different skill levels and work maturities (the third challenge), the guidebook notes that one strategy for tailoring job search training to the diverse needs of clients is through one-on-one assistance from the counselor or job developer. A second strategy consists of offering job search training in the form of short topical modules or seminars to meet the needs of different dislocated populations. Several examples of modular workshops operated at the substate level are provided.

Regarding the fourth challenge, linking job search training and job search assistance services, the guidebook describes four methods that have been used to ensure that participants make a smooth transition from job search training to job search assistance. These are: (1) describing the substate area's job search support services and facilities as a regular feature of the job search workshop; (2) introducing workshop participants to staff who will later assist with job search; (3) having Employment Service representatives present for part of the workshop; and (4) having graduation requirements for the workshop to ensure that participants are capable of conducting a job interview before they are allowed to proceed to job development activities.

The fifth challenge relates to job search assistance—providing ongoing support for participants during their job search. The authors point out that this can be

accomplished by providing individual support for self-directed job search initiatives, by promoting mutual support among participants (through job clubs and motivational workshops), or by providing facilities for self-directed job search efforts (telephones, word processors, clerical support, library facilities, access to job listings, and having counselors or job developers on hand to provide help as needed).

The final challenge in the area of job search assistance, matching participants to jobs in keeping with their skills and previous wage levels, can be accomplished by: (1) using Job Banks and matching job orders to participants; (2) conducting employer outreach and developing jobs for individual participants; and (3) offering job fairs and employer presentations for clients. Examples of these activities are provided.

Two case examples are also included in the guidebook. One describes comprehensive services (including services tailored to managerial and technical workers), and the other provides information about an intensive workshop with strong case management during job search.

### **Basic Readjustment Services: Crisis Adjustment, Job Readiness, and Relocation Services**

The final component of basic readjustment services involves crisis adjustment, job readiness training, and, in some cases, relocation services. Several challenges faced by substate area staff are noted in this regard. Staff must:

- Help dislocated workers manage the stress of being laid off;
- Help clients adjust financially;
- Help clients develop appropriate workforce skills; and
- Provide relocation assistance, when appropriate.

Strategies for meeting each of these challenges are discussed. In the area of stress management services, the guidebook points out that there are four stages most commonly experienced by dislocated workers: disbelief (or denial), anger, depression, and acceptance of the job loss. In addition to helping dislocated workers address each stage of job loss, some substate areas have further helped clients by teaching them about the physical and emotional ways of coping with stress, helping them alter their negative behavior, or helping them to improve their self-esteem.

Because financial insecurity is often a major source of stress for dislocated workers, providing financial management services is another important activity undertaken by substate area staff. Strategies for providing this service include helping clients develop budgets, helping them work with creditors, providing counseling about maintaining or replacing employee benefits (e.g., managing severance pay, maintaining health insurance, etc.), and helping dislocated workers determine if they are eligible for other income assistance programs such as unemployment insurance, trade readjustment assistance, food stamps, or Pell grants.

Several strategies are noted that can help clients become better prepared for their new jobs. These include instruction in communication skills, conflict resolution, and organizational skills.

Regarding relocation assistance, the guidebook suggests that, while most substate areas studied did not emphasize this type of assistance, it was used effectively in a few areas. Some programs provided newspapers from other regions, long distance telephone privileges, employer directories, and listings of jobs in other regions and States. In addition, some areas helped dislocated workers with out-of-area job search expenses or moving expenses.

The guidebook includes an example of a substate area initiative that met the basic crisis adjustment and job readiness needs of clients and provided relocation

assistance. An example of a customized crisis adjustment and job readiness initiative designed to meet the special needs of dislocated workers is also provided. A brief listing of relevant publications is included.

## **Retraining Services: Classroom Training in Basic Skills**

The guidebook notes that substate areas must help clients whose basic skills deficiencies prohibit them from obtaining new jobs or may limit their access to occupational training for better jobs. Pointing out that clients often have diverse educational backgrounds and skills, the authors suggest that substate areas face two challenges in their efforts to offer basic skills classroom training. They must:

- Provide high-quality basic skills training that meets the varied needs of dislocated workers; and
- Promote basic skills curricula that are appropriate for dislocated workers.

Regarding the first challenge, the authors suggest that referring clients to *existing* basic skills training providers may help meet their diverse needs. This strategy offers substate areas two advantages. First, it allows them to offer a wide range of training options to meet individual needs, and second, it reduces program costs. Disadvantages of this strategy include the possibility of reduced local funds available for basic skills training, and the programs themselves may not be geared to the specific needs of the dislocated workers. In overcoming these disadvantages, the guidebook suggests that substate area staff must know the training approaches used by each basic skill provider and they must be able to match participants to programs that are successful in training participants with similar backgrounds and needs. It is also important that dislocated workers are enrolled in EDWAA while receiving remedial classroom training to ensure that they complete basic skills instruction.

Another strategy is to provide basic skills training through in-house skill centers. The advantage of this strategy is that it gives programs maximum control over almost all aspects of basic skills instruction and it is easier to set up case management procedures to monitor participant progress and to provide EDWAA services at the same time. However, substate areas must bear the cost of developing and maintaining in-house training facilities. They must also ensure that they have expert instructional staff, develop appropriate basic skills curricula, and operate efficient in-house centers.

The authors offer two suggestions that might help substate areas provide quality in-house basic skills remediation efforts. First, they can use facilities that are also available for participants in JTPA Title II-A programs. This will help reduce instructional costs by distributing operating costs between the two programs. Second, they can develop a separate basic skills program specifically for dislocated workers. This strategy gives programs more control over the operation of the skills center and participants may be less likely to be intimidated by the training environment because they are surrounded by their peers.

Regarding the second challenge, promoting basic skills curricula that are appropriate for dislocated workers, the guidebook points out that those that meet clients' diverse needs include vocationally relevant instructional materials, efficient training schedules, and a nonthreatening environment. Each of these aspects of quality curricula are described in detail and appropriate examples are offered. Case examples of the integration of basic skills remediation with vocational classes and the use of a joint remedial skill center are also provided.

## **Retraining Services: Classroom Training in Occupational Skills**

In addition to *basic* skills classroom training, dislocated workers often need

*occupational* skills classroom training. Challenges faced by substate areas in providing this training include:

- Providing a wide range of occupational training options;
- Providing training that prepares dislocated workers for jobs paying high wages;
- Encouraging workers without marketable skills to participate in retraining; and
- Providing flexible scheduling.

The authors suggest that strategies to provide a wide range of retraining options include arranging for referrals to local educational institutions (ensuring that vocational programs respond to occupations in demand, are vocationally relevant, and are comprehensive enough to enable clients to obtain jobs beyond the entry level), permitting EDWAA clients to select courses among a number of public and private course offerings, and developing new training programs for dislocated workers. The guidebook discusses the advantages and disadvantages of these strategies and provides examples how substate areas have implemented these strategies.

In responding to the challenge of preparing dislocated workers for high-wage jobs in demand occupations, the authors stress that detailed information about labor markets and labor market trends is essential in targeting training to jobs that are available. This can be accomplished through surveys of occupational demand at a local or regional level and by having individuals seek training in a particular field to document the availability of jobs in that field.

Another strategy to prepare clients for high-wage jobs is to provide training that builds on their existing skills. The objective of enhancing existing skills is to prepare dislocated workers for a lateral move into another skilled job rather than beginning at the bottom of a new career ladder. Developing training linked to economic development or entrepreneurship efforts may also help provide high-wage jobs for some clients.

Regarding the third challenge, encouraging workers without marketable skills to participate in retraining, the authors suggest two approaches: (1) developing short-term classes to introduce dislocated workers to classroom training in a “safe” setting (classes are designed to provide some skills enhancement while encouraging participants to continue with additional retraining at existing educational institutions); and (2) providing academic counseling and support for clients. This strategy allows clients to receive on-campus support such as counseling and case management.

In designing strategies to promote flexible scheduling of retraining options, the guidebook suggests that substate areas may use existing opportunities for open-entry/open-exit training or they may tailor existing programs to meet the scheduling needs of dislocated workers.

Examples of comprehensive occupational skills training and short-term, intensive training tailored to the specific needs of dislocated workers are provided.

### **Retraining Services: On-the-Job Training**

The guidebook points out that on-the-job training serves several important functions. It provides short-term training in new skills for clients who need immediate income; it takes full advantage of clients’ transferable skills, particularly where those skills can be enhanced; it provides training in occupations for which no classroom training is available locally; and it helps classroom training graduates overcome hiring barriers due to their lack of practical work experience in a new field.

Challenges associated with designing and delivering effective on-the-job training services include:

- Matching clients to jobs in higher-skilled occupations;

- Developing individualized training plans; and
- Helping employers provide effective training.

The authors point out that developing appropriate job openings is the first step in matching clients to appropriate on-the-job training positions. Several strategies may be used in accomplishing this objective. First, substate areas may identify potential on-the-job training positions through general job development activities. Second, on-the-job training positions may be developed for specific participants (matching clients' employment goals with appropriate potential employers). Third, clients themselves may seek out potential positions. Finally, "reverse referrals" may also be used, in which employers who are familiar with on-the-job training refer prospective employees to substate area staff to determine whether they qualify for a training subsidy. (The authors discourage this approach.)

A second step in matching clients to on-the-job training positions is to assess whether a particular position is appropriate for a specific client. In accomplishing this, staff can use interviews with clients, formal assessment tests, or performance tests to determine the appropriateness of an on-the-job training opportunity.

The final step in this matching process is to evaluate the suitability of employers who might provide the training. Several aspects of the employers and their positions should be considered by substate staff, including whether the wage and skill levels are appropriate for clients, whether the job can provide stable employment, whether on-the-job training is actually needed, whether the company provides appropriate working conditions and employee benefits, and the employer's ability to carry out on-the-job training.

Regarding the second challenge, developing individualized training plans for on-the-job training participants, the authors suggest that several factors should be considered. First, the skills required for these positions must be analyzed. Next, the

number of training hours and wage reimbursement levels must be determined. Finally, there must be an assurance that trainees with satisfactory performance will be retained as regular employees.

The authors offer suggestions about how to conduct a thorough job analysis, discuss ways to determine the length of training, and provide information about how to design on-the-job training contracts that retain workers once training is complete.

In expanding on the third challenge, helping employers provide effective skills training, the authors suggest that substate staff can provide seminars for employers on work site training techniques. Appropriate monitoring efforts are also discussed.

Case examples of on-the-job training programs are described and publications that may be useful in setting up on-the-job training programs are noted.

## **Organizational Issues**

The guidebook highlights some of the ways that substate areas promote high quality services through organization and staff development techniques, which were adopted to address two important challenges:

- Promoting high-quality, client-centered services; and
- Developing staff skills and avoiding staff “burnout.”

Several strategies are offered for promoting high-quality, client-centered services. These include viewing services from the client’s perspective, emphasizing continuous improvement of services, collecting and analyzing data to improve services, and involving outside agencies (e.g., classroom training providers and other human service agencies) in quality improvement efforts.

Strategies suggested to avoid staff burnout include emphasizing staff development, as well as the use of a team approach in assisting dislocated workers.

The guidebook provides an example of an effort to implement total quality management for substate staff in one program and an example of a program that emphasized high-quality services.

## **EASING JOB LOSS IN THE DEFENSE INDUSTRY**

### **Overview**

In addition to overseeing the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act (EDWAA), which provides retraining and other assistance for workers who have lost their jobs through plant closings and mass layoffs,<sup>32</sup> the Department of Labor designed and implemented an important initiative aimed at easing the transition to new employment of individuals who have been adversely affected by cutbacks in defense spending.

Between 1987 and 1997, Department of Defense (DOD) outlays are projected to

---

<sup>32</sup>For more information about programs to help dislocated workers, see David Drury, Stephen Walsh, and Marlene Strong, *Evaluation of the EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates, 1994). See also Katherine Dickinson, et al., *A Guide to Well-Developed Services For Dislocated Workers* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates; Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates; and Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, 1994). These reports are summarized in this chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

drop by 30 percent.<sup>33</sup> Defense procurement will be hardest hit, with expenditures for DOD contractors estimated to decrease by \$46 billion during this 10-year period.

Expenditures for military personnel may decline by \$25 billion over the same period.<sup>34</sup>

This decrease in defense spending will affect individual defense-industry workers and military personnel, firms that are dependent on the defense industry, and communities with high concentrations of defense-related activities.

Defense workers and military personnel who have lost their jobs, or who can expect to lose their jobs because of decreased expenditures for defense, as well as laid off civilian DOD employees, will need to find new employment opportunities in the nondefense sector. These workers share similar characteristics: (1) they have relatively high levels of education and technical skills; (2) they lack information about nondefense occupations and employers; (3) they have extensive job-related experience and training that may not be reflected in formal educational credentials; and (4) they have experience in a defense industry “corporate culture” that emphasizes top-down decision-making rather than participatory work teams and technical quality over cost control and efficiency.

In response to this situation, the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991

---

<sup>33</sup>In absolute terms, these reductions will amount to an average reduction of \$10 billion per year over a 10-year period. As a percentage of gross national product, defense outlays are expected to fall from six percent in 1987 to three and a half percent in 1997.

<sup>34</sup>Defense Conversion Commission, *Adjusting to the Drawdown* (Washington, D.C., 1992); and U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, *After the Cold War: Living with Lower Defense Spending* (Washington, D.C., 1992).

allocated \$150 million to the Department of Labor to operate the Defense Conversion Adjustment Program (DCA), which is administered under Section 325 of Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Twelve DCA demonstration grants were awarded in November 1992 (with a total of about \$5 million in funding) and seven additional grants (with a total of about \$3.4 million in funding) were awarded in November 1993. These projects were funded to design and implement innovative approaches that were not otherwise found in standard JTPA Title III or defense conversion activities supported by other funding sources. Areas of potential innovation included:

- Use of grantee organizations and administrative entities not generally responsible for dislocated worker services;
- Targeting of demonstration activities and services to individuals and groups not generally included in EDWAA services, including defense-dependent firms and adversely affected communities as well as individual workers dislocated or at risk of dislocation as a result of the reductions in defense spending;
- Provision of a wide range of services and activities related to defense conversion objectives (e.g., formation of community task forces, business development assistance, entrepreneurial training, workforce training in high performance workplace skills and total quality management concepts, and training in technical fields for individual workers); and
- Coordination of DCA demonstration activities with other defense conversion activities such as economic development or community adjustment funding.

An interim report, based on an evaluation of the implementation of the DCA demonstration, describes the Federal Government's response to the decrease in defense spending, discusses various strategies taken to prevent layoffs from defense-related firms, provides information about strategies used to help defense workers who have lost their jobs (or who are about to lose their jobs), and outlines strategies used to plan appropriate responses for military base closures and cutbacks in defense

industries.<sup>35</sup>

## Study Methodology

The evaluation of the DCA demonstration was designed to: (1) describe and document the implementation and short-term outcomes of the demonstration projects as they relate to the specific problems faced in defense-related dislocations; (2) identify exemplary approaches to the specific problems faced in defense-related dislocations; and (3) identify the factors that contribute to or impede the success of various responses to defense conversion.

Qualitative data on project designs, implementation experiences, and outcomes were collected through site visits to each project (conducted between October 1983 and February 1994). The researchers also reviewed project proposals and quarterly progress reports that were submitted to the Department of Labor.

Although the DCA demonstrations were awarded under five different categories—dislocation aversion, increased worker mobility, community planning, economic development, and locally initiated projects, the various demonstration approaches that were taken can be described using three conceptual models. (Some demonstrations could be categorized as using a single model, while others developed designs that combined multiple models.) These three models are briefly summarized below.

---

<sup>35</sup>Mary G. Visher and Deborah Kogan, *Evaluation of the Defense Conversion Adjustment Demonstration: Interim Report on Implementation* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates, 1994).

## The Dislocation Aversion Approach

In this approach, defense-dependent firms received help in restructuring their operations in order to compete in commercial markets. In contrast to traditional EDWAA services which help individual workers, this approach was designed to reduce dislocations through *early intervention for the entire firm* in order to *preserve the jobs of at-risk workers*. Chart 13 depicts the basic components of this approach. Projects using this approach helped firms to:

- Assess their strengths and weaknesses and find opportunities for conversion or diversification;
- Develop detailed strategic plans for conversion or diversification, including developing financing for implementing the strategic plan;
- Reorganize their workplace to implement improved technologies and more flexible production procedures, or to transform worker roles and responsibilities;
- Provide technical assistance and training to managers on marketing, reorganization of production, financial restructuring, recordkeeping, and total quality management, as needed; and
- Retrain workers in needed technical skills or high-performance workplace skills necessary to help the firm compete in broader markets.

## The Worker Mobility Approach

While the Dislocation Aversion Approach was designed to help companies avoid laying off workers, the Worker Mobility Approach helps dislocated workers *once they have lost their jobs* (or once dislocation is unavoidable). The demonstrations using this

approach tested innovative ways of increasing mobility for workers affected by the decrease in defense spending. Chart 14 shows the basic components of this approach.

The study report points out that after identifying a group of workers laid off from defense-related employment, the worker mobility approach attempts to intervene as soon as possible to help affected workers become reemployed in high quality jobs that offer high wages, benefits, and job security. Projects using this approach may:

- Provide services that respond to the crisis adjustment needs of dislocated workers (e.g., personal and family counseling, financial counseling, and stress management);
- Assess individual skills and interests, identify employment barriers and transferable skills, help workers explore occupational choices, and develop individual employment goals and strategies;
- Identify occupations that can benefit from the skills of dislocated workers and help these workers transfer their skills to these jobs through skills certification, short-term skills enhancement, or longer-term retraining;
- Help interested individuals start small businesses or joint ventures that transfer technology developed in the defense sector to commercial applications;
- Train workers in the cultural and organizational differences between defense-oriented and commercially-oriented workplaces;
- Assist workers to market their defense/military work experience to commercial employers; and
- Help workers identify job opportunities in other regions of the country and plan for relocation, if necessary.

Although many of these design elements are incorporated into other projects such as EDWAA, the worker mobility demonstrations were built on the premise that *innovative* responses to the *specific* challenges of worker mobility in the context of defense conversion were needed.

## The Community Planning Approach

This approach addresses the need for *community action* to ease the impact of mass layoffs in the defense industry in a geographical area or in cases where a large military facility closes down. The community planning approach emphasizes activities needed to develop a coherent and unified community response to the local situation and to coordinate available resources to further the selected response. Chart 15 shows the basic components of this approach. It includes activities such as:

- Developing effective coalitions that involve State and local officials, public and private agencies, and interest groups and agreeing on a process for reaching consensus on key goals;
- Collecting and analyzing information about the direct and indirect impacts of defense cutbacks on the local community;
- Identifying decisions to be made and alternative options for preventing dislocations (e.g., options for facility reuse, alternative strategies to prevent further dislocations through services to at-risk firms and workers, possible service designs and delivery approaches to help dislocated workers adjust, and analyzing an area's potential for regional economic development);
- Identifying available community assets and resources;
- Using the agreed upon participatory decision process, developing a coherent and comprehensive plan for the community response that coordinates the activities of all agencies and individuals; and
- Mobilizing Federal, State, and community resources needed to develop the plan and oversee its implementation.

The approach helps communities to identify innovative models that link workforce development issues and retraining initiatives to plans for longer-term regional economic development and/or reuse of military facilities.

## **Preventing Layoffs From Defense Firms**

The study report provides information about efforts to prevent layoffs in six projects that had dislocation aversion components. These projects were:

- The Management Assistance and Technology Transfer Program, administered by the St. Louis County Economic Council in St. Louis, Missouri.
- The Long Island Defense Diversification Project, administered by the New York State Department of Economic Development in Long Island, New York.
- The Strategic Skills Program, administered by the Industrial Services Program in Massachusetts, which serves the entire State of Massachusetts.
- The Business Roundtables, administered by a Private Industry Council-led Consortium in San Diego County, California.
- The Sargent Controls Project, administered by the Regional Reemployment Center in Pima County, Arizona.
- The Machinists Project, administered by the International Association of Machinists in Burbank, California.

The authors use examples from each of these projects in discussing four key implementation topics: (1) project goals; (2) recruitment and selection of firms; (3) services; and (4) project organization. Within each of these topics, important challenges faced by the projects during the early months of the demonstration are noted. The authors compare and contrast the experiences of the six projects and categorize the projects based on how they reacted to or planned for these challenges.

Short descriptions of various aspects of some of the projects are highlighted to illustrate a particular category of strategies or approaches.

The publication also includes detailed profiles of the dislocation aversion

projects. The profiles present information about the context in which the projects operated, project planning activities, goals, organization, funding, coordination with other efforts, services provided to firms and workers, and preliminary outcomes.

In summarizing the implementation experiences of the dislocation aversion projects, the researchers point out that the first challenge that project designers faced was to set goals that were realistic, measurable, and closely tied to targeting and service strategies. Most of the projects included in their formal goal statements an expectation that participating firms would reduce their dependence on the defense-related activities (as measured by factors such as a reduction of the total sales to a defense customer or the marketing of a commercial application for a defense product). A few projects avoided conversion as a goal that could be reached within the demonstration period. These projects focused on providing services that would enhance defense-dependent firms' capabilities to compete in any market.

The second challenge was to identify and enroll firms that were in need of and could benefit from services that the projects planned to offer. As such, targeting strategies appropriate to the goals and service strategy were important during the demonstration's implementation phase. About half of the projects targeted firms that had recently begun investing resources in conversion and diversification, and about half recruited firms that were substantially more advanced in their conversion processes. While half the projects used detailed recruitment and selection procedures to choose the firms that most closely matched their target group, the other half practiced more open recruitment practices.

Another challenge facing project designers was to create or arrange services that were appropriate to the characteristics and needs of participating firms. The services to be offered had to be well articulated with the conversion plans and goals of the firms. The process of assisting defense-dependent, at-risk firms tended to follow three stages: (1) collecting and assessing information needed to determine the firm's

weaknesses and strengths and to develop a strategic plan for change; (2) developing a strategic conversion plan; and (3) providing training to employees to prepare them for conversion processes. About half the projects emphasized services to firms designed to build commitment or inform and prepare management for developing strategic conversion plans.

Several dislocation aversion projects emphasized services that built commitment among company managers and provided information to management about workforce skills, technological capacities, and other factors important to the conversion process. (Half the projects skipped this phase, assuming that the firms had already completed this process.) These projects emphasized training to employees, and to a lesser extent, managers. The types of training varied. Some projects emphasized training in skills such occupational training to use new machines, while others emphasized communication skills, teamwork, and sensitivity training for managers.

The fourth challenge faced by project designers was to administer activities to maximize firm participation and effort, while ensuring that project managers remained *active partners* in selecting and delivering services. While some projects adopted a “hands-off” approach (offering firms wide discretion in selecting and monitoring consultant services), others featured close, collaborative relationships with firms, keeping tighter control over the services that firms received.

## **Assisting Dislocated Defense Workers**

The study report points out that among the first round of DCA grantees, six projects included elements of worker mobility strategies in their approaches. These were:

- Project EARN, administered by McDonnell Douglas Corporation in Titusville,

- Florida and operated jointly with its partner, Brevard Community College.
- StepOut, operated by Arizona State University, in Tempe Arizona, in association with the Arizona Governor's Office for Women.
  - MilCert, operated by the Clemson University College of Education in Clemson, South Carolina.
  - A project in San Diego, California, operated by a partnership of agencies led by the San Diego Consortium and Private Industry Council.
  - A project operated by the Center for Commercial Competitiveness in association with the State University of New York at Binghamton, New York.
  - A project administered by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers in Burbank, California, in association with the Verdugo Private Industry Council.

The authors summarize the distinguishing features of these demonstration approaches and identify some of the challenges they faced in the areas of project goals and objectives, client targeting, service design, and project organization. Detailed profiles of the worker mobility projects are also provided which offer information about the context in which the projects operated, project planning activities, goals, organization, funding, coordination with other efforts, services provided to firms and workers, and preliminary project outcomes.

In summarizing various aspects of the worker mobility projects, the authors note that project designers and operators faced several challenges in addressing the needs of defense industry workers or military personnel who were either dislocated or who expected to be dislocated.

The first challenge was to *identify high-quality reemployment opportunities* for dislocated defense workers, many of whom had advanced technical skills and earnings. This was a particularly difficult task because a number of the projects operated in labor markets with limited high-quality job openings. The demonstrations tested several

strategies to meet this challenge, including: (1) providing services to help individuals set and pursue individual reemployment goals; (2) offering skills enhancement training to give participants an advantage in seeking new jobs in similar occupations; (3) training participants for jobs in emerging industries or “niche” occupations that could use their transferable skills; and (4) promoting entrepreneurship in high-technology fields.

A second challenge was to *develop clear client targeting goals and effective procedures to recruit and enroll members of the intended target groups*. The authors note that recruitment of military personnel had been difficult for the two projects that initially targeted this group. One project gave up trying to recruit military personnel altogether and the other project, which targeted separated military personnel, contacted prospective participants in advance of the layoff and recruited personnel stationed throughout the United States as well as overseas.

Projects that served civilian defense workers fell into two groups: those with inclusive recruitment goals that intended to serve as many affected workers as possible, and projects with selective recruitment goals that screened applicants for qualifications and interests appropriate to the specific occupations targeted by the project. Four methods were used to meet client targeting goals: (1) attempting to recruit at-risk workers from defense contractors prior to layoff announcements; (2) participating in rapid response activities scheduled once layoffs were announced; (3) selecting appropriate applicants from the pool of dislocated workers enrolled in local JTPA Title III programs; and (4) contacting individual dislocated workers through discussions with employers, personal networks, and public media announcements.

The study report points out that projects with inclusive recruitment goals had the most success using on-site outreach activities directed toward employees of defense-dependent firms that had announced layoffs or that expected layoffs. Projects with more selective recruitment goals had the most success in reaching appropriate applicants by using public media announcements and by reviewing the existing pool of

local JTPA Title III enrollees.

The third challenge faced by the worker mobility demonstrations was to *offer applicants a mix of basic readjustment, retraining, and supportive services*, and to ensure that these services were appropriate to the specific employment barriers faced by dislocated workers and separated military personnel. Rather than offering a mix of services, these demonstrations emphasized either basic readjustment services or retraining. When offered, basic readjustment services tended to be narrow, with little attention to crisis adjustment needs. Neither of the projects that emphasized basic readjustment services tailored the content of these services to meet specific aspects of the transition from defense-related to commercial employment.

Projects that emphasized retraining services provided either very short-term or very long-term training. Only one project offered any supportive services or financial support to participants using demonstration funds. The authors suggest that the absence of financial support became a problem in several projects that offered long-term services.

The final challenge faced by the worker mobility demonstrations was *to develop an organizational structure to promote innovative and effective services to the targeted population*. Projects addressed this challenge by giving the lead administrative role to agencies that were distinct from the JTPA Title III substate agencies by promoting partnerships among local agencies (e.g., economic development agencies, educational institutions, and substate administrative entities). While this organizational structure encouraged the development of new occupational training designs and enabled projects to link worker mobility and economic development objectives, it also prevented projects from developing a full range of responsive services.

## **Community Planning Projects**

Two projects received funding under the community planning category:

- The Castle Air Force Base Closure Community Planning Project (referred to as the Merced Project), administered by the Merced County Department of Economic and Strategic Development, California.
- The Philadelphia Naval Base and Shipyard Community Planning Project (referred to as the Philadelphia Project), administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry.

A third project, the San Diego Defense Conversion Project in California, which was funded under the worker mobility category, also included a strategy that included a community planning approach.

The study report describes the events or conditions that the communities were responding to and analyzes the experiences of the projects in the context of three key goals. These were: (1) establishing a functional planning body or participation of the local employment and training community in a planning body; (2) collecting and assessing information on the effects of closure on local businesses and workers; and (3) identifying a viable plan to respond to the reemployment needs of dislocated workers or the needs of at-risk firms. Detailed profiles of the two projects are provided.

In summarizing the study of the projects in the community planning category, the researchers point out that the two projects were quite different. One eventually evolved into a worker mobility strategy project, while the other evolved into a dislocation aversion strategy project. Although neither served as a good example of a “typical community planning” model, the researchers suggest that the projects’ experiences during the first two years exemplified several challenges (and strategies to deal with those challenges) that may be expected in community planning projects.

First, the fact that one project struggled to find a meaningful role for itself within a

complex environment where many organizations were already involved in planning activities, while the other project experienced no such difficulty, underscores the importance of understanding the effects of contextual factors on community planning activities.

Second, while one project did not attempt to become involved with a larger planning body, and the other did, neither seemed to be highly successful in integrating its objectives with the objectives of other planning bodies.

Finally, both projects made significant progress in achieving their other objectives, such as collecting and analyzing information about the impact of closures or massive downsizing on local businesses, or information about the skill levels of affected workers that may prove important in helping them to find new jobs.

A final report is expected to be published in the spring of 1996.

## **Conclusions**

Several conclusions are offered throughout the study report. They are summarized below.

- Regarding the implementation experience of the dislocation aversion projects, the researchers note that the six projects which were the first round grantees are testing strategies to avert job loss by working with at-risk firms and workers to stabilize and improve the firms' chances for survival. The authors note that the dislocation aversion approach is the most innovative of all the approaches funded by the DCA demonstration.
- Regarding the worker mobility projects, the authors suggest that these projects differ from many other dislocated worker programs in their attempts to prepare groups of dislocated defense workers for reemployment in specific occupational niches offering high-quality jobs. Among the more innovative aspects of the

demonstration project designs are efforts to build closer linkages between economic development and worker retraining. The authors also point out that the worker mobility projects that promote individual entrepreneurship are breaking new ground in their efforts to use small business start-ups as catalysts for regional economic development.

□ In the area of community planning projects, the study report notes that although the two projects in this area were highly dissimilar, both made significant progress in achieving their objectives.

## **HELPING DISLOCATED WORKERS TO BECOME ENTREPRENEURS**

### **Overview**

As a number of the studies summarized in this chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* indicates, the Department of Labor has designed, implemented, and sponsored numerous initiatives to assist the general dislocated worker population, as well as special groups such as farmers and defense workers.<sup>36</sup> These efforts have incorporated diverse strategies in their program designs

---

<sup>36</sup>See, for example, Katherine Dickinson, et al., *A Guide to Well-Developed Services For Dislocated Workers* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates; Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates; and Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, 1994), Mary G. Visser, Stephen Walsh, and Ronald D'Amico, *Serving Dislocated Farmers: An Evaluation of the EDWAA Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration* (Oakland and Menlo Park, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994), Liz Wiegardt and Phyllis Weinstock, *From the Farm to the Job Market: A Guide to Employment and Training Services for Farmers and Ranchers* (Oakland and Menlo Park, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994), and Mary G. Visser and Deborah Kogan, *Evaluation of the Defense Conversion Adjustment Demonstration: Interim Report on Implementation* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates and Menlo Park, Calif.: Social Policy Research Associates, 1994). Each of these reports is summarized in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

to help workers who have lost their jobs through plant closings or mass layoffs receive the training and services they need to find new jobs.

The Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act (EDWAA) Job Creation Demonstration represents one such strategy. Initiated in June 1991, one of its directives was to explore the effectiveness of Community Development Corporations (CDCs)<sup>37</sup> and similar organizations in expanding opportunities for dislocated workers through entrepreneurial training and by establishing linkages with local economic development activities.

CDCs encompass a wide variety of organizations with disparate aims, clients, and activities. These organizations created over 54,600 permanent jobs between 1986 and 1990, and helped retain an additional 35,888 jobs in their communities during this same period.<sup>38</sup>

A study of the demonstration revealed that one of its key components, microbusiness training, produced total employment rates that matched outcomes from traditional EDWAA retraining services, although average initial earnings from participants who became self-employed were much lower than the average EDWAA

---

<sup>37</sup>Community Development Corporations are generally private, nonprofit organizations, governed by a board of local residents, business, and civic leaders, with by-laws or a mission statement affirming a focus on economic development. They generally deal with low-income areas and populations, including communities affected by plant closures.

<sup>38</sup>National Congress for Community Economic Development, *Against All Odds*, March 1989; and *Changing the Odds*, December, 1991, Washington, D.C.

wage at termination.<sup>39</sup>

The study's objectives included:

- Assessing the effectiveness of the EDWAA Job Creation demonstrations, both in absolute terms and against the background of other CDC-led job creation efforts and mainstream EDWAA reemployment training;
- Providing technical assistance for data collection activities, information exchange, and dissemination to the EDWAA demonstrations; and
- Examining the CDC-linked job creation efforts as a whole, with special emphasis on the projects that served dislocated workers as a target group or that had service models applicable to dislocated workers.

Demonstration grantees were not held to a specific service model. Rather, they could change and improve their service arrangements as needed, within the general guidelines of the demonstration and JTPA legislation. Because the demonstration was not designed to yield net impact estimates, random assignment was not used and there was no experimental control group.

The researchers used a variety of methods to address the study's objectives. Members of the research team visited each project four times during the demonstration period. During these visits, they interviewed demonstration project administrators, trainers, counselors, and other service delivery staff, as well as curriculum designers, and participants. Training sessions and other activities were observed and participant case files and data collection procedures were reviewed. EDWAA staff in the substate areas served by the demonstrations were also interviewed, and information about substate area client characteristics and outcomes was collected.

---

<sup>39</sup>David Drury, Stephen Walsh, and Marlene Strong, *Evaluation of the EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration* (Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Planning Associates, 1994).

The study report provides an overview of the job creation field as a whole, with special emphasis on CDCs, self-employment training, microbusiness lending, and programs targeted to dislocated workers and other disadvantaged populations. It includes profiles of the six Job Creation Demonstration projects, discusses recruitment, curriculum design, the search for business startup capital, coordination with Unemployment Insurance and EDWAA, and several implementation issues faced by the demonstrations. Participant characteristics are described, along with an analysis of both short- and longer-term program outcomes. The study report also explores the potential of job creation for dislocated workers in mainstream EDWAA programs, and compares outcomes from the demonstration projects with other self-employment programs.

Profiles of five supplementary case study programs and participant-level data items collected from the demonstrations are provided in the publication's appendix.

## **The Job Creation Demonstration**

Job Creation demonstration grants were awarded to six community development organizations:

- MAN-TRA-CON (formerly Illinois Farmers Union-Training) in southern Illinois;
- The Muskegon Economic Growth Alliance (MEGA) of Muskegon, Michigan;
- The Greater Atlanta Small Business Project (GRASP) of Atlanta, Georgia;
- Friends of Children of Mississippi (FCM) in Jackson, Mississippi;
- HACER, Inc. in the borough of the Bronx, New York City; and
- The Center for Practical Solutions (CPS) in Hauppauge, Long Island.

In addition to providing demonstration-funded services, one of the grantees (MAN-TRA-CON) operated as a JTPA substate grantee, and another (MEGA) was a

major subcontractor for the local substate EDWAA grantee. All grantees were private nonprofit organizations with some prior degree of involvement in economic development activities. The service areas of the demonstration projects reflected the diversity of CDC service areas nationwide, ranging from rural areas covering several thousand square miles, to sections of the inner city.

Funding for the demonstration was provided in two stages—an initial 15-month grant period ending in September 1992, and an option year extending through September 1993. Grant awards totaled \$4.9 million across both periods, with individual grants ranging from about \$607,000 to \$925,000.

Services provided centered on self-employment training and assistance for starting microbusinesses. During the first grant period, three grantees also offered reemployment training or job search assistance oriented to existing businesses. During its 27-months of operation, the demonstration projects enrolled a total of 645 self-employment and 351 reemployment participants.

## **A Review of Job Creation Efforts**

Before discussing the specific EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration projects, the study report provides information about job creation in general. It describes how these efforts support EDWAA goals, provides an overview of how CDCs and other organizations support local economic development efforts (discussing various types of job creation projects and outlining several microenterprise program strategies), and provides examples of microenterprise development programs.

In their discussion of the job creation field, the authors point out that job creation strategies have the potential for addressing problems of worker dislocation at several

levels. They can target new, expanding, or relocating industries to take advantage of skills already acquired by a community's dislocated workers. Job creation efforts in a particular industry can also have a "multiplier effect" that increases overall employment in an area as new businesses buy or lease space, purchase equipment and services from other local firms, and augment the local tax base. Thus, owners and employers "recycle" their income throughout the community by purchasing goods and services. These efforts also help promote organization and capacity-building at the local level.

The researchers note that CDCs and Local Economic Development Corporations (LEDCs)<sup>40</sup>, working in conjunction with city or county economic development offices and redevelopment agencies, enterprise zones, small business development centers and minority business development centers, community colleges, loan and industrial revenue bond programs, private foundations, and JTPA Title II and Title III programs, are often at the center of job creation efforts. The study report describes these activities and provides examples of job creation initiatives that are typically undertaken by these organizations. These include commercial and industrial development, business enterprises (CDCs may have for-profit components that become involved with business ventures, or they may make equity investments in businesses managed by others), customized training, and microenterprise<sup>41</sup> development.

Because they are important components of job creation efforts, the study report provides information about microenterprise program strategies, pointing out that

---

<sup>40</sup>Local Economic Development Corporations are a broad category of organization that is usually defined to include CDCs. In practice, the distinction between CDCs and other LEDCs has blurred considerably over the past 10 years, and there is now a great deal of overlap in the types of activities in which they engage.

<sup>41</sup>Microenterprises are generally defined as businesses with less than five employees and with initial credit needs of under \$15,000.

microbusiness entrepreneurs typically require varying amounts of capital, but often lack the income and assets to qualify for any type of commercial loan. The study report reviews some sources of loan funding, which may include State funds, Federal funds (including the Small Business Administration's Microloan Demonstration Program), private foundations, and commercial capital (which is often limited in relation to demand). Loans may be made to individuals, or to groups known as "peer lending circles," which generally consist of four to six borrowers.

In addition to capital, many potential entrepreneurs also need the knowledge and skills required to start and operate new businesses. The researchers point out that microenterprise development programs address this need by providing a variety of training activities, which may be offered on a one-to-one basis or to groups, in classrooms with a set curriculum, or informally on an as-needed basis by a business mentor.

New entrepreneurs can also benefit from supportive and affordable work environments. Small business "incubators" have been developed to meet this need. These facilities offer a range of support to new businesses which may include low rent, office support for accounting and purchasing, access to office machines, bulk purchasing pools to obtain lower prices on materials, help in locating capital, and management guidance. Technology-oriented incubators may also offer specialized tools and facilities for product development. Some may provide linkages with corporate or university-based research groups.

Incubators can create jobs in two other ways. First, short-term construction jobs and training opportunities may be created as the incubator facility itself is rehabilitated and prepared for use (many business incubators are developed in existing facilities which are rehabilitated for this purpose). Secondly, the new businesses supported by incubators may hire small numbers of employees, which may increase as successful businesses expand and eventually leave the incubator.

Several examples of microenterprise development programs are provided, including special programs that target women, ethnic groups, recipients of income support payments, low income individuals, and dislocated workers.

## **The EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration Projects**

The study report includes synopses of each of the six EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration projects. Information about the setting, organization, major services provided, and distinctive features of the projects is provided. Highlights of these synopses follow.

### **BEST Program**

The BEST program was characterized by close ties with the mainstream EDWAA program, open-entry/open-exit classroom training, multiple approaches to training, startup counseling, and business-oriented computer training for participants. Recruitment and lack of access to loan capital were the major problems encountered.

The study report provides details of the program, noting that MAN-TRA-CON (for “management, training, and consulting”) received a total of \$908,000 in demonstration funds over the two grant periods. The program provided self-employment training to 67 dislocated workers in southern Illinois. Fifty-four percent of the enrollees started businesses during the grant period, and created 18 additional employee jobs. The program’s service model and training curriculum were suitable for dissemination to both urban and rural areas.

The program served a 2,400 square-mile area with a population of about 220,000. The area had experienced a decline in high-sulfur coal production and major layoffs also occurred in retail department stores, printing, and service industries. Unemployment in the five-county area averaged 11.4 percent in August 1993.

Throughout the initial grant period, MAN-TRA-CON, a nonprofit community-based organization, subcontracted with staff of the Small Business Incubator Program which was operated by the Office of Economic and Regional Development at Southern Illinois University for business training and follow-up services. Entrepreneurship classes were held at a community college as well as at the incubator facility. (Administrative changes at the Incubator in 1992 resulted in shifting the training subcontract to American Enterprise Systems (AES) and all business training activities were later consolidated at the AES site, with little disruption to the program.)

Although a third of its participants were former coal miners, the BEST program was designed for the general dislocated worker population. All participants were co-enrolled in the mainstream EDWAA program in order to make them eligible for support services and occupational skills training if needed.

Staff developed their own training model and materials. Training consisted of three, 13-week phases. Using an open-entry/open-exit approach, the classroom training was modularized into marketing, management, and finance units. The second component of the training was the BEST Club—less formal meetings which covered such topics as time and stress management, and business-related computer skills. The program also offered monthly seminars covering topics such as taxes, market research, and franchising.

After completing classroom training, participants were eligible for 26 weeks of business plan development and startup assistance. Technical assistance was available for up to two years after enrollment. A computer lab was set up at the AES site,

offering intensive training in word processing and accounting software. A computer package was also developed to help participants develop their business plans.

### **Muskegon Economic Growth Alliance (MEGA) Job Creation Demonstration Program**

The MEGA program was characterized by close ties to the business community as well as the substate area service provider. It offered a wide range of both reemployment and self-employment training. Like MAN-TRA-CON, it took full advantage of existing EDWAA arrangements for occupational skills training, on-the-job training, and basic skills training. Through its ties to a Small Business Development Center and other economic development activities, MEGA offered training services to relocating and expanding businesses, and provided support for EDWAA participants who were interested in starting microbusiness. The program's chief implementation problems were a lack of access to capital, problems in coordinating individual technical assistance for business startups, and staff turnover in key positions.

The program offered services to dislocated workers primarily from Muskegon and Oceana Counties in western Michigan. In addition to its role as one of the largest economic development organizations in the area, MEGA served as the main EDWAA service provider for the substate area. The project's major goal was to demonstrate how local economic development entities could work closely with mainstream EDWAA programs to provide more comprehensive services. It was funded at \$804,800 over the two grant periods and accepted 104 self-employment participants and 263 reemployment participants. Forty-six percent of the self-employment trainees started businesses, and 79 percent of the reemployment trainees found unsubsidized employment.

The researchers point out that the local economy in the area served by the

program had historically relied on the manufacturing sector, and that this sector had declined over the past decade. MEGA, a private, nonprofit community organization formed in 1988 to address serious economic problems confronting Muskegon County, had become a focal point for local economic development and training efforts.

As part of the intake process, applicants who expressed interest in self-employment received an assessment followed by a group orientation session. Individual interviews with the project coordinator, in which participants could discuss their business ideas, were then conducted.

Once enrolled, self-employment participants attended a 12-week (or more intensive six-week) business class covering such topics as marketing, legal issues, management, and financing. Regular classroom sessions were supplemented by group meetings featuring speakers from the business community.

Participants who had completed their business plans could apply for supportive services payments of up to \$3,000 (later changed to \$1,000).

During the startup phase, participants were eligible for ongoing technical assistance from the Small Business Development Center, supportive services, and classroom training for work-related skills, supplemented by entrepreneur support group meetings.

Participants in the demonstration's reemployment service track received basic readjustment services and classroom or on-the-job training. All were co-enrolled in EDWAA. Reemployment participants went through an extensive two and a half day assessment that included reading and math tests, values clarification exercises, interest and ability surveys, and career exploration. Demonstration funds were also used to expand on-the-job training and job development efforts in a four-county area, with special targeting of new and expanding employers. The on-the-job contracts that

resulted from these efforts were then funded through the substate area using JTPA Title III formula funds. (The reemployment track was dropped in the grant's option year as the program focused on self-employment training.)

### **Friends of the Children of Mississippi Project**

The Friends of the Children of Mississippi (FCM) project demonstrated ways to use grassroots-level organizing techniques to promote microbusiness training in poorly served rural areas. Many aspects of the program were designed to meet the special needs of low-skilled, long-term unemployed individuals. The demonstration featured a strong emphasis on self-help, family and community needs, and modest, but practical, steps to overcome difficult circumstances. Apart from external obstacles like the lack of capital and a stagnant local economy, the project's greatest difficulties stemmed from its highly decentralized organization.

Operating largely within seven counties in Mississippi, the project offered microbusiness training and referrals for basic skills and occupational training, as well as an extensive personal motivational and life-skills workshop. Over the course of the demonstration, the program was awarded \$677,565 in Department of Labor funds. It enrolled 142 participants in its self-employment track and 19 in its reemployment track. Of those in self-employment, 47 percent started businesses, creating 35 full- or part-time jobs in addition to the owners' positions. Fifty-three percent of those in the reemployment track found jobs or entered academic training programs.

The project operated in a dispersed area of central Mississippi which covered about 4,200 square miles, with a total population of about 175,000. Although some manufacturing jobs were available in the area, farming and transfer payments were the largest sources of income. Per-capita incomes were among the lowest in the United

States and unemployment rates ranged from six to 25 percent during the demonstration period. The true extent of unemployment may have been obscured by the area's low labor force participation rates.

The study report provides details of the program, noting that the service infrastructure for training and business development was spread thinly across the region.

Although the bulk of FCM's (a nonprofit corporation) activities centered on the Head Start program, it also operated a Self-Employment Initiative Demonstration (SEID) grant for Aid to Families with Dependent Children recipients, and a SEID-type program for dislocated workers under a JTPA Title III subcontract.

The researchers found that FCM's service delivery arrangements were the most decentralized of all the demonstrations.

Recruitment was accomplished through brochures, notices posted in Employment Service and other service agency offices, public service announcements and word of mouth. Relatively few participants were referred by the substate area.

After intake, all participants were required to complete a three-week, 27-hour workshop which combined basic skills testing with training in stress management, personal finances, job search "world of work," and self-motivation. Participants entered either the microbusiness training or reemployment track upon completion of the workshop. Reemployment participants were originally offered immediate job search and placement assistance, referral for General Educational Development (GED) equivalency degree preparation, and referral for occupational skills training or academic course work leading to a two-year associate's degree. (The reemployment track was dropped in the grant's option year.)

Microbusiness candidates were screened using the Small Business Administration Entrepreneurial Quiz, a family needs assessment, and a personal interview. This track was oriented primarily toward simple enterprises that would help participants become economically self-sufficient with relatively little startup capital. It was a six-week, 72-hour course that provided a basic introduction to marketing, production, business management, and accounting. After completing this training, participants received three additional weeks of individual help in refining their business plans.

In its final year, the program provided supportive service payments for business startup expenses. (Fifty grants were made at an average of about \$1,130 each.)

Informal peer groups, known as ACCESS (“assist, comfort, cultivate, encourage, support and sustain”) were developed, and informal incubators were developed by project participants to share space and facilities.

## **Project Excel**

In New York City’s South Bronx, HACER, Inc. operated Project Excel, a program designed to provide both self-employment and reemployment training to Spanish-speaking dislocated workers.

The project offered an innovative approach to self-employment for disadvantaged clients in a troubled community. It provided fairly short-term training in essentially a single occupation (home-based child care), combined with substantial individual support.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>About six participants received building maintenance training.

Self-employment candidates were trained and certified to provide child care services in their own homes. The reemployment training track was dropped as a medical supplies company, which was the focal point of training and placement activities, lost the contract under which it planned to hire participants. Nevertheless, 118 self-employment participants and 69 reemployment participants received training, resulting in 41 home-based child care businesses and 39 job placements.

HACER received a total of \$935,428 in funding over the course of the demonstration.

The study report provides details of the program, suggesting that on almost any index of social or economic well-being, the South Bronx would rank at or near the bottom. One bright spot was the fact that Port Morris, the central neighborhood of Project Excel was a local employment center, with nearly 400 businesses and over 20,000 workers. Warehousing, shipping, packing, and industrial supply businesses accounted for many of these positions, as did a number of small manufacturers.

The unemployment rate in the South Bronx was as high as 12 percent during the demonstration and this figure did not include a large number of discouraged workers who were no longer in the labor force.

HACER, Inc. was established in 1979 as a nonprofit community-based organization. Many of the project's participants became aware of the program through public service announcements on a local Spanish-language radio station. Local unemployment insurance offices and word of mouth referrals also provided the demonstration with clients.

Excel's assessment procedures consisted of a math test, a vocabulary and reading test, and a test of oral proficiency. The researchers note that Excel targeted

applicants who were in the greatest need of services and that this strategy may have had negative effects on the program's outcomes relative to other demonstration grantees.

After assessment, participants received self-employment or reemployment services, depending on their preference. The project's self-employment track offered only one course, which centered on in-home day care and helped participants gain State certification. One of the reasons that the program targeted family day care was that participants could operate this business without learning English. (This differed significantly from the other demonstration efforts which provided general business tracks for self-employment participants.) The family day care course met twice a week for two hours over a period of 10 weeks. Participants also attended GED and English-as-a-second language courses, depending on their needs and interests. After the course, participants worked with project staff to complete applications for State certification. They also received an in-kind stipend of equipment required for certification (e.g, fire extinguishers and other required equipment).

As originally designed, the project's reemployment track was intended to train and place individuals with a local medical supply firm. Because these jobs never materialized, the customized training component for those in the reemployment track was never implemented. However, basic skills classes, supplemented with job search assistance, which were originally developed for the reemployment track, continued for the life of the program on an open-entry/open-exit basis, while HACER job developers attempted to find alternative employment for these participants.

In the final months of the demonstration, the project began working on a reemployment initiative that would provide jobs for participants in a worker-owned home cleaning business.

## **Project New Ventures**

Project New Ventures was operated by the Greater Atlanta Small Business Project (GRASP), a nonprofit organization founded in 1987 as a joint project of Fulton County and the City of Atlanta. GRASP was established to help expand and stabilize the local economy by fostering small business growth.

The project offered substantially longer training than its counterparts in the demonstration and served dislocated workers along with low-income individuals. Demonstration clients were actually a minority of all participants served by GRASP. Implementation problems faced by the project included staff turnover during the first year of the program and a lack of startup capital for participants.

GRASP received \$607,426 in funding and served 66 clients, 30 of whom started businesses.

Although the project served the entire Atlanta metropolitan area, with a population of 2.7 million, 80 percent of its clients and businesses were located in Fulton county, which includes the city of Atlanta. Primarily a service-oriented city with a relatively healthy economy, Atlanta had been hit by several large-scale layoffs and business closings. Since the end of 1990, the city had lost over 13,000 jobs in large-scale dislocations alone.

GRASP served both existing and startup businesses in several programs, and received funding from a number of local and Federal sources. In addition to Project New Ventures, the organization operated a business development initiative that provided technical assistance and mentoring to new and existing businesses in economically depressed areas, a management assistance program that provided services and training to owners of existing small businesses, a Small Business Administration-funded program that provided marketing assistance to existing

businesses, a demonstration project that provided entrepreneurial training to low-income individuals, and a project that assisted entrepreneurs in two low-income target areas.

Although GRASP had always provided mentoring, technical assistance, and counseling for existing small businesses, classroom training was not originally offered. In 1990, however, the organization developed its own classroom training. Curricula emphasized practical knowledge and trainers with hands-on experience from the business community were recruited. An entirely new curriculum was developed for Project New Ventures to help participants start their businesses.

In addition to serving demonstration participants, Project New Ventures (with some funding from other sources) served a number of clients who were not in the demonstration.

Client recruitment was carried out through print advertisements and public service announcements. Prospective candidates attended an orientation seminar, completed an application, and went through an initial assessment that included personality, vocational interest, and aptitude tests.

GRASP staff found that the best candidates for entrepreneurship had good basic skills, some work or business experience, a strong desire for achievement, good business ideas, and some savings, assets, or other personal financial resources. Staff considered these factors and looked closely at personality and motivation in selecting participants.

The project's business training involved two phases. The first phase consisted of 22 weeks of classroom training, with an additional two weeks of business plan refinement. The training featured four modules—business feasibility, business basics, marketing, and business plan development. Training culminated in the production of a

final business plan. The second phase, business development and startup, followed. Clients worked with a mentor who provided ongoing technical assistance and counseling throughout the business startup phase.

During most of the demonstration, GRASP did not provide startup capital for demonstration-funded programs, although five clients received loans late in the demonstration period.

### **The Center for Practical Solutions**

The Center for Practical Solutions (CPS), based in Hauppauge, Long Island, operated a self-employment program that underwent a series of changes over time. CPS began the demonstration with an ambitious and innovative model for regional revitalization, but ended with a self-employment program quite similar in approach to other demonstration grantees. The project's major service was self-employment training, although a variety of additional services, including business planning, sales training, and goal setting seminars complemented this effort. CPS's major implementation difficulties resulted from an overly ambitious organizational mission, an open admissions policy in the project's first year, and a lack of startup capital.

CPS originally planned to retrain dislocated defense workers as entrepreneurs and cooperated with local industries to develop new products and services. It received \$972,248 in funding and served 148 clients, helping 72 of them to create new businesses.

The organization's service area consisted of Long Island's two suburban counties, Nassau and Suffolk, with a combined total population of 2.6 million. In the early 1990s, defense cutbacks, combined with a lengthy recession, resulted in record job losses for the area.

CPS was founded in 1990 as a nonprofit membership organization to work with dislocated professionals and local business to advance peacetime economic growth on Long Island. In the demonstration's first year, CPS organized its activities within a matrix of business and industry areas. It employed business planners with special expertise in technology, engineering, marketing, public relations, information services, and research. The business planners organized participants into industry area groups, composed of five to 10 participants who were developing businesses in the same technical area (e.g., biotechnology, trade, or information processing).

The organization experienced a number of changes at the beginning of its second year. Industry areas were dropped, the number of staff was reduced, and the initial goal of revitalizing the local economy was scaled back.

A major focus of CPS services in the first year was the development of business ideas among participants. This was abandoned the second year as project staff became more selective in their acceptance of new applicants. Also after the first year, the program broadened its target group from defense professionals to dislocated workers in general.

Recruitment efforts included a mix of press releases, paid advertising, and presentations to professional and business associations.

As originally designed, the CPS self-employment training combined classroom training with an innovative team approach to business development. The team approach was dropped the second year as it distracted participants from business development.

Upon enrollment, clients were guided toward an entrepreneurial skills training class which addressed various components of business plans. Self-employment

participants also received a range of services, including weekly meetings devoted to entrepreneurial concepts, sales, and public speaking, plus occasional seminars on topics such as team-building or goal-setting. During both years of the project, business planners (experienced business people) served as mentors to participants.

## **Service Models and Implementation Issues**

Based on four rounds of site visits conducted between December 1991 and August 1993, the study report highlights issues related to client targeting, project design, service model development, and project implementation which were found throughout the various demonstrations. Key observations which cut across most of the demonstration projects are noted below.

- For the most part, the demonstrations employed two basic service models: training and support for microenterprise development, and occupational or job search training for individuals seeking work in existing businesses.
- All six demonstrations had a self-employment component, which was usually the projects' main emphasis.
- Demonstration grantees were engaged in an appropriate but somewhat narrow set of activities centered on individual training.
- Overall project designs were shaped to some degree by their goals and specific target populations; there were substantial differences in the types of dislocated workers recruited by the various demonstrations.
- All of the demonstration's self-employment programs were variations on a generalized service model (see Chart 16), which began with recruitment, orientation, and general assessment, followed by classroom training in business skills and personal development training. Participants then developed business plans, received technical assistance and support to begin their businesses, and received some type of post-startup assistance.

- Two basic approaches to recruitment were used. Two organizations, which were established substate entities, relied on existing recruitment channels used by the substate area for the general JTPA Title III population. The other projects recruited largely through independent channels such as newspaper advertisements and public service announcements.
- Eligibility determination procedures were difficult for CDCs and other organizations that had no prior EDWAA experience.
- All but one of the demonstrations tested applicants for basic literacy and mathematical skills. Four basic assessment and screening elements were common in all of the programs: (1) a written assessment of business-specific abilities and interest; (2) an interview with experienced program staff; (3) demonstrating commitment and reliability by attending personal development training; and (4) psychological testing.
- All grantees were offered some form of classroom training for self-employment, although courses differed considerably in their length and format, particularly during the demonstration's first year. Several factors related to classroom training were common in each of the grantees—it should be relatively short, provide an adult learning approach, be supplemented with individual business counseling as well as emotional support, allow for differences in the types of business that participants want to start, take in to account various ethnicity and gender issues, and integrate business plans into the curriculum.
- All of the demonstrations' service models included a step in which participants developed business plans; those with integrated classroom training worked best.
- Although all grantees provided individual help during the business startup phase, the intensity and quality of the help differed considerably.
- The lack of access to startup capital was a significant problem in all of the demonstrations and all of the grantees stressed the need for Federal support in this area. (After exhausting several avenues for obtaining microloans and financial support for participants, five of the six grantees eventually obtained Department of Labor approval to provide supportive services payments that

served some of the same functions as working capital grants).

□ Although four of the original grantee proposals highlighted ties with business incubators, the effects of these linkages on demonstration services were indirect, at best. Incubators did not fulfill the roles they are usually expected to play in self-employment programs.

The report also discusses a number of general organizational issues relating to the demonstration projects. These include project staffing, organizational capacity and experience, and project linkages to mainstream EDWAA programs and to unemployment insurance.

The researchers provide examples of implementation problems encountered by the various projects including staff recruitment, management, and matching staff expertise to the needs of participants at different stages of their training. Several basic staffing principles for self-employment components were noted, including: (1) staff responsible for business instruction, individual technical assistance, and the business aspects of assessment should have small- or microbusiness experience; (2) qualified in-house staff or consultants should be used to help participants understand various areas related to finance/accounting, marketing, and law; (3) staff must be accountable to the program in some way, even if they are not employed by it (service designs should be cautious about relying on volunteers); and (4) if warranted by the size of the program, the positions of the director, administrative assistant, and instructor/mentor should be full-time positions.

In the area of organizational capacity and experience, the study report suggests that fundamental changes in programs, as they evolved, may have been reduced if the grantees had greater experience in self-employment training and technical assistance, and stronger organizational linkages to other organizations involved with local community development.

Regarding linkages with mainstream EDWAA programs, the study found that most of the grantees did establish closer ties with EDWAA over the course of the demonstration, especially for referrals into self-employment tracks.

The report also points out that establishing good relations with the unemployment insurance system was an important aspect of the demonstrations for a number of reasons. Although problems with unemployment insurance coordination were not as serious as expected overall, they did call for adaptive responses on the part of some grantees.

Finally, in the area of dissemination activities, the researchers found that all of the grantees took steps to generate local publicity about their activities.

## **Analysis of Participant-Level Data**

Based on data collected through forms completed by program participants, the researchers were able to analyze various participant characteristics (including sex, age, ethnicity, and education), work experience (including occupation and industry at layoff, as well as earnings at layoff, job tenure, and self-employment experience), and receipt of unemployment insurance and other benefits (including the reasons for their eligibility and the time between their layoff and application for benefits). The researchers also used client data to compare participant characteristics with those of mainstream EDWAA clients.

The study report presents outcomes for clients who had enrolled in self-employment components (including business startups and survival rates). Business

characteristics six months after startup are also presented (including types of business started, hours, the amount of participants' financial resources invested in their businesses, sales and earnings, employees and business partners, location, and the types of business organizations formed). The report also includes information about reemployment outcomes for those participants who were enrolled in self-employment tracks but failed to start new businesses.

Selected demographics of self-employment participants are shown in Table 20. Overall, just over half of the participants were male (52.4 percent), and almost 55 percent were 30-44 years old. Forty-five percent were white, while 31.1 percent were black, and 22.8 percent were Hispanic. Just under one third (31.1 percent) had some post-high school education.

**Table 20. Self-Employment Participants: Demographic Characteristics at Time of Application**

Characteristic	MTC	MEGA	FCM	HACER	GRASP	CPS <sup>a</sup>	Overall
Number of Participants	67	104	142	118	66	148	645
Sex (percent)							
Female	25.4	24.0	67.1	100.0	47.7	12.7	47.6
Male	75.6	76.0	32.9	0.0	52.3	87.3	52.4
Age (percent)							
Less than 30	3.0	7.7	17.9	19.1	0.0	0.0	11.5
30-44	53.7	71.2	52.9	44.3	73.2	21.4	54.7
45-54	34.3	16.3	19.3	26.1	19.5	35.7	23.2
55 and older	9.0	4.8	10.0	10.4	7.3	42.9	10.5
Mean (years)	42.5	39.5	38.9	40.1	40.9	52.1	40.7
Race/ethnicity (percent)							
White, not Hispanic	97.0	81.7	26.4	0.0	29.5	84.2	45.0
Black, not Hispanic	3.0	15.4	72.9	5.1	62.3	0.0	31.1
Hispanic	0.0	1.9	0.0	94.9	6.6	7.9	22.8
Asian/Native American	0.0	1.0	0.7	0.0	1.6	7.9	1.1
Highest grade completed (percent)							
Less than high school	3.0	2.9	12.9	51.3	0.0	0.0	13.0
High school diploma or GED	61.2	26.9	46.4	30.8	3.1	6.8	28.5
Post-high school	23.9	57.7	30.0	15.4	28.1	30.6	31.1
College graduate	7.5	11.5	7.9	1.7	32.8	30.6	15.0
Post-college	4.5	1.0	2.9	0.9	35.9	32.0	12.4
Mean (grade)	13	13	13	10	16	16	13

<sup>a</sup>Totals may differ from the *Interim Report* due to the exclusion of early dropouts from these calculations.

Source: *Evaluation of the EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration*.

Overall, 39.2 percent of the participants were employed in professional,

technical, or managerial positions prior to layoff, and the largest percentage (42.6 percent) were in the manufacturing industry at layoff. The mean hourly wage at layoff was \$12.41 and the mean number of years in their prior job was 5.6. Slightly less than 18 percent had been self-employed at some time in their careers.

At the time of program application just under half (49.2 percent) of the self-employment participants were receiving unemployment insurance and the mean number of weeks that participants received unemployment insurance was 15. A significant percentage (43.6 percent) were receiving unemployment insurance because of their recent layoff and the mean time between layoff and application was 54.6 weeks. Just under 10 percent of the self-employment participants were receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children at the time of program application and 15.3 were receiving food stamps.

Demonstration participants differed from mainstream EDWAA clients in several ways. Although overall, the demonstration projects served males and females in proportions that were very similar to the national average for JTPA Title III (EDWAA) programs, demonstration participants were generally older and better educated.

In reviewing the outcomes of the demonstration's self-employment component, the researchers found that even though the actual number of businesses started varied widely across the various projects, about 45 percent of the self-employment participants started businesses. Of these, over two-thirds (76.3 percent) were still in business 12 months after startup.

Almost half of the new businesses started were in the service sector and the mean time spent working on the businesses, across all projects, was 39 hours per week. During the six-month period between startup and followup, participants invested an average of \$8,200 of their own savings in their businesses. Also, on average, participant businesses had attained cumulative gross sales of more than \$15,200 during the six-month followup period (although 24 percent of the participants reported sales of less than \$500 during this period). Overall, 12 percent of the new businesses had paid employees. Although participants typically operated their new businesses from their homes, about one in five had moved to commercial space within six months

after startup. Seventy-three percent of the new businesses were set up as sole proprietorships.

The researchers also looked at the outcomes for participants in the three demonstration sites that offered reemployment tracks (MEGA, FCM, and HACER). The study report notes that by the time of termination, 72 percent of all reemployment participants served under the demonstration had found employment. This rate was identical to the national average for EDWAA participants.

## **Job Creation in Ongoing EDWAA Programs**

The researchers suggest that if any significant expansion of job creation activities for dislocated workers is to occur, it will be in the context of EDWAA or some other ongoing program rather than through separate demonstration efforts. For this reason, they investigated the experience of some State and substate programs involved with self-employment training within mainstream EDWAA operations. The researchers reviewed several EDWAA programs in an attempt to explore the range of service delivery arrangements used for self-employment training and to assess administrative, financial, and other barriers to the wider replication of job creation efforts in the EDWAA system. Information was obtained from 11 substate areas in eight States, supplemented by discussions with State-level officials in five States.<sup>43</sup>

Based on their investigation, the researchers determined that four basic service models had been implemented (or were being considered) by EDWAA substate areas to help dislocated workers who were seeking entrepreneurial training. These are summarized below.

---

<sup>43</sup>Substate area programs were contacted in Arizona, California, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New York, Texas, and Washington; State-level officials were interviewed in Delaware, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Mississippi.

- Model 1: Class-sized subcontracts for microbusiness classroom training, with follow-on support provided by the training contractor, a CDC, an incubator facility, or the local Small Business Development Center.
- Model 2: Self-employment training conducted by substate area staff, with technical assistance provided in-house or by referral to a Small Business Development Center or CDC.
- Model 3: Individual referral contracts with a local CDC or small business incubator for self-employment training and support.
- Model 4: Referrals to the Small Business Development Center, community college courses, or other forms of entrepreneurial training that do not involve enrollment in EDWAA, or further substate area involvement.

The study report provides profiles of several EDWAA-funded microenterprise programs that used a variety of service models.

In summarizing their findings about the ability of mainstream EDWAA programs to provide successful self-employment opportunities, the researchers note that State and substate area staff pointed to the JTPA performance standards and other administrative regulations as barriers to expanding microenterprise training. The study report discusses definitional, reporting, and service design issues arising from the incompatibility of microenterprise initiatives and mainstream EDWAA arrangements. The report also points out that after JTPA performance standards and administrative requirements, lack of access to capital was the barrier most frequently cited by the sample of EDWAA respondents. Several unemployment insurance regulations were also noted that posed obstacles for microenterprise programs that worked with dislocated workers.

## **Conclusions and Policy Recommendations**

The study report offers several conclusions about the effectiveness of microbusiness training based on the demonstrations' experiences, as well as those of

other CDCs and EDWAA programs that were engaged in job creation. These conclusions follow.

- The EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration achieved significant results from self-employment training. However, it was not designed to measure net impacts, and the extent to which outcomes are due to demonstration activities is not known.
- Self-employment training under the demonstration produced total employment rates that matched outcomes from traditional EDWAA retraining services, but initial earnings from self-employment were much lower than average EDWAA wage at termination.
- Microenterprise strategies offer a number of longer-term benefits for individuals and communities if program sponsors are prepared to accept the risks involved.
- Self-employment is a viable strategy only for a small subset of the dislocated worker population. Programs need to develop selection and screening procedures to ensure that participants are highly motivated, aware of the risks and work involved, and are prepared to focus on a specific business idea.
- Training for entrepreneurship is fundamentally different from reemployment training. Its goal is not merely to provide business skills, but to help develop a new and viable organization, a business entity, that will support the participant. This basic difference has a number of implications for program design and service delivery.
- It is vital for self-employment programs targeting dislocated workers to provide access to capital. For many participants, training alone is not sufficient to ensure successful outcomes.
- Establishing good working relations with State and local unemployment insurance offices is particularly important for self-employment programs targeting dislocated workers. Programs that fail to reach a firm understanding with unemployment insurance about allowable activities risk the loss of benefits for their participants.

- Although the Job Creation demonstration projects were not subject to EDWAA performance standards, these and certain other administrative requirements have posed serious obstacles for mainstream EDWAA programs seeking to become involved in microbusiness training.
- If the Department of Labor wishes to expand the scope of self-employment training for dislocated workers, initiatives that could be pursued include: (1) providing training and technical guidance for substate areas interested in offering microenterprise training; (2) providing incentives for substate areas to expand local linkages with CDCs and similar organizations that are experienced in microbusiness and other forms of job creation; and (3) supporting the expansion of microlending opportunities for dislocated workers.

## **HELPING DISLOCATED WORKERS THROUGH EARLY INTERVENTION**

### **Overview**

Throughout its history, the Unemployment Insurance program has provided temporary financial assistance for millions of workers whose job loss was primarily caused by variations in the business cycle. In the past, most unemployed workers received UI payments while they looked for a job which was generally similar to the one lost.

Recently, however, global competition and rapidly evolving technologies have resulted in job losses for millions of American workers. A large percentage of these “dislocated” workers must find new jobs that require different skills than those needed for their previous job. As a result, these workers may need additional education, training, and other reemployment assistance.

The vast majority of dislocated workers are already served by the UI program. While most of these workers need the temporary income provided by UI benefits, they may also need reemployment services to help them make the transition from their

previous jobs to new ones. Further compounding their problem is the fact that dislocated workers often delay their job search—believing that they will eventually return to their old jobs.

## **The Worker-Profiling and Reemployment Services System**

The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System (WP/RS) is an early intervention approach that helps dislocated workers speed their return to productive employment. It consists of two components: (1) a set of criteria—a “profile”—that can be used to identify UI claimants who are likely to exhaust their UI benefits before they find a new job; and (2) various reemployment services. Profiling selects those UI claimants who are likely to be dislocated workers out of the broad population of UI claimants and refers them to reemployment services early in their unemployment spell. Over the next several years, profiling may be used to select about two million dislocated workers from the eight to nine million UI initial claimants.

Under the WP/RS system, individuals identified as probable dislocated workers receive a set of reemployment services which are customized to their individual needs. Followup information on referred claimants is collected from organizations providing such services and then forwarded to the UI program.

In 1994, the Office of Legislation and Actuarial Services of the Department of Labor’s Unemployment Insurance Service published a report<sup>44</sup> that contains Federal legislative language on profiling.<sup>45</sup> It also contains a variety of public releases by the

---

<sup>44</sup>*The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System: Legislation, Implementation Process and Research Findings* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service, 1994).

<sup>45</sup>The language is found in Public Law 103-6, Section 4, “Profiling of New Claimants” and Public Law 103-152, Section 4, “Worker Profiling.”

Department of Labor which help States interpret profiling-related legislation.<sup>46</sup>

The report also includes material to support and provide technical assistance to States in implementing profiling legislation.<sup>47</sup>

Information about profiling mechanisms is also included in the publication,<sup>48</sup> along with research on profiling and reemployment services.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup>The following releases are included: (1) Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 13-94, which includes a copy of Public Law 103-152-Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993-"Provisions Affecting the Federal-State Unemployment Compensation Program"; (2) Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 13-94, Change 1, which provides draft language "Failure to Participate in Reemployment Services"; and (3) Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 41-94, "Unemployment Insurance Program Requirements for the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System."

<sup>47</sup> This material includes (1) Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 45-93, "Profiling of Unemployment Insurance Claimants"; (2) Field Memorandum No. 35-94, "Implementation of a System of Profiling Unemployment Insurance Claimants and Providing Them with Reemployment Services"; (3) Field Memorandum No. 35-94, Change 1, "Supplement No. 1-Questions and Answers Supplementing Field Memorandum No. 35-94, Implementation of a System of Profiling Unemployment Insurance Claimants and Providing Reemployment Services"; and (4) Field Memorandum No. 35-94 Change 2, "Supplement No. 2-Questions and Answers Supplementing Field Memorandum No. 35-94, Implementation of a System of Profiling Unemployment Insurance Claimants and Providing Reemployment Services."

<sup>48</sup>This includes: (1) UIS Information Bulletin No. 4-94, "Profiling Modeling Paper-Profiling Dislocated Workers for Early Referral to Reemployment Services"; (2) UIS Information Bulletin No. 11-94 "The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Assistance System: Identification Methods, Test State Analyses and Provision of Technical Assistance"; and (3) UIS Information Bulletin No. 15-94, "Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Test State: Development of the Maryland Model."

<sup>49</sup> The report contains a copy of UIS Information Bulletin 12-94, "Department of Labor Report, Reemployment Services: A

## How the Worker-Profiling and Reemployment Services System Works

Chart 17 shows how the Department of Labor envisions the operation of the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Systems model. Essentially, it will operate as follows:

- An individual files a new claim for unemployment benefits at a UI local office or through rapid response efforts. Data elements needed for profiling are collected from claimants through the initial claim and/or work registration process and entered into a computer database that will be used to profile claimants. Labor market information data (e.g., employment change by industry) necessary for profiling are also entered in the database.
- The first UI payment triggers the profile. First, claimants who are on recall or are covered by a union hiring hall agreement are excluded. Then the remaining claimants are assigned a probability of long-term unemployment through a statistical model.
- A list of claimants who are potentially eligible for referral to service providers is then created by the State's computer system at a local office level. Claimants are ranked, highest to lowest, in order of their probability of exhausting benefits.
- The UI agency and service provider jointly determine the number of profiled UI claimants to be selected and referred. This referral agreement involves a coordinated and ongoing interaction between UI and the service provider to match the local supply of reemployment services with the local demand for services by referred UI claimants. This referral agreement establishes the number of claimants that should be referred and who can be provided the reemployment services.

---

Review of Their Effectiveness.”

- The UI agency notifies selected claimants that they have been identified as likely dislocated workers and will be referred to reemployment services, why the reemployment services are being offered, and when and where to report. Referred claimants will also be informed that continuing eligibility for unemployment benefits is contingent upon their participation in reemployment services.
- Based on notification by the UI agency, selected claimants report to the designated service provider. Also, the service provider receives notification by the UI agency that the claimant has been referred.
- The service provider conducts an orientation for referred claimants and notifies the UI agency that the claimant was or was not present, and whether the claimant was appropriately referred.
- The service provider conducts an assessment and, in consultation with the claimant, develops an individual service plan. The plan is a compact between the claimant and the service provider that specifies a customized set of reemployment services for which participation is required.
- The claimant participates in reemployment services based upon the service plan and continues to submit weekly certifications to UI attesting to her/his continued participation for receipt of benefits.
- The service provider notifies the UI agency upon claimant completion or termination of participation in reemployment services based upon the service plan.
- Upon completion or termination of a service plan for any circumstances, the service provider furnishes the UI agency with the service plan record, which contains followup information relating to the services received.

In addition to providing technical material associated with profiling, the report briefly reviews the findings of recent research efforts related to profiling; describes legislation to implement worker profiling; discusses the purpose of worker profiling and how it works; describes various reemployment services; and provides technical assistance on the development of a profiling model based on national data and State-

specific profiling and reemployment systems.

## Research Results

The authors point out that results from the New Jersey UI Reemployment Demonstration Project<sup>50</sup> indicate that the combination of early intervention of dislocated workers plus intensive job search assistance can be effective in speeding the reemployment of dislocated workers *if they are required to participate in such an effort*. Research further indicates that this combination of early intervention and job search assistance resulted in a substantial cost savings to the Federal Government (when compared to a control group of UI claimants).<sup>51</sup>

The report provides highlights of a number of other evaluations related to worker profiling and suggests that several job search experiments have demonstrated that:

- Additional job finding services can reduce UI receipt and unemployment in a cost effective way.
- Nearly all of the combinations tried by five experiments reduced UI receipt.
- More intensive treatments tended to have greater effects.
- Nearly all of the treatments had benefits that exceeded the costs to the UI system.
- Some type of job search assistance should be made available to all UI claimants.

---

<sup>50</sup>See Walter Corson and Joshua Haimson, *The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project: Six-Year Followup and Summary Report* (Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1994) which is summarized in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

<sup>51</sup>The results of this research were summarized in a paper written by staff of the Department of Labor's Office of the Chief Economist, released as UIS Information Bulletin 12-94. This paper is included in its entirety in the report.

- Policymakers might want to consider tying eligibility for additional UI benefits to participation in some activity such as a job club or other program that accelerates job search.
- Evaluations of earlier demonstration projects for displaced workers in specific sites provide a basis for optimism about the effectiveness of job search assistance.

## **Legislation**

The report describes two pieces of legislation enacted to implement worker profiling. The first, Public Law 103-6, Section 4, "Profiling of New Claimants," called for the Secretary of Labor to establish a worker profiling program. State participation was voluntary. The FY 1994 Federal budget included \$9 million to establish such a program and another \$9 million was requested for FY 1995.

Public Law 103-6 was later superseded by Section 4, "Worker Profiling," of Public Law 103-152 which amended the Social Security Act by adding a new subsection that required the State Agency charged with administering State unemployment compensation laws to establish and use a system of profiling all new UI claimants for regular compensation.

Section 303 (j) (1) of the Social Security Act defines the worker profiling system. The Act states that the system:

- (A) Identifies which claimants are likely to exhaust regular compensation and will need job search assistance services to make a successful transition to new employment;
- (B) Refers such claimants to reemployment services, such as job search assistance services available under any State or Federal law;
- (C) Collects followup information relating to the services received by such claimants and the employment outcomes of such claimants subsequent to receiving such services and uses this information in making identifications

pursuant to (A) above; and

(D) Meets such other requirements as the Secretary of Labor determines are appropriate.

Public Law 103-152 also added Section 303 (a) (10) to the Social Security Act. It requires that UI claimants who are referred to reemployment services participate in those services or similar services as a condition of eligibility for UI benefits unless the claimant has already completed the services or has a justifiable cause for not participating.

The report includes the text of several documents that help define “justifiable cause” and further describe UI program requirements under the profiling amendments to Section 303 of the Social Security Act.

## **Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System**

Based on Public Law 103-152, the Department issued a Field Memorandum (FM 35-94) which discusses the purpose of WP/RS and how the profiling mechanism works. It also includes recommendations by the Department for providing reemployment services, particularly job search assistance. The report briefly reviews the contents of the memorandum.<sup>52</sup>

## **Technical Assistance**

The report also describes how the Department fulfilled its role for providing technical assistance to the States under the authorizing legislation for worker profiling. This was accomplished by developing a model based on national data. The author describes this model, noting that it uses a two-step approach. The first step consists of

---

<sup>52</sup>This Field Memorandum and two subsequent supplements are included in their entirety in the report.

“characteristic screens” which exclude UI claimants who are not permanently separated. The second step is an assessment of the likelihood of benefit exhaustion of the remaining workers, based on a statistical model that combines several of their characteristics.

The model produces a list of individuals ranked from highest to lowest based on their probability of exhausting UI benefits. Claimants on this list can be referred to reemployment services, beginning with those who have the highest probability of benefit exhaustion and working down the list until resources available for services have been exhausted. (The author points out that the model is subject to modification by individual States to meet their particular needs.)

Also in the area of technical assistance, the report describes the three phases of technical assistance provided to States. First, the Department worked with the State of Maryland to develop a State-specific profiling mechanism.<sup>53</sup> The model developed in Maryland confirmed the appropriateness of the approach taken in the national model.

The second phase consisted of implementing WP/RS in five prototype States—Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Oregon. The Department helped these States make their profiling systems more efficient and productive by providing labor market information needed for worker profiling from its Bureau of Labor Statistics. These prototype States will also produce alternative approaches that can be used by the remaining States when they implement their WP/RS in the third phase of implementation.

---

<sup>53</sup>The results of the Maryland initiative are summarized in UIS Information Bulletins 11-94 and 15-94; both of these documents are included in the report.

# ACCELERATING DISLOCATED WORKERS' RETURN TO EMPLOYMENT

## Overview

The Unemployment Insurance system has historically promoted reemployment for workers who involuntarily lose their jobs by requiring them to look for work and referring them to local Job Service offices for job placement assistance, counseling, and other services.

Innovations such as the UI self-employment demonstration project, which is described in this chapter, also speed up reemployment by helping unemployment insurance recipients start their own businesses.<sup>54</sup>

Another important reemployment effort, which began operating in 1986, was the New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project. It was designed to test whether the UI system could be used to identify displaced workers early in their unemployment spells and provide them with alternative, early intervention services to help them quickly return to work.

An initial evaluation of the demonstration and a first followup evaluation were conducted which provided insight into various aspects of the project.<sup>55</sup> A second

---

<sup>54</sup>See Jacob M. Benus, et al., *Self-Employment Programs: A New Reemployment Strategy, Final Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration* (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994). This report is discussed in detail in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

<sup>55</sup>For preliminary findings based on a review of the New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project, see Patricia Anderson, Walter Corson, and Paul Decker, *The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project*:

followup study<sup>56</sup> which extended the analysis of the demonstration for about six years after initial UI claims were filed, revealed that the project succeeded in targeting claimants who, in the absence of the demonstration, would have experienced more severe long-run reemployment difficulties. In addition, the job search assistance, training, and reemployment bonuses provided to the demonstration's participants (described in detail below) probably contributed to the project's positive longer-term impacts, and they generally generated jobs that were more stable than those found by control group members.

The positive results of the New Jersey Demonstration resulted in the enactment of national legislation requiring States to establish Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services systems.

The first part of the study report provides background information about the New Jersey demonstration, describes its impacts on UI receipt and earnings, includes information about the demonstration's targeting strategies, and offers a cost-benefit analysis. The report's second part provides a summary of the New Jersey project and

---

*Followup Report*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 91-1 (Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1990). This report was summarized in the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* which covered the period July 1990-September 1991. For additional study findings related to the New Jersey project, see Walter Corson et al., *The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Project*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 89-3 (Princeton, N.J.: New Jersey Department of Labor and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1989). This report was summarized in the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* which covered the period July 1988-September 1990.

<sup>56</sup>Walter Corson and Joshua Haimson, *The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project: Six-Year Followup and Summary Report* (Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1994).

presents several policy considerations.

## **The New Jersey UI Reemployment Demonstration Project**

The demonstration was initiated by the U.S. Department of Labor through a cooperative agreement with the New Jersey Department of Labor and began operating in July 1986. It was implemented in 10 randomly chosen sites in New Jersey<sup>57</sup>. The project's three objectives were to:

- Examine the extent to which UI claimants who might benefit from reemployment services could be identified early in their unemployment spells;
- Assess the policies and adjustment strategies that could help such workers become reemployed; and
- Examine how such a reemployment program should be implemented—particularly the importance of establishing operational linkages between the UI, ES, and JTPA programs.

Demonstration-eligible individuals were identified in the week after their first UI payment and randomly assigned to either one of three treatment groups which were provided alternative packages of reemployment services, or to a control group which received only existing UI services.

Since a major objective of the demonstration was to provide reemployment services to workers who were likely to face *prolonged* spells of unemployment, the project incorporated a few sample “screens” to identify experienced workers who were likely to be displaced permanently from their jobs. The following eligibility screens were

---

<sup>57</sup> The sites corresponded to State UI offices.

chosen for the demonstration:

- *First Payment.* Claimants who did not receive a first UI payment were excluded. Claimants who did not receive a first UI payment within five weeks after their initial claim were also excluded. In addition, individuals who were working and, consequently, who received a partial first payment were also excluded (because their job attachment meant that they had not necessarily been displaced). Individuals applying for special claims (e.g., unemployment compensation for ex-servicemembers or Federal civilian employees, interstate claims, and combined wage claims) were also excluded.
- *Age.* Workers under the age of 25 were excluded from the demonstration in order to eliminate the broad category of young workers who have traditionally shown limited attachment to the labor market and whose employment problems might be quite different from those of older, more experienced workers.
- *Tenure.* Claimants were required to have worked for their last employer for at least three years prior to applying for UI benefits and could not have worked full time for any other employer during the three-year period. This was required in order for participants to exhibit a substantial attachment to a job.
- *Temporary Layoffs.* Because the demonstration's treatments were not intended for workers who were temporarily laid off, individuals who both expected to be recalled and who had a specific recall date were excluded.
- *Union Hiring-Halls.* Individuals who were typically hired through union hiring halls were also excluded from the demonstration because they typically exhibit a unique attachment to a specific labor market.

Three treatment packages for enhancing employment were provided for treatment group participants: (1) job search assistance only; (2) job search assistance plus training or relocation assistance; and (3) job search assistance plus a reemployment bonus.

By the end of sample selection in June 1987, a total of 8,675 UI claimants were

offered one of the three packages and 2,385 claimants who were receiving existing UI services were used as a control group for future comparisons. Services continued into the fall of 1987 to ensure that all eligible individuals could receive the full set of demonstration services.

The initial components of all three treatments (job search assistance services) were the same: notification, orientation, testing, a job-search workshop, and an assessment/counseling interview. These services were delivered sequentially, early in the claimants' unemployment spells. Beginning with the assessment/counseling interview, the nature of the three treatments differed. These are described in more detail below.

### **The “Job Search Assistance Only” Group**

In this group, claimants were told that as long as they continued to collect UI they were expected to maintain periodic contact with the demonstration office, either directly with staff to discuss their job-search activities or by engaging in job search-related activities at a resource center in the office. The resource center offered job-search materials and equipment, such as job listings, telephones, and occupational and training literature. Claimants were encouraged to use the center and were told that, if they did not come to the office periodically, Employment Service (ES) staff would contact them and ask them to do so. These periodic followup contacts were to occur at two, four, eight, 12, and 16 weeks following the assessment interview.

### **The “Job Search Assistance Plus Training or Relocation” Group**

UI claimants in this group were also informed about the resource center and their obligation to maintain contact during their job search. They were also told about the availability of classroom and on-the-job training and were encouraged to pursue training if interested. Staff from the local Job Training Partnership Act Service Delivery Area program operator worked directly with these claimants to develop the training options. These claimants were also told about the availability of relocation assistance, which could be used for out-of-area job search and moving expenses by those who elected not to pursue training.

### **The “Job Search Assistance Plus Reemployment Bonus” Group**

Claimants in this treatment group were offered the same set of job search assistance services as the first treatment group as well as a bonus for rapid reemployment. The maximum reemployment bonus equaled one-half of the claimant’s remaining UI entitlement at the time of the assessment interview. This amount was available if the claimant started working either during the assessment week or within the next two weeks. The potential bonus declined at a rate of 10 percent of the original amount per week, until it was no longer available.<sup>58</sup> Claimants who received a bonus received 60 percent of the bonus if they remained employed for four weeks, and the remainder if they remained employed for 12 weeks.

### **Summary of the Initial and First Followup Evaluation Findings**

---

<sup>58</sup>Claimants recalled by their former employer could not receive a bonus. Neither could those who were employed by a relative or in temporary, seasonal, or part-time jobs.

The initial evaluation of the New Jersey project revealed that the eligibility screens directed services to about one-quarter of the UI claimant population. The most important screen was the tenure requirement, which excluded individuals who had not worked for their pre-UI employer for at least three years. The net result of applying the eligibility screens was an eligible population that contained a substantial proportion of older individuals, clients whose prior job was in a declining industry, and individuals with other characteristics usually associated with the displaced worker population and with difficulties in becoming reemployed.

The initial evaluation also revealed that, compared with a sample of individuals who were not eligible for the demonstration, the eligible population experienced considerably longer periods of UI collection and longer unemployment spells, on average. Thus, the eligibility screens appeared to have directed the demonstration's services toward a population that generally faced reemployment difficulties during the year after their initial layoff.

The researchers also found that the project achieved its objectives of increasing the level of reemployment services to eligible UI claimants and of providing these services early in the unemployment spell. Three-quarters of the treatment group claimants attended the initial orientation, and three-quarters of this group continued through the initial set of job-search services to the assessment/counseling interview. The level at which demonstration-eligible claimants received these services was substantially higher than the level at which individuals in the control group received them through existing service delivery arrangements.

Other key findings of the initial and first followup evaluation studies included:

- Early intervention services are effective.
- Programs that provide services for these individuals should be linked.
- The demonstration succeeded in maintaining ongoing contact with treatment group members after they received initial services.

- The rate of training receipt for members of the second treatment group (“job search assistance plus training or relocation” group) was also higher than rates for comparable groups of claimants whose exposure to training opportunities came through the regular JTPA service environment in New Jersey.
- Estimates of the impacts of the treatments on UI receipt showed that all three treatments reduced the amount of benefits collected over the initial benefit year; by .47 weeks per claimant for the “job search assistance only” group, .48 weeks for the “job search assistance plus training or relocation” group, and .97 weeks for the “job search assistance plus reemployment bonus” group. Estimates from the first followup study also showed further reductions in UI receipt in the second year after layoff.
- There was evidence that all three treatments increased employment and earnings in the year following the initial UI claim, although not in subsequent years.
- Comparisons of the earnings impacts for the “job search assistance plus training or relocation treatment” with those for the “job search assistance only” treatment suggest that the training component had no additional impact.
- Both classroom (occupational skills) and on-the-job training enhanced trainees’ earnings.
- The early benefit-cost analysis indicated that, relative to existing services, all three treatments offered net benefits to claimants and to society as a whole. The “job search assistance only” treatment and the “job search assistance plus reemployment bonus” treatment also led to net gains for the government as a whole and for the agencies involved in the demonstration.
- The “job search assistance plus training or relocation” treatment was relatively expensive for the government.

## **Findings from the Second Followup Study**

Because the impacts of the training provided by the project were expected to occur over a relatively long period of time, a second followup evaluation was performed to extend the analysis of the demonstration's impacts on its participants by about six years.<sup>59</sup> The study report describes the data that were analyzed for the second followup study. Following are highlights of the most recent study's findings based on: (1) the demonstration's impact on UI receipt and employment and earnings; (2) the impacts of its training; (3) the targeting of its services; and (4) the project's costs versus its benefits.

### **Impact on UI Receipt and Employment and Earnings**

Regarding the project's impact on UI receipt and employment/earnings, the researchers found that:

- Overall, the project reduced the amount of UI benefits received, both in the initial benefit year and in subsequent years.
- Compared to a control group, the demonstration's treatments reduced UI benefit receipt by about three-quarters of a week for the "job search assistance only" treatment, by one and a half weeks for the "job search assistance plus training or relocation assistance" treatment, and by nearly two weeks for the "job search assistance plus reemployment bonus" treatment. These findings suggest that each of the treatments probably contributed to the longer-term impacts and that the treatments, in general, generated jobs that were more stable than those

---

<sup>59</sup>Compared with the approximately three-year period covered by the first followup evaluations.

found by control group members.<sup>60</sup>

□ The “job search assistance plus reemployment bonus” treatment increased earnings initially, although none of the treatments had statistically significant longer-run impacts on the probability of working, the amount of earnings, or weeks worked. Since the variation in earnings among claimants was quite large, however, modest earnings impacts consistent with the UI impact estimates could still have occurred.

□ An examination of earnings for employed control group members showed that nominal annual earnings remained below base-period levels until the fourth year after the initial UI claim. Even by the sixth year, earnings for employed individuals had not kept pace with inflation. These findings suggest that, on average, claimants were unable to obtain reemployment in jobs with the same earnings potential as that of their pre-UI jobs.

## Impacts of Training

Regarding the impacts of training, the researchers found that:

□ The second followup study revealed that, although participation in training was expected to increase the long-run earnings of trainees, comparisons of the earnings impacts of the “job search assistance plus training or relocation” treatment group with those of the “job search assistance only” group suggest that the training component had no additional impact.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup>This finding differs from the first followup study’s conclusion which attributed longer-run impacts solely to the “job search assistance” component of the treatments.

<sup>61</sup>However, only a relatively small number of claimants participated in training, so the impacts of training would need to be quite large to be detected. Thus, the researchers examined the earnings experiences of trainees directly to determine

## Targeting of Services

Highlights of the findings related to targeting of services are shown below.

- The demonstration's eligibility screens succeeded in identifying a group of UI claimants who experienced relatively greater reemployment problems in the short term—as reflected by the number of weeks of employment and UI receipt in the first year of followup.
- During the full six years of followup, the group targeted by the demonstration continued to experience large reductions in earnings relative to their base-year earnings. These earnings reductions were considerably larger than those realized by noneligibles.
- Based in part on the demonstration's design and initial findings, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993 mandated that States identify workers likely to exhaust their UI benefits (through a “worker profiling” process) and refer them to reemployment services.

This initiative is called “Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services.”<sup>62</sup> The researchers found that the group targeted by profiling experienced somewhat greater reemployment problems than did the New Jersey project eligibles, as reflected in both

---

whether their pattern of earnings suggested that training may have had an impact not detected in the treatment group comparison. *This analysis suggested that both classroom (occupational skills) and on-the-job training did enhance trainees' earnings.*

<sup>62</sup>See the report entitled, *The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System: Legislation, Implementation Process and Research Findings* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service, 1994) which is summarized in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

groups' employment and UI receipt. These differences were apparent not only in the year following their initial claims but also during the full six years of followup.

Upon examining differences in impacts of the New Jersey demonstration's treatments among workers targeted or not targeted by profiling, the researchers found some evidence that treatment impacts were greater for the targeted group, particularly UI impacts. This suggests that the reemployment services offered in New Jersey, which emphasized job search assistance, may have a greater effect on UI receipt when offered to the high probability of exhaustion, harder-to-serve group identified through worker profiling.

### **Benefit-Cost Analysis**

The results of a benefit-cost analysis suggest that all three treatments offered net benefits to claimants and to society as a whole relative to existing services. The "job search assistance only" treatment and the "job search assistance plus reemployment bonus" treatment also led to net gains for the government as a whole and for the Department. The researchers also found that the "job search plus training or relocation" treatment was expensive for the government.

The authors note that these findings suggest that it may be possible to fund the "job search assistance only" and the "job search assistance plus reemployment bonus" treatments from the savings in UI benefits and increased UI tax collections.

The researchers estimate that the "job search assistance only" treatment would pay for itself from the perspective of the Department, while the "job search assistance plus reemployment bonus" treatment would lead to modest net benefits for the Department. On the other hand, the "job search assistance plus training or relocation" treatment could not be funded solely from the savings in UI benefits and increased UI

tax collections. Rather, it would require either a reduction in funding for other programs, or an increase in taxes because it appears to create net costs to the government as a whole.

## **Policy Analysis and Considerations**

The second section of the report, which summarizes the New Jersey demonstration, also includes several policy considerations that relate to the demonstration's various treatments, targeting of services, participation requirements, interagency coordination, and selection of services. Highlights of these considerations are presented below.

- Overall, the evaluation's generally positive findings suggest that the demonstration's treatments represent potentially useful reemployment policies that can be directed toward UI claimants. In short, early intervention services are effective.
- Generally, the objective of targeting services toward displaced workers who would experience reemployment difficulties was achieved.
- The demonstration's treatments were most successful at promoting reemployment for individuals facing hard-core, structural unemployment problems (including individuals with the highest likelihood of UI benefit exhaustion).
- Longer-term, more intensive services are probably needed for some portion of those displaced workers who face major structural dislocations.
- Evidence suggests that UI and ES staff successfully implemented the requirement that claimants report for initial job-search assistance services.
- Linkages among the UI, ES, and JTPA systems appeared to have been strengthened in the demonstration. This was an important element in the success of the demonstration.

- Each treatment component appeared to contribute to impacts on UI receipt and earnings, although the benefit-cost analysis provided the strongest support for the “job search assistance only” treatment.
- A reemployment bonus offer did not appear to improve labor market outcomes sufficiently to make the *combination* of mandatory job search assistance plus the bonus offer a more successful treatment than mandatory job search assistance alone.
- Because the cost of training was high (even though a small percentage of individuals received training), adding the training or relocation assistance offer to the basic “job search assistance” services raised costs to the government without generating sufficient UI savings or taxes to offset these costs.<sup>63</sup>

### III. BUILDING TOMORROW’S WORKFORCE

If the nation’s economic growth is to continue into the next century, it is important that businesses and educators work together to identify the skills necessary to succeed in various occupational fields and to ensure that young people are equipped with the skills needed to succeed in tomorrow’s workplace. Three studies are summarized in this section.

The first study focuses on the need to enhance work experience for young people in the “secondary” labor market. During 1993, more than three million 16- to 19-year-olds worked part-time, and almost two million more worked full-time in secondary labor markets. About 70 percent of 16-to-19-year-olds work in secondary labor market occupations related to sales, clerical work, labor, and services. It is perhaps the major

---

<sup>63</sup>However, the researchers point out that this finding should not be viewed as indicating that training should not be offered. Training, although expensive to the government, may be the only option to improve the *earnings* of individuals without marketable skills.

employer of young, minority, inner-city workers. The researchers found that secondary labor market jobs might be used to further youth development and their eventual transition into the primary labor market by providing adult interest and support, offering the opportunity to show and take initiative on the job, reinforce academic skills (including the opportunity to use them in the context of the job), and recognize and provide feedback on the youth's performance. They also could be used to support transitions to stable long-term employment.

The second study summarized in this section discusses the concept of identifying and standardizing the skills required to succeed in various jobs. These "skill standards" may be useful in better preparing students for future employment in tomorrow's more demanding workplaces.

The final study summary provides information obtained from an evaluation of school-to-work demonstration projects which were initiated in September 1990. Fifteen grantees designed and implemented school-to-work/youth apprenticeship demonstrations in 22 locations. The researchers found that employer involvement is often the key to successful programs.

## **SKILL STANDARDS IN THE SECONDARY LABOR MARKET**

### **Overview**

In recent years, the Department of Labor has supported a number of initiatives designed to provide young people with the skills they need to become productive members of an increasingly demanding labor market. The School To Work Opportunities Act,<sup>64</sup> for example, attempts to address this need by supporting and

---

<sup>64</sup>The School-To-Work Opportunities Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-239), was signed into law on May 4, 1994 and is jointly administered by the U.S. Departments of Labor and Education. It was designed to help States and localities design and implement effective School-To-Work systems or expand existing programs. The Act established specific components and goals of School-To-Work programs throughout the Nation. This included a work-based learning component that outlined skills to be mastered, paid

promoting the development of a national system that connects school-based and work-based learning in order to help the Nation's youth make the transition from education to employment. Encouraged by the Act and other Federal, State, and local initiatives, youth apprenticeship, tech prep, cooperative education, and career academy programs have increased significantly over the past several years.

Several of these new efforts, however, may be limited in their ability to reach young people who need the most assistance in securing stable employment. Many of them favor academically oriented students and some fail to fully engage youth who have dropped out of school or who are still enrolled but have little interest in the world of work. Furthermore, some programs, even if implemented widely, are unlikely to be available to large numbers of young people who move directly from high school to the workplace.

One way to overcome these limitations is to design initiatives that stress the involvement of employers in better preparing young workers to meet the demands of today's labor market.

---

work experience, workplace mentoring, general workplace competencies, and instruction in industry elements. Also included was a school-based learning component covering career exploration and counseling, high academic standards, a skill certificate, and student evaluation methods. A "connecting activities" component was also included which outlined certain requirements for matching students with employers; providing technical assistance for employers; providing training for teachers, mentors, and counselors; helping students find jobs or continue their education; establishing linkages with employer strategies for skills upgrading; and providing postprogram information. The Act provided development grants for all States to plan and create comprehensive statewide systems and provided five-year implementation grants to States that had completed the development process and are ready to begin operating School-To-Work systems. It also provided waivers of certain statutory and regulatory program requirements to allow other Federal funds to be coordinated with School-To-Work programs. Direct implementation grants to localities that were ready to implement School-To-Work systems, but that were in States that had not yet received implementation grants were also made available. The Act also provided grants directly to high-poverty areas.

Entry-level jobs in the “secondary” labor market<sup>65</sup> are the largest and most important vehicle through which many young people gain both income and initial work experience.<sup>66</sup> The features of most secondary labor market jobs raise concerns about their potential as productive learning experiences. For the most part, these jobs offer low wages and limited raises. Many provide little or no formal skill training, and opportunities for advancement are infrequent. Also, because profit margins are greatly affected by labor costs, employers in the secondary labor market are often hesitant to experiment with new training techniques.

As currently configured, many of these jobs fall short of meeting the economic, developmental, and educational needs of young people. They may also fall short of meeting the needs of *primary* labor market employers, who are finding an increasing need for higher and more varied skills in their employees.

While the school-to-work initiatives mentioned above are generally successful in linking schools with the workplace, the Department has an interest in exploring the developmental potential of the workplace itself, especially in the areas of defining and

---

<sup>65</sup>The secondary labor market is a widely used but loosely defined term that encompasses the entry-level stratum of the labor market. Jobs within the secondary labor market are often part-time and pay the minimum wage. They are further characterized by high turnover, limited training needs, low skill requirements, and generally require routine tasks to be performed. They are generally concentrated in the retail, clerical, and hospitality sectors, especially restaurant, supermarket, and fast-food chains.

<sup>66</sup>For more information about the secondary labor market and/or “dual economy,” see Stephen F. Hamilton, *Apprenticeship for Adulthood: Preparing Youth for the Future* (New York, N.Y.: The Free Press, 1990). See also Charles Brown, “Dead-End Jobs and Youth Unemployment,” in Richard B. Freeman and David A. Wise (eds.), *The Youth Labor Market Problem: Its Nature, Causes, and Consequences* (Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1982); David R. Howell, *Employment Restructuring in the 1990s: Implications for Low Skilled Youth in NYC* (New York, N.Y., discussion paper prepared for “Youth in the Future New York City Workforce” conference held at the New School for Social Research, 1993); and Toby L. Parcel and Charles W. Mueller, *Ascription and Labor Markets: Race and Sex Differences in Earnings* (New York, N.Y.: Academic Press, 1983).

building on the skills and competencies that private employers view as critical. This interest raises several policy concerns, specifically:

- The ability of public policy to devise effective strategies that seek to capitalize on the educational and developmental potential of private-sector, entry-level jobs;
- The feasibility of using the secondary labor market in a formal way to promote skill development in youth.
- The ability of youth to develop useful and transferable skills in these jobs; and
- The feasibility of assessing, documenting, and certifying these skills.

In an attempt to better understand these issues, the Department sponsored a year-long study<sup>67</sup> which was carried out as the third phase of research under the Youth Research and Technical Assistance Project (YRTAP). The study was aimed at analyzing how skill standards and the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills<sup>68</sup> (SCANS) framework in particular fit with emerging efforts to enhance the career development and trajectory of young workers who find naturally occurring work experiences in the secondary labor market.

The study report compiled and synthesized information that addressed the following issues: (1) recent policies regarding youth and work which culminated in the School to Work Opportunities Act of 1993; (2) the current configuration of school-to-work programming and skill standards initiatives; and (3) the nature of the secondary labor market (the jobs that youth hold in it and the potential of using that context for skill development).

---

<sup>67</sup>Keith MacAllum and Patricia Ma, *Skills, Standards and Entry-Level Work* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Public/Private Ventures, 1995).

<sup>68</sup>A history of the SCANS Commission can be found in *SCANS: Roadmap to the Future*, a report based on a series of articles written by Dale Hudelson that appeared in *Vocational Education Weekly* over a three-year period from 1990-1992, published by the American Vocational Association. With the issuance of its final reports in 1993, the SCANS Commission dissolved.

The report provides an overview of recent public policies concerning youth and work; reviews school-to-work strategies; describes the skill standards movement; discusses the rationale, challenges, and opportunities for using the secondary labor market as a context for youth development and a stepping stone for career development; provides a vision of what an ideal work experience in the secondary labor market might look like; examines the “high-performance workplace” concept and its implications for entry-level workers in the secondary labor market; and offers specific recommendations for initiatives aimed at improving school-to-work programming through enrichment of youth’s naturally occurring work experiences.

It concludes with a number of recommendations and suggested initiatives. An appendix presents the framework for a proposed secondary labor market demonstration and analyzes its strengths and weaknesses, and provides supplemental information about the work of the SCANS Commission.

## **School-To-Work Policy and Current Initiatives**

The report provides a brief discussion of the history and assumptions of public policy as they relate to youth and work. An examination of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act follows, along with a review of the limitations of current school-to-work models.

The researchers note that over the past 10 years, the search for ways to better prepare the American work force has focused on education and school reform. Recently, however, an emphasis on labor force skills, training, and productive employment has forced a reconsideration of public policy regarding youth and work.

The report points out that, despite the presence of a few prominent federal initiatives, such as the Job Training Partnership Act, public policy over the past decade has largely relied on market forces to create jobs. At issue in the present school-to-work agenda is not just youth employment *per se*, but productive and meaningful employment. The researchers further suggest that because the quality of jobs is

intricately linked to the skills they require, creating a coherent “school-to-work transition system” to move youth into and through the labor market has become a critical item on the national agenda.

In reviewing the ability of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act to help students make the transition from the classroom to productive employment in today’s labor market, the researchers point out that most States implemented the legislation by building on existing vocational education and job training efforts (i.e., tech prep, youth apprenticeship, cooperative education, and career academies). The benefits and limitations of these models are reviewed. Among the findings, the researchers suggest:

- As they currently stand, the school-to-work models are heavily weighted toward the education system; to rely solely on restructuring the school experience while neglecting work experience may result in a missed opportunity to enhance adolescents’ career development. Thus, concerted efforts should be undertaken to identify and enhance learning opportunities in the workplace.
- While the concept of school-to-work as it has been interpreted so far implies a one-time, one-way transition, the fact is that many students and workers experience alternating spells of work and learning.
- In addition to being unable to address the out-of-school population, current school-to-work strategies cannot be relied on to help those young people who are most disaffected with school. (While some may remain in school, they may be isolated from many of the newer school-to-work programs.)
- Additional avenues to the world of work need to be pursued.

## **Youth in the Secondary Labor Market**

During 1993, more than three million 16- to 19-year-olds worked part-time, and almost two million more worked full-time in secondary labor markets. Although the number of jobs in the secondary labor market has increased significantly in recent years, many of these jobs offer few opportunities for young workers to mature or to

sample various work experiences.

About 70 percent of 16-to-19-year-olds work in secondary labor market occupations related to sales, clerical work, labor, and services. In addition, the secondary labor market is perhaps the major employer of young, minority, inner-city workers.

The report discusses the rationale for enhancing the secondary labor market work experience, noting that it remains the largest and most important vehicle for work experience, income, and eventual connection to careers and roles in society. The researchers suggest that secondary labor market jobs might be used to further youth development by providing adult interest and support, offering the opportunity to show and take initiative on the job, reinforce academic skills (including the opportunity to use them in the context of the job), and recognize and provide feedback on the youth's performance. They also could be used to support transitions to stable long-term employment.

## **Work Experience and Skill Development**

The report outlines what a more constructive secondary labor market work experience would entail, discusses the feasibility of using the workplace for adolescent and career development, and outlines national trends and developments that might expedite these efforts. It also delineates the incentives for private-sector employer participation in initiatives to upgrade secondary labor market jobs, and suggests how such initiatives fit with broader efforts to upgrade American workplaces.

The researchers suggest that there is evidence that young workers in secondary labor market jobs gain more than just short-term economic benefits from their work. For example, a survey of youth workers<sup>69</sup> in the secondary labor market food industry

---

<sup>69</sup>Ivan Charner and Bryna S. Fraser, *Fast Food Jobs* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Work and Learning, 1984).

found that:

- The vast majority of hourly employees learned how to operate a cash register, food preparation machines, and other machines. Ninety percent of the survey respondents felt that their job taught them the skills associated with food preparation, 70 percent developed skills related to training, almost 50 percent learned supervisory skills, and 40 percent learned inventory control.
- Fast food employees also learned employability skills, including dealing with customers, taking directions, getting along with coworkers, being on time, being dependable, being well groomed, managing their own money, saving for what is wanted, and getting along on a certain amount of money.
- Younger employees, minority employees, lower socioeconomic background employees, and less schooled employees all appeared to get more out of these jobs than others.

The report points out that strengthening secondary labor market jobs would require building on these existing benefits and developing structures and supports to further youth development and facilitate transitions to long-term stable employment. Specifically, more constructive work experience in the secondary labor market might result by:

- Adding more varied tasks and skill requirements to the work itself to encourage greater use of school-taught academic skills and more on-the-job learning of competencies valued by the industry and reflected in industry-based standards.
- Modifying supervisory practices to encourage personal growth and skill development through greater coaching, assessment, feedback, and certification of skills attained.
- Where appropriate, planning a sequence of work experiences over two to four years—with the same or different employers—in order to broaden and deepen both personal growth and skill development.
- Providing external supports that include some combination of case management, career guidance, remedial education, life skills training, and other services, including the opportunity for regular reflection on and integration of

work-based learning experiences.

□ Providing advice on future career plans, which might include entering full-time employment that could lead to a career, finishing high school or obtaining a General Educational Development credential, and/or moving on to postsecondary education at a four-year college, a two-year technical institute or community college, or a higher-level skills certification program.

The report describes national-level issues related to the feasibility of enhancing work in the secondary labor market, such as the need for staffed entities under employer influence or control which set the standards and assemble, design, and monitor work-based learning experiences in places of private employment.

The researchers reviewed constraints faced by individual employers in improving secondary labor market jobs. They note that reducing turnover rates was a powerful motivator to spark their interest in this effort. It is also important to limit time constraints placed on employers, ensure that their role is well defined, and to provide incentives that offset direct costs employers might need to assume in hiring youth.

The potential benefits to employers for improving the secondary labor market are outlined, and the researchers discuss the relationship between the secondary labor market and high-performance workplaces. Some examples of high-performance workplace techniques in the fast food industry are provided.

The report describes the importance of using skill standards to improve jobs in the secondary labor market, noting that broadly defined skill standards provide a framework for ensuring that workers have the portable skills necessary to make value-added contributions on the job and can move easily up a career ladder or move from one career to another<sup>70</sup>. When skill standards are connected to educational curricula and training programs (as is the ultimate goal of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act), they may serve to create a system of lifelong learning opportunities with certificates of

---

<sup>70</sup>For a discussion of skill standards, see *Voluntary Skill Standards and Certification: Skill Standards-A Primer*, which is summarized in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

mastery and competency that are recognized by employers nationally and internationally. Advocates claim that national skill standards will help secure:

- Greater worker mobility and portability of credentials.
- Higher wages, greater employment security, and more job opportunities.
- More efficient recruitment, screening, and placement.
- Clearer goals and direction for students.
- More consistent, targeted instruction.
- Greater accountability by education and training providers.
- Higher-quality products and services.
- Higher consumer confidence and satisfaction.

The report briefly describes past efforts to address skill standards and provides information about current skill standards projects. A listing of currently funded national skill standards projects, by industry, is provided in the report, along with a description of the implications of skill standards for school-to-work strategies.

## **Recommendations and Suggested Initiatives**

### **Policy Recommendations**

The researchers offer several policy recommendations that could serve to guide future initiatives. These are:

- The work side of the school-to-work transition should be more energetically pursued.
- Opportunities to leverage naturally occurring work experiences that facilitate adolescents' personal and career development must be identified and exploited.
- Efforts to develop and recognize a full range of workplace certification techniques should be expanded.
- A wider range of attainable work-learning opportunities should be made

available for disadvantaged youth.

## **Suggested Initiatives**

In addition to the policy recommendations, the report offers a number of specific initiatives that could be used to implement the policy recommendations. These are divided into community-centered strategies, national initiatives, and research initiatives.

**Community-Centered Strategies.** For most young people, the process of attaining work experience and connecting to the secondary labor market happens at the local level, particularly among employers in neighborhoods and communities where they live. Locally based strategies and interventions thus are crucial for enhancing the developmental opportunities and supports that young workers accrue through their jobs, while helping employers retain young workers and enhance their job performance.

Community-centered strategies, therefore, might concentrate on supporting and enriching local workplaces. For example, in well-defined neighborhoods, between 15 and 25 entry-level businesses could be invited to provide a set of supports to their young employees, including additional supervisory time, programs to recognize and reward positive job performance, strengthened interactions between schools and employers, and incentives for job retention and good school performance. Such an initiative could take place either through local community-based youth-serving organizations or schools (or a combination of the two).

Another local strategy might focus on building on summer youth employment, in which opportunities are provided to blend in summer youth training and employment programs. A sequence could be developed which includes summer employment, school activities, and part-time work over several years. The sequence would maintain a focus on reinforcing educational attainment, providing continuity between different jobs and educational experiences, offering increased challenges and rewards to youth, compiling information about skill attainments, and focusing on long-term careers.

Establishing formal connections to training and careers in service-sector industries, such as hospitality and tourism, might be another community-centered

strategy to improve the experiences of young people in the secondary job market. In addition, establishing local “training centers” which would embody many aspects of the “apprenticeship” approach to training might strengthen the transitional potential of entry-level work.

Finally, in cases where career-connected jobs within or near communities are sparse, there is potential in closing the geographical distance between young workers in inner cities and permanent jobs in more distant locations through “reverse commuting” schemes. Transporting young people from neighborhoods which may have fewer career-connected jobs to suburban locations may result in more attractive, better-paying jobs which have career connections.

**National Initiatives.** The researchers suggest that two complementary approaches might be explored and developed at the national level—upgrading training and supervision in entry-level jobs, and establishing certification programs. In the first case, efforts could focus on designing more developmentally oriented training and supervision practices among nationally known fast food franchises and other high-volume employers of young people. These efforts might center on the attainment of “youth development” milestones. Secondly, certification programs could be established by secondary labor market employers. These programs would help youth to build portfolios of their work and education experiences, using skills and milestones that are recognized and valued by employers.

**Research Initiatives.** The authors suggest that efforts could be made to study and evaluate initiatives undertaken by major fast food chains to provide incentives to young workers. A second line of research could focus on the long-term effects of entry-level work experiences on youth in order to determine whether and what social, psychological, and economic benefits accrue from early work experiences in the secondary labor market. Finally, it is suggested that a study be designed to analyze the degree to which employers would be willing and able to enhance work and supervisory practices, and whether these changes could be effective in promoting positive corporate outcomes as they relate to improving the work experiences of young people in the secondary labor market.

## USING SKILL STANDARDS TO IMPROVE THE NATION'S WORKFORCE

### Overview

American businesses are responding to international competition by continually stressing quality in every phase of operations, using the latest technology, and reorganizing the way work is performed. In this new work environment, current workers, as well as new entrants to the labor market, are finding that they must continually master new skills in order to prepare themselves for a number of job changes over the course of their careers. At the same time, employers are finding that a better understanding of the skills required to accomplish new and more complex tasks is essential if they are to ensure that their employees are capable of responding to changing work requirements.

Skill standards, used to define the common core of knowledge required for broad-based occupational clusters, represent an important tool in helping both employers, employees, and educators respond to these needs.

Against a backdrop of concern about the vocational preparation of noncollege bound students and the academic preparation of students in general, national attention relating to education reform and the development of voluntary skill standards has increased markedly in recent years.<sup>71</sup>

In response to this concern, the National Advisory Commission on Work-Based Learning was established. One of the Commission's objectives is to focus attention on the need for a national system to promote the voluntary use of skill standards. In

---

<sup>71</sup>For a more detailed discussion of the Department of Labor's efforts in the area of skill standards and certification, see the Introduction to the Program Activities chapter in the previous edition of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*. Also, see the summary of the evaluation report, *Skills, Standards, and Entry-Level Work* in this chapter.

addition, after hearings were held throughout the country to assess interest in pursuing this strategy, which was overwhelmingly supportive, the Departments of Labor and Education provided funds for 22 pilot projects to identify standards in a wide variety of industries. Following this effort, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act was signed into law in March 1994. Title V of the Act, the National Skill Standards Act of 1994, created the National Skill Standards Board (NSSB) to serve as a catalyst for developing a voluntary system of skill standards.

In an effort to provide basic information about the development and use of skill standards, the Institute for Educational Leadership's Center for Workforce Development produced a Primer<sup>72</sup> which provides an overview of the skill standards concept, describes the history of the skill standards movement, discusses current efforts to build a skill standards system, offers details about the characteristics of an "ideal" skill standards system, and outlines some of the key tasks facing the NSSB. The *Primer* also includes a bibliography and a listing of skill standards demonstration projects.

## **The Emergence of Skill Standards**

After describing a number of early publications and reports that focused attention on education reform and upgrading academic quality, the *Primer* outlines the evolution of the skill standards movement by briefly describing: (1) the findings of the Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce; (2) the establishment of the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills; (3) efforts of the National Advisory Commission on Work-Based Learning; (4) public hearings held throughout the country to assess interest in the skill standards concept; (5) the development of specifications for creating cooperative agreements with a number of industry coalitions; (6) funding by the Departments of Labor and Education of 22 pilot projects in the area

---

<sup>72</sup>Joan L. Wills, *Skill Standards: A Primer* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Workforce Development, Institute for Educational Leadership, 1995).

of skill standards; and (7) the enactment in March 1994 of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which established the NSSB.

The *Primer* briefly discusses the NSSB's areas of responsibility and notes that the legislative vision of the Goals 2000 Act (which focused on education reform) was that skill standards should be used by:

- The nation for ensuring the development of a highly skilled, high-quality, high performance workforce, including front line workers;
- Industries to inform training providers and prospective employees of needed skills;
- Employers to evaluate the skill levels of prospective employees and assist with the training of current employees;
- Labor organizations to enhance employment security through portable credentials and skills;
- Workers to obtain certifications of skills, pursue career advancement, and enhance their abilities to reenter the workforce;
- Students and entry-level workers to determine needed skill levels and competencies for the workforce;
- Training providers and educators to ascertain appropriate training services; and
- Government to evaluate publicly funded training; facilitate transition to high-performance work organizations; increase opportunities for minorities and women in the workforce; and facilitate linkages with other national efforts aimed at enhancing workforce skills, such as school-to-work opportunities, vocational technical education, and job training programs.

The *Primer* describes the composition of the NSSB and the nature of the partnerships formed to develop standards for various occupations, as well as the rationale for using the Goals 2000 Act as a catalyst for the skill standards movement.

## **Building a Skill Standards System**

## Historical Foundation

In describing the base upon which the skill standards system has been developed, the *Primer* highlights several important initiatives which led to the development of skill standards. These include:

- The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act Amendments of 1990 (P.L. 101-392);
- Initiatives led by the Department of Labor to improve the quality of federally sponsored training programs;
- The Department of Education's funding of a report on skill standards systems in education and industry in the United States and six other countries;
- The awarding of 22 grants and cooperative agreements which initiated skill standards development and implementation in a variety of industries;
- The historical use of work-linked, knowledge-based standards by professional societies or craft guilds throughout the country;
- National experience with self-regulation of credentialing through nonpublic organizations; and
- Government participation in licensure requirements for some occupations.

## Education- and Industry-Driven Skill Standards

In addition to these national activities, the *Primer* addresses skill standards systems which have been developed and used by educational institutions and various industries.

In discussing education-driven skill standards systems, the author suggests that the primary approach of the vocational education system has been to use task lists (i.e., a listing of specific duties of a common set of jobs found in most enterprises) to establish the skill requirements needed for entry-level or intermediate jobs. These lists

then become the basis for developing curricular, instructional, and evaluation criteria to ensure that students acquire the skills they need for specific jobs. About 700 committees, using industry volunteers, exist across the country to help States develop skill standards for educational institutions. In addition, a substantial portion of the education-driven skill standards are developed as part of consortia, such as the Vocational Technical Education Consortium of the States, with member States regularly adding to the pool of standards and task lists.

Linkages are also emerging between the occupational skill requirements identified through a job analysis process for individuals and the program performance standards used for vocational-technical education programs established under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act Amendments of 1990.

In the area of industry-driven skill standards initiatives, the *Primer* points out that about 400 professional societies and industry-based associations are involved in promoting and issuing some form of skills-based credential. Credentialing activities can include prescribing education and experience qualifications for certification candidates; establishing for potential accredited institutions qualifications for curriculum, faculty, and facilities; administering competitive examinations; and conducting assessment visits. For many industry groups, these activities are self-regulating and privately driven. The *Primer* outlines several common features associated with industry-driven skill standards programs. These are noted below.

## **Lessons from Other Countries**

Because the experience of other countries in developing skill standards may be useful as the United States faces the challenge of building a national skill standards system, the *Primer* includes the experience of six countries<sup>73</sup> in the creation of a national system of skill standards certification. (Each of these countries has developed

---

<sup>73</sup>Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom.

systems to meet its own purposes.) The author suggests that these systems can be divided into one of three categories:

- The “initial preparation” model (Germany and Denmark) which focuses on the school-to-work transition of young people attending compulsory school.
- The “craft certification” approach (Japan and Canada) which meets the needs of more mobile adult workers, such as construction workers.
- The “comprehensive” model (United Kingdom and Australia) which relies on occupational core standards (broad-based competencies that must be achieved by all persons in an occupation regardless of their particular jobs) and industrial core standards (specific knowledge and skills that must be mastered for work in specialized areas).

Because the legislative intent for establishing voluntary academic and occupational skill standards in the United States falls into the third category, more extensive details of the Australian and United Kingdom models are provided in the *Primer*.

## **Related Activities**

The author notes that while the National Advisory Commission on Work-Based Learning was exploring a more coherent national skill standards effort, an Advisory Panel on the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*<sup>74</sup> was reconstructing and revitalizing the

---

<sup>74</sup>The revised *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, known as the Occupational Information Network, or O\*NET, is an information system that includes concise, up-to-date occupational (job content) and labor market (wages, supply, demand) information. The system offers users data on the increasing cognitive demands of jobs and new ways of thinking and managing that focus on quality, variety, speed, and customer service. Because it is helpful in identifying and describing the skills, knowledge, and competencies needed to produce high performance workplaces, it assists educators to better prepare students to meet future workplace challenges and it helps employers to better select, train, and place workers in appropriate jobs. The O\*NET also helps workers to identify the skills needed to maintain livable wages and achieve their career goals.

basic occupational classification system used in the United States. Also, a technical advisory group established by the National Education Goals Panel was supporting the organizations establishing academic standards in such areas as science, mathematics, and geography. Definitive issues related to the term “standard” were addressed.

## **The Ideal Skill Standards System**

Based on a study conducted by the Institute for Educational Leadership, the *Primer* lists several characteristics of an ideal skill standards system. The author suggests that such a system would:

- Be widely accessible to students and workers regardless of age;
- Respond to changes and differences in local and individual needs through flexibility in education and training provided (e.g., types of institutions, full-time versus part-time);
- Be able to meet the needs of individuals regardless of the types of education and training they are pursuing (e.g., initial preparation, continual, upgrading, or remedial);
- Allow career paths within and between industries;
- Be explicit, so that firms, educators, training providers, and individuals know what the standards are and where information about them can be obtained;
- Be competency-based;
- Formally assess and certify an individual’s skills through an independent third party;
- Be progressive and modular, so that people can build upon blocks of competencies and adapt to technological, organizational, and market changes to improve their prospects or to explore their potential; and
- Have a common framework and use common language when describing skill levels across industries and occupations, so that both individuals and employers can understand easily workplace expectations. The framework should progress

from initial (entry) qualifications through several levels to mastery and/or specialization recognition.

## **Key Tasks of the National Skill Standards Board**

The *Primer* describes the tasks of the National Skill Standards Board as outlined in the law as: (1) to identify broad occupational clusters for skill standards around which to organize the voluntary system; (2) to recognize voluntary partnerships; and (3) to establish objective criteria for purposes of endorsements. In addition, the skill standards to be developed should provide credentials (through formal assessments); be useful for institutions of higher education, labor organizations, trade associations and employers providing formalized training; and be useful for School-to-Work Opportunity Systems explicitly.

The *Primer* points out that the Board needs to ensure that occupational clusters are organized around common skill sets and are sufficiently broad so that individuals do not become trapped in narrow, job-specific programs of study. It also suggests that employers must actively participate in building the skill standards system. Furthermore, while meeting the needs of employers, occupational clusters selected by the Board must also be meaningful for secondary and postsecondary educational institutions, apprenticeship programs, other work-site trainers, and developers of study programs and articulation agreements among education and training institutions.

The importance of creating and maintaining a viable coalition among representatives from business, organized labor, educational institutions, community-based organizations, State and local governments, and nongovernmental civil rights organizations with respect to developing the skill standard system is also stressed.

As it carries out its responsibilities relating to the development of skill standards, the creation of credentials based on attainment of the standards, and assessment

mechanisms associated with determining whether standards have been met, the author suggests that the NSSB consider the quality and respectability of assessment mechanisms; the effective use of skill standards by higher education, organized labor, trade groups, and employers; and the use of the credentials within the School-to-Work Opportunity System.

The NSSB is also responsible for ensuring quality throughout the skill standards system. In this regard, the Board must take into account: (1) the relationship between the skill standards and various existing international standards; (2) requirements of high-performance work organizations; (3) previously established apprenticeship standards; and (4) consistency with the content and performance standards certified by the National Educational Standards and Improvement Council.

The publication briefly describes the NSSB's mandate to ensure that standards are compatible with existing Federal civil rights laws, updated regularly, and portable.

Finally, the *Primer* discusses the Board's requirement for developing an infrastructure to support the total skill standards system, noting that this task will be accomplished through the following activities:

- Conducting research;
- Identifying and maintaining a catalog of skill standards (domestic and international);
- Acting as a clearinghouse and facilitator;
- Developing common nomenclature relating to skill standards;
- Encouraging the development of and adoption of curricula and training materials;
- Providing funding and technical assistance to voluntary partnerships; and
- Promoting the development of a coherent system.

## **HELPING STUDENTS MOVE FROM SCHOOL TO WORK**

### **Overview**

Each year, about half of the Nation's high school graduates go directly into the job market. Because an increasing number of jobs require higher level skills than many high school graduates possess, a large number of these new workers must begin their careers through the secondary labor market<sup>75</sup>—in positions that require few skills and offer low pay, few or no fringe benefits, little training, and few opportunities for advancement. Typically, these young people go through a string of part-time and low-paying jobs in the first three to five years after they leave high school. Many also experience frequent unemployment, and some will never leave the secondary labor market.

In looking at ways to better prepare students for entry-level jobs and subsequent careers, there is evidence that many “traditional” high school vocational education programs, which historically have prepared non-college-bound young people for the labor market, no longer provide them with the full range of skills needed to succeed in today's jobs. Furthermore, according to one study, fewer than three of every 10 graduates of vocational education programs find jobs that require skills they learned in school.<sup>76</sup>

In recent years, the Departments of Labor and Education have supported several initiatives designed to help the U.S. education system develop programs and practices to help students acquire the skills that employers require and make a successful transition into well-paying jobs.<sup>77</sup> The School-to-Work Transition/Youth

---

<sup>75</sup>For more information about youth entering the secondary labor market, see Keith MacAllum and Patricia Ma, *Skills, Standards and Entry-Level Work* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Public/Private Ventures, 1994), which is summarized in this chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

<sup>76</sup>Robert I. Lerman and Hillard Pouncy, “The Compelling Case for Youth Apprenticeships,” *The Public Interest*, no. 101, Fall 1990, pp. 62-77.

<sup>77</sup>See the discussion of the School-To-Work Opportunities Act and other initiatives in Keith MacAllum and Patricia Ma, *Skills, Standards and Entry-Level Work*

Apprenticeship Demonstration, sponsored by the Department of Labor, helped educators to combine elements of several innovative school-to-work programs and link the classroom and the workplace through a series of school- and work-based learning initiatives.

Preliminary findings, based on a review of the demonstration's early activities, suggest that these demonstration programs used a diverse set of approaches that could be helpful in planning, designing, and implementing future school-to-work programs.

The study report presents the policy background for the demonstration effort, describes the key elements of youth apprenticeship, and discusses each of the demonstration efforts undertaken by the various grantees.<sup>78</sup> The report also highlights implementation lessons relevant for developing similar programs on a larger scale.

## **The Demonstration Projects**

The demonstration projects were initiated by the Department of Labor in September 1990. The Department awarded two-year grants to six organizations to plan and implement projects in nine sites. In the fall of 1992, five of the original six grantees were subsequently awarded an additional year of funding and 10 new two-year grants for youth apprenticeship demonstrations were awarded. (Nine of the 10 new grants went to new organizations and one went to a prior grantee for an additional project.) The 15 grantees designed and implemented school-to-work/youth apprenticeship demonstrations in 22 locations. Most of the projects focused on manufacturing occupations, particularly ones in the field of metalworking. Table 21 provides

---

(Philadelphia, Pa.: Public/Private Ventures, 1994).

<sup>78</sup>Walter Corson and Marsha Silverberg, *The School-to-Work/Youth Apprenticeship Demonstration: Preliminary Findings* (Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1994).

information about the location and status of the grantees.

Visits to each of the sites were made by the researchers in the spring of 1993 (two earlier visits had also been made to each of the initial sites). At the time, the sites' experience in operating their programs was somewhat limited; many programs had been operating for a relatively short period of time and some sites had not yet enrolled students. The study report provides an overview of each site's program as it existed in spring 1993. Program highlights are noted below.

### **Boston Private Industry Council**

The Boston Private Industry Council (PIC) received two grants from the Department. One supported the ProTech Health Care Project, a four-year program (the last two years of high school and two post-high school years) designed to prepare students from three Boston high schools for careers in health care. Most ProTech Health Care students enrolled as juniors and took classes together in applied math, science, and health careers. They spent one day each week at one of four participating hospitals and began part-time employment at one of the hospitals during the second semester of their junior year. In their senior year, students took one course each semester at an area community college while they completed their academic classes. Upon high school graduation, the students attended either a two- or four-year college and worked part-time during the school year and full-time during summers at one of the hospitals. The project completed its second year of operation in the 1992-93 school year.

**Table 21. Location and Status of Youth Apprenticeship Grantees**

Grantee Name	Location of Sites	Occupations	Date of First Student Participation	Number of Students (Spring/Summer 1993)
<b>1990 Grantees:</b>				
Boston Private Industry Council (ProTech Health Care) . . . . .	Boston, Mass.	Allied Health	Fall 1991	108
MechTech, Inc. . . . .	Baltimore, Md.	Metalworking	Summer 1993	6
Pennsylvania Youth Apprenticeship Program . . . . .	Lancaster, Pa.	Metalworking	Fall 1992	14
	Lycoming County, Pa.	Metalworking	Fall 1991	21
	Montgomery County, Pa.	Metalworking	Fall 1992	15
	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Metalworking	Fall 1992	18
	Philadelphia, Pa.	Metalworking	Fall 1992	9
	York, Pa.	Metalworking	Fall 1992	18
Sears/Davea . . . . .	Du Page County, Ill.	Appliance repair	Fall 1991	19
Workforce LA Youth Academies . . . . .	Los Angeles, Calif.	—	Fall 1990	520
<b>1992 Grantees:</b>				
Boston Private Industry Council (ProTech Financial Services) . . . . .	Boston, Mass.	Financial services	Sept. 1993	NA
Craftmanship 2000 . . . . .	Tulsa, Okla.	Metalworking	Sept. 1992	16

---

**Table 21. Location and Status of Youth Apprenticeship Grantees (continued)**

---

Grantee Name	Location of Sites	Occupations	Date of First Student Participation	Number of Students (Spring/Summer 1993)
Manufacturing Technology Partnership	Metalworking/ Flint, Mich.	Manufacturing	Sept. 1992	50
Gwinnett Youth Apprenticeship Program	Lawrenceville, Ga.	—	Sept. 1993	NA
Illinois State Board of Education	Chicago, Ill.	Metalworking	Sept. 1992	22
	Rockford, Ill.	Metalworking	Sept. 1992	13
	Whitehall, Ill.	Food service	July 1993	NA
Middle Georgia Aerospace	Middle, Ga.	Aerospace	Sept. 1993	NA
OaklandWorks	Oakland, Calif.	—	Sept 1993	NA
Scripps Ranch High School	San Diego, Calif.	—	Sept. 1993	NA
Seminole County/ Siemens	Seminole County, Fla.	Electronics/ Telecommunications	Sept. 1992	19
Toledo Private Industry Council	Toledo, Oh.	Industrial automation and robotics, drafting and architecture, medical and dental assisting.	April 1993	8

---

NA = not available.

Source: Walter Corson and Marsha Silverberg, *The School-to-Work/Youth Apprenticeship Demonstration: Preliminary Findings* (Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1994).

---

A second grant supported the ProTech Financial Services project which prepared students from three Boston high schools for careers in banking, insurance, or financial services. Participating high school students took applied academic classes, received help from mentors at work sites, and worked part-time during the school year and full-time during the summer months in the financial services field. After graduation, they attended a two-year college with the goal of obtaining an associate's degree. During their college experience, they worked part-time in the banking, insurance, or financial services field.

### **Craftsmanship 2000**

This four-year project, which began in the 1992-93 school year, prepared students from public schools in Tulsa, Oklahoma for careers in metalworking. In their first year of participation (their junior year in high school) students attended Tulsa Technical Center instead of their regular high schools. They received a bimonthly stipend as well as financial bonuses for academic performance. Sponsoring companies employed the students during the summer and provided employee mentors. The companies provided work-site instruction throughout the school year which increased in intensity as students progressed through the program. After graduation, participating students attend Tulsa Junior College for two years and continued to receive work-site instruction and summer employment.

### **Gwinnett Youth Apprenticeship**

Reviewed in the planning stage, this project was operated by the county school system with no specific occupational focus. It attempted to develop four-year

apprenticeship programs in three Gwinnett County, Georgia high schools. Program operators planned to first solicit employers for jobs and to subsequently build the program around these jobs. In the early stages, the school system provided students with experience working as teacher's aides and clerical workers. One employer, Gwinnett Aeronautics, provided students with experience working on propeller engines. Students planned to apply for available jobs, and, if accepted, they would be released from school to work for a specified number of hours. They were to take regular courses as well as an elective course that would provide "personalized" instruction linked to work-site experience. At the time of the study, a postsecondary education component was being arranged with the area's two-year technical school.

### **Illinois State Board of Education**

The Illinois State Board of Education sponsored youth apprenticeship sites in Rockford, Chicago, and Whitehall. The Rockford and Chicago sites prepared students for metalworking careers and began operating in the 1992-93 school year. At the time of the research project, the Whitehall site was preparing to begin in fall 1993 to prepare students for food service management careers<sup>79</sup>.

The Rockford site was a four-year program (the final two years of high school and two years at a community college). Successful students received associate's degrees. Beginning in their junior year of high school, students received vocational instruction in a simulated work environment at an employer facility each morning and attended applied academic classes at their high school in the afternoon. Students worked full-time for six weeks, one week at each of the sponsoring employers during the summer. They also took a related community college course for the rest of the

---

<sup>79</sup>Because the Whitehall program was still in the planning stage when the study was undertaken, it was not included in the site visits.

summer. Students worked part-time during their senior school year and were encouraged to attend a local community college for two years after high school (while working part-time).

The Chicago site prepared students from Senn Metropolitan Academy for careers in metalworking through a three- or four-year program (students entered the program in their junior or senior year in high school). Students visited employer sponsors for an orientation and shadowing experience during their spring break. Students who entered as juniors worked full-time during the summer and part-time during their senior year. After graduation, they were encouraged to attend metalworking classes at local community colleges while working in the metalworking industry.

### **Manufacturing Technology Partnership**

Beginning in fall 1992, the General Motors/United Auto Workers' Manufacturing Technology Partnership (MTP) program in Flint, Michigan prepared high school students to enter General Motors' (GM) Skilled Trades Apprenticeship Program. Students received academic instruction in high school in the morning and received vocational instruction—geared towards the General Motors Apprenticeship Test—at the local vocational technical school in the afternoon. The students worked two additional hours each day in a training center at a local GM plant, and the company employed the students for eight weeks during the summer months. Upon high school graduation, students took the GM Apprenticeship Test. High-scoring students were eligible to enter apprenticeships as electricians, sheetmetal workers, tool and die makers, welders, drafters, or machinists. If no positions were available, students could attend a local community college for two years at GM's expense.

### **MechTech, Inc.**

This four-year program prepared students from Baltimore area high schools for careers in the machine tool trades. Successful students received an associate's degree in computer-integrated manufacturing from a local community college and were registered as apprentices with the Maryland Apprenticeship and Training Council. High school juniors and seniors received academic instruction in their local high schools, vocational instruction in the area vocational technical school, and work experience after school and during the summer. Students were expected to attend community college and to continue part-time employment after high school as they worked toward their associate's degrees.

### **Middle Georgia Aerospace**

In the planning stage at the time of the research study, this project was a four-year effort to train students for careers as aircraft structural mechanics. Initiated by companies from the local aerospace industry, the program selected high school juniors from three school districts, each paired with a postsecondary technical school and one of the three aerospace firms in the partnership (Boeing, Northrop, and McDonnell-Douglas). Students received academic and vocational instruction from their high school using an applied academic curriculum. Technical schools helped high schools develop and implement vocational curricula. Although students were not placed at the work site during the school year, a business mentor met with each student regularly to monitor school progress and provide information about the business environment. Following high school, each company selected several graduates for its apprenticeship program. Postsecondary program participants received advanced training in aircraft structural technology at local technical schools (leading to an associate's degree).

### **OaklandWorks**

Beginning in summer 1993, this project was designed to enhance an existing career academy/magnet program in four high schools in Oakland, Calif. Each high school focused on a different occupational theme—media, health care, law and government, and computers. Students in the career academies were clustered in three academic courses related to the occupational focus of the academy, as well as a relevant lab course. Work-related experiences began in the 10th grade with the assignment of a business mentor. Students participated in job shadowing in the 11th grade and received a paid internship for several weeks the following summer. Short-term internships were offered in the senior year for some participants.

### **Pennsylvania Youth Apprenticeship Program**

Developed by the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce, the Pennsylvania Youth Apprenticeship Program (PYAP) was a four-year program that focused primarily on careers in metalworking (although one program model was later adapted to the health care industry). Programs operated in six sites throughout the Commonwealth (five began operating in the 1992-93 school year and one began the previous year). Students began in the 11th grade. The program was a “school-within-a-school” initiative in which participating students took most or all of their classes together. Three days each week, 11th and 12th grade high school students attended academic classes which featured a curriculum designed especially for the program. Students also worked two days a week in various firms. They continued to work and were encouraged to attend relevant community college programs after high school graduation.

### **Scripps Ranch High School**

Beginning in fall 1993, the Scripps Ranch High School project combined work-

site experience and other apprenticeship features into a model high school. The curricula was structured around four career paths—engineering technology, biotechnology, business, and arts and humanities. All of these paths were developed with input from the business community. The project featured interdisciplinary instruction (vocational and academic) and guest speakers, as well as special career-oriented educational events. Ninth and 10th grade students focused on building strong academic foundations and participated in job shadowing. Eleventh and 12th grade students chose career paths and selected courses to suit their educational and occupational goals. They were also allowed to hold part-time jobs either after school or during a portion of the school day.

### **Sears/Davea**

Beginning in the 1991-92 school year, this project, a collaborative effort among the National Alliance of Business, Sears, and the DuPage County Area Vocational Education Authority (Illinois), prepared high school students for careers in the appliance repair industry. Sears developed a comprehensive curriculum that combined principles of physics and applied technical exercises in a course on appliance repair which was offered at the Davea career center. Students attended academic classes in their high schools for part of the day and spent the other part at the Davea career center. Work-site experiences involved students rotating individually through one-week internships at three different Sears service center departments.

### **Seminole County/Siemens**

Beginning in the 1992-93 school year, this project was initiated by the Siemens Stromberg-Carlson company to train electronic technicians. It recruited juniors from Seminole County's (Florida) two high school electronics programs and provided work

site experience at the company's facility. Students attended high school each day, taking tech-prep electronics courses or their equivalent. They also spent three hours per day, twice a week, at the company's training facility. Students received instruction in job-related skills using a curriculum adapted from the one used by the company in its apprenticeship program in Germany. Following high school, students continued to work part-time at Siemens and enrolled in the company's apprenticeship program, which was offered at the local community college. Successful students received an associate's degree as an electronic technician.

### **Toledo Private Industry Council**

Enrolling its first students in spring 1993, this was a two-year program that prepared selected students from three Toledo high schools for careers in robotics, industrial automation, drafting and architecture, computer-aided design and manufacturing, and medical and dental assisting. (Carpentry and insurance data processing were added the following year.) Students in regular vocational technical classes were interviewed and evaluated by participating employers and began part-time employment in their junior year of high school. The academic curriculum was tied to the specific vocational area and classes were taught jointly by a vocational teacher and a math teacher. Upon high school graduation, students received a diploma, a certificate of competency, and a portfolio that documented their competencies and work experiences.

### **Workforce LA Youth Academies**

This was a citywide effort in Los Angeles to encourage continued school attendance and promote general employability skills for high school students who were at risk of dropping out. About 500 high school juniors and seniors were placed in paid,

part-time employment four afternoons per week to gain work experience. They attended regular classes and spent one afternoon each week in a special class to improve their basic skills and prepare them for work. Most of the students worked in Los Angeles city government agencies, and a few students were employed at a telecommunications firm.

## **Program Participation**

The researchers reviewed the initial experiences of the project sites in enrolling students to gather information about how program design and various external factors affected participation. They examined factors that affected program size and the types of students who participated. They also looked into a number of issues that influenced students' continued participation. Highlights from this investigation are noted below.

- Most of the programs were quite small and most did not expect to enroll more than 20 to 30 students annually in each school in any single occupational cluster. This was due primarily to the fact that it was difficult to obtain participation from employers and to recruit eligible students.
- Differences among programs in occupational objectives, location, entrance requirements, and other factors affected the characteristics of students served.
- Some students were likely to drop out of school-to-work programs during the school year (most programs experienced declines in enrollment of about 10 to 20 percent during the first year of operation). Reasons for this included students' difficulty in keeping up academically, leaving school entirely, deciding that an occupation was not of interest once they learned more about it, or deciding that they wanted to switch to college preparatory courses

### **Meeting Student Expectations**

The study report points out that students who participated in the 15 demonstration programs came from diverse backgrounds and had different expectations about how programs were likely to affect them both educationally and occupationally. Based on a series of focus groups conducted with students, the researchers describe student career and educational goals, discuss why students entered school-to-work programs, provide information about how the students thought they benefitted from participating in programs, and outline some of the problems experienced by participating students. The researchers found that:

- Many students who enrolled in the programs had decided to attend college before they enrolled. Most intended to pursue two-year degrees or certificates at community or technical colleges.
- Few students entered demonstration programs with a concrete interest in or plan for pursuing a job in the field that was the focus of their program. Instead, most of the students viewed the programs as a way of “trying out” a possible occupation. In a few of the demonstration sites, a number of students did enter programs with a well-defined interest in a particular occupation or related field.
- Students entered school-to-work programs for a variety of reasons. These included the need for income (school-to-work programs generally paid more than other part-time jobs available to high school students), the need for financial assistance, the need for work experience while in high school, or the desire to try out a possible career or trade.
- Students, including those who did not intend to pursue careers in the target occupations, generally believed that their program experience has a positive effect on them.
- Problems encountered or program features disliked by participants included unrealistic expectations, a lack of preparation for work-site positions and employer expectations, a lack of understanding of the rules governing program or employer assistance in paying for postsecondary education, delays in program implementation and program changes, and disappointment with certain program features. Some students also expressed concern about the availability

of jobs at the end of their program experience.

## **School-Based Learning**

A key component of school-to-work programs is their ability to deliver in-school instruction that provides the basic skills, occupational competencies, and broad employability skills required for successful entry into the workforce. Because these programs are designed to offer improved teaching methods which emphasize hands-on, student-centered learning that is relevant to students' career interests, students are expected to become more engaged in learning and to acquire skills more readily. Students are also expected to receive career guidance that exposes them to a broad range of occupational opportunities, helps them identify career interests, and encourages them to develop educational plans that meet their career goals. In addition, special program arrangements are expected to promote student entry into postsecondary education.

The researchers investigated a number of issues related to the school-based learning component, including: (1) the characteristics of the school setting (i.e., type of school and school schedule); (2) the effectiveness of school-to-work curriculum, including its content (its emphasis on vocational instruction, integration of academic and vocational education, and link to work-site activities), and the instructional methods used; (3) career guidance and counseling support; and (4) linkages to postsecondary education. Selected findings based on this review are noted below.

- The extent of the demonstration's impact on schools in participating programs varied significantly and it may be difficult to isolate the school-based component of school-to-work programs from regular high school offerings.
- School-to-work programs that take place within a vocational center or special facility are more occupationally focused, offering not only a strong vocational program, but also applied academic courses geared toward the target

occupations.

□ The scheduling characteristic that appears most critical to the effectiveness of a school-to-work program is the grouping of participants in key classes.

Clustering students is vital to implementing an integrated curriculum in which academic courses reflect the program's occupational theme.

□ Regarding the content of school-to-work curriculum, the researchers point out that the school-based component of programs that offer practical technical instruction as well as academic education may better equip students with the skills they need to enter the workforce in their targeted occupation.

□ The most frequent strategy for integrating academic and vocational education was the development or purchase of curricula that enhanced the occupational context (and in some cases, the instructional approach) of academic courses. In addition, applied academic curricula developed specifically for use in the demonstration programs tended to be more occupationally relevant.

□ Regarding the linkage of school-based learning with work-site activities, the researchers suggest that the extent to which the programs' school-based curricula are linked effectively to work-site experiences has lagged far behind the implementation of applied academic curricula. Furthermore, for programs that had placed students at work sites, substantial diversity in students' workplace experiences hindered school- and work-based integration efforts, and programs that had not institutionalized methods of communication between teachers and employers had more difficulty linking school curricula to work-site activities.

□ Changes in instructional methods are important in delivering curricula for school-to-work initiatives; time and the commitment of teachers are the critical elements for successful implementation of contextual learning strategies.

Because contextual learning techniques (which are preferable in the school-based component of school-to-work programs) require more experimentation, creativity, and responsiveness from teachers, applied academic curricula that call for these techniques are viewed as harder to teach than other courses.

□ Career exposure and counseling are important parts of school-to-work

programs, and they are often the weakest part of the programs. Most program participants have about the same level of opportunities for career awareness as other students in their schools.

□ Regarding linkages to postsecondary education, because most of the demonstration efforts were in the early stages of development at the time the study was conducted, it was unclear to what extent plans for these linkages would be implemented. A rather wide variety of efforts to promote postsecondary education and training were observed.

## **Work-Based Learning**

Work-based learning—a key component of effective school-to-work programs—generally provides students with paid work experience under the supervision of a job coach or mentor and includes a formalized sequence of training that leads to progressively higher skills and pay. The researchers suggest that implementing the work-based learning component of the school-to-work model has proved more difficult than the implementation of the school-based component.

The report discusses various features of the demonstration programs' work-site experiences and describes a number of factors that have influenced the inclusion of these features. The "intensity" (their timing, duration, and wages provided) of work-based learning experiences are described; the extent to which students' work-site training is shaped by a formal curriculum or training plan is examined; the role, selection, and training of work-site coaches and/or mentors is outlined; and various challenges created by relying on large and small employers for work-based learning experiences are explored. The researchers caution that their analysis of work-site issues was limited by the programs' degree of work-site implementation (only seven programs had engaged students in such an experience). Highlights of the findings of work-site experiences follow.

- Work-based experiences ranged from short-term, unpaid job shadowing and internships, to paid part-time employment for a year or more. Wages, when offered, ranged from the Federal minimum to more than \$7.00 per hour. Most programs did not provide extended paid work-site experiences during the students' junior year; many did not begin any workplace exposure until the summer before 12th grade.
- Only a few of the demonstration programs had structured training plans for their work-based learning components. Although students might have been developing increasingly higher levels of skills at work sites, training or instruction appeared to be provided primarily on an "as-needed" basis.
- Regarding job coaches and mentors (adults who supervise students at the work site), the researchers found that many of the demonstration programs had a designated staff person responsible for each student and that mentors in several of the programs had received training to help them in their role.
- The biggest problem most school-to-work programs faced was obtaining firm commitments from employers to provide work-site positions. Some of the demonstration programs were built around a single employer; others relied on multiple firms and/or small businesses for work-based learning opportunities. Larger firms could generally employ more students and can offer students a broader exposure to industry skills. Although students who worked in smaller firms tended to receive more attention and guidance from coworkers, smaller firms generally offered limited exposure to the particular occupation or industry (because they often specialized in a particular aspect of production or type of service and used a narrower range of equipment).

## **Integrating School and Work**

Not only must school-to-work programs feature well-structured school- and work-based learning components, it is critical that these components be carefully linked

in order to ensure that competencies learned in the classroom are useful at work (and vice versa) and reinforce the acquisition of basic and technical skills.

The researchers found that although the programs studied were making some progress in integrating school- and work-based learning, very few, if any, had achieved it in a systematic way. They note that integrating these two components requires two steps. First, teachers and employers must exchange information about the type and pace of students' activities and skill development that will take place at school and at work. Second, this information must be used to develop curricula that incorporate work-site tasks and issues into classroom instruction and projects (workplace activities must be structured to reflect the academic and vocational skills being taught in school).

Most programs studied provided opportunities for school and employer staff to meet before the start of the program or at the beginning of the school year to discuss expectations about school-site and work-site activities. In some cases, ongoing communication was formalized through regularly scheduled meetings of teachers and mentors. Other programs, however, relied on a more ad hoc approach to teacher-employer communication.

The researchers found that linking work-site tasks to school curricula occurred sporadically and in different ways, even within individual programs. Factors that affected the extent and success of the programs' efforts to integrate school-based and work-based learning include:

- Grouping students in key classes (students in similar workplaces should be grouped together in the classroom setting as much as possible).
- The flexibility and willingness of teachers to frequently adapt curricula. Teachers must modify school instruction and projects to coordinate with work-site activities during a program's planning stages as well as on an ongoing basis.
- Classroom teachers' visits to student worksites to gain knowledge of the target occupation and to become exposed to equipment, tasks, and terminology.

- Teachers having planning time in order to effectively integrate school- and work-based learning. This time may be used for discussions with mentors or other teachers and for developing new projects and tasks that incorporate workplace activities.
- Encouraging consistency in workplace experiences for individual students. It is easier for teachers to incorporate work-site skills into classroom instruction if students' experiences at the workplace are similar.

## **Program Partnerships**

The research report describes the roles played by various organizations in developing and implementing the school-to-work/youth apprenticeship demonstration programs. It discusses the roles played by high schools and employers; examines the roles of third parties (such as Private Industry Councils, Chambers of Commerce, or State agencies) in initiating, designing, and implementing programs; provides information about the involvement of other organizations (i.e., community colleges and unions); and addresses several issues related to recruiting employers to participate in school-to-work programs.

Regarding the roles of high schools and employers, the researchers point out that high schools are the points of recruitment for program participants and provide academic and vocational instruction. High schools or school districts may also initiate school-to-work programs, recruit employers, develop school curricula, coordinate school and worksite activities, and provide administrative support for program efforts. The researchers suggest that the schools studied had assumed these roles, and that in most sites studied, schools have been primarily developing school-based curricula for programs. Student recruitment and teaching follows once a program is operational. None of the programs initiated by schools at the time of the study had secured firm commitments from employers.

In most sites, employers were recruited to provide work experience and work-site training. Also, in most sites, employers participated in student recruitment. In four of the sites, employers had been largely responsible for initiating and developing the school-to-work programs.

The study report points out that a major challenge facing program operators is the recruitment of participating employers. The researchers found that employer recruitment was most difficult for sites that relied on small employers to take a few students and that recruitment efforts required not only access to employers, but the ability to convince them that participation is worthwhile.

## **Resources Used in Program Planning and Implementation**

The research report presents information obtained during site visits about the use (or planned use) of Department of Labor funds to plan and implement the programs. (Resources from schools, employers, and third party organizations were also used.)

The report notes that the school-to-work/youth apprenticeship sites received Department of Labor grants that, in total, ranged from more than \$1 million for the 1990 grantees to \$250,000 for the 1992 grantees. Five of the grantees said that the grants provided the impetus and the main support for developing their programs. The remaining sites indicated that their Labor Department grant strengthened an existing effort to develop a program.

In most cases, the grants were used by staff who were engaged in program planning and by staff who directed and coordinated program operations after they

began. Grant funds were also used to support a variety of activities that stretched the capacities of existing school and employer budgets (i.e., to support curriculum development or to pay for teacher workshops on curriculum implementation). Funds were also used to pay for release time for teachers to visit work sites, and several sites used grant funds to purchase special supplies or to upgrade equipment. A few sites used funds to offset costs borne by employers.

The study report also provides illustrations of how funds were used for program planning and offers examples of how funds were used for program operations (e.g., linkages between school and workplace activities and ongoing program development, in-school instruction, and various workplace activities).

## **Study Conclusions**

The researchers point out that the 15 Department of Labor grantees were developing programs using a diverse set of approaches that could provide guidance for planning, designing, and implementing future school-to-work programs. They suggest, however, that any conclusions or lessons based on the demonstration programs' experiences must be viewed with some caution because most programs were still in the early stages of planning or implementation at the time of the site visits (spring 1993). Major conclusions presented in the study report are noted below.

- It is critical to the effectiveness of a school-to-work program that the students who are placed at work sites in a particular industry or occupation be grouped together in key school classes.
- Integrating academic and vocational instruction, or modifying academic material to integrate with workplace learning, is particularly difficult when students split their time between a home high school and a special vocational-technical center.
- Although the ideal model encourages both structured, progressive skill

development and paid work experience, in practice, it may be difficult to implement the two types of work-site activities simultaneously.

- If workplace training that provides broad exposure to an industry is a program objective, staff will need to play an active role in structuring work-site activities or finding ways to compensate for unintended but more narrow work-based learning.
- The challenges of integrating school and work are similar to, but even greater than, those of integrating academic and vocational instruction.
- Many school-to-work/youth apprenticeship programs are likely to target students who are motivated, interested in the program's selected occupation, and show some academic promise. Programs that initially target a wider range of students, including economically or educationally disadvantaged youths, are likely over time to experience some pressure to increase entrance requirements.
- Program expansion will be necessary to reduce per-student costs, but these costs are still likely to be substantially higher than current education spending, even after full-scale operations are achieved. The long-run visibility of programs is likely to depend on clear evidence that they enhance student outcomes.
- Although expanding programs is desirable, a number of factors are likely to limit the size of most programs. These include difficulties in recruiting employers to participate, student interest in these programs, entrance requirements, and class size.
- Recruiting employers to provide paid work-site training and work experience for students is an ongoing process that is a challenging and important priority for most programs.
- Organizations with access to employers are likely to help in developing work-based learning positions, but employers' assessments of their own benefits and costs of providing these positions will ultimately determine if they participate.

#### **IV. HELPING THE NATION'S UNEMPLOYED**

The three studies summarized in this section focus on the concept of assisting unemployed individuals to become self-employed.

The first summary provides information obtained from an evaluation of the Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) demonstration. The demonstration tested various packages of self-employment assistance (a combination of financial payments and business development services) for unemployment insurance recipients who had been permanently laid off. The researchers found that the SEED program increased the likelihood of having a business and receiving business income.

The second and third summaries also focus on the SEED program as well as another self-employment demonstration which operated in Massachusetts. The researchers concluded that in both demonstrations, treatment group members were more likely than control group members to become self-employed.

## **THE WASHINGTON STATE SELF-EMPLOYMENT DEMONSTRATION**

### **Overview**

The Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) demonstration was the first federally sponsored program in the United States designed to help unemployed workers start their own businesses. SEED, along with a similar effort conducted in Massachusetts, tested packages of self-employment assistance—a combination of financial payments and business development services—for UI recipients on permanent layoff.

## The SEED Demonstration

The SEED demonstration was initiated in September 1989 in one site and expanded to five additional sites in February 1990. Demonstration intake activities continued through early September 1990 and business support services remained available to participants through March 1991.

Details of the demonstration are provided elsewhere in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* under the heading “From Unemployment to Self-Employment: Interim Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration,” which summarizes the study report: *Self-Employment as a Reemployment Option: Demonstration Results and National Legislation*. Following is a brief overview of the demonstration.

- The intake process began with the targeting of new UI claimants (i.e., individuals filing a claim for a new benefit year). Certain potential participants were excluded: persons filing interstate claims; persons filing claims backdated more than 14 days; claimants who were employer-attached (i. e., on standby) or who were full-referral union members; and claimants under 18 years of age.
- UI claimants interested in self-employment were recruited through letters which invited them to attend a meeting to learn more about the SEED program.
- An “awareness day” meeting was held to provide interested claimants with information about the demonstration. They received basic information about the risks and rewards of self-employment and key features of the SEED demonstration were described.
- Application packets were provided to interested attendees at the awareness day meeting.
- Individuals who applied to enter the demonstration were randomly assigned

into a treatment group or a control group. The treatment group received SEED services while the control group did not. (The control group received regular UI payments and services.)

- Within two weeks following their random assignment, treatment group members were scheduled to attend a set of four training modules which covered business feasibility, marketing, finance and accounting, and organization and management. Approximately 20 hours of classroom time were spent on these topics over four days during a one-week period. Attendance at the first module was required, in part to ensure that participants signed an agreement which included a list of project requirements and a list of program services.<sup>80</sup>
- Participants developed individualized business plans with the assistance of business development specialists. Help was also provided through optional monthly “entrepreneur club” meetings.
- Business development specialists serving as case managers conducted a “milestone review” for each client. After completing five milestones,<sup>81</sup> participants were eligible to receive a lump-sum payment equal to their remaining UI entitlement at the time, in addition to the bi-weekly UI payments received prior to completing their milestones, while engaged in their business startup activities.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup>In signing the agreement, claimants waived all claims against the project for financial losses.

<sup>81</sup>These were: completion of training modules, development of a business plan, setting up a business bank account, satisfying licensing requirements, and obtaining adequate financing.

<sup>82</sup>Because the remaining entitlement at any point in the claim was the maximum benefit payable less the amount of UI benefits already paid out in the form of bi-weekly payments, the amount of the lump-sum payment depended on the participant’s UI entitlement, as well as the time taken to achieve the milestones.

□ Participants whose businesses closed were allowed to return to the regular UI program after receiving their lump-sum payment and draw the remainder of their UI entitlement in the form of bi-weekly payments provided they met the normal UI eligibility requirements, including the work search requirement.<sup>83</sup>

Chart 18 shows the SEED intake and assessment process. A total of 755 new UI claimants were enrolled in SEED's six sites and offered demonstration services; 752 new UI claimants who applied to SEED were assigned to the control group. Chart 19 shows the business startup services provided to members of the SEED treatment group.

A study of the SEED demonstration revealed that it increased the likelihood of being self-employed, accelerated the timing of entry into self-employment, and increased earnings from self-employment.<sup>84</sup> The study report provides an overview of

---

<sup>83</sup>Because the lump-sum payments were paid out of Federal research funds, rather than State UI funds, they did not affect a participants' UI net balance available.

<sup>84</sup>Jacob M. Benus, Terry R. Johnson, and Michelle Wood, *First Impact Analysis of the Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-1 (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994). See also Jacob M. Benus et al., *Self-Employment Programs: A New Reemployment Strategy, Final Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration* (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994) which is summarized in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*. See also Jacob M. Benus, Michelle L. Wood, and Neelima Grover, *Self-Employment as a Reemployment Option: Demonstration Results and National Legislation*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-3 (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc. 1994) which is also summarized in this Chapter. For earlier information about the Washington State demonstration, see Terry R. Johnson and Janice J. Leonard, *Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration, Interim Report: Implementation and Process Analysis* (Seattle, Wash.: Battelle Human Affairs Research Centers, 1991).

the demonstration; discusses its experimental and operational design; reviews sources of data used to evaluate the effort; outlines the demonstration's implementation activities and participants' perceptions of the program; provides information about SEED's impacts on self-employment, wage and salary employment, and total employment and earnings; reviews the demonstration's impacts using administrative data; describes its impacts on job creation and satisfaction; and offers a number of conclusions based on the evaluation effort.

## **Implementation Results**

Highlights from an analysis of followup survey data on program experiences are noted below.

- Only a relatively small fraction of invited UI claimants were interested enough in self-employment to attempt to qualify for selection into the demonstration. Of the 42,350 targeted new UI claimants who received an invitation letter to attend a meeting about the SEED demonstration, 7.5 percent attended the meeting and 4.6 percent submitted an application to participate in SEED.
- Recruitment and intake procedures were implemented as designed, with individuals, on average, being randomly assigned within four weeks from their effective date of UI claim.
- The 1,507 claimants who were randomly assigned (755 members of the treatment group and 752 control group members) represented 3.6 percent of the targeted UI claimants.
- Participants tended to be older, more educated, more likely to be in professional, managerial, or technical occupations, and had higher pre-claim earnings than the broader group of targeted claimants. In addition, many had a working spouse and substantial assets.

- The evaluation revealed that the program met its objective of early intervention; treatment group members received training services, on average, within 5.5 weeks after their effective date of claim.
- Business training services were provided consistently across all six demonstration sites. Participants who attended business training modules and individual counseling sessions gave both the sessions and the instructors high ratings.
- About 60 percent of the treatment group received a lump-sum payment equal to their remaining UI benefits after achieving the five milestones.
- The average lump-sum payment was \$4,225, and the average length of time after random assignment until receipt of the payment was 7.8 weeks.
- The most common use of lump-sum payments was for business startup expenses.
- Among treatment group members who received specific SEED services, the aspects of the program they found most useful were the waiver from the UI work search requirement, the lump-sum payment, and business training.

## **Self-Employment Impacts**

The researchers measured the effects of SEED by calculating the difference in the outcomes of the treatment and control groups. The researchers found that the demonstration increased the likelihood and accelerated the timing of entry into self-employment, leading to higher self-employment earnings. The demonstration did not, however, affect the treatment group's survival rate in self-employment. Specifically, the researchers found that:

- The demonstration increased the likelihood of being self-employed during the observation period by 25 percentage points. Fifty-two percent of the treatment group was self-employed at some time during the observation period compared

to 27 percent for the control group.

- Demonstration services had a greater impact in raising the likelihood of self-employment for females than for males.
- Treatment group members' entry into self-employment was accelerated by about six months.
- Both treatment and control group members tended to start businesses in the service industry sector.
- Availability of demonstration services did not affect the survival rate in self-employment; approximately one-third of the businesses in both the treatment and control groups failed in the first year.
- Total time in self-employment was increased by about four months over the entire followup period.
- Total earnings from self-employment increased by about \$3,000 over the observation period.
- Average gross monthly earnings from self-employment increased by about \$150.

## **Wage and Salary Employment Impacts**

The study revealed that the positive impacts on self-employment of SEED participants may coincide with negative program impacts on wage and salary incomes for individuals who did not become self-employed. The researchers found that:

- Participation in SEED delayed reemployment in a wage and salary job by approximately one month.
- SEED reduced the likelihood of wage and salary employment during the observation period by five percentage points.
- Treatment group members became reemployed in a wage and salary job

approximately one month later than control group members and, over the entire observation period, worked one month less in wage and salary employment than control group members.

- SEED reduced total earnings from wage and salary employment over the observation period by approximately \$2,500.
- The SEED program had no impact on average monthly earnings from wage and salary employment.

## **Impacts on Total Employment and Earnings**

Because the demonstration had positive impacts on a number of self-employment outcomes and negative impacts on various wage and salary incomes, the researchers analyzed the *combined* self-employment and wage and salary experience of treatment and control group members. They found that the demonstration had significant positive impacts on the likelihood of employment and the duration of employment during the observation period. However, it did not significantly affect the *combined* earnings from wage and salary employment and self-employment. Among the main findings were:

- SEED increased the likelihood of employment (either wage and salary *or* self-employment) during the observation period by about five percentage points).
- Treatment group members worked about two months more in total during the observation period than control group members.
- SEED had no significant impact on total earnings or on average monthly earnings during the observation period.

## **Impacts Using Administrative Data**

In an effort to enhance their analysis of several key study outcomes, the researchers reviewed additional data which were obtained from administrative (rather than survey) sources. These data were used to examine the demonstration's impacts on business activity, State tax payments, and UI benefit receipt. The researchers point out that the findings derived from administrative records were consistent with the results based on survey data. The main findings from the impact analysis using administrative data are summarized below.

- SEED increased the likelihood of having a business and receiving business income.
- The demonstration did not affect the rate of business failure.
- Gross business income, State sales taxes, and business and occupation taxes were significantly higher for the treatment group than for the control group.
- SEED did not affect the likelihood of working in UI-covered employment at some time during the benefit year.
- Treatment group members worked fewer hours in non-UI-covered employment and obtained lower earnings in UI-covered employment than control group members.
- The demonstration reduced the length of the first spell of UI benefit payments by about six weeks.
- Although SEED reduced the length of UI benefit payments, it actually increased the amount of total benefits paid to treatment group members by slightly over \$1,000 per claimant (i.e., after taking into account the lump-sum payments—paid from Federal research funds—treatment group members received an average of \$4,858 as compared to \$3,777 for the control group).

### **Indirect Impacts on Job Creation and Job Satisfaction**

The researchers found that the demonstration may also have had *indirect*

impacts on the employment of treatment group members (e.g., increasing the number of businesses created, the number of jobs for nonparticipants, and job satisfaction). The researchers compared the employment level (other than the owners) in treatment group business with the employment level in control group businesses and obtained information about job satisfaction from treatment and control group members. Their main findings in this regard include:

- Within the 21-month followup period, SEED led to the creation of 49 net new jobs for nonparticipants in addition to the jobs created for the self-employed participants.
- SEED increased the employment of family members in the newly created businesses, but did not affect the employment of nonfamily members in the businesses.
- The demonstration did affect the job satisfaction level of demonstration participants. While the demonstration may not have had a *direct* impact on job satisfaction, it may have had an *indirect* impact because self-employment may provide more job satisfaction than wage and salary employment. The researchers found that self-employed individuals were more satisfied than those employed in wage and salary jobs with the type of work they do; their degree of independence; their work hour flexibility; and their physical work environment (although wage and salary employees were more satisfied with fringe benefits and the number of hours worked).

## Conclusions

The researchers suggest that self-employment programs like SEED represent viable policy tools for promoting rapid reemployment of UI claimants, although the cost-

effectiveness of such programs remains unanswered.<sup>85</sup>

Specifically, they found that the demonstration dramatically increased the likelihood of being self-employed, accelerated the timing of entry into self-employment, and increased earnings from self-employment. They also found that the demonstration generally had negative impacts on wage and salary outcomes (i.e., it delayed reemployment and reduced earnings from wage and salary employment).

In combining self-employment and wage and salary outcomes, the researchers found that the demonstration had significantly positive impacts on employment outcomes (it increased the likelihood of being employed and increased the total time employed) and had no significant impacts on total earnings. An analysis of the demonstration's impact on job creation revealed that it had a significant impact on the employment of family members but no impact on the employment of nonfamily members.

## **FROM UNEMPLOYMENT TO SELF-EMPLOYMENT: INTERIM REPORT ON THE UI SELF-EMPLOYMENT DEMONSTRATION**

### **Overview**

As part of its effort to help unemployed workers find new jobs, the Department of Labor sponsored two demonstration projects during the late 1980s and early 1990s that

---

<sup>85</sup>The cost-effectiveness of the SEED program is discussed in, *Self-Employment Programs: A New Reemployment Strategy, Final Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration* which is summarized in this Chapter.

helped unemployment insurance recipients start their own businesses.<sup>86</sup> The UI self-employment demonstration projects, conducted in Washington State and in Massachusetts, tested packages of self-employment assistance for UI recipients on permanent layoff. These packages included a combination of financial payments ("self-employment allowances") and business development services (business training, counseling, technical assistance, and peer support).<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup>The demonstration effort began in September 1987 with the selection of Washington State as the site for a self-employment project. Section 9152 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987, enacted in December 1987, authorized the Department to proceed with UI self-employment projects in other States. The following year, the Department initiated a second self-employment project in Massachusetts.

<sup>87</sup>For details about the Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) demonstration, see Jacob M. Benus, Terry R. Johnson, and Michelle Wood, *First Impact Analysis of the Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-1 (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994) which is summarized in this chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*. A final report on the UI self-employment demonstration was also published by the Department; see Jacob M. Benus et al., *Self-Employment Programs: A New Reemployment Strategy, Final Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration* (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994) which is also summarized in this chapter. For earlier information about the Washington State demonstration, see Terry R. Johnson and Janice J. Leonard, *Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration, Interim Report: Implementation and Process Analysis* (Seattle, Wash.: Battelle Human Affairs Research Centers, 1991). Early information about the Massachusetts demonstration can be found in Jacob M. Benus et al., *Massachusetts UI Self-Employment Demonstration: Interim Report to Congress* (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1991). See also Stephen A. Wandner, et al., *Self-Employment Programs for Unemployed Workers*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 92-2 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1992). For an overview of self-employment programs in Western Europe and early self-employment activities in the United States, see Steven A. Wandner and Jon C. Messenger, "From Unemployed to Self-Employed: Self-Employment as a Reemployment Option in the United States,"

Each project was jointly operated by the State employment security agency and the economic development agency. The employment security agency paid the self-employment allowances, while the State economic development agency, along with local service providers, provided business development services to project participants.

The Washington demonstration offered financial assistance to eligible participants in the form of lump-sum UI payments, while the Massachusetts project offered biweekly payments equal to an individual's regular UI benefits.

A comparative analysis of the Washington and Massachusetts demonstrations revealed that both increased the likelihood of self-employment and both accelerated the timing of entry into self-employment.<sup>88</sup> The study report summarizes the impacts of the two demonstrations based on a first round of post-project followup surveys. It presents information about the experimental and operational design of both projects, describes data sources used in the analysis, compares the implementation procedures followed in the two demonstrations, discusses the demonstrations' impacts on employment and earnings, and describes other outcomes such as the programs' impact on job creation and unemployment insurance receipt.

---

prepared for the Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management's 13th Annual Research Conference, October 1991. See also *New Forms of Activity for the Unemployed and Measures to Assist the Creation of Self-Employment: Experiences and Opportunities in Combatting Unemployment*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 93-2 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1993).

<sup>88</sup>Jacob M. Benus, Michelle L. Wood, and Neelima Grover, *Self-Employment as a Reemployment Option: Demonstration Results and National Legislation*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-3 (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc. 1994).

A second section of the publication focuses on recent national legislation authorizing self-employment assistance (SEA) programs. The legislation and Department guidance to States in developing their SEA programs are included.

## **The Demonstration Projects**

The analysis presented in the study report covers, on average, the first 19 months after participants were randomly assigned to either a treatment or a control group in Massachusetts and the first 21 months after random assignment in Washington.<sup>89</sup> The researchers briefly describe each project, noting that the Washington Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration was initiated on a pilot basis in one site beginning in September 1989 and was then implemented in five additional sites in February 1990. SEED enrollments continued through early September 1990, with business support services available through March 1991. The demonstration used a classical experimental design, with random assignment to either a treatment or a control group of eligible claimants interested in starting their own businesses. A total of 755 new UI claimants were enrolled in SEED in six sites and 752 new UI claimants who applied to SEED were assigned to the control group. (Control group individuals were not eligible to receive SEED services, but remained eligible for regular UI benefits and services.)<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup>The final report on each of the two demonstrations which is summarized in this Chapter, covers the first three years after random assignment.

<sup>90</sup>Early impacts of the SEED demonstration are described in Jacob Benus et al., *Does Self-Employment Work for the Unemployed? First Impact Analysis of the Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration* (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1993) which is summarized in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*.

The Massachusetts Enterprise Project began operating in May 1990, with enrollment taking place in three phases. The first phase took place in May- September 1990, the second phase took place April-October 1991, and the third phase took place March 1992 through April 1993. The study report reviews the preliminary results from the first two enrollment periods. During that time, a total of 521 UI claimants were randomly assigned to either the treatment group (263) or to the control group (258).

## **Experimental and Operational Designs**

The researchers compare and contrast the experimental and operational design features of both demonstrations, noting that both projects targeted new UI claimants and both excluded persons filing interstate claims, claimants on temporary layoff (or full-referral union members), and individuals under 18 years old. The Washington demonstration also excluded individuals filing claims backdated more than 14 days and the Massachusetts project excluded claimants eligible for less than 26 weeks of benefits. Because the authorizing legislation for the Massachusetts project required that it focus on UI claimants who were likely to exhaust their benefits, these individuals were further targeted.

The intake and assessment process for each program is shown in Chart 20. As the Chart shows, both projects recruited claimants who were interested in self-employment. These clients were then sent a letter inviting them to attend an initial information session held at the local UI office where the UI claim was filed.

Individuals who were still interested in the program after the information sessions received and completed applications which included personal background information and a description of their proposed business idea. Applications were subsequently reviewed by project staff and clients and were then randomly assigned to either the treatment group (eligible to receive business development services and financial

assistance from the demonstration) or to a control group.

Chart 21 illustrates the business startup and financial assistance services provided by the two demonstrations.

## **Massachusetts**

As Chart 21 indicates, clients in the Massachusetts project attended an Enterprise Seminar, a one-day session conducted by business experts. Within two weeks of the seminar, participants were required to attend an individual counseling session with a business counselor. (Participants were encouraged to attend additional counseling sessions.) Massachusetts participants were also required to attend “enterprise workshops,” which covered issues such as marketing, personal effectiveness, cash flow, financing, legal requirements and insurance, and bookkeeping/taxes. During the period, participants were encouraged to develop a business plan and received help from their counselors to develop the plan. Following the workshops, participants were eligible to receive self-employment allowances (or stipends) equal to their regular bi-weekly UI benefits.

Participants were exempt from the regular UI work search requirements while enrolled in the program and their earnings from self-employment were disregarded in calculating their self-employment allowance amount. Treatment group members could collect self-employment allowances through week 24 of their UI claim and, because they were eligible for up to 30 weeks of UI benefits, they had to choose between continuing with their self-employment activities full-time or returning to UI for up to six weeks of remaining eligibility and meeting the work search requirements.

Additional support was provided in Massachusetts through a loan program sponsored by a local bank.

## Washington

The business startup services provided in the Washington demonstration differed somewhat from those provided in Massachusetts. Within two weeks following their random assignment, treatment group members were scheduled to attend a set of four training modules which covered business feasibility, marketing, finance and accounting, and organization and management. Individualized business plans were then developed by participants in Washington with the assistance of a business development specialist. Help was also provided through Entrepreneur Club meetings which were scheduled monthly.

Participants received their regular UI payments and were eligible for a lump-sum payment of an amount equal to their remaining available UI benefits; they received their regular bi-weekly payments while engaged in business startup activities and became eligible for the lump-sum self-employment payment when they had completed five milestones: (1) completion of the training modules; (2) development of business plans; (3) setting up a business bank account; (4) satisfying all licensing requirements; and (5) obtaining adequate financing. Because the remaining entitlement at any point in the claim was the maximum benefits payable, less the amount of UI benefits already paid out in the form of bi-weekly payments, the amount of the lump-sum payment depended on the participants' UI entitlement, as well as the time taken to achieve the milestones.

Business development specialists conducted the "milestone review" to determine if all objectives had been attained and whether the lump-sum payment would be made.

Participants in Washington whose businesses closed were allowed to return to the regular UI program after receiving their lump-sum payment and draw the remainder of their UI entitlement in the form of bi-weekly payments provided they met the normal

UI eligibility requirements, including the work requirement.<sup>91</sup>

## **Data Sources**

The study report reviews the sources of data used for the study. These included a Participant Tracking System (PTS)—an on-line database system developed by the Department which, among other functions, provided data on individual participant characteristics, demonstration services, and UI payment information.

Two followup telephone surveys were also conducted by research staff. The first was administered to both participant groups and to the control groups approximately one and a half to two years after random assignment. The second survey was administered one year after the first survey. The surveys collected detailed pre- and post-program information on both the treatment and control groups about employment, earnings, periods of unemployment, periods of time spent looking for work, demographic characteristics, and experiences with the programs. The overall response rate to the telephone interviews for both the treatment and control groups was about 80 percent.

## **Demonstration Implementation**

The study report reviews the implementation of both projects, presenting information about program participation rates, the timing and use of program services, and participants' opinions about the services.

---

<sup>91</sup>Because the lump-sum payments were paid out of Federal research funds, rather than State UI funds, they did not affect a participants' UI net balance available.

The report points out a number of changes that occurred in the Massachusetts project after its initial 1990 implementation and discusses their effects on participant characteristics. The authors note that although some significant changes occurred in the delivery of business assistance services in 1991, participant characteristics between the two years remained substantially the same. From 1990 to 1991, however, the application rate (the percentage of information session attendees who submitted applications) dropped from 69 percent to 59 percent, although the combination of attendance rates and application rates yielded about the same overall application rates in both years. The rate of participation in business services did not change between 1990 and 1991. There was, however, a significant increase in the percentage of treatment group members who attended at least one bi-weekly workshop (77.1 percent in 1990 versus 89.9 percent in 1991).

The researchers suggest that the changes in program implementation between 1990 and 1991 in Massachusetts did not affect program participation levels.

In discussing the timing of project activities in Massachusetts, the researchers point out that for most activities, the elapsed time between consecutive activities was significantly lower in 1991 than in 1990, most likely reflecting improved organization in the delivery of program services that resulted from experience with early program implementation.

In comparing the implementation of the demonstrations in Massachusetts and Washington, the study report points out that the response rate to the invitations to attend the information session was significantly higher in Washington. The application rate among information session attendees in Massachusetts was only slightly higher than in Washington (63 percent versus 61 percent). Despite some differences in the application review process, both demonstrations had similar random assignment rates. (In Massachusetts, 81.7 percent of all applications were deemed acceptable and were

randomly assigned to either the treatment or control groups, while the percentage was 78.0 in Washington.)

Ninety-two percent of the participants in Massachusetts who were assigned to the treatment group attended the first training session (the “enterprise seminar”), while 85 percent of the Washington participants attended their first training session. More than 90 percent of all treatment group members in Massachusetts attended at least one individual counseling session, while only 70 percent of Washington participants attended such a session.

The researchers suggest that the goal of early intervention may have been more effective in the Washington demonstration, as the average number of days between the benefit year begin date and the date of attendance at the orientation session in Massachusetts was 33 days, compared to 18 days in Washington.<sup>92</sup>

Overall, while a higher percentage of Massachusetts treatment group members attended the first key training activity (either the enterprise seminar for the Massachusetts project or the first training module in Washington), 83 percent of the Washington treatment group members attended *all* training modules, compared to only 46 percent of the Massachusetts treatment participants.

In addition, the researchers found that the Massachusetts participants used the counseling that was available to them more extensively than the Washington participants; Massachusetts participants received an average of 6.5 hours of counseling each, while Washington participants received about 1.5 hours of counseling.

Participants were also surveyed regarding their opinions of the demonstration's business assistance services. Treatment group participants in both projects indicated

---

<sup>92</sup>This was due largely to the fact that Massachusetts was a wage-request State while Washington was a wage-reporting State.

that they had positive opinions about the quality of the business services they received.

## **Employment and Earnings**

Using data from the first followup survey, the study report presents information about the impacts of the demonstrations on participants by describing their self-employment experiences and earnings.

In addressing participants' self-employment experiences, the study report examines the impact of the two demonstrations on the likelihood of entering self-employment, the elapsed time between random assignment and the start of self-employment, the likelihood of being self-employed at the time of the followup survey, the likelihood of self-employment termination, the total time spent in self-employment, and the earnings from self-employment since random assignment.

The researchers found that treatment group participants in both States were significantly more likely than control group members to have at least one self-employment experience following random assignment. The research revealed that in Massachusetts, 43.2 percent of the treatment group participants had one self-employment spell, versus 27.7 percent of the control group individuals. In Washington, 48.8 percent of the treatment group participants had one self-employment spell, versus 25.3 percent of the control group individuals.

In addition, in Massachusetts, treatment group members started their first self-employment spell 2.4 months earlier than control group members. In Washington, treatment group members started their first self-employment spell 5.9 months before control group members. Treatment group participants in both demonstrations were more likely to continue to be self-employed at the time of the followup survey than control group members.

In Massachusetts, control group members spent an average of 2.3 months in self-employment, while the treatment group spent an average of 3.9 months in self-employment. In Washington, control group members spent an average of 1.9 months in self-employment, while treatment group members spent an average of 5.8 months in self-employment.

In reviewing self-employment earnings, the researchers found that the Enterprise Project in Massachusetts did not have a significant impact on self-employment earnings, while the Washington SEED project did, although the lack of significant impacts in Massachusetts may reflect the relatively small sample for the first two years of project enrollment.

In looking at program impacts, the researchers analyze the number of wage and salary jobs held by treatment and control group members, discuss the effects of the demonstrations on the likelihood of having a wage and salary job at the time of the survey, note the mean elapsed time to the beginning of the first wage and salary spell and the time spent in wage and salary employment since random assignment, and present information about participant earnings from wage and salary jobs since random assignment.

The study found that in Massachusetts, treatment group members were slightly more likely than control group members to have at least one wage and salary spell after enrollment in the demonstration (63 percent versus 60 percent), although these differences were not statistically significant. However, in Massachusetts, treatment group members worked about one month more than control group members in wage and salary employment. On the other hand, in Washington, treatment group members were less likely than control group members to have at least one wage and salary job (70 percent versus 75 percent) and treatment group members worked about one month less in wage and salary employment. This difference was statistically significant. Thus,

the results suggest that the Massachusetts demonstration increased the wage and salary employment of treatment group members, while the Washington demonstration reduced the wage and salary employment of treatment group members.

The researchers also found that the Washington demonstration delayed the start of the first wage and salary job spell by about one month, while the Massachusetts demonstration had no significant impact on the timing of a first wage and salary job after random assignment.

In Massachusetts, treatment group members earned significantly more than their control group counterparts in *total* wage and salary earnings as well as in average *monthly* wage and salary earnings since random assignment. On the other hand, in Washington, total wage and salary earnings for treatment group members were less for control group members during the observation period, although there was no impact on average monthly wage and salary earnings during the observation period.

Combining self-employment outcomes with a number of wage and salary outcomes, the researchers determined that both demonstrations had a positive and significant impact on the likelihood of having *either* wage and salary employment *or* self-employment during the observation period. Both demonstrations also had a positive and significant impact on the likelihood of having a wage and salary job and/or being self-employed at the time of the followup survey.

Both demonstrations also had a positive impact on the total time employed.

Regarding earnings estimates, the researchers found that in Massachusetts, the impacts were positive and significant for *both* total earnings and monthly earnings during the observation period. The Washington program, however, did not have a significant impact on total earnings or on average monthly earnings.

## **Impacts on Job Creation and UI Outcomes**

In addition to providing employment for new business owners, small businesses often generate wage and salary employment for others. Therefore, the researchers investigated the demonstration's impacts on the wage and salary employment of nonparticipants. The researchers found that in Massachusetts, among the 91 businesses operated by treatment group members at the time of the followup survey, 23 businesses (25 percent) had a family member employed in the business.

Among the 63 businesses started by control group members in Massachusetts, 14 businesses (22 percent) employed a family member. Similar proportions were found in Washington, where among the 223 businesses operated by treatment group members, 49 businesses (22 percent) employed a family member and among the 128 control group businesses, 27 businesses (21 percent) employed a family member.

Little difference was found in the propensity of treatment and control group members to employ nonfamily members.

In investigating the impacts of the demonstration on the receipt of UI benefits, the researchers developed three main measures of UI benefit receipt: (1) number of weeks of the first spell of UI receipt; (2) total amount of UI benefits received during the first benefit year; and (3) the UI exhaustion rate. The study found that the Massachusetts demonstration reduced the length of the first UI spell by about two weeks and the Washington demonstration reduced its length by about six weeks.

Regarding program impacts on UI benefits received during the first year, the researchers found that the Massachusetts demonstration had a significant negative impact on UI benefit receipt during the initial benefit year (i.e., the treatment group

received considerably less in total UI benefits over the first year than did the control group). Because the Washington demonstration offered a lump-sum payment in addition to regular UI benefits, treatment group members in the Washington program, on average, received over \$1,000 more in UI payments than control group members.

## **Implementation Summary**

In summarizing the main findings from their analysis of program implementation, the researchers point out:

- In Washington, 7.5 percent of the 42,350 targeted new UI claimants invited to a meeting about the SEED demonstration attended the meeting. In Massachusetts, 3.8 percent of the 26,170 invitees attended a meeting about the Enterprise project.
- In both demonstrations, the recruitment and intake procedures were implemented as designed, meeting program objectives of early intervention. In Washington, attendance at the information session occurred on average 18 days after the benefit year begin date; in Massachusetts, this interval was, on average, 33 days.
- In Washington, the 1,507 claimants who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control groups represented 3.6 percent of the targeted UI claimants. In Massachusetts, the 521 claimants who were randomly assigned represented 2.0 percent of the targeted UI claimants.
- In Washington, treatment group members began training, on average, within six weeks of the effective date of their UI claim. In Massachusetts, training began within nine weeks.
- In both States, a high proportion of treatment group members participated in program services such as business training and counseling.
- Program design differences led to greater use of counseling services in

Massachusetts than in Washington. The mean number of hours of counseling in Massachusetts was 6.5, while the mean number of hours in Washington was 1.5.

□ In Washington, about 60 percent of the treatment group received a lump-sum payment (equal to their remaining UI benefits) after achieving five program milestones. The average lump-sum payment was \$4,225. There was no such payment in Massachusetts; instead, participants received biweekly self-employment payments equal to their regular UI benefits.

In summarizing the main findings from their analysis of the program's impacts on employment and earnings, the researchers suggest that:

□ In both of the demonstrations, treatment group members were more likely than control group members to be self-employed at some point during the observation period.

□ In both demonstrations, treatment group members entered self-employment earlier than control group members.

□ Treatment group members were nearly twice as likely as control group members to be self-employed at the time of the followup survey in both demonstrations.

□ Neither demonstration had an impact on the likelihood of ending a self-employment spell during the observation period.

□ In Massachusetts, there was no statistically significant effect on earnings from self-employment. In Washington, treatment group members earned significantly more than control group members from self-employment.

□ In both demonstrations, treatment group members spent more time in self-employment than control group members.

In summarizing the main findings from their analysis of the program's wage and salary impacts, the researchers conclude:

□ In Massachusetts, the demonstration did not reduce the likelihood of wage and

salary employment during the followup period. In Washington, on the other hand, the demonstration did reduce the likelihood of wage and salary employment.

- In Massachusetts, the demonstration increased the treatment group's likelihood of wage and salary employment at the time of the followup survey; in Washington, the demonstration did not affect wage and salary employment at followup.
- The Massachusetts demonstration increased the time worked in wage and salary employment by one month. The Washington demonstration reduced the time in wage and salary employment by one month.
- The Massachusetts demonstration did not affect the mean elapsed time to the start of the first wage and salary job. The Washington demonstration, on the other hand, delayed the start of the first wage and salary job.
- In Massachusetts, the demonstration increased the duration of wage and salary employment; in Washington, it reduced the duration of such employment.
- The Massachusetts demonstration increased total and average monthly wage and salary earnings; the Washington demonstration, on the other hand, reduced total wage and salary earnings.
- Both demonstrations increased the likelihood of employment (in either wage and salary or self-employment) during the observation period.
- Both demonstrations increased the total time employed during the observation period.
- The Washington demonstration had no impact on either total earnings or on average monthly earnings during the observation period. The Massachusetts demonstration, on the other hand, had substantial positive impacts on these earnings.

In summarizing the main findings from their analysis of the program's impacts on job creation and UI outcomes, the researchers point out that:

- Neither demonstration had any statistically significant impact on the

employment of nonparticipants (family and nonfamily employees, excluding the business owner(s)).

- Both demonstrations significantly reduced the length of the first unemployment spell.
- Excluding the lump-sum payment in Washington, treatment group members drew fewer UI benefits than control group members during the first benefit year.
- Including the lump-sum payment, however, Washington treatment group members received higher total payments than control group members during the benefit year. (The Massachusetts demonstration did not have a lump-sum payment.)

## Conclusions

Following are the major conclusions presented in the study report.

- Both demonstrations increased the likelihood of self-employment and both accelerated the timing of entry into self-employment.
- The Massachusetts demonstration had *positive* impacts on wage and salary employment outcomes, while the Washington demonstration had negative impacts on wage and salary employment.
- If self-employment and wage and salary employment outcomes are taken together, both demonstrations had positive impacts on these *combined* outcomes.
- The Washington demonstration had a positive impact on self-employment earnings and a negative impact on wage and salary earnings. When self-employment earnings and wage and salary earnings are *combined*, there were no observable impacts on total earnings in Washington.
- In Massachusetts, no significant self-employment earnings impacts were observed, but there were positive wage and salary earnings impacts. Combining earnings from self-employment and wage and salary employment yielded a

significant positive impact on total earnings.

□ Self-employment programs like Washington State's SEED and Massachusetts' Enterprise Project represent viable tools for promoting the rapid reemployment of UI claimants. While the impacts of such self-employment programs on earnings remain ambiguous, their impact on employment outcomes appears robust.

## FROM UNEMPLOYMENT TO SELF-EMPLOYMENT: FINAL REPORT ON THE UI SELF-EMPLOYMENT DEMONSTRATION

### Overview

Unemployment Insurance self-employment demonstration projects, conducted in Washington State and in Massachusetts,<sup>93</sup> tested packages of self-employment

---

<sup>93</sup>Information from an interim evaluation of the Washington State and Massachusetts demonstrations can be found in Jacob M. Benus, Michelle Wood, and Neelima Grover, *Self Employment as a Reemployment Option: Demonstration Results and National Legislation*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-3 (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994) which is summarized in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor*. For details about the Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration, see Jacob M. Benus, Terry R. Johnson, and Michelle Wood, *First Impact Analysis of the Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-1 (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994) which is also summarized in this chapter. Earlier information about the Washington State demonstration can be found in Terry R. Johnson and Janice J. Leonard, *Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration, Interim Report: Implementation and Process Analysis* (Seattle, Wash.: Battelle Human Affairs Research Centers, 1991). Early information about the Massachusetts demonstration can be found in Jacob M. Benus et al., *Massachusetts UI Self-Employment Demonstration: Interim Report to Congress* (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1991).

assistance for UI recipients on permanent layoff.<sup>94</sup>

The demonstrations also tested the ability of the U.S. employment security and economic development systems to work together<sup>95</sup> and help UI recipients to become employed by starting their own businesses. Based on the positive findings of early evaluations of the two self-employment demonstrations, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Implementation Act (P.L. 103-182) authorized States to establish self-employment assistance programs for unemployed workers. By the end of 1994, California, Connecticut, Maine, New York, and Rhode Island had enacted enabling legislation to implement these programs. In 1995, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, and Oregon enacted self-employment assistance legislation.

A report presenting final impact estimates of the two UI self-employment demonstrations largely reinforces earlier findings and underscores the prior conclusion that self-employment is a viable policy tool to promote the rapid reemployment of unemployed workers.<sup>96</sup> The study report provides background information about the two demonstrations, discusses their experimental and operational designs, outlines and

---

See also Stephen A. Wandner, et al., *Self-Employment Programs for Unemployed Workers*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 92-2 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1992).

<sup>94</sup>The packages included a combination of financial payments ("self-employment allowances") and business development services (business training, counseling, technical assistance, and peer support).

<sup>95</sup>Each project was jointly operated by State employment security and economic development agencies.

<sup>96</sup>Jacob M. Benus, et al., *Self-Employment Programs: A New Reemployment Strategy, Final Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration* (Bethesda, Md.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1994).

compares their implementation, describes sources of data used in evaluating the programs, analyzes and compares the impacts of each demonstration, and provides information about the benefits and costs of the demonstrations.

## Findings

Because details of the two demonstrations can be found in this Chapter of the *Training and Employment Report of the Secretary of Labor* under the heading “From Unemployment to Self-Employment: Interim Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration,” and because final study results reinforce the interim report’s preliminary findings and conclusions, only the main findings from the final study are presented here.

Regarding the analysis of the implementation of the two demonstrations, the researchers found that:

- In Washington, 7.5 percent of the 42,350 targeted new UI claimants invited to a meeting about the SEED demonstration attended that meeting. In Massachusetts, 4.2 percent of the 63,921 invitees attended a meeting about the Enterprise Project.
- In both demonstrations, the recruitment and intake procedures were implemented as designed, meeting the program objective of early intervention. In Washington, attendance at the information session occurred on average 18 days after the initial UI claim date; in Massachusetts, this interval was on average 33 days. The longer interval in Massachusetts relative to Washington was largely due to the fact that Washington was a wage-reporting State for UI purposes and Massachusetts was a wage-request State (i.e., Massachusetts had to request wage data from employers to determine claimants’ eligibility for UI

benefits) during the demonstration.<sup>97</sup>

□ In Washington, the 1,507 claimants who applied (and were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control groups) represented 3.6 percent of the targeted UI claimants. In Massachusetts, the 1,222 applicants who were randomly assigned represented 1.9 percent of the targeted claimants.

□ In Washington, treatment group members began training services, on average, within six weeks of their initial claim date. In Massachusetts, training services began within nine weeks.

□ In both States, a high proportion of treatment group members participated in program services such as business training and counseling. In Washington, for example, approximately 85 percent of the treatment group attended the first training session and 70 percent received some counseling. In Massachusetts, the proportions were even higher.

□ Program design differences led to greater use of counseling services in Massachusetts than in Washington. The mean hours of counseling in Massachusetts was 7.5 hours per participant, while the mean number of hours in Washington was 1.5.

□ In both States, treatment group members received regular benefit payments while developing their businesses. In Washington, however, treatment group members were also eligible for a lump-sum payment (equal to their remaining available UI benefits) after achieving five program milestones.<sup>98</sup> A total of 451 treatment group members (60 percent) received a lump-sum payment averaging \$4,225. There was no lump-sum payment in Massachusetts.

---

<sup>97</sup>Massachusetts procedures were later changed and both are now wage-reporting States.

<sup>98</sup>The milestones were: completion of training modules, development of a business plan, setting up a business bank account, satisfying licensing requirements, and obtaining adequate financing.

The study report points out that the analyses of both demonstrations were based largely on data from an on-line database system developed by the Department of Labor to provide information about project participants and project services, as well as on two telephone surveys.

The authors present the impact results of the demonstration for two observation periods—the period from random assignment to the first followup survey, and the period from random assignment to the second followup survey.<sup>99</sup> Results from the longer observation period (approximately 31 months in Massachusetts and 33 months in Washington) revealed that:

- The Washington SEED program had a very large and positive impact on the self-employment experiences of UI claimants. Treatment group members were much more likely than control group members to have a self-employment experience, to spend more time per year in self-employment, and were more likely to remain self-employed at the time of the second followup survey. The demonstration increased claimants' self-employment earnings by over \$1,600 per year.
- In contrast to the Washington demonstration, the Massachusetts Enterprise Project had significant positive impacts on only some of the self-employment outcomes analyzed. Specifically, treatment group members were more likely than control group members to have a self-employment experience and to spend more time per year in self-employment. However, in contrast to the Washington

---

<sup>99</sup>The first Washington followup survey was conducted, on average, 21 months after random assignment; a total of 1,204 sample members (or 80 percent) responded to the survey. In Massachusetts, the first telephone followup survey was conducted, on average, 19 months after random assignment; 449 sample members (or 80 percent) responded to this survey. The second followup survey in each State was conducted approximately one year after the first survey.

demonstration, treatment group members in Massachusetts were not significantly more likely than controls to be self-employed at the time of the second survey. Furthermore, the Massachusetts demonstration did not have a significant impact on self-employment earnings.

□ In Washington, the estimated program impacts on wage and salary employment measures were consistently negative. Specifically, the Washington program significantly reduced claimants' likelihood of and number of months per year working in wage and salary employment. It also reduced their earnings from wage and salary employment by about \$1,800 per year.

□ In Massachusetts, the estimated impacts on wage and salary outcomes were positive, but generally insignificant, although the project increased claimants' earnings from wage and salary employment by over \$3,000 per year.

□ The Washington demonstration did not significantly increase the combined likelihood of employment in *either* a wage and salary job *or* in self-employment. It did however increase the time worked per year and increased the likelihood of being employed at the time of the second survey. On the other hand, the impacts on total earnings (self-employment and wage and salary earnings) were not statistically significant. Thus, the demonstration's positive impact on self-employment earnings together with its negative impact on wage and salary earnings resulted in a zero impact on claimants' total earnings.

□ The effect of the Massachusetts project on total employment and earnings outcomes (self-employment plus wage and salary employment), on the other hand, was large and consistent. The Massachusetts demonstration significantly increased the likelihood of finding employment, the time worked per year, and the likelihood of being employed at the time of the second survey. In addition, the demonstration increased combined annual earnings by nearly \$6,000.

□ The Washington demonstration had a significant positive impact on the employment of nonparticipants (family and nonfamily employees, excluding the business owner(s)) during the 33-month observation period. The researchers estimated that the Washington SEED demonstration created a total of 316

nonparticipant jobs, while control group businesses created 128 nonparticipant jobs. The Massachusetts demonstration did not have a significant impact on nonparticipant job creation.

□ The Washington demonstration significantly increased receipt of total UI benefits. Taking into account both the regular UI benefits and the lump-sum payments provided to treatment group members who met the required milestones for starting a business, the Washington SEED demonstration increased total benefits by about \$1,000. In Massachusetts, on the other hand, benefits were reduced by nearly \$900.

□ The Massachusetts demonstration was cost effective for participants, nonparticipants (taxpayers), society as a whole, and the government. The Washington State demonstration was cost effective from participants' and from society's perspectives. However, it had a net cost to the government (and thus to tax payers).

The researchers suggest that the results of the final study of the two demonstrations indicate that self-employment assistance programs are a cost-effective approach in promoting the rapid reemployment of unemployed workers. They recommend that these programs be permanently incorporated into the U.S. employment security and economic development system.

## **V. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT**

This final section contains summaries of three studies related to the Unemployment Insurance program.

The first summary provides information obtained from an examination of the effects of an alternative "base period" for determining eligibility for monetary UI benefits. The study stemmed from a concern that, as currently set up in most States, workers with low wage rates and intermittent labor force attachment might be disproportionately

excluded from UI eligibility.

The second summary looks at various scenarios related to hypothetical changes to the taxable wage base for unemployment insurance.

The final study summarized in this section provides information about extended benefits (EB) programs which are designed to go into effect (“triggered”) when unemployment reaches a certain level.

In response to a Congressional request, the Department sponsored a study that examined the implications of using alternative triggers for extended UI benefits.

## **ALTERNATIVE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BASE PERIODS**

### **Overview**

Eligibility for monetary UI benefits depends on worker earnings during a “base” period—a 12-month interval which precedes filing the claim for benefits. In determining benefits, most States rely on workers’ base period earnings during the earliest four calendar quarters of the five completed quarters immediately preceding the claim. In order to be qualified for UI payments, worker earnings during the full 12 months of the base year (or base period) and during the three months of highest earnings (the high quarter) must exceed minimum thresholds as specified in the State’s UI statute.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup>Other requirements may also be imposed such as minimum base period weeks of employment (with earnings above a specified threshold in each week), minimum base period hours worked, and minimum combined earnings for the two highest quarters of the base period.

In most States, claimants who do not satisfy the regular base period earnings requirements cannot receive UI benefits.<sup>101</sup> Since earnings requirements are typically expressed as minimum dollar thresholds, workers with low wage rates and intermittent labor force attachment might be disproportionately excluded from UI eligibility.

An examination of the effects of an alternative base period (in which the last four completed quarters immediately preceding the claim are used in determining UI eligibility) focused on the numbers and characteristics of workers who would qualify for benefits under such a period. The study revealed that this alternative base period would raise the number of monetarily eligible UI claimants by six to eight percent and that low-wage, part-time, and intermittent workers would benefit disproportionately in determining UI eligibility.<sup>102</sup>

Using information supplied by six States which employed alternative base periods in determining monetary UI eligibility,<sup>103</sup> and tabulations of micro data from three States, the researcher describes various options regarding the choice of the base period for making UI eligibility determinations and provide information about the demographic profile of workers who would be eligible for benefits under an alternative base period.

---

<sup>101</sup>Although exceptions may be made in situations of illness and injury when earnings from a longer base period can be considered.

<sup>102</sup>Wayne Vroman, *The Alternative Base Period in Unemployment Insurance: Final Report* (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1995).

<sup>103</sup>The States were Maine, Massachusetts, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington.

The author also considers the effects of the alternative base period on potential and actual benefit outlays and estimates its effects on aggregate UI trust fund outlays. A number of issues related to UI program administration as it relates to an alternative base period are also raised in the study report.

## **The Alternative Base Period**

The report points out that Maine, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Washington use the four most recent completed quarters as their alternative base periods. Massachusetts uses the last 52 weeks as its alternative base period, and Vermont uses two alternative base periods; the last four quarters or (for those still ineligible for UI benefits) the last three completed quarters plus earnings in the current quarter. Base periods and high quarter earnings requirements in the six States that use alternative base periods are shown in Table 22 which provides a summary of the effects of the alternative base period on UI eligibility.

As the table shows, only three States (Maine, Rhode Island, and Vermont) have a high quarter requirement, and, in Maine, this requirement covers earnings in the highest two quarters. Ohio's base period requirement is 20 weeks of employment, during which earnings are at least equal to 27.5 percent of the average weekly wage, while Washington State requires 680 hours of work in the base period. The table also shows that across the six States, claimants who achieved eligibility under the alternative base period made up from six to 10 percent of the total pool of eligible applicants. For five of the six States, the additions fall into a narrow band from six to eight percent of total eligibles.

**Table 22. Descriptive Detail on States with Alternative Base Periods**

Detail	Maine	Massachu- setts	Ohio	Rhode Island	Vermont	Washing- ton
Date started . . . . .	Sept. 1992	Oct. 1993	Oct. 1988	Oct. 1992	Jan. 1988	July 1987
Regular base period . . .	First four of last five completed quarters	First four of last five completed quarters				
Alternative base period .	Last four completed quarters	Last 52 weeks	Last four completed quarters	Last four completed quarters	Last four completed quarters or last three completed quarters plus current quarter	Last four completed quarters
Base period earnings requirement - 1993 . . . . .	6 X Annual AWW <sup>a</sup>	30 X Weekly benefit amount \$1,800	20 Weeks @ 27.5% AWW <sup>a</sup>	400 X minimum wage	140% X high quarter earnings \$1,628	680 hours
High quarter earnings requirement - 1993 . . . . .	2 X Annual AWW <sup>a</sup> in 2 quarters	--	--	200 X minimum wage	\$1,163	--

**Table 22. Descriptive Detail on States with Alternative Base Periods (continued)**

Detail	Maine	Massachu- setts	Ohio	Rhode Island	Vermont	Washing- ton
Recent Experiences:						
Time period . . . . .	1993	1994 (I-II)	1990	1993	1994 (I-II)	1990
Percent eligible under alternative base period . . . . .	8%	7%	8%	8%	10%	6%
Weekly benefit amount - regular base period . . . . .	\$159	--	\$171	\$213	\$165	\$173
Weekly benefit amount - alterna- tive base period . . . . .	\$126	--	\$137	\$157	\$120	\$122

<sup>a</sup>Average weekly wage.

Source: All information presented in this table is based on discussions with State officials and tabular data summaries supplied by the States, as reported in *The Alternative Base Period in Unemployment Insurance: Final Report*.

## Conclusions

The author notes that the main argument for offering the alternative base period relates to equity, in that many low wage and intermittent workers who do not satisfy regular base period monetary eligibility requirements do achieve eligibility under the alternative base period. Their ineligibility arises simply because a large share of their recent earnings is not considered when regular base period determination procedures are followed. Because the purpose of UI is to provide temporary and partial wage loss replacement for individuals who have become unemployed through no fault of their own, having an alternative base period helps UI to fulfill its mission for a wider range of claimants, particularly those with low wages and more intermittent employment patterns.

The author also suggests that, although there are UI trust fund and administrative considerations in offering the alternative base period, neither pose especially large burdens on UI programs.

In addition, the study report points out that the strongest argument for specifying the last four completed quarters as the alternative base period is the potential for using automated earnings records in making eligibility determinations.

The author summarizes four main conclusions, which are noted below.

- The presence of an alternative base period raises the number of monetarily eligible claimants by six to eight percent. The increase is even larger in a State like Vermont where earnings from the current quarter are also used to assess eligibility.
- Low-wage, part-time, and intermittent workers benefit disproportionately from the alternative base period. Since these workers usually experience above average unemployment rates, arguments that stress the role of UI in social protection can be made to support the wider use of alternative base period arrangements.
- The presence of the alternative base period has noticeable effects on UI

benefit outlays and short run effects on UI trust fund balances. Because it enhances the eligibility of low wage workers more than other workers, the proportionate increase in benefit outlays is less than the increase in the number of beneficiaries. It is estimated that the number of UI recipients would increase by six-eight percent and that annual benefit payouts would increase by four-six percent.

□ The administration of an alternative base period would entail extra costs.

Because of time and resource constraints, this report did not cover several areas of interest to the Department. Therefore, the Department is conducting additional research which will gather information about: administrative costs imposed on States and employers for expanded wage record searches; the impact over time on claims volume and trust fund solvency; the types of employers that could report wage data more rapidly; and the feasibility of using the latest four quarters as the base period for claimants filing after the completion of the first or second month following the end of a quarter. The project is scheduled for completion in July 1997.

## **INCREASING THE FEDERAL TAXABLE WAGE BASE FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

### **Overview**

The Unemployment Insurance system<sup>104</sup> is financed by a 6.2 percent gross tax rate applied to the Federal taxable "wage base." The wage base is currently the first \$7,000 paid annually in wages to each employee by covered employers. Employers in States with UI programs approved by the Federal Government and with no delinquent Federal UI loans may credit 5.4 percentage points against the 6.2 percent tax rate (for a

---

<sup>104</sup>Includes UI program administration in all States, as well as Federal administration and several specialized Federal benefit programs.

tax rate of 0.8 percent).

States are required to levy UI payroll taxes on State wage bases that are equal to the Federal taxable wage base, although they may set their own wage bases above the Federal minimum.

The current 0.8 percent Federal Unemployment Tax Act (FUTA) rate has two components: a permanent tax rate of 0.6 percent and a temporary surtax rate of 0.2 percent.<sup>105</sup> UI tax revenues are deposited into one of 59 separate accounts that make up the Federal Unemployment Trust Fund. These funds are managed by the U.S. Treasury.

## **Federal and State Taxable Wage Bases**

Since the inception of UI in the 1930s, the Federal taxable wage base has changed four times. Between 1937 and 1939, there was no Federal wage base. Between 1940 and 1971, the Federal wage base was set at \$3,000. It was increased to \$4,200 in 1972 and to \$6,000 in 1978. It has been at \$7,000 since 1983.

Originally, the Social Security Act did not provide for a taxable wage base for the UI program and both Federal and State contribution rates applied to total wages.<sup>106</sup> In the early 1970s, however, the ratio of taxable payrolls to total payrolls had declined

---

<sup>105</sup>The temporary surtax was first added to the permanent FUTA tax rate in 1976 by Public Law 94-566. Since 1976, authorization for the surtax has been extended repeatedly. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (Public Law 101-203) extended the 0.2 percent surtax through 1990. In 1990, the surtax was extended again through 1995. Most recently, the surtax was continued through 1996 under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-164).

<sup>106</sup>Michigan, New York, and South Carolina were exceptions; taxing only the first \$3,000 of wages in 1939. A Federal taxable wage base equal to the Social Security tax base (\$3,000) became effective January 1, 1940.

from 0.93 in 1940 to 0.45 in 1971. Subsequently, the tax base was increased to \$4,200. In the mid-1970s, the UI program faced financing problems once again, and by 1978 the tax base increased to \$6,000. The taxable wage base was increased to \$7,000 in 1983 and has remained at that level.

In 1990, average earnings in taxable covered employment were slightly above \$23,000. The gap between average annual earnings of covered workers and the Federal taxable wage base has since increased. The growing gap means that the taxable share of covered wages is declining. For example, in 1990, only 37.6 percent of covered wages were taxable compared to 92.8 percent in 1940. This means that even though the statutory Federal tax rate doubled between the late 1960s and the late 1980s from 0.4 to 0.8 percent, the effective tax rate—or the amount of FUTA revenue collected as a percent of the total covered wages—only fluctuated between 0.2 and 0.3 percent of total wages during this period.

Not only have Federal taxable wage bases increased over the years, most State UI programs now have taxable bases that exceed the \$7,000 Federal level. In fact, 41 States had tax bases above the Federal level—more than at any other point in the history of the Federal-State UI system.

A study of the effects of any further increases in the UI Federal taxable wage base revealed that increasing the wage base would result in: (1) an immediate increase in Federal payroll taxes (unless the Federal tax rate is reduced by an amount that offsets the increase in the tax base); (2) higher State UI payroll taxes in States where the taxable wage base falls below the new (higher) Federal tax base; and (3) subsequent reductions in State UI tax rates as UI trust fund balances increase and experience-rating provisions come into play.<sup>107</sup>

The study report offers a history and overview of the UI system, discusses the rationale for raising the Federal taxable wage base, and explores the various effects of

---

<sup>107</sup>Robert F. Cook et al., *The Effects of Increasing the Federal Taxable Wage Base for Unemployment Insurance*, Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 95-1 (Silver Spring, Md.: KRA Corporation, 1995).

an increase in the wage base.

## **Rationale for Raising the Federal Taxable Wage Base**

The authors suggest that there are essentially four reasons for raising the Federal taxable wage base.

First, because the real value of the taxable wage base has decreased substantially since the program's inception, the UI tax burden has become unevenly distributed across low- and high-wage firms. As the real value of the taxable wage base has declined, low-wage employers have had to pay taxes on a higher proportion of their employees' wages, thus paying a higher effective tax rate than their high-wage counterparts.

Second, trust fund contributions have been adversely affected. In most States, benefit formulation is tied to a higher and ever-increasing portion of wages. Contributions, however, are not tied to a similar base. As a result, there has been a decline in State trust fund balances and it has become more difficult for States to provide adequate benefits during recessions.

Third, the use of trust fund surcharges is inversely related to the level of the trust fund. This relationship has encouraged increases in the average UI tax rate structure concurrent with cyclical downturns. Increasing taxes during recessionary periods may be undesirable from a macroeconomic perspective because this may delay economic recovery and prolong periods of high unemployment.

Fourth, the gap between total covered wages and the Federal taxable wage base has widened considerably since the inception of the UI program. At the start of the program in 1939, the Federal taxable wage base represented 100 percent of total wages; by 1992, the taxable wage base represented only 36 percent of total wages. In addition, average annual wages are currently more than three times the taxable wage

base.

The study report points out that for the above reasons, many researchers and policymakers have advocated raising the Federal taxable wage base. Assuming the States also raise the State wage bases to the new Federal level and enact no subsequent change in the tax rate, an increase in the taxable wage base would reduce the tax inequity between low- and high-wage firms and industries, improve trust fund balances, and eliminate part of the difference between average covered wages and the wage base.

## **Study Methodology**

The researchers obtained universe wage record data from four States (Colorado, Maryland, Missouri, and Texas) for Calendar Years 1990 and 1991.<sup>108</sup> A State-by-State simulation model was developed based on historical relationships between the taxable wage base and the taxable wage proportion of total wages. Combined with estimates of the elasticities of demand and factor substitution obtained from a review of the theoretical literature, a model was derived to provide estimates of the employment effects of raising the Federal taxable wage base to various levels using different assumptions of model parameters.

The universe data from the four States were also used to estimate the revenue effects on the Federal and State trust funds of raising the Federal taxable maximum (assuming conformity by the States). The researchers used a sample of firms stratified by industry and size to estimate payroll tax increases and changes in effective tax rates for different sizes of firms, firms in different industries, firms with different experience rated State tax rates, average wage levels, and for firms at the minimum and maximum tax rates for the State. Similar results were also estimated assuming revenue neutral offsetting tax rate changes by the States.

---

<sup>108</sup>The weighted average wage in these States in 1991 was very close (98.7 percent) to the weighted average wage of all States.

The study's State-by-State macromodel of employment and revenue effects allows employment and trust fund revenue effects to be estimated for the effects of increases in State, Federal, and total UI taxes.

## Study Findings

Findings in the study are presented based on the macromodel estimates, universe data, and sample data. Highlights of the study's findings, based on these categories are shown below.

### Macroeconomic Estimates

- Increasing the Federal tax base to \$28,000 would raise Federal tax contributions by \$7.2 billion per year and, assuming conformity and no change in State tax rates or experience rating, raise State tax contributions by \$15.4 billion annually.
- Complete elimination of the cap on Federal taxable wages would raise Federal tax contributions by \$11.2 billion and State revenues by \$25.4 billion.
- With a modest elasticity of labor demand and a low labor supply elasticity, raising the taxable wage base to \$14,000 would reduce employment by slightly less than 100,000.
- Increased Federal UI taxes account for a measurable share of the total employment effect. Just over one-third of the reduction associated with increasing the Federal tax base to \$14,000 is due to higher Federal taxes, the remainder is due to higher State tax bases.
- Eliminating the taxable wage base (i.e., making all UI-covered wages taxable) would reduce employment by 381,000, less than 0.5 percent of covered employment.

## Universe Data

- Based on universe data from the sample States, doubling the taxable wage base to \$14,000 would increase Federal trust fund contributions by more than 50 percent.
- Tripling the taxable wage base to \$21,000 would roughly double the contributions to the Federal trust fund.
- The current Federal wage base covers roughly one-third of total wages in the States. Raising this to \$14,000 would raise that percentage to roughly 55 percent of total wages.
- Raising the Federal wage base to \$65,000 would translate into more than 90 percent of wages in the sample States being covered.

## Sample Data

- The taxable wage proportion increases the most for the largest firm sizes as the taxable wage base increases from \$7,000 to \$65,000. As the wage base increases, relative differences in the effective tax rate tend to diminish, reducing the relative disadvantage of the smaller firm sizes.
- Raising the taxable wage base would cause all industries to pay more and result in some convergence of the effective tax rates. It would also increase the effective tax rate for high-wage industries more than for low-wage industries.
- The taxable wage portion increases within each experience-rated tax rate category as the taxable wage increases. However, there seems to be no discernable relationship between the taxable wage proportion and the experience-rated tax rate.
- Raising the taxable wage base would increase the taxable wage proportion. This would result in a significant convergence of effective tax rates among firms with differing average wages.

- Minimum tax rate firms (with the exception of Missouri which has a zero minimum tax rate) are paying more than their benefit charges. This only increases as the taxable wage base increases. Among firms with maximum rates on wages, raising the taxable wage base to \$14,000 would, essentially, remove the ineffective charges in all the States examined (except for Missouri, where ineffective charges would still be one percent of UI taxes for maximum tax rate firms).
- If each State reduced its average tax rate to raise the same amount of revenue with a higher tax base as it does currently, the difference in the effect by firm size would be negligible, as would be the effect on firms with different experience-rated rates. However, the revenue effect on industries with high and low wages would be substantial, as would the effect on firms with higher and lower average wages. With the exception of the highest wage category (average wages near or in excess of \$65,000), this revenue effect would be substantial.

## **EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFIT TRIGGERS**

### **Overview**

Most recipients of unemployment insurance receive income support through State UI programs which provide up to 26 weeks of benefits. Extended benefit programs offer additional weeks of UI payments when unemployment rates are high. Since 1970, these programs have included a permanent Extended Benefits (EB) program and a series of temporary programs which operated during major recessions.

Extended benefits programs are designed to go into effect (“triggered”) when unemployment reaches a certain level. The permanent EB program and most temporary programs have historically used the unemployment rate among the population covered by the UI program (known as the insured unemployment rate, or IUR) to determine either when extended benefits are made available or the number of

weeks benefits are extended.

In recent years, however, dissatisfaction with the IUR as a “trigger” for extended benefits has caused policymakers and members of Congress to examine the use of the unemployment rate among the entire population (TUR) as an alternative trigger for EB.<sup>109</sup>

In response to a Congressional request, the Department sponsored a study which examined the implications of using alternative IUR- and TUR-based triggers for extended UI benefits.<sup>110</sup> The examination included alternative trigger rates and trigger definitions that, in many cases, included a “threshold” requirement (a requirement that the current IUR or TUR exceed 120 or 110 percent of the average rate in the corresponding period during the previous two years).

The examination considered the degree to which alternative triggers and trigger rates would have provided extended benefits coverage to the UI population during the past decade and how this coverage would have been distributed by labor market, stage of the business cycle, calendar quarter, and region of the country.

The study report describes the historical use of triggers in extended benefits programs, provides definitions of triggers used in the analysis, discusses coverage and labor market performance of alternative extended benefits triggers, outlines their performance during business cycle stages, provides information based on an analysis of their seasonal and regional performance, and discusses several factors affecting the availability of extended benefits (including national employment and unemployment patterns and their potential effects on the IUR, State eligibility requirements, and benefit generosity).

---

<sup>109</sup>As a result, in 1991, the TUR was used as an alternative trigger in a temporary extended benefits program.

<sup>110</sup>Walter Corson and Anu Rangarajan, *Extended UI Benefit Triggers* (Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1994).

## Historical Use of Triggers

The researchers provide information about various trigger rates and definitions that have been used to extend UI benefits over the past several decades. The study report points out that the permanent UI extended benefits program was enacted as part of the Employment Security Amendments of 1970 which, unlike two previous temporary extensions of UI benefits, incorporated a mechanism to trigger extended benefits automatically when unemployment increased beyond a specific level.<sup>111</sup> EB was triggered when the 13-week average IUR for a State equaled or exceeded four percent and was at least 120 percent of the State's average IUR in the corresponding calendar period during the previous two years. Benefits were made available in all States, regardless of the State IUR when the national IUR (averaged over a 13-week period) equaled or exceeded 4.5 percent.

In the early 1980s the EB program was modified substantially. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 instituted several changes in the EB triggering formula which made it more difficult for States to become and remain eligible for the program. These changes included the elimination of the national trigger, elimination of EB claimants from the IUR trigger rate calculation, and an increase in the State trigger rate from four to five percent (or to six percent if the 120 percent criterion was waived).

It has been estimated that these changes led to a reduction in first payments under the EB program by about 24 percent in late 1982 and 1983—a recessionary period of high national unemployment rates. The changes in the trigger rates accounted for much of the decline. Actual first payments under the EB program during this period declined by as much as 55 percent from the level that would have been expected, on the basis of the relationship between EB program first payments and the

---

<sup>111</sup>The triggering mechanism used a moving 13-week average of the IUR in a State to determine when extended benefits—which provide a maximum of 13 additional weeks of benefits to eligible claimants—would be available.

TUR in the 1970s.

The study report also notes that a number of temporary extended benefits programs (enacted during recessionary periods) have used triggers to determine when extended benefits would be available or to determine the duration of extended benefits in a State. In most cases, the IUR has been used as the trigger in these temporary programs, but in several cases alternative triggers have been used. Both the Temporary Compensation program established by the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1971 and the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program established in November 1991 used an adjusted IUR designed to account for benefit exhaustions. The study report compares the triggers in these two temporary programs with each other and with the basic EB program.

## Study Methodology

The researchers analyzed the performance of alternative extended benefits triggers by simulating the performance of alternative triggers from 1980 through 1991.<sup>112</sup> The simulations included all 50 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.<sup>113</sup> For each State, monthly Bureau of Labor Statistics data on the TUR and weekly UI data on the IUR were used to compute an on-off indicator for each trigger for each month (in

---

<sup>112</sup>This period was chosen primarily because monthly seasonally adjusted data on the TUR by State were available beginning in 1978 and because two years of data (1978 and 1979) before the beginning of the simulation period were needed to compute the thresholds used in some of the simulations. This period also included a wide range of labor market conditions, from an initial recessionary period, to a period of recovery, to a subsequent recession.

<sup>113</sup>Some of the Bureau of Labor Statistics data used for the distributional analysis were unavailable for Puerto Rico. In these cases, the analysis included the 50 States plus the District of Columbia.

the case of the TUR-based triggers) and each week (in the case of the IUR-based triggers). When the trigger definition included a threshold requirement, these on-off indicators considered not only the current level of the unemployment rate (TUR or IUR) but also the rate in the corresponding period in two prior years.

Similarly, the on-off indicator for the adjusted IUR was computed using weekly IUR data and monthly data on the number of UI exhaustees.

Monthly or weekly indicators were then aggregated to quarterly measures for each State, showing the proportion of time the State would have been on extended benefits during each quarter. These quarterly indicators were then combined with State-level BLS data on the components of employment and unemployment and UI data on exhaustions to create a data set for the analysis. This data set was then used to examine the degree of coverage of the unemployed provided by alternative triggers and to examine the distributional impacts of alternative triggers relative to labor market conditions, business cycle stages, seasons, and the geographic regions.

Additional data on UI eligibility conditions by State were added to the data set to explore the effect that eligibility conditions and other factors may have had on the availability of extended benefits.

## **Study Findings**

Based on their analysis, following are the key findings presented in the study.

- The TUR-based trigger rates included in the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program and in changes to the permanent EB program provide substantially more extended benefits coverage of UI exhaustees than the IUR-based trigger rates also used in these two programs.
- The imposition of thresholds has a major impact on coverage. When a threshold is used, a substantially lower trigger rate is needed to provide the same coverage as a given trigger rate without a threshold. Triggers with thresholds also tend to direct benefits to States and time periods with worsening labor market conditions. Triggers without thresholds do a better job of directing

benefits to States and time periods with high current rates of long-term unemployment. The performance of mechanisms that trigger extended benefits when either of two rates is satisfied—a lower rate with a threshold and a higher rate without a threshold—falls between that of the comparable triggers with and without thresholds.

□ The performance of TUR- and IUR-based triggers providing equal extended benefits coverage shows that the TUR-based triggers are better at directing benefits to States and time periods experiencing high current rates of long-term unemployment. The IUR-based triggers are better at directing benefits to States and time periods experiencing worsening labor markets. Because the TUR triggers are based on seasonally adjusted unemployment rates, they provide approximately equal coverage to exhaustees regardless of the season. The IUR-based triggers provide less equal coverage because they rely on data that are not seasonally adjusted. The TUR-based triggers also appear better at directing extended benefits coverage to regions with high unemployment rates.

□ Regarding how differences in State UI eligibility requirements and the shift from a manufacturing to a service economy might affect the availability of extended benefits, the researchers found that the restrictive State eligibility criteria tended to have a negative and statistically significant effect on the IUR, while State benefit generosity had a positive and statistically significant effect on the IUR. However, the magnitude of these estimates effects was fairly small. Also, the proportion of unemployment in manufacturing had a positive and significant effect on the IUR in the first half of the 1980s, but it had an insignificant effect when the entire decade was considered.

**ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY  
OF RESEARCH AND  
EVALUATION REPORTS  
COMPLETED DURING  
PROGRAM YEARS 1985-94**

# ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Following is a bibliography of research and evaluation reports completed or reviewed by ETA from PY 1985 through PY 1994 (July 1985 through June 1995). Each report is listed by title, contractor/grantee, and contract/grant number (as appropriate).

Many of the reports are available free from ETA's Office of Policy and Research, Room N-5637, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210. Most are also available in paper or microfiche through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Operations Division, Springfield, Va. 22151, (703) 487-4650. NTIS numbers are provided for reports.

***Access of Female Workers to On-the-Job Training***—University of Kentucky, 1989. Examines the impact of on-the-job training on gender wage differences.  
Grant Number: 99-8-3435-75-002-02  
NTIS Number: PB 90-205352/AS

***Administrative and Policy Studies of Unemployment Insurance Qualifying Requirements***—The Policy Research Group, Inc., 1985. Analyzes various State UI qualifying requirements in terms of distribution of benefits, costs, and paperwork burden.  
Contract Number: 20-11-82-26  
NTIS Number: PB 86-104544/AS

***AFDC Recipients in JTPA***—Westat, Inc., 1987. Two volumes. Focuses on Title II-A participants who were receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children at the time of program entry.  
Contract Number: 99-6-0584-77-066-01

***The Alternative Base Period in Unemployment Insurance: Final Report***—(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 95-3)—Urban Institute, 1995. Examines the effects of alternative base period arrangements for determining monetary eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits.  
Contract Number: K-4244-3-00-80-30, Task Order 8.  
NTIS Number: PB95-232401

***Alternative Methods for Evaluating the Impact of Training on Earnings***—Economics Research Center, University of Chicago, 1983. Considers the problems of estimating the impact of training on earnings.  
Contract Number: 20-17-82-20

***America and the New Economy***—American Society for Training and Development, 1991. Examines the impact of changing competitive standards, new technologies, and emerging organizational structures on jobs and skill requirements in the American workplace.

Grant Number: 99-6-0705-75-079-02

NTIS Number: PB 91-219527

***American Poverty: The Role of Education, Training and Employment Strategies in the New Anti-Poverty Struggle***—(Evaluation Forum, Issue 10)—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1994. A review journal for employment and training professionals; includes numerous articles on the topic of poverty in America and interviews with individuals who have extensive knowledge on the topic. Also includes information about recent research efforts and available resources.

***An Analysis of the Impact of CETA Programs on Components of Earnings and Other Outcomes***—SRI International, 1984. Focuses on estimating the impact of participation in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act program on earnings and the composition of earnings changes.

Contract Number: 20-06-82-22

***An Analysis of the Impact of CETA Programs on Participants' Earnings***—SRI International, 1984. Estimates the net impact of CETA programs on participants' postprogram earnings.

Contract Number: 20-06-82-21

***An Analysis of Pooled Evidence from the Pennsylvania and Washington Reemployment Bonus Demonstrations*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 92-7)—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1992. Analyzes the experience of a merged sample of unemployment insurance claimants in two demonstrations that tested reemployment bonuses for unemployed workers.

Contract Number: 99-7-0805-04-137-01

NTIS Number: PB 93-160703

***An Analysis of UI Trust Fund Adequacy***—ICF Incorporated, 1987. Analyzes State benefit financing in the unemployment insurance system and suggests alternative measures of adequacy of the UI Trust Fund.

Contract Number: 99-5-3024-04-090-01

NTIS Number: PB 87-209342

***Anatomy of a Demonstration: The Summer Training and Education Program (STEP) from Pilot through Replication and Postprogram Impact***—Public/Private Ventures, 1992. Analyzes the Summer Training and Education Program from its early conceptualization through the five-city demonstration, to its replication in over 100 locations throughout the country.

Grant Number: 99-6-3372-75-004-02

***Assessing the Adequacy of Labor Market Information at the State and Local Level***—Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1990. Describes findings from research on the adequacy of labor market information for State and local data users in the public and private sectors.

Contract Number: 99-9-3436-75-050-01

NTIS Number: PB 91-112953

***Assessing JOBSTART Interim Impacts of a Program for School***

***Dropouts***—Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1991. Summarizes findings on the implementation of the JOBSTART demonstration and presents information (based on two years of followup) on the difference that the program made in the educational attainment, employment, welfare receipt, and other outcomes of participants.

Grant Number: 99-6-3356-75-003-02

***An Assessment of Alternative Comparison Group Methodologies for Evaluating Employment and Training Programs***—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1984.

Provides an empirical assessment of the reliability of net program impact estimates.

Contract Number: 20-11-82-15

***Assessment of the Implementation and Effects of the JTPA Title V***

***Wagner–Peyser Amendments—Phase II Final Report***—Macro Systems, Inc., 1985.

Process study assessing the effects of the Job Training Partnership Act Title V amendments during PY 1984. The report is based primarily upon interviews with officials in 16 States and 31 SDAs.

Contract Number: 99-4-576-77-081-01

NTIS Number: PB 86-169604/AS

***An Assessment of the JTPA Role in State and Local Coordination Activities***

—James Bell Associates, 1990. Assesses the role of program coordination in enhancing JTPA program effectiveness and efficiency. The report identifies major strategies and characteristics of coordination; assesses relative advantages and disadvantages of coordination; identifies factors which are effective in promoting and enhancing coordination; and assesses legal, administrative, and other barriers to coordination.

Contract Number: 99-8-4701-75-065-01

NTIS Number: PB 91-219519/AS

***The Availability of Information for Defining and Assessing Basic Skills Required for Specific Occupations***—The Urban Institute, 1990. Incorporates a literature review,

employer interviews, and an assessment of all available skill–measurement tests.

Identifies skills that employers highly value.

Contract Number: 99-9-0421-75-081-01

NTIS Number: PB 91-212357

***Best Practices: What Works in Training and Development (Accounting and***

**Evaluation)**–American Society for Training and Development, 1989. Highlights the responsibilities of human resource developers for measuring and evaluating training. Includes a discussion of the main reasons for measuring and evaluating training, the costs of training, and the problems that impede measuring and evaluating training.

Grant Number: 99-6-0705-75-079-02

NTIS Number: PB 89-223705/AS

**Best Practices: What Works in Training and Development (Basic Skills)**–American Society for Training and Development, 1989. Assesses the skills that employers want in their workforce, why those skills are strategically important to organizations, and why they should be considered "basic." Examines 16 skills in detail and provides a model for establishing a workplace basics program.

Grant Number: 99-6-0705-75-079-02

NTIS Number: PB 89-181754/AS

**Best Practices: What Works in Training and Development (Basic Skills Manual)**–American Society for Training and Development, 1989. Companion manual to the *Basic Skills* text (above). Provides practical information for employers and trainers on how to set up workplace basics programs. The model identified in the text is the basis for the step–by–step process that is the "blueprint for success" in the manual.

Grant Number: 99-6-0705-75-079-02

NTIS Number: PB 89-181747/AS

**Best Practices: What Works in Training and Development (Organization and Strategic Role)**–American Society for Training and Development, 1989. Identifies who receives training in America and how training is structured, financed, and connected to the strategic goals of employers. Suggests practical methods for connecting training to employer goals and for influencing strategic decision–making.

Grant Number: 99-6-0705-75-079-02

NTIS Number: PB 89-181762/AS

**Best Practices: What Works in Training and Development (Technical Training)**–American Society for Training and Development, 1989. Provides an understanding of America's technical workforce, the learning systems that keep the workforce well–skilled, and how corporations are managing their technical training needs.

Grant Number: 99-6-0705-75-079-02

NTIS Number: PB 89-223713/AS

**Beyond the School Doors: The Literacy Needs of Job Seekers Served by the U.S. Department of Labor**–Educational Testing Service, 1992. Describes the literacy needs of participants in ETA–administered programs—JTPA, Employment Service, and unemployment insurance.

Contract Number: 99-8-3458-75-052-01

NTIS Number: PB 93-169191

***Building a Job Service for the Year 2000: Innovative State Practices***—Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, 1989. Analyzes innovative State Job Service practices in four general areas: improving the job match process, developing applicant jobseeking skills, recruiting workers in a labor–short economy, and improving the efficiency of public training and employment programs through a cooperative service delivery system.

Grant Number: 99-7-1154-98-357-02

NTIS Number: PB 90-216664

***Case Studies of Exemplary Dislocated Worker Programs***—CSR Incorporated, 1986. Provides descriptions of 10 projects operated under Title III of JTPA.

Contract Number: 9-5-2224-61-019-01

***Case Studies of JTPA Title III Projects Serving Workers Dislocated from the Steel and Copper Industries***—CSR Incorporated, 1986. Describes five JTPA Title III projects serving workers dislocated from the steel and copper industries.

Contract Number: 99-5-2224-61-019-01

***Child Care and the Labor Supply of Married Women***—David Christopher Ribar (Doctoral Dissertation), Brown University, 1990. Uses information from the Survey of Income and Program Participation to provide labor supply and cross–section child care data. Examines family demands for child care services and presents a conceptual child care and labor supply model.

Grant Number: 99-93545-98-078-04

***A Comparison of the Effectiveness of JTPA Training Programs Administered under Tuition vs. Performance-Based Contracts in the City of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County***—University of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County Commission for Workforce Excellence, 1991. Summarizes the findings of a study that examined the effectiveness of administering public training programs under tuition versus performance-based contracts.

Contract Number: 99-0-1500-98-003-04

***Coordination of Housing and Job Training Services: A Review of Best Practices in 12 Cities***—Westat, Inc., 1992. Describes the variety of approaches 12 cities have adopted to coordinate housing and job training services.

Contract Number: 99-0-0584-75-055-01

***The Cyclical Effects of the Unemployment Insurance Program: Final Report*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 91-3)—Metrica, Inc., 1991. Analyzes the effect of the unemployment insurance program as an automatic economic stabilizer. Discusses theoretical reasons that enable the UI program to stabilize the business cycle, presents evidence of the effect of UI on the cycle, reviews literature about UI's ability to act as a stabilizer, and estimates the effect of UI on stabilizing the business cycle.

Contract Number: 99-9-4818-98-037-01

NTIS Number: PB 91-197897/AS

***The Decline in Unemployment Insurance Claims Activity in the 1980s***

(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 91-2)—The Urban Institute, 1991.

Analyzes the decline in the number of unemployment insurance recipients during the 1980s. Presents background information about the decline, reviews previous literature, describes new survey data on UI receipt, presents a statistical analysis of new survey data, and discusses some of the reasons for the decline in the number of recipients.

NTIS Number: PB 91-160994/AS

***Development of Employment Service Performance Standards for Sub-State***

***Areas***—Abt Associates, Inc., 1985. Concerned with updating the existing State-level performance standards model and applying the model to substate areas.

Contract Number: 20-25-82-09

NTIS Number: PB 86-144896/AS

***Dilemmas in Youth Programming: Findings from the Youth Research and Technical Assistance Project—Volumes I and II***

—Brandeis University and Public/Private Ventures, 1992. Two-volume report presents findings of 10 studies of youth programs. Provides insight into the types of programs, services, and techniques that best prepare young people for jobs and careers; discusses strategies of governance and management that offer the greatest opportunity for effective delivery of training and employment services for young people; and lists factors regarding youth, their environment, and the labor market that must be addressed in providing services to youth.

Contract Number: 99-0-1879-75-053-01

NTIS Number: PB 93-167633 (Volume I); PB 93-167641 (Volume II)

**"Displaced Workers of 1979–1983: How Well Have They Fared?"**—U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Monthly Labor Review*, June 1985. Analyzes the effects of plant closings and long-term unemployment on various age, sex, ethnic, and occupational groups with regard to earnings, health benefits, period of unemployment, and other relevant factors.

***Displaced Workers, 1981-1985***—U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1987. Provides an update on the status, location, and demographics of displaced workers through 1985, based on Current Population Survey data.

BLS Bulletin 2289

***Displaced Workers, 1985-89***—U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1991. Provides an overview of worker displacement patterns during the 1980s and describes the employment situation of workers displaced during the 1985-89 period.

BLS Bulletin 2382

***Dual Careers, Volume 6: Fifteen Year Report on the National Longitudinal***

***Surveys of Mature Women's Cohort***—The Ohio State University, 1985. Explores

similarities and differences of black and white mature women covering a broad spectrum of occupational and family considerations.

Contract Number: 82-39-72-21

NTIS Number: PB 86-144995/AS

***Economic Change and the American Workforce***—Jobs for the Future, Inc., 1992. An executive summary of findings from a three-volume study of the economic and employment dynamics in four States that are broadly representative of the United States. Defines specific employment and training issues associated with the new economic era and provides suggestions for meeting new workplace demands.

Grant Number: 99-9-3485-98-009-02

NTIS Numbers: PB 92-226356 (Executive Summary) and PB 91-191749 (All four volumes)

***The Effects of Increasing the Federal Taxable Wage Base for Unemployment Insurance***—(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 95-1)—KRA Corporation, 1995. Provides estimates of the employment and revenue effects of raising the Federal taxable wage base to various levels.

Contract Number: 3965-2-00-80-30

NTIS Number: PB95-216545

***The Emerging Hispanic Underclass***—The Rand Corporation, 1991. Describes trends in wage ratios for Hispanic men from 1971 to 1987, discusses trends in their schooling, summarizes the impact of recent Hispanic immigration on the demographics of the Hispanic population, and describes the results of a statistical analysis of the determinants of male Hispanic wages from 1971 to 1987.

Contract Number: 99-8-3055-75-080-01

***Employer Layoff and Recall Practices*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 92-3)—U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1992. Explores the needs of dislocated workers; attempts to gather additional information from an employer's perspective regarding the planning and implementation of layoffs, including the employer's expectations prior to the onset of layoff and the method and timing of providing workers with layoff information.

Contract Number: 99-0-3252-75-002-03

NTIS Number: PB 92-174903/AS

***Employer-Supported Child Care: Measuring and Understanding Its Impacts on the Workplace***—Berkeley Planning Associates, 1989. Investigates the relationship between child care and productivity and includes a review of the literature. Contains case studies of seven firms deciding to provide child care for employees, traces the decision-making process leading firms to become involved in child care, and provides an evaluation design by which to assess results.

Contract Number: 99-8-3229-075-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-225285/AS

***The Employer's Decision to Train Low-Wage Workers***—University of Washington, 1992. Uses survey data and tax records for 544 employers in Washington State to examine the decisions of employers to train low-wage workers.

Grant Number: 99-0-1897-75-104-02

***Employment and Training for America's Homeless: Report on the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program***—James Bell Associates, 1994. Presents the results of an evaluation of the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program and assesses its implications for providing effective employment and training services for homeless individuals.

Contract Number: 99-1-4701-79-086-01.

***Enhancing Literacy for Jobs and Productivity***—Council of State Policy and Planning Agencies (now known as the Council of Governors' Policy Advisors), 1989. Provides guidance to States and organizations interested in developing statewide coordinated policies aimed at raising workforce literacy levels.

Grant Number: 99-7-3415-98-336-02

NTIS Number: PB 89-205322

***Evaluation of Existing Automated Interstate Job Finding Programs***—Macro Systems, 1989. Examines various aspects of the existing interstate automated job finding system and a variety of alternative approaches to the existing system.

Contract Number: 99-8-0576-75-030-01

***Evaluation of Job Corps' Pilot Project to Include 22-to 24-Year-Olds***—Executive Resource Associates, Inc., 1987. Studies the value of serving 22- to 24-year-olds in Job Corps.

Contract Number: 99-6-2746-35-011-01

***Evaluation of the Defense Conversion Adjustment Demonstration: Interim Report on Implementation***—Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994. Based on an ongoing evaluation of the Defense Conversion Adjustment Demonstration—which provides innovative approaches to help workers in defense industries remain employed or to find new jobs—provides information about key design features of the demonstration sites and summarizes implementation experiences during their first 12 to 14 months.

Contract Number: Q-4294-3-00-87-30

NTIS Number: PB96-146162

***Evaluation of the EDWAA Job Creation Demonstration***—Berkeley Planning Associates, 1994. Summarizes findings from a three-year evaluation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act Job Creation Demonstration which was designed to explore the effectiveness of Community Development Corporations in expanding employment opportunities for dislocated workers through entrepreneurial training and linkages to other economic development activities.

Contract Number: 99-1-3229-71-054-01

NTIS Number: PB96-146220

***An Evaluation of the Feasibility of a Substate Area Extended Benefit Program***

(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 89-5)—Mathematica Policy Research, 1989. Assesses the feasibility of developing and operating a program of extended UI benefits at the substate level. Examines differences in labor market conditions among substate areas and uses a simulation model to evaluate the targeting efficiency of alternative substate program design options.

Contract Number: 99-7-0805-04-138-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-127531/AS

***An Evaluation of the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program***—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1986. Analyzes the effects of the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program on recipients in the economic context of the recession of the 1980s.

Contract Number: 99-3-2034-77-139-01

NTIS Number: PB 86-163144/AS

***Evaluation of the Impacts of the Washington Alternative Work Search Experiment***

(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 91-4)—Battelle Human Affairs Research Centers, 1991. Describes findings from an experimental evaluation of the effectiveness of four alternative work search approaches in the UI program.

Contract Numbers: 91-PS-067 and 86-PS-29

NTIS Number: PB 91-198127/AS

***Evaluation of the Implementation of Performance Standards Under JTPA Title II—A***

—Centaur Associates, Inc., 1987. Describes the standards used to evaluate program management and the strengths and weaknesses of the performance management system, among other items.

Contract Number: 99-5-3348-77-050-01

***Evaluation of the JTPA Title IV Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker***

***Program***—Berkeley Planning Associates and SPR Associates, 1994. Summarizes the results of a study of the JTPA Title IV, Section 402 program for migrant and seasonal farmworkers which assists farmworkers in obtaining or retaining upgraded agricultural or nonagricultural employment.

Contract Number: 99-1-3229-75-074-01

NTIS Number: PB96-146170

***An Evaluation of Short-Time Compensation Programs***

—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1986. Analyzes the effects of short-time compensation programs on employment stability of workers and demands on the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund.

Contract Number: 99-3-0805-77-117-01

NTIS Number: PB 86-167616/AS

***Evaluation of the Transition to Work Demonstration Projects Using a Natural Supports Model: Final Report***—Pelavin Research Institute, 1995. Describes the results of an evaluation of six projects designed to demonstrate the effectiveness of using “natural supports” (relying on supervisors, coworkers, family members, friends, and other personnel) to provide the training and supervision needed to help individuals with disabilities perform satisfactorily in jobs.

***Evaluation Study of the Senior Community Service Employment Program***—Centaur Associates, Inc., 1986. Assesses the ability of the SCSEP program to reach and serve target groups, provides a process description of the program, and describes satisfaction of participants and host agencies.

Contract Number: 99-5-3333-77-021-01

***An Examination of Declining UI Claims During the 1980s*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 88-3)—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1989. Describes factors contributing to the decline in the number of initial claims in the 1980s.

Contract Number: 99-6-0805-04-097-01

NTIS Number: PB 89-160048/AS

***Experience Rating in Unemployment Insurance: Some Current Issues***

(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 89-6)—U.S. Department of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Service, 1989. Looks at experience rating in unemployment insurance by defining important experience rating concepts, reviewing four associated issues, examining the degree of experience rating, and critiquing an analysis of the system conducted by the Department of Labor.

NTIS Number: PB 90-216656

***Extended UI Benefit Triggers***—(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-2)—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1994. Examines the implications of using alternative triggers for extended UI benefits based on the insured unemployment rate and the total unemployment rate. Also examines how differences in State UI eligibility requirements and the shift from a manufacturing to a service economy may affect the availability of extended benefits.

Contract Number: 7949-002

NTIS Number: PB94-178290

***The Extent and Pattern of Joblessness Among Minority Men***—SRI International, 1989. Documents and analyzes the disparity in the labor market performance of black and Hispanic men vis-à-vis white men, focusing specifically on labor force participation, unemployment, and hours of work during a year.

Contract Number: 99-8-3055-75-080-01

NTIS Number: PB 89-218671/AS

***Fairness in Employment Testing: Validity Generalization, Minority Issues, and the General Aptitude Test Battery***—National Research Council, 1989. Investigates various aspects of the General Aptitude Test Battery related to accuracy and fairness.

Contract Number: 99-7-3239-98-101-01

***Fifty Years of Unemployment Insurance-A Legislative History: 1935-1985***—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1986. Provides the background, framework, and detailed legislative history of the Federal-State unemployment insurance system.  
NTIS Number: PB 87-179834/AS

***Financial Incentives for Employer-Provided Worker Training: A Review of Relevant Experience in the U.S. and Abroad***—The Urban Institute, 1990. Explores several incentives, such as tax credits, direct government grants, and mandatory training programs, that could be used to encourage employers to provide additional training for their employees.  
Contract Number: 99-9-0421-75-081-01  
NTIS Number: PB 91-212373

***Finishing Up with Pride: A Case Study in Early Intervention Assistance for Tennessee Copper Miners***—Annapolis Economic Research, 1989. Describes advance notification in connection with the Tennessee Chemical Company's mass layoff in 1987. The case study shows that early intervention assistance, when coupled with union and company support, can significantly increase the number of workers who can be assisted in their reemployment efforts.  
Contract Number: 99-8-4521-75-007-04

***FIRMSTART: An Examination of Self-Employment***—Corporation for Economic Development, 1989. Provides research on and policy analysis of the viability of self-employment for people who are unemployed or have low incomes. Produced as a joint effort of three States—Massachusetts, Michigan, and New Jersey.  
Grant Number: 99-8-3394-98-001-02

***First Impact Analysis of the Washington State Self-Employment and Enterprise Development (SEED) Demonstration***—(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-1)—Abt Associates, 1994. Presents interim estimates of the impacts of the SEED demonstration program—a self-employment program for unemployed workers—on the employment and earnings of participants based primarily on data from a followup telephone survey conducted approximately 21 months after participants were randomly assigned to either a treatment group (which received demonstration services), or to a control group.  
Contract Number: 99-8-0803-98-047-01  
NTIS Number: PB94-162203

***Flexible Employment, Contingent Work: Implications for Workers' Benefits***—Columbia University, 1990. Presents findings from research on whether, and how, employers modify work schedules, the terms of employment, and nonwage benefits in response to changes in labor demand and labor supply conditions. Discusses various aspects of "contingent" work, which is defined as self-employment,

part-time work, and temporary work.  
Contract Number: 99-8-0422-75-067-01  
NTIS Number: PB 92-236033

***From the Farm to the Job Market: A Guide to Employment and Training Services for Farmers and Ranchers***—Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994. Describes the differences between farmers and other clients served by training and employment programs, outlines startup activities for programs seeking to improve services to farmers, and describes how programs can be designed to meet the needs of farmer clients.

Contract Number: 99-1-3229-71-036-01  
NTIS Number: PB96-146147

***A Guide to Assessing the Benefits and Costs of Employer Child Care Assistance***—Berkeley Planning Associates, 1989. Assists employers and managers to reach decisions about whether child care benefits are appropriate for their organizations and, if so, which types of benefits are most appropriate. For employers who already provide support for child care, the guidebook assists in determining the best approach to evaluating employer efforts.

Contract Number: 99-8-3229-075-01  
NTIS Number: PB 90-225285/AS

***A Guide to High School Redirection***—High School Redirection, 1991. Provides information about High School Redirection, an alternative high school in New York that helps dropouts or potential dropouts complete their education. Discusses the school's philosophy, student population, admissions policies, staff, administrative structure, budget, operations, and discipline. Provides information on replication efforts in seven sites.

Purchase Order Number: 99-8-4671-75-010-04  
NTIS Number: PB 91-219501

***A Guide to Well-Developed Services for Dislocated Workers***—Social Policy Research Associates, Berkeley Planning Associates, and SRI International, 1994. Provides information about effective strategies to service dislocated workers under a variety of local conditions.

Contract Number: 99-9-3104-98-084-01  
NTIS Number: PB96-146188

***Health Status and Work Activity of Older Men: Events-History Analyses of Selected Social Policy Issues***—The Ohio State University, 1985. Describes the effects of health, longevity, ethnicity, inherited factors, occupation, and job satisfaction on decisions to retire or remain employed.

Contract Number: 82-39-72-21  
NTIS Number: PB 85-235497/AS

***Hispanics and the American Dream: An Analysis of Hispanic Male Labor Market***

**Wages.** Part of a two-volume report. See *The Emerging Hispanic Underclass*.

**How Workers Get Their Training**—U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1985. Describes sources and uses of training to obtain jobs. Contains information useful in career guidance and planning education and training programs.

**ICD Survey II: Employing Disabled Americans**—International Center for the Disabled, 1987. Describes the responses of top managers and line supervisors to questions on hiring policy and practices, experiences with disabled employees, and attitudes concerning reasons for not hiring disabled workers; the survey also suggests further actions to promote their hiring.

Grant Number: 99-6-3396-98-073-02

**Immigration Demonstration Grant Final Evaluation Report**—Seattle-King County Private Industry Council, 1995. Presents findings from a demonstration project that provided job training and employment services to Asians and Hispanics in the Seattle area.

**Impact of Advance Notice Provisions on Postdisplacement Outcomes**—Boston University, 1990. Examines the extent to which advance notice eases adjustment problems for workers displaced from their jobs due to plant closings and permanent layoffs.

Contract Number: 99-8-2152-95-082-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-226648/AS

**Impact Study of the Implementation and Use of the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program**—Macro Systems, Inc., 1986. Five volumes plus overview and summary. Looks at the effectiveness of the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit and describes its short-term net impact on four target groups: disadvantaged youth, welfare recipients, veterans, and handicapped persons.

Contract Number: 99-4-576-77-091-01

**Implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act: Final Report**—Westat, Inc., 1985. Studies the implementation period of JTPA Titles II–A and III during the first nine months of PY 1984.

Contract Number: 99-3-0584-75-104-01

NTIS Number: PB 85-198661

**Implementing the National JTPA Study**—Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1990. Reviews various technical aspects of the implementation of the National JTPA Study.

Contract Number: 99-6-3356-77-061-01

**Improving the Quality of Training Under JTPA**—Berkeley Planning Associates and SRI International, 1989. Examines the quality of training provided to adults under JTPA Title II–A. Forty-three occupational training programs were visited in 15 randomly

selected SDAs.

Contract Number: 99-8-3229-75-087-01

NTIS Number: PB 91-212143

***Intake Systems for Dislocated Worker Programs: Matching Dislocated Workers to Appropriate Services***—CSR Incorporated, 1986. Concerned with intake systems for controlling the flow of eligible applicants for programs funded under Title III of JTPA.

Contract Number: 99-5-2224-61-019-01

***International Trade and Worker Dislocation: Evaluation of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program***—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1993. Offers findings from a study of the prelayoff characteristics and postlayoff labor market experiences of Trade Readjustment Allowance recipients and describes the training provided under the program based on data obtained from nationally representative samples of Trade Adjustment Assistance trainees.

Contract Number: 99-9-0805-75-071-01

***Interorganizational Partnerships in Local Job Creation and Job Training Efforts: Six Case Studies***—Cosmos Corporation, 1989. Presents examples of best practices in linking local resources and organizations to job creation and job training initiatives.

Contract Number: 99-8-4700-75-064-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-131392/AS

***Issues for Active State Management of the JTPA Title III Grant***—Westat, Inc., 1986. A guide for State planners and managers on the grant management process for Title III.

Contract Number: 99-5-2224-61-019-01

***The Jacksonville Experience: Building on Success***—MDC, Inc., 1988. Examines the JTPA summer youth program operated by the City of Jacksonville, Fla., during 1986 and 1987. The city's program was one of the first summer programs to combine classroom basic education and work experience.

Grant Number: 99-6-3393-77-068-02

***Job Corps: Evaluation of Computer-Assisted Instruction Pilot Project***—Shugoll Research, Inc., 1989. Assesses the impact of computer-assisted instruction on Job Corps members' academic performance and behavior.

Contract Number: 99-6-4524-77-073-01

NTIS Number: PB 89-218580/AS

***Job Corps Process Analysis***—Macro Systems, Inc., and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1985. Pulls together information on components of, and services associated with, the program, and documents how they operate at specific centers and support agencies.

Contract Number: 99-4-805-75-64-01

***Job Development for Dislocated Workers***—CSR Incorporated, 1986. Provides Title

III program operators with guidance regarding the technical issues entailed in the design and implementation of dislocated worker programs.

Contract Number: 99-5-2224-61-019-01

***Job Displacement and Labor Market Mobility***—University of Massachusetts, 1990. Examines labor market mobility of dislocated workers using an analysis of matching data from the 1984, 1986, and 1988 Displaced Worker Supplements to the Current Population Surveys of the same years.

Contract Number: 99-8-3481-75-085-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-218660/AS

***Job Placement Systems for Older Workers***—National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, Inc., 1987. Two volumes. Describes participant characteristics, services provided, and employment outcomes for a sample of JTPA three percent set-aside programs. The study also provides 23 case studies of training and employment programs for older workers, and advice on designing and managing a job placement system for older workers.

Interagency agreement with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Development Services, Administration on Aging.

NTIS Number: PB 90-205311/AS

***Job Training for the Homeless: Report on Demonstration's First Year***—R.O.W. Sciences, Inc., 1991. Describes and analyzes the first year of operations of the Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Program. Emphasizes the need for a diversified and coordinated approach to serving the needs of the homeless population.

Contract Number: 99-9-4806-79-023-01

NTIS Number: PB 92-163765

***JOBSTART: Net Impact Study***—Manpower Demonstration Research Corp., 1991. Identifies results of a followup of JOBSTART participants over a three-year period. Assesses the impact of JOBSTART projects which provided remedial education, skills training, job counseling, and placement assistance within the JTPA system to dropout youths.

Grant Number: 99-6-3356-75-003-02

***JTPA Staffing and Staff Training at the State and SDA Levels***—Berkeley Planning Associates, 1991. Summarizes the educational background, experience, and skills of JTPA staff at the State and local levels and examines JTPA staff capabilities, the adequacy of existing staff training, and unmet staff training needs.

Contract Number: 99-8-3229-75-079-01

NTIS Number: PB 91-219543/AS

***JTPA Title II-A Participants Who Were Receiving Public Assistance at Program Application: New Enrollees and Terminees During PY 1984***—Westat Inc., 1986. Describes the new enrollees and terminees who were receiving public assistance at the time of entry into JTPA Title II-A programs.

Contract Number: 99-6-0584-75-083-01

***JTPA Title II-A Participants Who Were School Dropouts at Program Application: Program Year 1986***—Westat, 1988. Summarizes the characteristics and experiences of dropouts who participated in JTPA programs.

Contract Number: 99-6-0584-75-083-01

***JTPA Title II-A and III Enrollments and Terminations During Program Year 1988***—Westat, Inc., 1990. Summarizes the characteristics and experiences of persons who participated in training programs authorized under Title II-A and Title III of JTPA during PY 1988. Data were obtained from the Job Training Quarterly Survey.

Contract Number: 99-0-0584-75-013-01

***The Jump Start to Language Power Program Pilot Study*** (Phase II: Gary Job Corps Center and Clements Job Corps Center)—Helen G. Cappleman, 1988. Compares Job Corps' Jump Start experimental reading program with the regular program, and offers evidence that the Jump Start program enhances Corps members' reading performance and attitude toward reading.

Contract Number: 99-6-4488-35-014-01

***Kansas Nonmonetary Expert System Prototype*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 90-1)—Evaluation Research Corporation, 1990. Reviews various steps involved in developing the Nonmonetary Expert System Prototype in Kansas.

Contract Number: 99-7-4646-04-142-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-232711

***Labor Market Information: An Agenda for Congress***—Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1988. Evaluates the adequacy of currently available labor market information as the basis for lawmaking and policy decisions.

Grant Number: 99-8-3436-75-003-02

NTIS Number: PB 91-111690/AS

***Labor Market Information: A State Policymaker's Guide***—Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1988. Describes and assesses labor market information sources and programs of interest to State policymakers.

Grant Number: 99-8-3436-75-003-02

NTIS Number: PB 91-111740

***Labor Shortage Case Studies: Final Report***—James Bell Associates and Lewin-ICF, 1992. Provides case studies of supply and demand in four occupations—special education teachers, home health care workers, electrical/electronic engineers, and tool and die workers. Indicates why labor shortages may develop in these occupations; discusses adjustments that employers and workers make in response to the shortages; describes symptoms and likely consequences of labor shortages; and explains why they may persist for extended periods.

Contract Number: 99-9-4710-75-077-01

NTIS Number: PB 94-144334

***Launching JOBSTART: A Demonstration for Dropouts in the JTPA***

**System**—Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1987. Describes the initial results of the JOBSTART demonstration in 13 sites, all of them funded primarily through the JTPA system.

Grant Number: 99-6-3356-75-003-02

***Leadership in Appellate Administration: Successful State Unemployment***

**Insurance Appellate Operations** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 89-7)—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1989.

Presents findings of a project which reviewed 15 State UI appeals units to document the administrative practices and procedures used to promptly decide unemployment insurance appeals.

NTIS Number: PB 90-161183/AS

***Learning a Living: A Blueprint for High Performance. A SCANS Report for***

**America 2000**—U.S. Department of Labor, Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, 1992. Calls for a reorganization of education and work to close the skills gap and prepare the workforce for the future. Identifies three areas that must change, and lists several recommendations to bring about this change. Final report of commission.

Government Printing Office Stock Number: 029-000-00440-4

NTIS Number: PB 93-107449

***The Learning Disabled in Employment and Training Programs***—The Urban Institute,

1991. Provides estimates of the extent to which adults eligible for JTPA and other education, employment, and training programs normally identified as "functionally illiterate" are learning disabled. Discusses methods of testing and assessment to identify learning disabilities in adults and presents policy recommendations for serving this population in training and employment programs.

Contract Number: 99-9-0421-75-081-01

NTIS Number: PB 92-163781

***The Learning Enterprise***—American Society for Training and Development, 1989.

Summarizes information obtained from a 30-month research effort which explored public and private training practices. Summarizes diverse data that were obtained during the research effort.

Grant Number: 99-6-0705-75-079-02

NTIS Number: PB 89-218721/AS

***Literacy Audit of Maintenance Workers***—Interactive Training, Inc., 1990. Reviews findings of a national literacy audit of maintenance worker jobs in multifamily apartment complexes. Presents findings from mail surveys, site visits, and telephone interviews.

Contract Number: 99-8-4704-75-077-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-218785/AS

***Long-Term Earnings Effects of the National Supported Work (NSW) Experiment: Evidence for the Youth and AFDC Target Groups***—University of Wisconsin, 1991.

Investigates the long-term earnings effect of the National Supported Work experiment on recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Extends prior evaluations of the NSW's earnings effect by seven years.

Contract Number: 99-1-3605-75-001-04

NTIS Number: PB 92-239664

***Low-Wage Jobs and Workers: Trends and Options for Change***—Institute for Women's Policy Research for Displaced Homemakers Network, 1989. Analyzes the characteristics of low-wage jobs and workers by industry, occupation, ethnicity, gender, family status, and other factors over a 10-year period from 1975-1984.

Contract Number: 99-8-2438-75-081-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-204595/AS

***Measuring the Effect of CETA on Youth and the Economically Disadvantaged***—The Urban Institute, 1984. Describes research using the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey to measure the effect of employment and training programs on youth and the economically disadvantaged.

Contract Number: 20-11-82-19

***Measuring the Performance of Job Training Programs in Reducing Welfare Dependency***—New York City Department of Employment, 1985. Studies the impact of job training programs on reducing welfare grants.

Contract Number: 21-36-82-04

***A Micro Assessment of the Determinants of Productivity in the U.S.***

***Manufacturing Industry***—Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1985. Assesses industry-related productivity factors beyond the control of workers.

Contract Number: 21-25-82-09

NTIS Number: PB 86-154028/AS

***Micro Consequences of Macro Policies: Employment Effects of Federal Business Tax Incentives***—Duke University, 1985. Analyzes varying effects of Federal taxes across industries and geographic locations.

Contract Number: 21-37-82-19

***The National JTPA Study: Title II-A Impacts on Earnings and Employment at 18 Months***—Abt Associates, Inc., 1992. Reports on findings from a large-scale study of JTPA in which 20,000 applicants were randomly assigned to participant and control groups. Provides interim estimates of program impact on the employment and earnings of adults and out-of-school youth during the first 18 months after their acceptance into the program.

Contract Number: 99-6-0803-77-068-01

NTIS Number: PB 94-142122

***A Net Impact Analysis of Differential Earnings of CETA Participants and Current Population Survey Matched Comparison Groups***—College of William and Mary, Department of Economics, 1982. Analyzes the pattern of earnings of CETA participants entering adult-oriented programs in FY 1976.  
Grant Number: 24-51-79-02

***New Chance: Implementing a Comprehensive Program for Disadvantaged Young Mothers and Their Children***—Manpower Demonstration Research Corp., 1991. Deals with the early experiences of the 16 New Chance sites, factors associated with project implementation, and early results.  
Contract Number: 99-9-3356-98-003-02

***New Forms of Activity for the Unemployed and Measures to Assist the Creation of Self-Employment; Experiences and Opportunities in Combatting Unemployment*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 93-2)—U.S. Department of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Service, 1993. Presented at a meeting of the General Assembly of the International Social Security Association, examines a variety of programs in 16 countries that combat unemployment by encouraging unemployed workers to become self-employed.  
Department of Labor Publication  
NTIS Number: PB 94-145299

***New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 89-3)—New Jersey Department of Labor and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1989. Details the results of a demonstration that provided three different packages of reemployment services to UI recipients to accelerate their return to work.  
Cooperative Agreement Number: 99-2325-04-055-05  
NTIS Number: PB 90-216714/AS

***The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project: Follow-Up Report*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 91-1)—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1990. Summarizes the purpose and features of the New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration, describes the impacts of the program on UI receipt and earnings, and presents a cost-benefit analysis of the demonstration's components.  
Contract Number: P31948  
NTIS Number: PB 91-160838

***The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project Six-Year Follow-up and Summary Report***—(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 95-2)—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1995. A second followup study of the New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project covering a six-year period. The project was designed to examine whether the UI system could be used to identify displaced workers early enough in their unemployment spells and

provide them with alternative, early intervention services to accelerate their return to work.

Contract Number: P39803

NTIS Number: PB95-225785

***On the Use of Expectations Data in Micro Surveys: The Case of Retirement***—The Ohio State University, 1985. Tests the accuracy of a retirement prediction model as compared with workers' self-prediction of age of retirement.

Contract Number: 82-39-72-21

NTIS Number: PB 85-235497/AS

***Operating Effective Reemployment Strategies for Dislocated Workers***—CSR Incorporated, 1986. Addresses the question of what training and employment interventions work best for dislocated workers.

Contract Number: 99-5-2224-61-019-01

***Papers and Materials Presented at the Unemployment Insurance Expert System Colloquium, June 1991*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 92-5)—U.S. Department of Labor, Unemployment Insurance Service, 1992. Presents papers prepared for the Unemployment Insurance Expert System Colloquium in June 1991 which describe demonstration efforts to test and evaluate expert system software to enhance UI services.

NTIS Number: PB 93-202695

***Pathways to the Future, Volume 6: A Report on the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience of Youth in 1984***—The Ohio State University, 1986. Describes youth training and employment experiences with the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act programs and explores the effects of education and training on earnings.

Contract Number: 82-39-72-21

NTIS Number: PB 86-198918/AS

***Pennsylvania Reemployment Bonus Demonstration Final Report*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 92-1)—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1991. Analyzes various aspects of the Pennsylvania Reemployment Bonus Demonstration which tested the effect of alternative reemployment bonuses on the reemployment and unemployment receipts of UI claimants.

Contract Number: 99-7-0805-04-137-01

NTIS Number: PB 93-152684

***Policy Evaluation and Review of the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit***—TvT Associates, 1991. Based on a review and synthesis of Targeted Jobs Tax Credit literature available as of mid-1991, presents information about the goals of TJTC from various viewpoints; assesses the appropriateness of TJTC as a means of accomplishing identified goals; reviews what is known about the benefits of TJTC; outlines which groups benefit the most and the least from TJTC; reviews the administration of the program; and

examines the costs of the program.  
Contract Number: 99-0-3588-75-027-01

***The Potential Role of Volunteerism in JTPA***—The Urban Institute, 1989. Reviews literature and presents information from informal interviews with individuals representing national agencies, associations, and selected JTPA Service Delivery Areas to provide insight into the most promising areas for volunteer involvement in JTPA and methods for and sources of recruitment of volunteers.  
Contract Number: 99-9-0421-75-081-01  
NTIS Number: PB 91-212365

***Practical Guidance for Strengthening Private Industry Councils***—CSR, Inc., 1990. Reviews the elements which make an effective Private Industry Council and strategies used by effective PICs in relating their JTPA programs to other organizations and segments of their communities.  
Contract Number: 99-8-2224-75-078-01  
NTIS Number: PB 91-219535/AS

***Productive America***—The National Council for Occupational Education, 1990. Focuses on two-year colleges and the role they play in improving workforce productivity and increasing national economic vitality. Examines potential problems of special populations of the future workforce and proposes models for defining workforce needs of employers and for improving two-year college education delivery systems to meet employer needs.  
Grant Number: 99-9-3513-75-013-02  
NTIS Number: PB 90-226648/AS

***Productivity Effects of Worker Participation in Decision-Making and Profits: Statistical Estimation from the Example of Worker-Owned Firms in Plywood Manufacturing***—University of Idaho, 1984. Compares productivity of employee-owned and managed plywood plants with similar plants having traditional ownership and management.  
Contract Number: 21-16-80-28  
NTIS Number: PB 86-144797/AS

***A Profile of JTPA Enrollments***—Westat, Inc., 1989. Presents information from the longitudinal interview component of the Job Training Quarterly Survey to describe characteristics of persons served by JTPA and to compare these individuals with subgroups of participants, with persons served by earlier programs, and with the population eligible for JTPA.  
Contract Number: 99-6-0584-75-083-01

***Profiling the Literacy Proficiencies of JTPA and ES/UI Populations***—The Educational Testing Service, 1992. Captures detailed information on individuals in JTPA and ES/UI programs and measures literacy skills in three areas: prose comprehension, document literacy, and quantitative skills.

Contract Number: 99-8-3458-75-052-01  
NTIS Number: PB 93-169209

***Referral of Long-Term Unemployment Insurance (UI) Claimants to Reemployment Services*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 89-2)—Macro Systems, Inc., 1989. Addresses the feasibility of identifying and targeting services to long-term UI claimants who need reemployment services and have reached the later stages of their UI benefit period.

Contract Number: 99-6-0576-04-096-01  
NTIS Number: PB 89-153100/AS

***Reemployment Services to Unemployed Workers Having Difficulty Becoming Reemployed*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 90-2)—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1990. Compiles information about State programs that utilize the unemployment insurance system to provide reemployment services or benefits to unemployed workers having difficulty becoming reemployed.

NTIS Number: PB 91-106849

***A Report Card on Special Education: International Center for the Disabled Survey III***—Louis Harris and Associates for the International Center for the Disabled, 1989. Presents results of a survey of public school educators, handicapped students, and parents of handicapped students designed to determine how well the Nation's special education system serves the needs of handicapped students.

Grant Number: 99-7-3396-98-021-02

***Report on Benefits to Employers Providing On-Site Child Care Centers, Flexible Spending Accounts for Dependent Child Care Costs or Child Care Resource and Referral Services***—State of Wisconsin, 1989. Contains selected data related to *Wisconsin's Response to Families and Work* report.

Contract Number: 99-8-3482-75-086-01  
NTIS Number: PB 90-218728

***Report on Policy Academy on Families and Children At Risk***—Council of Governors' Policy Advisors, 1992. Describes the Family Academy and its purpose, reviews the results of the efforts of Family Academy teams established in 10 States, discusses challenges associated with collaborative, strategic policy development and how States meet these challenges, and provides guidance to Governors in designing policies to improve outcomes for people in health, education, training and employment, self-sufficiency, and family functioning.

Contract Number: 99-9-3415-98-022-01  
NTIS Number: PB 92-226364

***Review of Participant Characteristics and Program Outcomes for the First Eleven Quarters of JTPA Operation*** (October 1983-June 1986)—Westat, Inc., 1987. Identifies patterns in JTPA Titles II-A and III program participation and outcomes over 11

quarters, starting with Transition Year 1984.  
Contract Number: 99-6-0584-75-083-01

***San Diego Immigrant Training Demonstration Project (I.D.P.): Final Evaluation Report, 1992-1994***—San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council, 1995. Summarizes the findings of an evaluation of a two-year project that provided Latin American immigrants in north San Diego County with training, employment, English language instruction, and supportive services.

***The St. Louis Metropolitan Reemployment Project: An Impact Evaluation***—Abt Associates, 1991. Estimates the net impacts of the St. Louis Metropolitan Reemployment Project, a JTPA Title III program, on participants' subsequent earnings, receipt of unemployment insurance benefits, and reemployment. Describes differences in the project's impacts based on the types of services received by program participants.  
Contract Number: 99-6-0803-77-074-01

***SCANS Blueprint for Action: Building Community Coalitions***—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1992. Provides more than 100 examples of how recommendations of the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills are being implemented around the country.

***School-to-Work Connections: Formulas For Success***—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1992. Offers guidelines on how to set up school-employer partnerships based on how others have planned, organized, operated, promoted, and funded their programs.  
NTIS Number: PB 92-199231

***The School-to-Work/Youth Apprenticeship Demonstration: Preliminary Findings***—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1994. Assesses the initial implementation of several school-to-work/youth apprenticeship programs funded by the Department of Labor.  
Contract Number: 99-1-0805-75-073-01  
NTIS Number: PB96-146204

***The Secretary's Seminars on Unemployment Insurance*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 89-1)—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1989. Contains background documents and summaries of discussions at three Secretary's seminars held in 1988 which addressed the widening gap between total and insured unemployment; the tradeoffs between the income maintenance and reemployment goals of the UI system as they pertain to choosing potential UI duration policies; and alternative uses of UI.  
Contract Numbers: 99-6-0805-04-097-01; 99-7-0805-04-138-01; and 99-7-3434-04-006-05  
NTIS Number: PB 90-216649/AS

***Sectoral Change and Worker Displacement***—National Bureau of Economic Research, 1990. Provides a comprehensive view of worker displacement and its role in the evolution of unemployment patterns over the past 25 years.

Contract Number: 99-8-4518-75-083-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-21923/AS

***Self-Employment as a Reemployment Option: Demonstration Results and National Legislation***—(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-3)—Abt Associates, 1994. Offers a comparative analysis summarizing the impacts of two UI self-employment demonstration projects in Washington State and Massachusetts based on postproject followup surveys. Also includes national legislation authorizing self-employment assistance programs.

Contract Number: 99-8-0803-98-047-01

NTIS Number: PB94-188679

***Self-Employment Programs: A New Reemployment Strategy, Final Report on the UI Self-Employment Demonstration***—(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 95-4)—Abt Associates, Inc., 1994. Presents final impact estimates of two demonstration projects in Washington State and Massachusetts that helped UI recipients create their own jobs by starting businesses.

Contract Number: 99-8-0803-98-047-01

NTIS Number: PB95-225777

***Self-Employment Programs for Unemployed Workers*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 92-2)—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1992. Provides an overview of the self-employment option for unemployed workers who receive unemployment insurance payments, reviews two self-employment demonstration projects to test the feasibility of implementing self-employment programs for the unemployed, and analyzes policies related to self-employment.

NTIS Number: PB 92-191626/AS

***Serving Dislocated Farmers: An Evaluation of the EDWAA Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration***—Berkeley Planning Associates and Social Policy Research Associates, 1994. Concludes the evaluation of the Farmers and Ranchers Demonstration Project—authorized under the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Act—which provided training and employment services to dislocated and at-risk farmers and ranchers.

Contract Number: 99-1-3229-71-036-01

NTIS Number: PB96-146139

***Shifts in Income Segmentation by Education Level***—Boston University, 1989. Uses Current Population Survey data for May 1973 and March 1987 to analyze the changing inequality of wage rates and of shifts in the education–income stratification of workers.

Contract Number: 99-8-2152-75-081-01

NTIS Number: PB 90-219221/AS

***Short-Time Compensation: A Handbook of Basic Source Material***—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1987. Provides a ready reference for persons interested in short-time compensation programs.  
NTIS Number: PB 88-163589

***Skill Standards: A Primer***—Institute for Educational Leadership, 1995. Provides an overview of the “skill standards” concept (the common core of knowledge required for broad-based occupational clusters). Also describes the history of the skill standards movement, discusses efforts to build a skill standards system, and provides details about the characteristics of such a system.  
NTIS Number: PB96-146196

***Skills and Tasks for Jobs: A SCANS Report for America 2000***—U. S. Department of Labor, Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, 1991. Serves as a resource for educators and employers to use in developing curriculum to teach the SCANS competencies and foundation skills and to understand how SCANS know-how is used in specific jobs.  
Government Printing Office Stock Number: 029-000-00433-1  
NTIS Number: PB 92-181379

***Skills, Standards and Entry-Level Work***—Public/Private Ventures, 1995. Provides an overview of the skill standards movement and examines the role (and limitations) of existing school-to-work efforts in supporting the movement. Reviews research on the potential of work experience to foster youth development.  
Contract Number: 99-0-1879-75-053-01  
NTIS Number: PB96-146162

***Strengthening Programs for Youth: Promoting Adolescent Development in the JTPA System***—Public/Private Ventures, 1993. Describes the findings of an investigation of methods for strengthening youth programs. Presents findings of a panel of experts on critical developmental areas in the lives of young people, provides an overview of four background research papers on various youth issues, and describes some exemplary youth programs.  
Contract Number: 99-0-1879-75-053-01

***Study of the Implementation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act-Phase II: Responsiveness of Services***—Social Policy Research Associates, Berkeley Planning Associates, and SRI International, 1993. A followup to a Phase I study of how States and substate areas implemented the key features of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act. Presents findings on how EDWAA programs operated at the State, substate, and service provider levels during PY 1990.  
Contract Number: 99-9-3104-98-084-01

***Study of the Implementation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act-Report on the Survey of Substate Areas***—Social Policy Research

Associates and SRI International, 1993. Presents findings of a survey of substate areas conducted as part of a study of EDWAA. Provides information about how EDWAA programs are organized, the types of dislocated workers served, the services provided to participants, and the outcomes achieved by EDWAA participants.  
Contract Number: 99-9-3104-98-084-1

***Study of Federal Funding Sources and Services for Adult Education: Final Report***—COSMOS Corporation, 1992. Synthesizes information about adult education programs within the Federal Government that support literacy, basic skills, English—as-a—second language, or adult secondary education. Provides recommendations regarding Federal, State, and local level program coordination.  
Contract Number: LC 89-058001 (U.S. Department of Education)

***Study of the Implementation of the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance Act***—SRI International, 1992. Examines the design and operations of the EDWAA program at the State and substate levels during PY 1989, the year in which the EDWAA legislation was implemented. Provides program information and recommendations to help program operators run more effective programs.  
Contract Number: 99-9-3104-98-084

***Study of Selected Aspects of Dislocated Worker Programs: Final Report***—CSR Incorporated, 1986. Summarizes the principal findings from 15 case studies of JTPA Title III projects.  
Contract Number: 99-5-2224-61-019-01

***Study of State Management of the Job Training Partnership Act***—National Governors' Association, 1988. Examines how States have used the policy and management tools available under JTPA to exert influence on the delivery of employment and training services throughout the Nation. The study focuses on Title II-A programs and the Wagner-Peyser 10 percent set-aside.  
Grant Number: 99-6-2189-77-064-01

***A Study of Unemployment Insurance Recipients and Exhaustees: Findings from a National Survey*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 90-3)—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1990. Examines the characteristics and behavior of UI exhaustees and nonexhaustees and explores the implications of this examination for policy formulation.  
Contract Number: 99-8-0805-75-071-01  
NTIS Number: PB 91-129247

***Summary of the JTLS Data for JTPA Title II-A Enrollments and Terminations During Program Year 1984***—Westat, Inc., 1985. Summarizes the characteristics and experiences of persons who participated in training programs authorized under Title II-A of JTPA. Data were obtained from the Job Training Longitudinal Survey (JTLS).  
Contract Number: 99-3-0584-77-137

**Summary of the JTLS Data for JTPA Title II-A and III Enrollments and Terminations During Program Year 1985**—Westat, Inc., 1986. Summarizes the characteristics and experiences of persons who participated in training programs authorized under Title II-A and Title III of JTPA. Data were obtained from the JTLS. Contract Number: 99-6-0584-75-083-01

**Summary of the JTQS Data for JTPA Title II-A and III Enrollments and Terminations During PY 1986**—Westat, Inc., 1987. Summarizes the characteristics and experiences of persons who participated in training programs authorized under Title II-A and Title III of JTPA. Data were obtained from the Job Training Quarterly Survey (JTQS), formerly the JTLS. Contract Number: 99-6-0584-75-083-01

**Summary of the JTQS Data for JTPA Title II-A and III Enrollments and Terminations During PY 1987**—Westat, Inc., 1988. Summarizes the characteristics and experiences of persons who participated in training programs authorized under Title II-A and Title III of JTPA during PY 1987. Data were obtained from the JTQS. Contract Number: 99-6-0584-75-083-01

**Summary of Net Impact Results**—Westat, Inc., 1984. Summarizes the research done by Westat on the estimation of the net impact of CETA on the postprogram earnings of participants. Contract Number: 23-24-75-07

**Summer Training and Education Program (STEP): Report on the 1986 Experience**—Public/Private Ventures, 1987. Describes the results of the STEP Program in five demonstration cities in 1986. Grant Number: 99-6-3372-75-004-02

**The Temporary Help Supply Industry in the U.S.A.**—Jewish Employment and Vocational Service, 1989. Focuses on the changing programs and policies in the temporary help supply industry. Considers occupational trends, pay and benefits, recruiting and retention, and industry's ability to provide employment for several targeted groups. Contract Number: 99-8-3146-75-072-01  
NTIS Number: PB 90-218694

**Training Partnerships: Linking Employers & Providers**—American Society for Training and Development, 1989. Summarizes research conducted by the American Society for Training and Development about partnerships in training and provides an overview of various aspects of training published in four reports. Grant Number: 99-6-0705-75-079-02

**UI Research Exchange** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 88-2)—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1988. Contains a variety of UI research information, including summaries of projects planned, in

progress, and completed; financial and legislative developments; a paper on quality control; and a paper which provides an analysis of benefit payments for positive and negative balance employers, by industry, for Fiscal Years 1983 and 1986.

NTIS Number: PB 89-160030/AS

***UI Research Exchange*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 89-4)—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1989. Contains a variety of UI research information, including three papers on developing and implementing a form of advanced computer software, called expert systems, in a UI operating environment; the probability that a State unemployment reserve fund will remain solvent; and the work search error claimant profile.

NTIS Number: PB 90-11425/AS

***UI Research Exchange*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 90-4)—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1990. Includes announcements and reports on seminars, UI personnel, legislative and financial developments, and descriptions of research projects conducted by State agencies and the UI Service.

***UI Research Exchange*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 92-4)—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1992. Contains eight papers on a variety of UI-related topics. Also presents summaries of planned and in-progress research projects; brief descriptions of seminars, meetings and significant activities; research data and information sources; and financial and legislation developments. Includes a listing of personnel involved in UI research in State Employment Security Agencies, a national and regional UI directory, and a listing of UI Occasional Papers published since 1977.

NTIS Number: PB 93-117968

***Unemployment Insurance and Employer Layoffs*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 93-1)—Arizona State University, 1992. Presents findings of the first micro data set which used detailed information from matched firm-worker records to analyze the behavior of firms regarding decisions to lay off workers.

NTIS Number: PB 93-205573

***The Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment Final Report*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 92-6)—W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1992. Analyzes various aspects of the Washington Reemployment Bonus Experiment, which tested the effect of alternative reemployment bonuses on the reemployment and unemployment receipt of UI claimants.

NTIS Number: PB 93-159499

***What Work Requires of Schools***—Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1991. Sets forth the foundation skills and competencies that high-performance workplaces require and that high-performance schools should produce.

Government Printing Office Stock Number: 029-000-0433-1

***What Works for Dislocated Workers: Final Report***—Sociometrics, Inc., 1991. Describes 10 quality JTPA Title III projects considered exemplary based on tailored training, early intervention/voluntary advance notification, labor management cooperation, linkages to trade adjustment assistance and unemployment insurance, and services for female dislocated workers.  
Contract Number: 99-8-4690-75-058-01

***Wisconsin's Response to Families and Work***—State of Wisconsin, 1989. Includes a comparison of three types of child care benefits used in the State of Wisconsin. These include child care centers linked with employer establishments; an employee benefit enabling pretax dollars to be used to purchase child care services; and a child care resource and referral service. Authors describe each model and assess results.  
Contract Number: 99-8-3482-75-086-01  
NTIS Number: PB 90-218728

***Women's Relative Pay: The Factors That Shape Current and Future Trends***—The Urban Institute, 1989. Identifies factors that contribute to the improvement in women's pay relative to that of men in the 1980s; analyzes the potential of high-wage, high-growth jobs for increasing women's relative pay; and provides an analysis of the influence of women's intermittent labor force participation as it relates to relative pay.  
Contract Number: 99-8-0421-75-066-01  
NTIS Number: PB 90-218710/AS

***Women's Work, Men's Work: Sex Segregation on the Job***—National Academy of Sciences, 1986. Describes wage differentials and occupational segregation of men and women and looks into causes and possible short- and long-range solutions.  
Interagency Agreement  
National Academy Press Publication

***Work Search Among Unemployment Insurance Claimants: An Investigation of Some Effects of State Rules and Enforcement*** (Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 88-1)—Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 1988. Looks at the effects of work-search rules on the work-search behavior of UI claimants, their job-finding success, and payment error rates.  
Contract Number: J-9-M-5-0052  
NTIS Number: PB 89-160022/AS

***"Worker Displacement in a Period of Rapid Job Expansion: 1983–1987"***—U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Monthly Labor Review*, May 1990. Presents findings of a survey of displaced workers which was conducted by the Bureau of the Census. Notes that since the mid-1980s, fewer workers were displaced from their jobs and the reemployment rate among them was higher.

***The Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System: Legislation,***

**Implementation Process and Research Findings**—(Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 94-4)—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1995. Contains Federal legislative language on “profiling” (using a set of criteria that can help identify UI claimants who are likely to exhaust their benefits before they find a new job); a variety of public releases by the Department to interpret the legislation and provide technical assistance to the States in their implementation of the legislative provisions; and research relating to worker profiling and the provision of reemployment services.

NTIS Number: PB95-172730

**Workforce Quality: Perspectives from the U.S. and Japan**—U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1990. Summarizes proceedings of a major symposium of Japanese and American officials. Examines successful Japanese practices used to prepare workers for a technologically advanced workplace and discusses ways to apply these practices in the United States.

NTIS Number: PB 92-146539

**Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the Twenty-First Century**—Hudson Institute, 1987. Identifies key trends that will characterize the remainder of the 20th century, changes in the composition of the workforce and of jobs, and the major policy challenges ahead.

Grant Number: 99-6-3370-75-002-02

**Workplace Basics: The Skills Employers Want**—American Society for Training and Development, 1988. Describes six basic skill groups, in addition to reading, writing, and computation, which employers look for in successful workers.

Grant Number: 99-6-0705-079-02

NTIS Number: PB 92-116276

**Workplace Literacy and the Nation's Unemployed Workers**—U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Development, 1993. Offers findings from an analysis of the effects of workplace literacy on the labor market performance of unemployed workers who were studied in the Department's Workplace Literacy Survey in 1990 and identifies the determinants of workplace literacy.

NTIS Number: PB 94-150513

**Table A-1. Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population  
16 years and over, 1960-95 annual averages  
(Numbers in thousands)**

				Civilian Labor Force					
				Employed			Unemployed		
Year	Civilian noninstitutional population	Number	Per- cent of Pop- ulation	Total	Agri- culture	Nonagri- cultural industries	Number	Percent of Labor Force	Not in Labor Force
1960 <sup>a</sup>	117,245	69,628	59.4	65,778	5,458	60,318	3,852	5.5	47,617
1961	118,771	70,459	59.3	65,746	5,200	60,546	4,714	6.7	48,312
1962 <sup>a</sup>	120,153	70,614	58.8	66,702	4,944	61,759	3,911	5.5	49,539
1963	122,416	71,833	58.7	67,762	4,687	63,076	4,070	5.7	50,583
1964	124,485	73,091	58.7	69,305	4,523	64,782	3,786	5.2	51,394
1965	126,513	74,455	58.9	71,088	4,361	66,726	3,366	4.5	52,058
1966	128,058	75,770	59.2	72,895	3,979	68,915	2,875	3.8	52,288
1967	129,874	77,347	59.6	74,372	3,844	70,527	2,975	3.8	52,527
1968	132,028	78,737	59.6	75,920	3,817	72,103	2,817	3.6	53,291
1969	134,335	80,734	60.1	77,902	3,606	74,296	2,832	3.5	53,602
1970	137,085	82,771	60.4	78,678	3,463	75,215	4,093	4.9	54,315
1971	140,216	84,382	60.2	79,367	3,394	75,972	5,016	5.9	55,834
1972 <sup>a</sup>	144,126	87,034	60.4	82,153	3,484	78,669	4,882	5.6	57,091
1973 <sup>a</sup>	147,096	89,429	60.8	85,064	3,470	81,594	4,365	4.9	57,667
1974	150,120	91,949	61.3	86,794	3,515	83,279	5,156	5.6	58,171
1975	153,153	93,775	61.2	85,846	3,408	82,438	7,929	8.5	59,377
1976	156,150	96,158	61.6	88,752	3,331	85,421	7,406	7.7	59,991
1977	159,033	99,009	62.3	92,017	3,283	88,734	6,991	7.1	60,025
1978 <sup>a</sup>	161,910	102,251	63.2	96,048	3,387	92,661	6,202	6.1	59,659
1979	164,863	104,962	63.7	98,824	3,347	95,477	6,137	5.8	59,900
1980	167,745	106,940	63.8	99,303	3,364	95,938	7,637	7.1	60,806
1981	170,130	108,670	63.9	100,397	3,368	97,030	8,273	7.6	61,460
1982	172,271	110,204	64.0	99,526	3,401	96,125	10,678	9.7	62,067
1983	174,215	111,550	64.0	100,834	3,383	97,450	10,717	9.6	62,665
1984	176,383	113,544	64.4	105,005	3,321	101,685	8,539	7.5	62,839
1985	178,206	115,461	64.8	107,150	3,179	103,971	8,312	7.2	62,744
1986 <sup>a</sup>	180,587	117,834	65.3	109,597	3,163	106,434	8,237	7.0	62,752

1987	182,753	119,865	65.6	112,440	3,208	109,232	7,425	6.2	62,888
1988	184,613	121,669	65.9	114,968	3,169	111,800	6,701	5.5	62,944
1989	186,393	123,869	66.5	117,342	3,199	114,142	6,528	5.3	62,523
1990b	189,164	125,840	66.5	118,793	3,223	115,570	7,047	5.6	63,324
1991	190,925	126,346	66.2	117,718	3,269	114,449	8,628	6.8	64,578
1992	192,805	128,105	66.4	118,492	3,247	115,245	9,613	7.5	64,700
1993	194,838	129,200	66.3	120,259	3,115	117,144	8,940	6.9	65,638
1994	196,814	131,056	66.6	123,060	3,409	119,651	7,996	6.1	65,758
1995	198,584	132,304	66.6	124,900	3,440	121,460	7,404	5.6	66,280

---

<sup>a</sup>Not strictly comparable with data for prior years. For an explanation, see the section "Noncomparability of Labor Force Levels" in the note on "Historical Comparability" at the beginning of this Appendix.

<sup>b</sup>Data for 1990 are not directly comparable with data for 1989 and earlier years because of the introduction of a major redesign of the Current Population Survey (household survey) questionnaire and collection methodology. Beginning with 1990, data incorporate 1990 census-based population controls, adjusted for the estimated undercount. For additional information, see "Revisions in the Current Population Survey Effective January 1994" and "Revisions in Household Survey Data Effective February 1996" in the February 1994 and March 1996 issues, respectively, of *Employment and Earnings*.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population  
16 years and over by sex, 1981-95 annual averages  
(Numbers in thousands)**

				Civilian Labor Force						
				Employed			Unemployed			
Year	Civilian noninstitutional population	Number	Per- cent of Pop- ulation	Total	Agri- culture	Nonagri- cultural industries	Number	Percent of Labor Force	Not in Labor Force	
Men										
1981	80,511	61,974	77.0	57,397	71.3	2,700	54,697	4,577	7.4	18,537
1982	81,523	62,450	76.6	56,271	69.0	2,736	53,534	6,179	9.9	19,073
1983	82,531	63,047	76.4	56,787	68.8	2,704	54,083	6,260	9.9	19,484
1984	83,605	63,835	76.4	59,091	70.7	2,668	56,423	4,744	7.4	19,771
1985	84,469	64,411	76.3	59,891	70.9	2,535	57,356	4,521	7.0	20,058
1986 <sup>a</sup>	85,798	65,422	76.3	60,892	71.0	2,511	58,381	4,530	6.9	20,376
1987	86,899	66,207	76.2	62,107	71.5	2,543	59,564	4,101	6.2	20,692
1988	87,857	66,927	76.2	63,273	72.0	2,493	60,780	3,655	5.5	20,930
1989	88,762	67,840	76.4	64,315	72.5	2,513	61,802	3,525	5.2	20,923
1990 <sup>b</sup>	90,377	69,011	76.4	65,104	72.0	2,546	62,559	3,906	5.7	21,367
1991	91,278	69,168	75.8	64,223	70.4	2,589	61,634	4,946	7.2	22,110
1992	92,270	69,964	75.8	64,440	69.8	2,575	61,866	5,523	7.9	22,306
1993	93,332	70,404	75.4	65,349	70.0	2,478	62,871	5,055	7.2	22,927
1994	94,355	70,817	75.1	66,450	70.4	2,554	63,896	4,367	6.2	23,538
1995	95,178	71,360	75.0	67,377	70.8	2,559	64,818	3,983	5.6	23,818
Women										
1981	89,618	46,696	52.1	43,000	48.0	667	42,333	3,696	7.9	42,922
1982	90,748	47,755	52.6	43,256	47.7	665	42,591	4,499	9.4	42,993
1983	91,684	48,503	52.9	44,047	48.0	680	43,367	4,457	9.2	43,181
1984	92,778	49,709	53.6	45,915	49.5	653	45,262	3,794	7.6	43,068
1985	93,736	51,050	54.5	47,259	50.4	644	46,615	3,791	7.4	42,686
1986 <sup>a</sup>	94,789	52,413	55.3	48,706	51.4	652	48,054	3,707	7.1	42,376
1987	95,853	53,658	56.0	50,334	52.5	666	49,668	3,324	6.2	42,195
1988	96,756	54,742	56.6	51,696	53.4	676	51,020	3,046	5.6	42,014
1989	97,630	56,030	57.4	53,027	54.3	687	52,341	3,003	5.4	41,601

1990b	98,787	56,829	57.5	53,689	54.3	678	53,011	3,140	5.5	41,957
1991	99,646	57,178	57.4	53,496	53.7	680	52,815	3,683	6.4	42,468
1992	100,535	58,141	57.8	54,052	53.8	672	53,380	4,090	7.0	42,394
1993	101,506	58,795	57.9	54,910	54.1	637	54,273	3,885	6.6	42,711
1994	102,460	60,239	58.8	56,610	55.3	855	55,755	3,629	6.0	42,221
1995	103,406	60,944	58.9	57,523	55.6	881	56,642	3,421	5.6	42,462

---

<sup>a</sup>Not strictly comparable with data for prior years. For an explanation, see note on "Historical Comparability" at the beginning of this Appendix.

<sup>b</sup>Data for 1990 are not directly comparable with data for 1989 and earlier years because of the introduction of a major redesign of the Current Population Survey (household survey) questionnaire and collection methodology. Beginning with 1990, data incorporate 1990 census-based population controls, adjusted for the estimated undercount. For additional information, see "Revisions in the Current Population Survey Effective January 1994" and "Revisions in Household Survey Data Effective February 1996" in the February 1994 and March 1996 issues, respectively, of *Employment and Earnings*.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-3. Unemployed men by marital status, race, and age, 1994 and 1995 annual averages**

Marital status, race, and age	Thousands of persons		Unemployment rates	
	1994	1995	1994	1995
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	4,367	3,983	6.2	5.6
Married, spouse present . . . . .	1,592	1,424	3.7	3.3
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	594	551	7.4	6.9
Single (never married) . . . . .	2,181	2,007	11.0	10.1
White, 16 years and over . . . . .	3,275	2,999	5.4	4.9
Married, spouse present . . . . .	1,288	1,165	3.4	3.0
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	451	428	6.8	6.4
Single (never married) . . . . .	1,535	1,406	9.6	8.7
Black, 16 years and over . . . . .	848	762	12.0	10.6
Married, spouse present . . . . .	195	166	6.0	5.0
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	114	100	10.6	9.3
Single (never married) . . . . .	540	496	19.4	17.6
Total, 25 years and over . . . . .	2,859	2,566	4.8	4.3
Married, spouse present . . . . .	1,484	1,322	3.6	3.1
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	568	531	7.3	6.8
Single (never married) . . . . .	806	712	8.0	7.0
White, 25 years and over . . . . .	2,180	1,982	4.3	3.8
Married, spouse present . . . . .	1,200	1,082	3.3	2.9
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	430	412	6.7	6.4
Single (never married) . . . . .	550	488	6.9	6.0
Black, 25 years and over . . . . .	509	441	8.8	7.5
Married, spouse present . . . . .	183	152	5.9	4.8
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	110	97	10.4	9.2
Single (never married) . . . . .	216	191	13.6	11.9

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-4. Unemployed women by marital status, race, and age, 1994 and 1995 annual averages**

Marital status, race, and age	Thousands of persons		Unemployment rates	
	1994	1995	1994	1995
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	3,629	3,421	6.0	5.6
Married, spouse present . . . . .	1,352	1,296	4.1	3.9
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	791	712	6.6	5.9
Single (never married) . . . . .	1,486	1,413	9.7	9.1
White, 16 years and over . . . . .	2,617	2,460	5.2	4.8
Married, spouse present . . . . .	1,129	1,070	3.9	3.6
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	569	526	6.0	5.5
Single (never married) . . . . .	920	864	7.8	7.3
Black, 16 years and over . . . . .	818	777	11.0	10.2
Married, spouse present . . . . .	133	143	5.4	5.5
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	185	155	8.9	7.5
Single (never married) . . . . .	499	479	17.3	16.2
Total, 25 years and over . . . . .	2,444	2,248	4.9	4.4
Married, spouse present . . . . .	1,190	1,147	3.8	3.6
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	726	651	6.3	5.6
Single (never married) . . . . .	528	450	7.2	6.0
White, 25 years and over . . . . .	1,801	1,659	4.3	3.9
Married, spouse present . . . . .	994	946	3.6	3.4
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	522	478	5.7	5.1
Single (never married) . . . . .	285	235	5.3	4.4
Black, 25 years and over . . . . .	506	462	8.3	7.3
Married, spouse present . . . . .	117	125	5.0	5.0
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	169	147	8.4	7.3
Single (never married) . . . . .	220	190	12.7	10.6

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-5. Unemployed persons by reason for unemployment,  
sex, and age, 1994 and 1995 annual averages  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Reason	Total, 16 years and over		Men, 20 years and over		Women, 20 years and over		Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	
	1994	1995	1994	1995	1994	1995	1994	1995
<b>NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED</b>								
Total unemployed . . . . .	7,996	7,404	3,627	3,239	3,049	2,819	1,320	1,346
Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs . . . . .	3,815	3,476	2,296	2,051	1,334	1,211	185	214
On temporary layoff . . . . .	977	1,030	579	602	330	356	69	72
Not on temporary layoff . . . . .	2,838	2,446	1,717	1,449	1,004	856	116	142
Permanent job losers . . . . .	2,090	1,730	1,252	1,024	771	627	68	79
Persons who completed temporary jobs . . . . .	748	716	466	425	234	228	49	63
Job leavers . . . . .	791	824	367	356	339	366	84	102
Reentrants . . . . .	2,786	2,525	898	775	1,253	1,135	634	615
New entrants . . . . .	604	579	65	57	122	107	416	415
<b>PERCENT DISTRIBUTION</b>								
Total unemployed . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs . . . . .	47.7	46.9	63.3	63.3	43.7	43.0	14.0	15.9
On temporary layoff . . . . .	12.2	13.9	16.0	18.6	10.8	12.6	5.2	5.4
Not on temporary layoff . . . . .	35.5	33.0	47.3	44.7	32.9	30.4	8.8	10.5
Job leavers . . . . .	9.9	11.1	10.1	11.0	11.1	13.0	6.4	7.6
Reentrants . . . . .	34.8	34.1	24.8	23.9	41.1	40.3	48.1	45.7
New entrants . . . . .	7.6	7.8	1.8	1.8	4.0	3.8	31.5	30.8
<b>UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE</b>								
Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs . . . . .	2.9	2.6	3.4	3.0	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.8
Job leavers . . . . .	.6	.6	.5	.5	.6	.6	1.1	1.3
Reentrants . . . . .	2.1	1.9	1.3	1.2	2.2	2.0	8.5	7.9
New entrants . . . . .	.5	.4	.1	.1	.2	.2	5.6	5.3

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-6. Unemployed persons by reason for unemployment, race, and  
Hispanic origin, 1994 and 1995 annual averages  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Reason for unemployment	Total		White		Black		Hispanic origin	
	1994	1995	1994	1995	1994	1995	1994	1995
<b>NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED</b>								
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	7,996	7,404	5,892	5,459	1,666	1,538	1,187	1,140
Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs . . . . .	3,815	3,476	2,972	2,710	651	584	573	559
On temporary layoff . . . . .	977	1,030	800	856	134	117	139	163
Not on temporary layoff . . . . .	2,838	2,446	2,172	1,854	516	467	434	397
Permanent job losers . . . . .	2,090	1,730	1,625	1,352	354	290	310	271
Persons who completed temporary jobs . . . . .	748	716	547	502	162	177	123	126
Job leavers . . . . .	791	824	638	660	116	123	89	90
Reentrants . . . . .	2,786	2,525	1,898	1,728	729	657	402	369
New entrants . . . . .	604	579	385	361	172	174	124	122
<b>PERCENT DISTRIBUTION</b>								
Total unemployed . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs . . . . .	47.7	46.9	50.4	49.6	39.0	38.0	48.2	49.1
On temporary layoff . . . . .	12.2	13.9	13.6	15.7	8.1	7.6	11.7	14.3
Not on temporary layoff . . . . .	35.5	33.0	36.9	34.0	31.0	30.4	36.5	34.8
Job leavers . . . . .	9.9	11.1	10.8	12.1	6.9	8.0	7.5	7.9
Reentrants . . . . .	34.8	34.1	32.2	31.7	43.7	42.7	33.8	32.4
New entrants . . . . .	7.6	7.8	6.5	6.6	10.3	11.3	10.5	10.7
<b>UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE</b>								
Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs . . . . .	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.4	4.5	3.9	4.8	4.6
Job leavers . . . . .	.6	.6	.6	.6	.8	.8	.7	.7
Reentrants . . . . .	2.1	1.9	1.7	1.5	5.0	4.4	3.4	3.0
New entrants . . . . .	.5	.4	.3	.3	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.0

Note: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-7. Unemployed total and full-time workers by duration of unemployment, 1994 and 1995 annual averages**

Duration of unemployment	Thousands of persons		Percent distribution	
	1994	1995	1994	1995
<b>TOTAL, ALL WORKERS</b>				
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	7,996	7,404	100.0	100.0
Less than 5 weeks . . . . .	2,728	2,700	34.1	36.5
5 to 14 weeks . . . . .	2,408	2,342	30.1	31.6
5 to 10 weeks . . . . .	1,651	1,631	20.6	22.0
11 to 14 weeks . . . . .	757	711	9.5	9.6
15 weeks and over . . . . .	2,860	2,363	35.8	31.9
15 to 26 weeks . . . . .	1,237	1,085	15.5	14.6
27 weeks and over . . . . .	1,623	1,278	20.3	17.3
27 to 51 weeks . . . . .	645	561	8.1	7.6
52 weeks and over . . . . .	978	717	12.2	9.7
Average (mean) duration, in weeks . . . . .	18.8	16.6	-	-
Median duration, in weeks . . . . .	9.2	8.3	-	-
<b>FULL-TIME WORKERS</b>				
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	6,513	5,909	100.0	100.0
Less than 5 weeks . . . . .	2,008	1,971	30.8	33.3
5 to 14 weeks . . . . .	1,960	1,889	30.1	32.0
5 to 10 weeks . . . . .	1,317	1,289	20.2	21.8
11 to 14 weeks . . . . .	643	600	9.9	10.1
15 weeks and over . . . . .	2,544	2,050	39.1	34.7
15 to 26 weeks . . . . .	1,073	929	16.5	15.7
27 weeks and over . . . . .	1,471	1,122	22.6	19.0
27 to 51 weeks . . . . .	578	491	8.9	8.3
52 weeks and over . . . . .	893	631	13.7	10.7
Average (mean) duration, in weeks . . . . .	20.4	17.9	-	-
Median duration, in weeks . . . . .	10.2	9.1	-	-

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-8. Unemployed job seekers by sex, age, race, and active job search methods used, 1995 annual averages**

	1995									
	Thousands of Persons		Methods used as a percent of total job seekers							Average number of methods used
Sex, age, and race	Total un-employed	Total job seekers	Employer directly	Sent out resumes or filled out applications	Placed or answered ads	Friends or relatives	Public employment agency	Private employment agency	Other	
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .										
	7,404	6,375	65.3	45.1	18.5	17.3	18.8	6.5	7.9	1.80
16 to 19 years . . . . .	1,346	1,274	63.0	50.8	10.4	11.4	8.8	2.5	5.3	1.52
20 to 24 years . . . . .	1,244	1,123	66.7	45.5	18.0	15.3	18.7	6.3	7.2	1.78
25 to 34 years . . . . .	1,841	1,578	66.7	44.3	19.9	18.5	22.4	7.7	7.6	1.88
35 to 44 years . . . . .	1,549	1,274	64.6	44.4	22.4	20.0	22.7	7.8	8.9	1.91
45 to 54 years . . . . .	844	676	66.8	43.7	22.5	21.6	24.2	9.4	10.3	1.99
55 to 64 years . . . . .	425	332	62.6	39.1	21.2	21.3	17.8	7.6	11.8	1.82
65 years and over . . . . .	153	117	64.6	24.2	18.0	21.4	9.7	3.7	10.5	1.52
Men, 16 years and over . . . . .										
	3,983	3,336	66.8	42.8	18.1	19.5	20.1	6.5	8.9	1.83
16 to 19 years . . . . .	744	698	63.8	49.9	9.5	12.3	9.1	2.9	5.2	1.53
20 to 24 years . . . . .	673	591	68.3	43.2	18.6	17.7	19.8	6.3	7.1	1.82
25 to 34 years . . . . .	961	783	68.5	41.4	19.8	22.4	25.1	7.7	8.6	1.94
35 to 44 years . . . . .	815	644	67.1	41.5	21.6	21.7	24.5	7.4	10.8	1.95
45 to 54 years . . . . .	464	361	68.4	41.8	22.1	23.4	27.0	9.4	12.6	2.05
55 to 64 years . . . . .	233	183	63.6	34.6	22.0	23.1	17.3	7.7	13.8	1.82
65 years and over . . . . .	94	75	63.8	23.7	16.1	22.4	7.1	3.9	12.9	1.50
Women, 16 years and over . . . . .										
	3,421	3,039	63.6	47.7	18.9	15.0	17.4	6.6	6.8	1.76
16 to 19 years . . . . .	602	576	62.0	52.0	11.6	10.4	8.4	2.0	5.4	1.52
20 to 24 years . . . . .	571	533	65.0	47.9	17.2	12.5	17.4	6.2	7.2	1.74
25 to 34 years . . . . .	880	795	65.0	47.2	20.0	14.7	19.8	7.7	6.7	1.81
35 to 44 years . . . . .	735	630	62.0	47.4	23.3	18.1	20.9	8.3	6.9	1.87
45 to 54 years . . . . .	381	315	64.9	45.9	23.0	19.5	20.9	9.4	7.6	1.92
55 to 64 years . . . . .	193	149	61.3	44.6	20.1	19.0	18.3	7.4	9.3	1.81
65 years and over . . . . .	60	42	66.0	25.1	21.5	19.6	14.3	3.4	6.1	1.56
White, 16 years and over . . . . .										
	5,459	4,603	65.6	45.5	19.4	17.6	18.5	6.5	8.4	1.82
Men . . . . .	2,999	2,454	67.3	42.7	19.0	14.8	20.0	6.6	9.5	1.85
Women . . . . .	2,460	2,150	63.8	48.7	19.9	20.0	16.8	6.4	7.3	1.78
Black, 16 years and over . . . . .										
	1,538	1,421	64.6	45.1	15.4	15.2	20.4	6.7	5.8	1.73
Men . . . . .	762	694	65.3	44.5	14.7	16.3	21.1	6.4	6.4	1.75
Women . . . . .	777	727	63.9	45.6	16.1	14.1	19.8	7.0	5.1	1.72

Note: The jobseekers total is less than the total unemployed because it does not include persons on temporary layoff. The percent

using each method will always total more than 100 because many jobseekers use more than one method.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-9. Unemployed job seekers by sex, reason for unemployment,  
and active job search methods used, 1995 annual averages**

	1995									
	Thousands of persons		Methods used as a percent of total jobseekers							
Sex, age, and race	Total unemployed	Total job-seekers	Employer directly	Sent out resumes or filled out applications	Placed or answered ads	Friends or relatives	Public employment agency	Private employment agency	other	Average Number of Methods used
Total, 16 years and over	7,404	6,375	65.3	45.1	18.5	17.3	18.8	6.5	7.9	1.80
Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs <sup>1</sup>	3,476	2,446	68.5	44.4	22.8	21.0	25.7	8.7	8.7	2.06
Job leavers	824	824	66.6	48.1	21.1	17.4	19.3	7.5	7.2	1.88
Reentrants	2,525	2,525	62.6	44.2	15.2	14.2	14.2	5.0	7.9	1.63
New entrants	579	579	61.9	48.1	10.8	15.6	8.9	2.9	5.6	1.54
Men, 16 years and over	3,983	3,336	66.8	42.8	18.1	19.5	20.1	6.5	8.9	1.83
Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs <sup>1</sup>	2,190	1,543	70.1	40.9	21.6	22.8	26.3	8.0	9.7	2.05
Job leavers	407	407	67.2	44.3	21.8	18.5	20.9	7.3	6.9	1.87
Reentrants	1,113	1,113	63.0	43.5	13.8	16.3	13.8	5.0	9.2	1.65
New entrants	273	273	63.7	48.3	9.8	15.0	9.3	2.7	5.7	1.54
Women, 16 years and over	3,421	3,039	63.6	47.7	18.9	15.0	17.4	6.6	6.8	1.76
Job losers and persons who completed temporary jobs <sup>1</sup>	1,286	904	65.7	50.3	24.8	17.9	24.6	9.8	7.0	2.08
Job leavers	417	417	66.1	51.9	20.5	16.3	17.8	7.6	7.4	1.88
Reentrants	1,412	1,412	62.2	44.7	16.3	12.5	14.6	4.9	6.8	1.62
New entrants	306	306	60.3	48.0	11.6	16.2	8.6	3.0	5.4	1.59

<sup>1</sup>Data on the number of jobseekers and the jobsearch methods used exclude persons on temporary layoff.

Note: The jobseekers total is less than the total unemployed because it does not include persons on temporary layoff. The percent using each method will always total more than 100 because many jobseekers use more than one method.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-10. Persons not in the labor force by desire and availability  
for work, age, and sex, 1995 annual averages  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Category	1995					
	Total	Age			Sex	
		16 to 24 years	25 to 54 years	55 years and over	Men	Women
Total not in the labor force . . . . .	66,280	10,922	18,854	36,503	23,818	42,462
Do not want a job now <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	60,610	8,807	16,246	35,557	21,536	39,074
Want a job <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	5,670	2,115	2,608	947	2,282	3,388
Did not search for work in previous year . . . . .	3,286	1,153	1,436	697	1,231	2,054
Searched for work in previous year <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	2,384	963	1,172	250	1,050	1,334
Not available to work now . . . . .	791	397	350	45	302	490
Available to work now . . . . .	1,593	566	822	205	749	844
Reason not currently looking:						
Discouragement over job prospects <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	410	108	231	72	245	166
Reasons other than discouragement . . . . .	1,182	458	591	133	504	679
Family responsibilities . . . . .	185	39	131	15	26	159
In school or training . . . . .	245	199	44	2	131	114
Ill health or disability . . . . .	131	19	84	28	60	71
Other <sup>4</sup> . . . . .	621	201	331	89	287	334

<sup>1</sup>Includes some persons who are not asked if they want a job.

<sup>2</sup>Persons who had a job in the prior 12 months must have searched since the end of that job.

<sup>3</sup>Includes believes no work available, could not find work, lacks necessary schooling or training, employer thinks too young or old, and other types of discrimination.

<sup>4</sup>Includes those who did not actively look for work in the prior 4 weeks for such reasons as child care and transportation problems, as well as a small number for which reason for nonparticipation was not ascertained.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-11. Multiple job holders by selected demographic and economic characteristics, 1995 annual averages**  
(Numbers in thousands)

Characteristic	1995					
	Both sexes		Men		Women	
	Number	Rate <sup>1</sup>	Number	Rate <sup>1</sup>	Number	Rate <sup>1</sup>
<b>AGE</b>						
Total, 16 years and over <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	7,693	6.2	4,139	6.1	3,554	6.2
16 to 19 years . . . . .	350	5.4	153	4.7	196	6.3
20 years and over . . . . .	7,343	6.2	3,986	6.2	3,358	6.2
20 to 24 years . . . . .	829	6.7	404	6.1	424	7.3
25 years and over . . . . .	6,515	6.1	3,582	6.2	2,933	6.0
25 to 54 years . . . . .	5,874	6.5	3,217	6.6	2,657	6.3
55 years and over . . . . .	641	4.2	364	4.3	276	4.1
55 to 64 years . . . . .	537	4.7	298	4.8	238	4.6
65 years and over . . . . .	104	2.8	66	3.1	38	2.5
<b>RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN</b>						
White . . . . .	6,764	6.4	3,650	6.3	3,114	6.4
Black . . . . .	688	5.2	362	5.6	326	4.8
Hispanic origin . . . . .	430	3.9	252	3.8	178	4.0
<b>MARITAL STATUS</b>						
Married, spouse present . . . . .	4,398	5.9	2,683	6.4	1,715	5.3
Widowed, divorced, or separated . . . . .	1,235	6.5	412	5.5	823	7.2
Single (never married) . . . . .	2,061	6.5	1,044	5.9	1,016	7.2
<b>FULL- OR PART-TIME STATUS</b>						
Primary job full time, secondary job part time . . . . .	4,446	--	2,664	--	1,781	--
Primary and secondary jobs both part time . . . . .	1,693	--	533	--	1,160	--
Primary and secondary jobs both full time . . . . .	257	--	185	--	72	--
Hours vary on primary or secondary job . . . . .	1,262	--	740	--	521	--

<sup>1</sup>Multiple jobholders as a percent of all employed persons in specified group.

<sup>2</sup>Includes a small number of persons who work part time on their primary job and full time on their secondary job(s), not shown separately.

Note: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, race, and Hispanic origin, 1994 and 1995 annual averages**  
(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status and age	Veterans						Nonveterans					
	White		Black		Hispanic origin		White		Black		Hispanic origin	
	1994	1995	1994	1995	1994	1995	1994	1995	1994	1995	1994	1995

**Total, 40 to 54 years**

Civilian noninstitutional population . . . . .	5,812	5,815	597	588	260	264	13,605	14,540	1,722	1,829	1,616	1,680
Civilian labor force . . . . .	5,383	5,335	514	496	239	238	12,435	13,279	1,395	1,451	1,414	1,475
Employed . . . . .	5,181	5,160	480	462	228	229	11,986	12,837	1,291	1,362	1,303	1,379
Unemployed . . . . .	202	174	34	35	11	9	449	442	104	89	111	95
Unemployment rate . . . . .	3.7	3.3	6.7	7.0	4.5	4.0	3.6	3.3	7.5	6.2	7.8	6.5

**40 to 44 years**

Civilian noninstitutional population . . . . .	1,610	1,288	202	176	93	76	6,328	6,828	800	848	737	759
Civilian labor force . . . . .	1,494	1,178	174	150	86	69	5,937	6,389	694	702	674	694
Employed . . . . .	1,426	1,126	157	137	82	65	5,740	6,175	637	655	630	651
Unemployed . . . . .	68	52	17	14	1	4	198	214	57	47	44	42
Unemployment rate . . . . .	4.5	4.4	9.7	9.1	.8	6.3	3.3	3.3	8.2	6.7	6.5	6.1

**45 to 49 years**

Civilian noninstitutional population . . . . .	2,886	2,884	269	276	127	131	3,963	4,334	510	562	510	540
Civilian labor force . . . . .	2,694	2,666	234	236	118	118	3,626	3,959	395	454	440	471
Employed . . . . .	2,601	2,584	222	218	112	115	3,491	3,838	367	428	405	442
Unemployed . . . . .	93	82	13	18	6	3	135	121	28	27	35	29
Unemployment rate . . . . .	3.4	3.1	5.4	7.6	5.2	2.4	3.7	3.1	7.0	5.9	8.0	6.2

**50 to 54 years**

Civilian noninstitutional population . . . . .	1,315	1,642	125	137	40	58	3,314	3,378	412	420	369	382
Civilian labor force . . . . .	1,195	1,491	105	110	35	51	2,872	2,931	306	295	300	310
Employed . . . . .	1,154	1,451	101	107	34	49	2,755	2,824	286	279	268	286
Unemployed . . . . .	41	40	5	3	-	2	117	107	20	16	32	24
Unemployment rate . . . . .	3.4	2.7	4.6	2.6	1.1	4.4	4.1	3.6	6.4	5.3	10.6	7.7

<sup>1</sup>Data not shown where base is less than 35,000.

Note: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces. Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-13. Persons at work in agriculture and nonagricultural industries by hours of work, 1995 annual averages**  
(Numbers in thousands)

Hours of work	1995					
	Thousands of persons			Percent distribution		
	All industries	Agriculture	Nonagricultural industries	All industries	Agriculture	Nonagricultural industries
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	119,318	3,247	116,071	100.0	100.0	100.0
1 to 34 hours . . . . .	30,664	1,051	29,613	25.7	32.4	25.5
1 to 4 hours . . . . .	1,297	83	1,214	1.1	2.6	1.0
5 to 14 hours . . . . .	4,943	262	4,681	4.1	8.1	4.0
15 to 29 hours . . . . .	15,120	476	14,644	12.7	14.7	12.6
30 to 34 hours . . . . .	9,304	229	9,075	7.8	7.1	7.8
35 hours and over . . . . .	88,654	2,196	86,458	74.3	67.6	74.5
35 to 39 hours . . . . .	8,783	173	8,610	7.4	5.3	7.4
40 hours . . . . .	35.8	42,228	635	41,592	35.4	19.6
41 hours and over . . . . .	37,643	1,388	36,255	31.5	42.7	31.2
41 to 48 hours . . . . .	13,958	250	13,708	11.7	7.7	11.8
49 to 59 hours . . . . .	13,591	388	13,203	11.4	11.9	11.4
60 hours and over . . . . .	10,094	750	9,344	8.5	23.1	8.1
Average hours, total at work . . . . .	39.3	42.2	39.2	--	--	--
Average hours, persons who usually work full time . . . . .	43.4	49.7	43.2	--	--	--

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-14. Persons at work 1 to 34 hours in all and nonagricultural industries by reason for working less than 35 hours and usual full- or part-time status, 1995 annual averages**  
(Numbers in thousands)

Reason for working less than 35 hours	1995					
	All industries			Nonagricultural industries		
	Total	Usually work full-time	Usually work part-time	Total	Usually work full-time	Usually work part-time
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	30,664	9,924	20,740	29,613	9,615	19,998
Economic reasons . . . . .	4,473	1,468	3,005	4,279	1,373	2,906
Slack work or business conditions . . . . .	2,471	1,210	1,261	2,346	1,140	1,206
Could only find part-time work . . . . .	1,702	--	1,702	1,663	--	1,663
Seasonal work . . . . .	120	77	43	94	58	36
Job started or ended during week . . . . .	180	180	--	175	175	--
Noneconomic reasons . . . . .	26,191	8,457	17,734	25,334	8,242	17,093
Child-care problems . . . . .	774	71	703	765	70	695
Other family or personal obligations . . . . .	5,585	719	4,866	5,393	700	4,693
Health or medical limitations . . . . .	699	--	699	660	--	660
In school or training . . . . .	5,986	79	5,907	5,831	77	5,755
Retired or Social Security limit on earnings . . . . .	1,848	--	1,848	1,714	--	1,714
Vacation or personal day . . . . .	3,303	3,303	--	3,250	3,250	--
Holiday, legal or religious . . . . .	1,005	1,005	--	998	998	--
Weather-related curtailment . . . . .	439	439	--	375	375	--
All other reasons . . . . .	6,551	2,841	3,711	6,348	2,772	3,575
Average hours:						
Economic reasons . . . . .	22.9	24.1	22.3	23.0	24.2	22.4
Noneconomic reasons . . . . .	21.4	25.6	19.4	21.5	25.7	19.5

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table A-15. Employed persons by detailed industry, sex,  
race, and Hispanic origin, 1995 annual averages  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Industry	Total employed	Percent of total:		
		Women	Black	Hispanic origin
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	124,900	46.1	10.6	8.9
Agriculture . . . . .	3,440	25.6	2.9	17.5
Agricultural production, crops . . . . .	1,046	24.6	2.9	28.6
Agricultural production, livestock . . . . .	1,304	26.0	1.0	5.2
Veterinary services . . . . .	170	68.7	.5	3.5
Landscape and horticultural services . . . . .	743	11.1	6.7	24.9
Agricultural services, n.e.c. . . . .	177	48.3	3.9	25.7
Mining . . . . .	627	13.4	3.8	5.8
Metal mining . . . . .	66	10.2	.7	7.3
Coal mining . . . . .	115	7.2	3.1	.9
Oil and gas extraction . . . . .	337	16.2	3.9	7.4
Nonmetallic mining and quarrying, except fuel . . . . .	109	13.5	6.4	4.7
Construction . . . . .	7,668	9.9	6.6	10.4
Manufacturing . . . . .	20,493	31.6	10.4	10.2
Durable goods . . . . .	12,015	25.7	8.5	8.8
Lumber and wood products, except furniture . . . . .	816	13.2	9.3	8.0
Logging . . . . .	169	7.2	12.1	.5
Sawmills, planing mills, and millwork . . . . .	411	13.5	8.5	8.0
Wood buildings and mobile homes . . . . .	87	12.0	10.8	10.4
Miscellaneous wood products . . . . .	150	19.8	7.3	15.0
Furniture and fixtures . . . . .	645	30.6	8.1	11.4
Stone, clay, glass, and concrete products . . . . .	586	22.9	7.9	8.8
Glass and glass products . . . . .	193	30.5	8.5	6.4
Cement, concrete, gypsum, and plaster products . . . . .	213	11.4	7.5	10.4
Structural clay, pottery, and related products . . . . .	83	36.6	9.8	10.7
Miscellaneous nonmetallic mineral and stone products . . . . .	98	21.6	6.2	8.8
Metal industries . . . . .	2,118	19.0	9.5	11.0
Primary metal industries . . . . .	788	15.3	11.1	8.7
Blast furnaces, steelworks, rolling, and finishing mills . . . . .	349	11.1	12.6	6.8
Iron and steel foundries . . . . .	114	9.6	16.0	6.4
Primary aluminum industries . . . . .	138	18.3	7.7	13.1
Other primary metal industries . . . . .	187	24.3	7.7	10.5
Fabricated metal industries . . . . .	1,331	21.2	8.6	12.3
Cutlery, hand tools, and general hardware . . . . .	136	33.1	7.8	9.4
Fabricated structural metal products . . . . .	507	17.6	7.0	12.8
Screw machine products . . . . .	53	23.6	7.2	10.1
Percent of total:				
Metal forging and stampings . . . . .	159	20.6	6.7	8.9
Ordnance . . . . .	53	31.8	17.6	13.9
Miscellaneous and not specified fabricated metal products . . . . .	423	20.4	10.4	13.9
Machinery and computing equipment . . . . .	2,401	21.9	5.6	5.6
Engines and turbines . . . . .	59	20.9	13.4	3.3

Farm machinery and equipment . . . . .	114	22.0	6.8	5.3
Construction and material handling machines . . . . .	242	13.4	3.5	4.3
Metal working machinery . . . . .	320	18.8	3.4	4.0
Computers and related equipment . . . . .	502	32.7	6.9	6.1
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies . . . . .	1,849	38.4	9.2	9.7
Household appliances . . . . .	118	42.9	17.6	7.6
Radio, TV, and communication equipment . . . . .	404	37.7	9.6	10.1
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies, n.e.c. and not specified . . . . .	1,327	38.3	8.3	9.7
Transportation equipment . . . . .	2,213	21.0	11.3	6.7
Motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment . . . . .	1,242	22.3	12.8	5.1
Aircraft and parts . . . . .	407	19.9	7.8	8.9
Ship and boat building and repairing . . . . .	177	14.4	19.8	4.1
Guided missiles, space vehicles, and parts . . . . .	289	23.9	5.2	11.7
Cycles and miscellaneous transportation equipment . . . . .	68	11.2	7.5	10.7
Professional and photographic equipment, and watches . . . . .	729	36.5	6.3	7.8
Scientific and controlling instruments . . . . .	212	31.3	3.6	7.1
Medical, dental, and optical instruments and supplies . . . . .	384	43.4	6.3	10.5
Photographic equipment and supplies . . . . .	128	24.1	10.9	1.3
Toys, amusements, and sporting goods . . . . .	173	44.4	8.2	13.9
Miscellaneous and not specified manufacturing industries . . . . .	484	41.1	7.0	18.0
<b>Nondurable goods . . . . .</b>	<b>8,478</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>12.2</b>
<b>Food and kindred products . . . . .</b>	<b>1,701</b>	<b>32.2</b>	<b>15.0</b>	<b>17.8</b>
Meat products . . . . .	442	35.8	23.8	25.2
Dairy products . . . . .	142	24.8	11.7	8.3
Canned, frozen, and preserved fruits and vegetables . . . . .	223	41.5	11.1	24.4
Grain mill products . . . . .	144	24.2	8.1	5.4
Bakery products . . . . .	235	30.1	14.9	11.8
Sugar and confectionary products . . . . .	99	42.5	10.4	18.2
Beverage industries . . . . .	211	19.9	13.0	15.4
Miscellaneous and not specified food and kindred products . . . . .	207	34.8	12.2	19.2
Tobacco manufactures . . . . .	53	30.8	27.8	.6
Textile mill products . . . . .	670	44.8	25.8	6.4
Knitting mills . . . . .	112	58.1	17.4	11.2
Carpets and rugs . . . . .	96	39.3	25.3	8.7
Yarn, thread, and fabric mills . . . . .	398	43.1	29.2	3.5
Apparel and other finished textile products . . . . .	1,011	70.1	15.0	24.0
Apparel and accessories, except knit . . . . .	827	70.9	14.4	25.7
Miscellaneous fabricated textile products . . . . .	185	66.1	17.7	16.7
Paper and allied products . . . . .	723	24.8	13.5	8.5
Pulp, paper, and paperboard mills . . . . .	299	16.3	10.7	6.0
Miscellaneous paper and pulp products . . . . .	216	35.2	11.7	8.5
Paperboard containers and boxes . . . . .	207	26.3	19.4	12.2
Printing, publishing, and allied products . . . . .	1,870	44.1	7.9	7.5
Newspaper publishing and printing . . . . .	491	48.2	8.4	4.8
Printing, publishing, and allied industries, except newspapers . . . . .	1,379	42.6	7.8	8.4
Chemicals and allied products . . . . .	1,295	33.2	11.4	8.4
Plastics, synthetics, and resins . . . . .	175	30.1	10.1	14.9
Drugs . . . . .	319	43.6	10.7	6.5
Soaps and cosmetics . . . . .	174	52.1	13.7	12.9
Paints, varnishes, and related products . . . . .	81	22.1	10.4	9.4
Industrial and miscellaneous chemicals . . . . .	504	23.7	12.3	6.0
Petroleum and coal products . . . . .	181	23.4	10.2	10.5
Petroleum refining . . . . .	151	23.1	9.1	10.4
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products . . . . .	830	32.0	10.6	10.5
Tires and inner tubes . . . . .	88	14.7	13.5	2.8
Other rubber products, and plastics footwear and belting . . . . .	155	33.8	10.7	10.0
Miscellaneous plastics products . . . . .	587	34.0	10.1	11.8

Leather and leather products .....	144	52.0	6.9	18.3
Footwear, except rubber and plastic .....	74	52.9	9.6	11.9
Transportation, communications, and other public utilities .....	8,709	28.9	14.5	7.7
Transportation .....	5,589	27.2	15.9	8.3
Railroads .....	265	9.5	16.8	5.3
Bus service and urban transit .....	584	32.6	26.6	9.0
Taxicab service .....	103	12.4	31.6	10.3
Trucking service .....	2,175	15.0	12.9	7.9
Warehousing and storage .....	153	24.7	20.4	15.0
U.S. Postal Service .....	875	38.6	21.8	7.4
Water transportation .....	176	17.9	12.2	7.9
Air transportation .....	831	35.7	12.7	9.1
Services incidental to transportation .....	418	62.8	6.7	9.4
Communications .....	1,607	44.2	12.3	6.0
Radio and television broadcasting and cable .....	425	41.5	10.3	6.5
Telephone communications .....	1,154	45.5	13.2	5.9
Utilities and sanitary services .....	1,512	18.5	11.5	7.2
Electric light and power .....	636	19.7	8.7	6.4
Gas and steam supply systems .....	174	25.6	13.5	5.0
Electric and gas, and other combinations .....	151	25.3	11.7	8.8
Water supply and irrigation .....	222	14.3	12.2	7.1
Sanitary services .....	316	11.3	15.2	9.7
Wholesale and retail trade .....	26,071	47.2	8.6	9.8
Wholesale trade .....	4,986	29.2	6.3	9.7
Durable goods .....	2,644	26.5	5.7	7.9
Motor vehicles and equipment .....	226	24.6	6.5	5.3
Furniture and home furnishings .....	93	23.5	7.0	14.1
Lumber and construction materials .....	215	20.4	6.4	7.5
Professional and commercial equipment and supplies .....	399	34.3	5.3	6.1
Metals and minerals, except petroleum .....	97	19.1	8.3	14.1
Electrical goods .....	300	32.6	4.7	7.0
Hardware, plumbing and heating supplies .....	285	21.8	3.9	6.7
Machinery, equipment, and supplies .....	652	27.7	3.6	4.9
Scrap and waste materials .....	238	13.9	12.1	17.3
Miscellaneous wholesale trade, durable goods .....	140	35.2	6.0	12.6
Nondurable goods .....	2,342	32.3	6.9	11.8
Paper and paper products .....	129	34.9	6.7	7.9
Drugs, chemicals, and allied products .....	195	39.3	5.7	8.1
Apparel, fabrics, and notions .....	167	52.8	8.2	21.0
Groceries and related products .....	930	26.4	8.8	15.6
Farm products-raw materials .....	80	24.9	1.1	3.4
Petroleum products .....	121	31.1	8.7	1.9
Alcoholic beverages .....	127	16.1	3.7	9.7
Farm supplies .....	151	26.9	2.5	2.5
Miscellaneous nondurable goods and not specified wholesale trade .....	441	41.1	6.1	10.9
Retail trade .....	21,086	51.5	9.1	9.8
Lumber and building material retailing .....	548	27.1	4.4	5.6
Hardware stores .....	242	33.2	5.1	6.5
Retail nurseries and garden stores .....	112	40.1	4.7	11.6
Department stores .....	2,255	68.8	12.4	10.1
Variety stores .....	134	69.5	16.4	8.5
Miscellaneous general merchandise stores .....	148	67.0	8.7	11.7
Grocery stores .....	3,018	50.4	9.9	9.4
Retail bakeries .....	179	60.9	5.0	16.0
Food stores, n.e.c. ....	200	51.6	9.1	9.8
Motor vehicle dealers .....	1,197	19.0	5.3	7.3

Auto and home supply stores . . . . .	429	16.3	8.2	9.7
Gasoline service stations . . . . .	357	32.5	7.8	6.4
Miscellaneous vehicle dealers . . . . .	107	21.2	1.5	5.0
Apparel and accessory stores, except shoe . . . . .	783	75.9	11.7	10.0
Shoe stores . . . . .	163	56.2	20.3	9.6
Furniture and home furnishings stores . . . . .	597	39.2	7.1	7.0
Household appliance stores . . . . .	89	30.8	3.4	8.4
Radio, TV, and computer stores . . . . .	428	31.4	6.2	5.4
Music stores . . . . .	138	39.5	10.1	10.0
Eating and drinking places . . . . .	6,282	53.4	10.8	13.4
Drug stores . . . . .	567	63.4	7.5	5.9
Liquor stores . . . . .	119	37.1	8.7	3.9
Sporting goods, bicycles, and hobby stores . . . . .	391	47.9	3.9	4.8
Book and stationery stores . . . . .	245	55.5	11.4	5.6
Jewelry stores . . . . .	176	62.3	4.3	10.1
Gift, novelty, and souvenir shops . . . . .	212	82.6	4.4	7.2
Sewing, needlework, and piece goods stores . . . . .	47	84.5	3.1	11.6
Catalog and mail order houses . . . . .	167	70.6	6.5	6.8
Vending machine operators . . . . .	78	24.4	4.2	8.6
Direct selling establishments . . . . .	393	74.0	5.7	8.3
Fuel dealers . . . . .	127	31.0	5.8	4.0
Retail florists . . . . .	207	71.6	4.4	3.5
Finance, insurance, and real estate . . . . .	7,983	58.3	9.3	6.7
Banking . . . . .	1,865	71.7	11.8	6.7
Savings institutions, including credit unions . . . . .	298	79.7	7.2	7.5
Credit agencies, n.e.c. . . . .	568	58.7	12.3	7.5
Security, commodity brokerage, and investment companies . . . . .	762	38.6	6.3	5.2
Insurance . . . . .	2,357	60.3	8.7	5.3
Real estate, including real estate-insurance offices . . . . .	2,135	48.2	8.6	8.4
Services . . . . .	43,953	61.9	12.0	
7.9				
Private households . . . . .	971	89.6	18.3	23.2
Other service industries . . . . .	42,982	61.3	11.8	7.6
Business, automobile, and repair services . . . . .	7,526	36.5	11.3	10.2
Advertising . . . . .	267	52.3	3.8	7.0
Services to dwellings and other buildings . . . . .	829	47.7	16.6	20.6
Personnel supply services . . . . .	853	59.4	19.6	9.0
Computer and data processing services . . . . .	1,136	34.8	8.2	3.9
Detective and protective services . . . . .	506	20.4	22.7	9.2
Business services, n.e.c. . . . .	1,748	51.4	8.6	8.1
Automotive rental and leasing, without drivers . . . . .	163	30.9	13.8	7.2
Automobile parking and carwashes . . . . .	204	18.2	22.0	24.6
Automotive repair and related services . . . . .	1,092	10.2	7.0	11.8
Electrical repair shops . . . . .	132	19.0	7.2	10.9
Miscellaneous repair services . . . . .	595	14.1	4.4	10.5
Personal services, except private household . . . . .	3,404	63.4	13.1	13.1
Hotels and motels . . . . .	1,359	56.0	16.6	17.0
Lodging places, except hotels and motels . . . . .	136	52.6	5.0	5.4
Laundry, cleaning, and garment services . . . . .	495	54.2	15.1	21.6
Beauty shops . . . . .	867	90.7	10.1	8.4
Barber shops . . . . .	85	12.7	26.4	11.3
Funeral service and crematories . . . . .	94	31.5	5.7	2.5
Entertainment and recreation services . . . . .	2,238	43.6	8.1	7.9
Theaters and motion pictures . . . . .	598	37.9	9.3	8.7
Video tape rental . . . . .	119	67.1	5.5	8.1

Bowling centers	58	46.0	3.1	6.8
Miscellaneous entertainment and recreation services	1,464	43.8	8.1	7.6
Professional and related services	29,661	68.9	12.1	6.2
Hospitals	4,961	76.1	16.2	6.0
Health services, except hospitals	5,967	79.1	13.5	6.8
Offices and clinics of physicians	1,512	73.9	4.5	6.7
Offices and clinics of dentists	644	77.3	2.1	7.4
Offices and clinics of chiropractors	99	62.1	1.0	4.3
Offices and clinics of optometrists	73	64.5	2.2	7.6
Offices and clinics of health practitioners, n.e.c.	96	71.0	10.4	3.6
Nursing and personal care facilities	1,718	86.9	24.0	6.2
Health services, n.e.c.	1,826	78.5	16.5	7.5
Educational services	9,894	68.4	11.2	6.6
Elementary and secondary schools	6,653	74.6	11.7	7.3
Colleges and universities	2,768	52.9	10.3	5.2
Vocational schools	78	59.1	12.2	3.1
Libraries	170	81.4	10.5	3.4
Educational services, n.e.c.	224	70.3	5.2	4.9
Social services	2,979	80.8	17.5	7.7
Job training and vocational rehabilitation services	225	61.0	14.2	5.5
Child day care services	831	96.0	16.3	7.5
Family child care homes	495	97.2	10.2	8.8
Residential care facilities, without nursing	424	67.5	21.1	6.1
Social services, n.e.c.	1,004	70.1	21.4	8.6
Other professional services	5,860	47.3	6.2	4.5
Legal services	1,335	55.7	5.7	4.8
Museums, art galleries, and zoos	101	60.8	13.1	4.1
Labor unions	70	34.4	10.5	7.3
Religious organizations	893	48.7	7.9	5.5
Membership organizations, n.e.c.	349	64.5	12.1	3.2
Engineering, architectural, and surveying services	787	21.9	3.0	5.1
Accounting, auditing, and bookkeeping services	693	56.6	5.9	4.3
Research, development, and testing services	590	43.7	6.3	4.5
Management and public relations services	761	42.1	5.6	3.3
Miscellaneous professional and related services	281	50.9	3.1	1.8
Forestry and fisheries	152	20.0	4.8	8.6
Forestry	71	28.6	6.8	10.5
Fishing, hunting, and trapping	81	12.4	3.1	6.9
Public administration	5,957	44.1	16.9	6.1
Executive and legislative offices	162	64.9	5.6	6.2
General government, n.e.c.	620	52.1	18.3	5.6
Justice, public order, and safety	2,298	31.7	14.1	6.7
Public finance, taxation, and monetary policy	374	60.3	14.3	4.8
Administration of human resources programs	858	67.5	26.0	7.6
Administration of environmental quality and housing programs	272	38.1	16.7	2.2
Administration of economic programs	589	43.9	14.3	6.3
National security and international affairs	783	38.8	19.4	5.2

Note: N.e.c. is an abbreviation for "not elsewhere classified" and designates broad categories of industries which cannot be more specifically identified. Generally, data for industries with fewer than 50,000 employed are not published separately but are included in the totals for the appropriate categories shown.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table B-1. Employees on nonfarm payrolls, total and goods-producing industries, 1960-95 annual averages**  
(Numbers in thousands)

Year			Goods-producing			
	Total	Total private	Total	Mining	Construction	Manufacturing
1960	54,189	45,836	20,434	712	2,926	16,796
1961	53,999	45,404	19,857	672	2,859	16,326
1962	55,549	46,660	20,451	650	2,948	16,853
1963	56,653	47,429	20,640	635	3,010	16,995
1964	58,283	48,686	21,005	634	3,097	17,274
1965	60,763	50,689	21,926	632	3,232	18,062
1966	63,901	53,116	23,158	627	3,317	19,214
1967	65,803	54,413	23,308	613	3,248	19,447
1968	67,897	56,058	23,737	606	3,350	19,781
1969	70,384	58,189	24,361	619	3,575	20,167
1970	70,880	58,325	23,578	623	3,588	19,367
1971	71,211	58,331	22,935	609	3,704	18,623
1972	73,675	60,341	23,668	628	3,889	19,151
1973	76,790	63,058	24,893	642	4,097	20,154
1974	78,265	64,095	24,794	697	4,020	20,077
1975	76,945	62,259	22,600	752	3,525	18,323
1976	79,382	64,511	23,352	779	3,576	18,997
1977	82,471	67,344	24,346	813	3,851	19,682
1978	86,697	71,026	25,585	851	4,229	20,505
1979	89,823	73,876	26,461	958	4,463	21,040
1980	90,406	74,166	25,658	1,027	4,346	20,285
1981	91,152	75,121	25,497	1,139	4,188	20,170
1982	89,544	73,707	23,812	1,128	3,904	18,780
1983	90,152	74,282	23,330	952	3,946	18,432
1984	94,408	78,384	24,718	966	4,380	19,372
1985	97,387	80,992	24,842	927	4,668	19,248
1986	99,344	82,651	24,533	777	4,810	18,947
1987	101,958	84,948	24,674	717	4,958	18,999
1988	105,210	87,824	25,125	713	5,098	19,314
1989	107,895	90,117	25,254	692	5,171	19,391
1990	109,419	91,115	24,905	709	5,120	19,076
1991	108,256	89,854	23,745	689	4,650	18,406
1992	108,604	89,959	23,231	635	4,492	18,104
1993	110,730	91,889	23,352	610	4,668	18,075
1994	114,172	95,044	23,908	601	4,986	18,321
1995	117,203	97,892	24,206	580	5,158	18,468

Note: Data presented in table B-1 are from the establishment survey. Establishment survey estimates are currently projected from March 1995 benchmark levels. When more recent benchmark data are introduced, all unadjusted data beginning April 1995 are subject to revision.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table B-2. Employees on nonfarm payrolls of service-producing industries, 1960-95 annual averages**  
(Numbers in thousands)

Year	Service-producing						Government		
	Total	Transportation and public utilities	Wholesale trade	Wholesale trade	Whole-Wholesale and real estate	Services	Federal	State	Local
	1960	33,755	4,004	3,153	8,238	2,628	7,378	2,270	1,536
1961	34,142	3,903	3,142	8,195	2,688	7,619	2,279	1,607	4,708
1962	35,098	3,906	3,207	8,359	2,754	7,982	2,340	1,668	4,881
1963	36,013	3,903	3,258	8,520	2,830	8,277	2,358	1,747	5,121
1964	37,278	3,951	3,347	8,812	2,911	8,660	2,348	1,856	5,392
1965	38,839	4,036	3,477	9,239	2,977	9,036	2,378	1,996	5,700
1966	40,743	4,158	3,608	9,637	3,058	9,498	2,564	2,141	6,080
1967	42,495	4,268	3,700	9,906	3,185	10,045	2,719	2,302	6,371
1968	44,158	4,318	3,791	10,308	3,337	10,567	2,737	2,442	6,660
1969	46,023	4,442	3,919	10,785	3,512	11,169	2,758	2,533	6,904
1970	47,302	4,515	4,006	11,034	3,645	11,548	2,731	2,664	7,158
1971	48,276	4,476	4,014	11,338	3,772	11,797	2,696	2,747	7,437
1972	50,007	4,541	4,127	11,822	3,908	12,276	2,684	2,859	7,790
1973	51,897	4,656	4,291	12,315	4,046	12,857	2,663	2,923	8,146
1974	53,471	4,725	4,447	12,539	4,148	13,441	2,724	3,039	8,407
1975	54,345	4,542	4,430	12,630	4,165	13,892	2,748	3,179	8,758
1976	56,030	4,582	4,562	13,193	4,271	14,551	2,733	3,273	8,865
1977	58,125	4,713	4,723	13,792	4,467	15,302	2,727	3,377	9,023
1978	61,113	4,923	4,985	14,556	4,724	16,252	2,753	3,474	9,446
1979	63,363	5,136	5,221	14,972	4,975	17,112	2,773	3,541	9,633
1980	64,748	5,146	5,292	15,018	5,160	17,890	2,866	3,610	9,765
1981	65,655	5,165	5,375	15,171	5,298	18,615	2,772	3,640	9,619
1982	65,732	5,081	5,295	15,158	5,340	19,021	2,739	3,640	9,458
1983	66,821	4,952	5,283	15,587	5,466	19,664	2,774	3,662	9,434
1984	69,690	5,156	5,568	16,512	5,684	20,746	2,807	3,734	9,482
1985	72,544	5,233	5,727	17,315	5,948	21,927	2,875	3,832	9,687
1986	74,811	5,247	5,761	17,880	6,273	22,957	2,899	3,893	9,901
1987	77,284	5,362	5,848	18,422	6,533	24,110	2,943	3,967	10,100
1988	80,086	5,514	6,030	19,023	6,630	25,504	2,971	4,076	10,339
1989	82,642	5,625	6,187	19,475	6,668	26,907	2,988	4,182	10,609
1990	84,514	5,793	6,173	19,601	6,709	27,934	3,085	4,305	10,914
1991	84,511	5,762	6,081	19,284	6,646	28,336	2,966	4,355	11,081
1992	85,373	5,721	5,997	19,356	6,602	29,052	2,969	4,408	11,267
1993	87,378	5,829	5,981	19,773	6,757	30,197	2,915	4,488	11,438
1994	90,264	5,993	6,162	20,507	6,896	31,579	2,870	4,576	11,682
1995	92,997	6,165	6,412	21,173	6,830	33,107	2,822	4,642	11,847

Note: Data presented in table B-2 are from the establishment survey. Establishment survey estimates are currently projected from March 1995 benchmark levels. When more recent benchmark data are introduced, all unadjusted data beginning April 1995 are subject to revision.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table B-3. Employees on nonfarm payrolls by major industry and selected component groups, 1992-95 annual averages  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Industry	1992	1993	1994	1995 <sup>P</sup>
Total .....	108,604	110,730	114,034	116,600
Total private .....	89,959	91,889	94,917	97,322
Goods-producing .....		23,231	23,352	23,913
24,229				
Mining .....	635	610	600	579
Metal mining .....	53.2	49.8	48.8	51.2
Coal mining .....	126.8	108.6	112.2	106.9
Oil and gas extraction .....	352.6	349.8	335.8	316.0
Nonmetallic minerals, except fuels .....	101.8	101.5	103.3	104.7
Construction .....	4,492	4,668	5,010	5,245
General building contractors .....	1,076.8	1,119.5	1,200.5	1,238.5
Heavy construction, except building .....	711.2	712.6	736.4	742.9
Special trade contractors .....	2,704.1	2,835.6	3,072.8	3,264.1
Manufacturing .....	18,104	18,075	18,303	18,405
Durable goods .....	10,277	10,221	10,431	10,595
Lumber and wood products .....	679.9	709.1	752.2	757.3
Furniture and fixtures .....	477.7	486.9	501.8	499.7
Stone, clay, and glass products .....	513.3	517.0	532.5	541.3
Primary metal industries .....	694.5	683.1	699.1	714.6
Blast furnaces and basic steel products .....	250.3	240.3	238.8	239.3
Fabricated metal products .....	1,329.1	1,338.5	1,387.1	1,433.8
Industrial machinery and equipment .....	1,928.6	1,930.6	1,984.7	2,042.3
Computer and office equipment .....	391.0	363.4	351.0	339.8
Electronic and other electrical equipment .....	1,528.1	1,525.7	1,570.8	1,623.8
Electronic components and accessories .....	527.4	527.7	544.3	581.6
Transportation equipment .....	1,829.6	1,756.2	1,748.9	1,745.2
Motor vehicles and equipment .....	812.5	836.6	898.6	933.4
Aircraft and parts .....	611.7	542.0	479.5	442.7
Instruments and related products .....	928.5	895.5	863.3	843.8
Miscellaneous manufacturing .....	367.6	378.3	390.3	393.4
Nondurable goods .....	7,827	7,854	7,872	7,809
Food and kindred products .....	1,662.5	1,679.6	1,679.6	1,685.6
Tobacco products .....	47.5	43.7	42.2	39.4
Textile mill products .....	674.1	675.1	673.2	655.9
Apparel and other textile products .....	1,007.2	989.1	969.4	916.1
Paper and allied products .....	690.3	691.7	691.3	688.0
Printing and publishing .....	1,506.5	1,516.7	1,541.5	1,555.6
Chemicals and allied products .....	1,084.1	1,080.5	1,060.6	1,045.2
Petroleum and coal products .....	157.6	151.5	148.9	143.7
Rubber and misc. plastics products .....	877.6	909.0	952.0	971.8
Leather and leather products .....	119.9	117.2	113.6	108.1
Service-producing .....		85,373	87,378	90,121
92,371				

Transportation and public utilities .....	5,721	5,829	6,006	6,193
Transportation .....	3,498	3,615	3,775	3,929
Railroad transportation .....	254.3	248.3	240.5	238.5
Local and interurban passenger transit .....	361.4	379.4	410.3	447.6
Trucking and warehousing .....	1,611.2	1,698.1	1,797.3	1,878.1
Water transportation .....	173.3	168.2	168.8	159.7
Transportation by air .....	730.1	740.1	747.8	765.1
Pipelines, except natural gas .....	19.2	18.4	17.6	16.5
Transportation services .....	348.4	362.5	392.4	423.2
Communications and public utilities .....	2,223	2,214	2,231	2,265
Communications .....	1,268.9	1,269.1	1,304.6	1,358.2
Electric, gas, and sanitary services .....	954.0	944.4	926.5	906.3
Wholesale trade .....	5,997	5,981	6,140	6,322
Durable goods .....	3,446	3,433	3,542	3,668
Nondurable goods .....	2,552	2,549	2,599	2,653
Retail trade .....	19,356	19,773	20,437	20,836
Building materials and garden supplies .....	757.7	779.0	828.0	852.8
General merchandise stores .....	2,451.0	2,488.3	2,545.4	2,538.4
Department stores .....	2,080.0	2,140.1	2,211.9	2,220.8
Food stores .....	3,179.8	3,224.1	3,289.1	3,354.9
Automotive dealers and service stations .....	1,966.3	2,013.8	2,122.5	2,213.2
New and used car dealers .....	875.4	908.3	964.4	1,002.8
Apparel and accessory stores .....	1,130.9	1,143.6	1,134.0	1,091.9
Furniture and home furnishings stores .....	799.8	827.5	890.0	949.6
Eating and drinking places .....	6,609.3	6,821.4	7,069.0	7,224.2
Miscellaneous retail establishments .....	2,461.4	2,475.5	2,559.5	2,610.7
Finance, insurance, and real estate .....	6,602	6,757	6,933	6,948
Finance .....	3,160	3,238	3,323	3,316
Depository institutions .....	2,095.7	2,088.8	2,075.4	2,055.8
Commercial banks .....	1,489.5	1,497.2	1,492.3	1,492.0
Savings institutions .....	345.9	324.1	307.7	282.9
Nondepository institutions .....	405.5	454.9	498.5	485.9
Mortgage bankers and brokers .....	180.2	224.8	256.5	229.1
Security and commodity brokers .....	440.1	471.6	518.0	530.3
Holding and other investment offices .....	219.0	222.6	231.4	243.6
Insurance .....	2,152	2,197	2,237	23,243
Insurance carriers .....	1,495.6	1,529.0	1,550.7	1,538.5
Insurance agents, brokers, and service .....	656.6	668.0	686.4	704.8
Real estate .....	1,290	1,322	1,373	1,389
Services <sup>a</sup> .....	29,052	30,197	31,488	32,794
Agricultural services .....	489.6	519.0	565.2	586.2
Hotels and other lodging places .....	1,576.4	1,595.7	1,618.0	1,625.7
Personal services .....	1,116.2	1,137.1	1,139.3	1,145.7
Business services .....	5,315.3	5,734.7	6,239.0	6,639.6
Services to buildings .....	805.4	823.0	854.5	877.7
Personnel supply services .....	1,629.3	1,906.1	2,253.6	2,410.6
Help supply services .....	1,410.6	1,669.2	2,001.7	2,134.6
Computer and data processing services .....	835.5	829.8	950.0	1,048.6
Auto repair, services, and parking .....	881.3	924.7	970.5	1,025.5
Miscellaneous repair services .....	347.0	348.5	333.9	342.4
Motion pictures .....	400.9	412.0	471.2	586.0
Amusement and recreation services .....	1,188.1	1,258.2	1,344.1	1,469.9
Health services .....	8,490.0	8,755.9	9,000.7	9,269.9
Offices and clinics of medical doctors .....	1,463.1	1,506.0	1,540.5	1,587.5

Nursing and personal care facilities	1,532.8	1,585.0	1,648.8	1,692.9
Hospitals	3,749.9	3,779.1	3,774.4	3,816.0
Home health care services	397.8	469.0	555.4	610.0
Legal services	913.5	924.0	926.8	930.5
Educational services	1,677.6	1,711.3	1,822.0	1,880.8
Social services	1,958.6	2,070.3	2,180.7	2,272.8
Child day care services	450.8	473.4	501.9	523.2
Residential care	533.5	567.2	602.0	634.6
Museums and botanical and zoological gardens	72.7	75.5	79.0	81.6
Membership organizations	1,973.0	2,034.6	2,059.1	2,061.1
Engineering and management services	2,470.8	2,520.9	2,567.0	2,704.6
Engineering and architectural services	742.4	751.7	774.9	803.2
Management and public relations	655.1	688.4	716.1	801.3
Services, (not elsewhere classified)	41.3	40.8	40.3	41.3
<b>Government</b>	<b>18,645</b>	<b>18,841</b>	<b>19,118</b>	<b>19,278</b>
<b>Federal</b>	<b>2,969</b>	<b>2,915</b>	<b>2,870</b>	<b>2,820</b>
Federal, except Postal Service	2,177.0	2,127.5	2,052.8	1,976.6
<b>State</b>	<b>4,408</b>	<b>4,488</b>	<b>4,562</b>	<b>4,603</b>
Education	1,798.6	1,834.1	1,875.0	1,909.7
Other State government	2,609.6	2,653.7	2,687.4	2,692.7
<b>Local</b>	<b>11,267</b>	<b>11,438</b>	<b>11,685</b>	<b>11,856</b>
Education	6,219.5	6,352.9	6,489.7	6,635.8
Other local government	5,048.0	5,085.1	5,195.0	5,219.8

<sup>a</sup>Includes other industries, not shown separately.

<sup>p</sup> = preliminary.

Note: Data presented in table B-3 are from the establishment survey. Establishment survey estimates are currently projected from March 1995 benchmark levels. When more recent benchmark data are introduced, all unadjusted data from April 1995 forward are subject to revision.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table C-1. Average hours and earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers<sup>1</sup> on private nonfarm payrolls by major industry, 1964-95 annual averages**

Year	Total private <sup>a</sup>			Mining			Construction		
	Weekly hours	Hourly earnings	Weekly earnings	Weekly hours	Hourly earnings	Weekly earnings	Weekly hours	Hourly earnings	Weekly earnings
1964	38.7	\$2.36	\$91.33	41.9	\$2.81	\$117.74	37.2	\$3.55	\$132.06
1965	38.8	2.46	95.45	42.3	2.92	123.52	37.4	3.70	138.38
1966	38.6	2.56	98.82	42.7	3.05	130.24	37.6	3.89	146.26
1967	38.0	2.68	101.84	42.6	3.19	135.89	37.7	4.11	154.95
1968	37.8	2.85	107.73	42.6	3.35	142.71	37.3	4.41	164.49
1969	37.7	3.04	114.61	43.0	3.60	154.80	37.9	4.79	181.54
1970	37.1	3.23	119.83	42.7	3.85	164.40	37.3	5.24	195.45
1971	36.9	3.45	127.31	42.4	4.06	172.14	37.2	5.69	211.67
1972	37.0	3.70	136.90	42.6	4.44	189.14	36.5	6.06	221.19
1973	36.9	3.94	145.39	42.4	4.75	201.40	36.8	6.41	235.89
1974	36.5	4.24	154.76	41.9	5.23	219.14	36.6	6.81	249.25
1975	36.1	4.53	163.53	41.9	5.95	249.31	36.4	7.31	266.08
1976	36.1	4.86	175.45	42.4	6.46	273.90	36.8	7.71	283.73
1977	36.0	5.25	189.00	43.4	6.94	301.20	36.5	8.10	295.65
1978	35.8	5.69	203.70	43.4	7.67	332.88	36.8	8.66	318.69
1979	35.7	6.16	219.91	43.0	8.49	365.07	37.0	9.27	342.99
1980	35.3	6.66	235.10	43.3	9.17	397.06	37.0	9.94	367.78
1981	35.2	7.25	255.20	43.7	10.04	438.75	36.9	10.82	399.26
1982	34.8	7.68	267.26	42.7	10.77	459.88	36.7	11.63	426.82
1983	35.0	8.02	280.70	42.5	11.28	479.40	37.1	11.94	442.97
1984	35.2	8.32	292.86	43.3	11.63	503.58	37.8	12.13	458.51
1985	34.9	8.57	299.09	43.4	11.98	519.93	37.7	12.32	464.46
1986	34.8	8.76	304.85	42.2	12.46	525.81	37.4	12.48	466.75
1987	34.8	8.98	312.50	42.4	12.54	531.70	37.8	12.71	480.44
1988	34.7	9.28	322.02	42.3	12.80	541.44	37.9	13.08	495.73
1989	34.6	9.66	334.24	43.0	13.26	570.18	37.9	13.54	513.17
1990	34.5	10.01	345.35	44.1	13.68	603.29	38.2	13.77	526.01
1991	34.3	10.32	353.98	44.4	14.19	630.04	38.1	14.00	533.40
1992	34.4	10.57	363.61	43.9	14.54	638.31	38.0	14.15	537.70
1993	34.5	10.83	373.64	44.3	14.60	646.78	38.5	14.38	553.63
1994	34.7	11.12	385.86	44.8	14.88	666.62	38.9	14.73	573.00
1995	34.5	11.44	394.68	44.7	15.30	683.91	38.8	15.08	585.10

See footnote at end of table.

**Table C-1. Average hours and earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers<sup>1</sup> on private nonfarm payrolls by major industry, 1964-95 annual averages (continued)**

Year	Manufacturing				Transportation and			Wholesale trade		
	Weekly Hourly	Hourly earnings	Hourly earnings, excluding overtime	Weekly earnings	Weekly Hourly	Hourly earnings	Weekly earnings	Weekly Hourly	Hourly earnings	Weekly earnings
1964	40.7	\$2.53	\$2.43	\$102.97	41.1	\$2.89	\$118.78	40.7	\$2.52	\$102.56
1965	41.2	2.61	2.50	107.53	41.3	3.03	125.14	40.8	2.60	106.08
1966	41.4	2.71	2.59	112.19	41.2	3.11	128.13	40.7	2.73	111.11
1967	40.6	2.82	2.71	114.49	40.5	3.23	130.82	40.3	2.87	115.66
1968	40.7	3.01	2.88	122.51	40.6	3.42	138.85	40.1	3.04	121.90
1969	40.6	3.19	3.05	129.51	40.7	3.63	147.74	40.2	3.23	129.85
1970	39.8	3.35	3.23	133.33	40.5	3.85	155.93	39.9	3.43	136.86
1971	39.9	3.57	3.45	142.44	40.1	4.21	168.82	39.4	3.64	143.42
1972	40.5	3.82	3.66	154.71	40.4	4.65	187.86	39.4	3.85	151.69
1973	40.7	4.09	3.91	166.46	40.5	5.02	203.31	39.2	4.07	159.54
1974	40.0	4.42	4.25	176.80	40.2	5.41	217.48	38.8	4.38	169.94
1975	39.5	4.83	4.67	190.79	39.7	5.88	233.44	38.6	4.72	182.19
1976	40.1	5.22	5.02	209.32	39.8	6.45	256.71	38.7	5.02	194.27
1977	40.3	5.68	5.44	228.90	39.9	6.99	278.90	38.8	5.39	209.13
1978	40.4	6.17	5.91	249.27	40.0	7.57	302.80	38.8	5.88	228.14
1979	40.2	6.70	6.43	269.34	39.9	8.16	325.58	38.8	6.39	247.93
1980	39.7	7.27	7.02	288.62	39.6	8.87	351.25	38.4	6.95	266.88
1981	39.8	7.99	7.72	318.00	39.4	9.70	382.18	38.5	7.55	290.68
1982	38.9	8.49	8.25	330.26	39.0	10.32	402.48	38.3	8.08	309.46
1983	40.1	8.83	8.52	354.08	39.0	10.79	420.81	38.5	8.54	328.79
1984	40.7	9.19	8.82	374.03	39.4	11.12	438.13	38.5	8.88	341.88
1985	40.5	9.54	9.16	386.37	39.5	11.40	450.30	38.4	9.15	351.36
1986	40.7	9.73	9.34	396.01	39.2	11.70	458.64	38.3	9.34	357.72
1987	41.0	9.91	9.48	406.31	39.2	12.03	471.58	38.1	9.59	365.38
1988	41.1	10.19	9.73	418.81	38.8	12.26	475.69	38.1	9.98	380.24
1989	41.0	10.48	10.02	429.68	38.9	12.60	490.14	38.0	10.39	394.82
1990	40.8	10.83	10.37	441.86	38.9	12.97	504.53	38.1	10.79	411.10
1991	40.7	11.18	10.71	455.03	38.7	13.22	511.61	38.1	11.15	424.82
1992	41.0	11.46	10.95	469.86	38.9	13.45	523.21	38.2	11.39	435.10
1993	41.4	11.74	11.18	486.04	39.6	13.62	539.35	38.2	11.74	448.47
1994	42.0	12.07	11.43	506.94	39.9	13.86	553.01	38.4	12.06	463.10
1995	41.6	12.37	11.74	514.59	39.5	14.23	562.09	38.3	12.43	476.07

See footnote at end of table.

**Table C-1. Average hours and earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers<sup>1</sup> on private nonfarm payrolls by major industry, 1964-95 annual averages (continued)**

Year	Retail trade			Finance, insurance, and real estate			Services		
	Weekly hours	Hourly earnings	Weekly earnings	Weekly hours	Hourly earnings	Weekly earnings	Weekly hours	Hourly earnings	Weekly earnings
1964	37.0	\$1.75	\$64.75	37.3	\$2.30	\$85.79	36.1	\$1.94	\$70.03
1965	36.6	1.82	66.61	37.2	2.39	88.91	35.9	2.05	73.60
1966	35.9	1.91	68.57	37.3	2.47	92.13	35.5	2.17	77.04
1967	35.3	2.01	70.95	37.1	2.58	95.72	35.1	2.29	80.38
1968	34.7	2.16	74.95	37.0	2.75	101.75	34.7	2.42	83.97
1969	34.2	2.30	78.66	37.1	2.93	108.70	34.7	2.61	90.57
1970	33.8	2.44	82.47	36.7	3.07	112.67	34.4	2.81	96.66
1971	33.7	2.60	87.62	36.6	3.22	117.85	33.9	3.04	103.06
1972	33.4	2.75	91.85	36.6	3.36	122.98	33.9	3.27	110.85
1973	33.1	2.91	96.32	36.6	3.53	129.20	33.8	3.47	117.29
1974	32.7	3.14	102.68	36.5	3.77	137.61	33.6	3.75	126.00
1975	32.4	3.36	108.86	36.5	4.06	148.19	33.5	4.02	134.67
1976	32.1	3.57	114.60	36.4	4.27	155.43	33.3	4.31	143.52
1977	31.6	3.85	121.66	36.4	4.54	165.26	33.0	4.65	153.45
1978	31.0	4.20	130.20	36.4	4.89	178.00	32.8	4.99	163.67
1979	30.6	4.53	138.62	36.2	5.27	190.77	32.7	5.36	175.27
1980	30.2	4.88	147.38	36.2	5.79	209.60	32.6	5.85	190.71
1981	30.1	5.25	158.03	36.3	6.31	229.05	32.6	6.41	208.97
1982	29.9	5.48	163.85	36.2	6.78	245.44	32.6	6.92	225.59
1983	29.8	5.74	171.05	36.2	7.29	263.90	32.7	7.31	239.04
1984	29.8	5.85	174.33	36.5	7.63	278.50	32.6	7.59	247.43
1985	29.4	5.94	174.64	36.4	7.94	289.02	32.5	7.90	256.75
1986	29.2	6.03	176.08	36.4	8.36	304.30	32.5	8.18	265.85
1987	29.2	6.12	178.70	36.3	8.73	316.90	32.5	8.49	275.93
1988	29.1	6.31	183.62	35.9	9.06	325.25	32.6	8.88	289.49
1989	28.9	6.53	188.72	35.8	9.53	341.17	32.6	9.38	305.79
1990	28.8	6.75	194.40	35.8	9.97	356.93	32.5	9.83	319.48
1991	28.6	6.94	198.48	35.7	10.39	370.92	32.4	10.23	331.45
1992	28.8	7.12	205.06	35.8	10.82	387.36	32.5	10.54	342.55
1993	28.8	7.29	209.95	35.8	11.35	406.33	32.5	10.78	350.35
1994	28.9	7.49	216.46	35.8	11.83	423.51	32.5	11.04	358.80
1995	28.8	7.69	221.47	35.9	12.33	442.65	32.4	11.39	369.04

<sup>1</sup>Data relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; construction workers in construction; and nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and services.

Note: Establishment survey estimates are currently projected from March 1995 benchmark levels. When more recent benchmark data are introduced, all unadjusted data from April 1995 forward are subject to revision.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-1. Civilian labor force by sex, age, race, and Hispanic origin, 1982,  
1993, and 1994, and moderate growth projection to 2005  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Group	Level				Change		Percent change		Percent distribution			Annual labor force growth rate (percent)	
	1982	1993	1994	2005	1982-1993	1994-2005	1982-1993	1994-2005	1982	1994	2005	1982-1993	1994-2005
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	110,204	128,040	131,056	147,106	17,836	16,050	16.2	12.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	1.4	1.1
Men, 16 years and over . . . . .	62,450	69,633	70,817	76,842	7,183	6,025	11.5	8.5	56.7	54.0	52.2	1.0	.7
Women, 16 years and over . . . . .	47,755	58,407	60,239	70,263	10,652	10,024	22.3	16.6	43.3	46.0	47.8	1.8	1.4
16 to 24 . . . . .	24,608	20,383	21,612	23,984	-4,225	2,372	-17.2	11.0	22.3	16.5	16.3	-1.7	1.0
25 to 54 . . . . .	70,506	92,271	93,898	101,017	21,765	7,119	30.9	7.6	64.0	71.6	68.7	2.5	.7
55 and over . . . . .	15,092	15,386	15,547	22,105	294	6,558	1.9	42.2	13.7	11.9	15.0	.2	3.3
White, 16 years and over . . . . .	96,143	109,359	111,082	122,867	13,216	11,785	13.7	10.6	87.2	84.8	83.5	1.2	0.9
Black, 16 years and over . . . . .	11,331	13,943	14,502	16,619	2,612	2,116	23.1	14.6	10.3	11.1	11.3	1.9	1.2
Asian and other, 16 years and over <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	2,729	4,742	5,474	7,632	2,013	2,158	73.8	39.4	2.5	4.2	5.2	5.0	3.1
Hispanic, 16 years and over . . . . .	6,734	10,377	11,975	16,330	3,643	4,355	54.1	36.4	6.1	9.1	11.1	4.0	2.9
Other than Hispanic, 16 years and over . . . . .	103,470	117,663	119,081	130,775	14,193	11,694	13.7	9.8	93.9	90.9	88.9	1.2	.9
White, non-Hispanic . . . . .	89,630	99,499	100,462	108,345	9,869	7,883	11.0	7.8	81.3	76.7	73.7	1.0	.7

Note: Data for 1994 are not strictly comparable with data for 1993 and 1982 because of the introduction of a major redesign of the Current Population Survey questionnaire and collection methodology and the introduction of 1990 census-based population controls, adjusted for the estimated undercount.

<sup>a</sup> The "Asian and other" group includes: (1) Asians and Pacific Islanders; and (2) American Indians and Alaskan natives. The historical data are derived by subtracting "black" from the "black and other" group; projections are made directly, not by subtraction.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-2. Current and past projections of the civilian labor force by growth path, sex, age, race, and Hispanic origin, 2005**

Group	Participation rate (percent)			Level (thousands)		
	Previous (1993)		Current moderate	Previous (1993)		Current moderate
	Moderate	Low		Moderate	Low	
Total .....	68.8	67.3	67.1	150,516	147,252	147,106
Men .....	74.7	73.6	72.9	78,718	77,558	76,842
Women .....	63.2	61.4	61.7	71,798	69,694	70,263
16 to 24 .....	67.5	65.6	64.9	24,127	23,436	23,984
25 to 54 .....	87.8	86.4	84.5	105,054	103,348	101,017
55 years and over .....	33.6	32.3	35.2	21,335	20,469	22,105
White, 16 years and over .....	69.5	68.0	67.7	124,847	122,478	122,867
Black, 16 years and over .....	66.2	64.0	61.9	17,395	16,820	16,619
Asian and other, 16 years and over .....	66.6	64.0	64.0	8,274	7,954	7,632
Hispanic, 16 years and over .....	68.4	66.0	64.7	16,581	16,006	16,330
Other than Hispanic, 16 years and over .....	68.8	61.5	67.4	133,935	119,632	130,775
White, non-Hispanic .....	69.4	68.3	68.6	109,753	107,906	108,345

<sup>a</sup> The "Asian and other" group includes: (1) Asians and Pacific Islanders and (2) American Indians and Alaskan natives.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-3. Civilian noninstitutional population by sex, age, race, and Hispanic origin,  
1982, 1993 and 1994, and middle projection to 2005  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Group	Level				Change		Annual growth rate (percent)		Percent distribution		
	1982	1993	1994	2005	1982-1993	1994-2005	1982-1993	1994-2005	1982	1994	2005
Total, 16 years and over . . . . .	172,271	193,550	196,814	219,185	21,279	22,371	1.1	1.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
16 to 24 . . . . .	36,608	30,840	32,549	36,956	-5,768	4,407	-1.5	1.2	21.3	16.5	16.9
25 to 54 . . . . .	88,367	110,508	112,618	119,494	22,141	6,876	2.1	.5	51.3	57.2	54.5
55 and over . . . . .	47,297	52,202	51,648	62,735	4,905	11,087	.9	1.8	27.5	26.2	28.6
Men, 16 years and over . . . . .	81,523	92,620	94,355	105,389	11,097	11,034	1.2	1.0	47.3	47.9	48.1
16 to 24 . . . . .	18,015	15,329	16,277	18,540	-2,686	2,263	-1.5	1.2	10.5	8.3	8.5
25 to 54 . . . . .	42,923	54,232	55,349	58,420	11,309	3,071	2.1	.5	24.9	28.1	26.7
55 and over . . . . .	20,586	23,059	22,728	28,430	2,473	5,702	1.0	2.1	11.9	11.5	13.0
Women, 16 years and over . . . . .	90,748	100,930	102,460	113,796	10,182	11,336	1.0	1.0	52.7	52.1	51.9
16 to 24 . . . . .	18,593	15,511	16,272	18,417	-3,082	2,145	-1.6	1.1	10.8	8.3	8.4
25 to 54 . . . . .	45,444	56,276	57,269	61,074	10,832	3,805	2.0	.6	26.4	29.1	27.9
55 and over . . . . .	26,711	29,143	28,919	34,305	2,432	5,386	.8	1.6	15.5	14.7	15.7
White, 16 years and over . . . . .	149,441	163,921	165,555	180,437	14,480	14,882	.8	.8	86.7	84.1	82.3
Black, 16 years and over . . . . .	18,584	22,329	22,879	26,831	3,745	3,951	1.7	1.5	10.8	11.6	12.2
Asian and other, 16 years and over <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	4,211	7,300	8,383	11,917	3,089	3,534	5.1	3.2	2.4	4.3	5.4
Hispanic, 16 years and over . . . . .	10,580	15,753	18,117	25,240	5,173	7,123	3.7	3.1	6.1	9.2	11.5
Other than Hispanic, 16 years and over . . . . .	161,691	177,797	178,697	193,945	16,106	15,248	.9	.7	93.9	90.8	88.5
White, non-Hispanic . . . . .	139,201	148,432	149,473	157,980	9,231	8,507	.6	.5	80.8	75.9	72.1

Note: Data for 1994 are not directly comparable with data for 1993 and 1982 because of the introduction of a major redesign of the Current Population Survey questionnaire and collection methodology and the introduction of 1990 census-based population controls, adjusted for the estimated undercount.

<sup>a</sup>The "Asian and other" group includes: (1) Asians and Pacific Islanders and (2) American Indians and Alaskan natives. The historical data are derived by subtracting "black" from the "black and other" group; projections are made directly, not by subtraction.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-4. Civilian labor force, 1982, 1993, and projected to 2005, and entrants and leavers, actual 1982-93 and projected 1994-2005**

Group	1982	1982-1993			1993	1994	1994-2005			2005
		Entrants	Leavers	Stayers			Entrants	Leavers	Stayers	
<b>Numbers (in thousands)</b>										
Total	110,204	37,313	19,485	90,730	128,039	131,051	39,343	23,289	107,762	147,106
Men	62,449	19,279	12,104	50,536	69,632	70,814	19,720	13,691	57,123	76,842
Women	47,755	18,034	7,381	40,374	58,407	60,238	19,624	9,598	50,640	70,263
White, non-Hispanic	89,525	26,409	16,440	73,096	99,502	100,463	26,058	18,177	82,286	108,345
Men	51,075	13,451	10,288	40,798	54,246	54,306	12,937	10,814	43,492	56,429
Women	38,450	12,958	6,152	32,298	45,256	46,157	13,122	7,363	38,794	51,916
Black, non-Hispanic	11,230	4,952	1,905	9,325	14,277	14,304	4,871	2,783	11,521	16,392
Men	5,744	2,403	1,079	4,665	7,068	6,981	2,314	1,512	5,469	7,783
Women	5,486	2,549	826	4,660	7,209	7,323	2,557	1,271	6,052	8,609
Hispanic origin	6,734	4,437	794	5,940	10,377	11,974	6,085	1,729	10,245	16,330
Men	4,148	2,654	545	3,603	6,257	7,210	3,321	1,039	6,171	9,492
Women	2,586	1,784	250	2,336	4,120	4,764	2,765	690	4,074	6,838
Asian and other, non-Hispanic <sup>1</sup>	12,714	1,515	345	2,369	3,883	4,310	2,329	600	3,710	6,039
Men	1,481	772	192	1,289	2,061	2,317	1,148	326	1,991	3,139
Women	1,233	743	153	1,079	1,822	1,994	1,180	274	1,720	2,900
<b>Share (percent)</b>										
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Men	56.7	51.7	62.1	55.5	54.4	54.0	50.1	58.8	53.0	52.2
Women	43.3	48.3	37.9	44.5	45.6	46.0	49.9	41.2	47.0	47.8
White, non-Hispanic	81.2	70.8	84.4	80.6	77.7	76.7	66.2	78.0	76.4	73.7
Men	46.4	36.0	52.8	45.0	42.4	41.4	32.9	46.4	40.4	38.4
Women	34.9	34.7	31.6	35.6	35.3	35.2	33.4	31.6	36.0	35.3
Black, non-Hispanic	10.2	13.3	9.8	10.3	11.2	10.9	12.4	12.0	10.7	11.1
Men	5.2	6.4	5.5	5.1	5.5	5.3	5.9	6.5	5.1	5.3
Women	5.0	6.8	4.2	5.1	5.6	5.6	6.5	5.5	5.6	5.9
Hispanic origin	6.1	11.9	4.1	6.5	8.1	9.1	15.5	7.4	9.5	11.1
Men	3.8	7.1	2.8	4.0	4.9	5.5	8.4	4.5	5.7	6.5
Women	2.3	4.8	1.3	2.6	3.2	3.6	7.0	3.0	3.8	4.6
Asian and other, non-Hispanic <sup>1</sup>	2.5	4.1	1.8	2.6	3.0	3.3	5.9	2.6	3.4	4.1
Men	1.3	2.1	1.0	1.4	1.6	1.8	2.9	1.4	1.8	2.1
Women	1.1	2.0	0.8	1.2	1.4	1.5	3.0	1.2	1.6	2.0

Note: Data for 1994 are not directly comparable with data for 1993 and 1982 because of the introduction of a major redesign of the Current Population Survey questionnaire and collection methodology and the introduction of 1990 census-based population controls. The components of this table are mutually exclusive. Entrants and leavers are calculated by comparing cohort labor force size at two points in time.

<sup>1</sup>The "Asian and other" group includes: (1) Asians and Pacific Islanders and (2) American Indians and Alaskan natives.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-5. Median ages of the labor force, by sex, race, and Hispanic origin, selected historical years, and projected years, 2000, and 2005**

Group	1962	1970	1980	1990	1994	2000	2005
Total .....	40.5	39.0	34.6	36.6	37.6	39.4	40.6
Men .....	40.5	39.4	35.1	36.7	37.6	39.2	40.3
Women .....	40.4	38.3	33.9	36.4	37.6	39.6	41.0
White .....	40.9	39.3	34.8	36.8	37.9	39.8	41.1
Black <sup>a</sup> .....	38.3	36.6	33.3	34.9	35.9	37.4	38.2
Asian and other races <sup>b</sup> .....	( <sup>c</sup> )	( <sup>c</sup> )	34.1	36.5	36.5	37.9	38.6
Hispanic origin <sup>d</sup> .....	( <sup>e</sup> )	( <sup>e</sup> )	32.0	33.2	33.6	35.2	36.2

<sup>a</sup> For 1962 and 1970: black and other.

<sup>b</sup> The "Asian and other" group includes: (1) Asians and Pacific Islanders and (2) American Indians and Alaskan natives. The historical data are derived by subtracting "Black" from the "Black and other" group; projections are made directly.

<sup>c</sup> Data not available before 1972.

<sup>d</sup> Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race.

<sup>e</sup> Data not available before 1980.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-6. Three projections of the civilian labor force by sex, age, race, and Hispanic origin, 2005**

Group	Participation Rate (percent)			Level (thousands)		
	High	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate	Low
Total .....	68.7	67.1	65.5	153,390	147,106	143,642
Men .....	74.4	72.9	71.8	79,801	76,842	75,645
Women .....	63.5	61.7	59.8	73,589	70,263	67,996
16 to 24 years .....	67.0	64.9	62.2	25,376	23,984	22,977
25 to 54 years .....	85.9	84.5	83.2	104,770	101,017	99,440
55 years and over .....	36.7	35.2	33.8	23,244	22,105	21,224
White, 16 years and over .....	69.6	67.7	66.5	127,301	122,867	120,065
Black, 16 years and over .....	64.3	61.9	60.2	17,476	16,619	16,151
Asian and other, 16 years and over <sup>a</sup> .....	66.1	64.0	62.3	8,613	7,632	7,426
Hispanic, 16 years and over .....	66.4	64.7	63.1	17,724	16,330	15,931
Other than Hispanic, 16 years and over .....	69.0	67.4	65.8	135,667	130,775	127,711
White, non-Hispanic .....	70.1	68.6	67.0	111,548	108,345	105,897

<sup>a</sup>The "Asian and other" group includes: (1) Asians and Pacific Islanders and (2) American Indians and Alaskan natives.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-7. Employment by major occupational group, 1983, 1994,  
and projected 2005, moderate alternative projection  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Occupation	1983		1994		2005		Employment Change			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	1983-94		1994-2005	
							Number	%	Number	%
Total, all occupations . . . . .	102,404	100.0	127,014	100.0	144,708	100.0	24,610	24.0	17,694	13.9
Executives, administrative, and managerial occupations . . . . .	9,591	9.4	12,903	10.2	15,071	10.4	3,312	34.5	2,168	16.8
Professional specialty occupations . . . .	12,639	12.3	17,314	13.6	22,387	15.5	4,675	37.0	5,073	29.3
Technicians and related support occupations . . . . .	3,409	3.3	4,439	3.5	5,316	3.7	1,030	30.2	876	19.7
Marketing and sales occupations . . . . .	10,497	10.3	13,990	11.0	16,502	11.4	3,493	33.3	2,512	18.0
Administrative support occupations, including clerical . . . . .	18,874	18.4	23,178	18.2	24,172	16.7	4,304	22.8	994	4.3
Service occupations . . . . .	15,577	15.2	20,239	15.9	24,832	17.2	4,662	29.9	4,593	22.7
Agricultural, forestry, fishing, and related occupations . . . . .	3,712	3.6	3,762	3.0	3,650	2.5	50	1.3	-112	-3.0
Precision production, craft and repair occupations . . . . .	12,731	12.4	14,047	11.1	14,880	10.3	1,316	10.3	833	5.9
Operators, fabricators, and laborers . . .	15,374	15.0	17,142	13.5	17,898	12.4	1,768	11.5	757	4.4

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-8. Occupations with the largest job growth,  
1994-2005, moderate alternative projection  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Occupation	Employment		Numerical Change	Percent Change
	1994	2005		
Cashiers . . . . .	3,005	3,567	562	19
Janitors and cleaners, including maids and housekeeping cleaners . . . . .	3,043	3,602	559	18
Salespersons, retail . . . . .	3,842	4,374	532	14
Waiters and waitresses . . . . .	1,847	2,326	479	26
Registered nurses . . . . .	1,906	2,379	473	25
General managers and top executives . . . . .	3,046	3,512	466	15
Systems analysts . . . . .	483	928	445	92
Home health aides . . . . .	420	848	428	102
Guards . . . . .	867	1,282	415	48
Nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants . . . . .	1,265	1,652	387	31
Teachers, secondary school . . . . .	1,340	1,726	386	29
Marketing and sales worker supervisors . . . . .	2,293	2,673	380	17
Teacher aides and educational assistants . . . . .	932	1,296	364	39
Receptionists and information clerks . . . . .	1,019	1,337	318	31
Truck drivers, light and heavy . . . . .	2,565	2,837	271	11
Secretaries, except legal and medical . . . . .	2,842	3,109	267	9
Clerical supervisors and managers . . . . .	1,340	1,600	261	19
Child care workers . . . . .	757	1,005	248	33
Maintenance repairers, general utility . . . . .	1,273	1,505	231	18
Teachers, elementary . . . . .	1,419	1,639	220	16
Personal and home care aides . . . . .	179	391	212	119
Teachers, special education . . . . .	388	593	206	53
Licensed practical nurses . . . . .	702	899	197	28
Food service and lodging managers . . . . .	579	771	192	33
Food preparation workers . . . . .	1,190	1,378	187	16
Social workers . . . . .	557	744	187	34
Lawyers . . . . .	656	839	183	28
Financial managers . . . . .	768	950	182	24
Computer engineers . . . . .	195	372	177	90
Hand packers and packagers . . . . .	942	1,102	160	17

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-9. Occupations with the largest job decline,  
1994-2005, moderate alternative projection  
(Numbers in thousands)**

Occupation	Employment		Numerical Change	Percent Change
	1994	2005		
Farmers . . . . .	1,276	1,003	-273	-21
Typists and word processors . . . . .	646	434	-212	-33
Bookkeeping, accounting, and auditing clerks . . . . .	2,181	2,003	-178	-8
Bank tellers . . . . .	559	407	-152	-27
Sewing machine operators, garment . . . . .	531	391	-140	-26
Cleaners and servants, private household . . . . .	496	387	-108	-22
Computer operators, except peripheral equipment . . . . .	259	162	-98	-38
Billing, posting, and calculating machine operators . . . . .	96	32	-64	-67
Duplicating, mail, and other office machine operators . . . . .	222	166	-56	-25
Textile draw-out and winding machine operators and tenders . . . . .	190	143	-47	-25
File clerks . . . . .	278	236	-42	-15
Freight, stock, and material movers, hand . . . . .	765	728	-36	-5
Farm workers . . . . .	906	870	-36	-4
Machine tool cutting operators and tenders, metal and plastic . . . . .	119	85	-34	-29
Central office operators . . . . .	48	14	-34	-70
Central office and PBX installers and repairers . . . . .	84	51	-33	-39
Electrical and electronic assemblers . . . . .	212	182	-30	-14
Station installers and repairers, telephone . . . . .	37	11	-26	-70
Personnel clerks, except payroll and timekeeping . . . . .	123	98	-26	-21
Data entry keyers, except composing . . . . .	395	370	-25	-6
Bartenders . . . . .	373	347	-25	-7
Inspectors, testers, and graders, precision . . . . .	654	629	-25	-4
Directory assistance operators . . . . .	33	10	-24	-70
Lathe and turning machine tool setters and set-up operators, metal and plastic . . . . .	71	50	-22	-31
Custom tailors and sewers . . . . .	84	63	-21	-25
Machine feeders and offbearers . . . . .	262	242	-20	-8
Machinists . . . . .	369	349	-20	-5
Service station attendants . . . . .	167	148	-20	-12
Machine forming operators and tenders, metal and plastic . . . . .	171	151	-19	-11
Communication, transportation, and utilities operations managers . . . . .	154	135	-19	-12

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-10. Percent distribution of employment by occupation,  
1994 and projected 2005 alternatives**

Occupation	1994	2005		
		Low	Moderate	High
Total, all occupations . . . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Executive, administrative, and managerial occupations . . . . .	10.2	10.4	10.4	10.4
Professional specialty occupations . . . . .	13.6	15.3	15.5	15.7
Technicians and related support occupations . . . . .	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.7
Marketing and sales occupations . . . . .	11.0	11.5	11.4	11.3
Administrative support occupations, including clerical . . . . .	18.2	16.6	16.7	16.7
Service occupations . . . . .	15.9	17.4	17.2	16.9
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and related occupations . . . . .	3.0	2.6	2.5	2.4
Precision production, craft, and repair occupations . . . . .	11.1	10.2	10.3	10.4
Operators, fabricators, and laborers . . . . .	13.5	12.3	12.4	12.5

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.



relations specialists . . . . .	307	360	374	391	17	22	27	67	129
Purchasing agents, except wholesale, retail, and farm products . . . . .	215	218	226	238	2	5	11	12	64
Tax examiners, collectors, and revenue agents . . . . .	63	60	63	66	-5	0	6	0	14
Underwriters . . . . .	96	101	103	105	5	7	9	7	25
Wholesale and retail buyers, except farm products . . . . .	180	173	178	183	-4	-2	1	-3	50
All other management support workers . . . . .	940	1,098	1,138	1,188	17	21	26	198	371
Professional specialty occupations . . . . .	17,314	21,430	22,387	23,540	24	29	36	5,073	8,376
Engineers . . . . .	1,327	1,516	1,573	1,658	14	19	25	246	581
Aeronautical and astronautical engineers . . . . .	56	57	59	62	12	6	12	3	16
Chemical engineers . . . . .	50	56	57	59	10	13	16	7	21
Civil engineers, including traffic engineers . . . . .	184	209	219	231	13	19	25	34	90
Electrical and electronics engineers . . . .	349	402	417	439	15	20	26	69	157
Industrial engineers, except safety engineers . . . . .	115	125	131	139	8	13	21	15	47
Mechanical engineers . . . . .	231	266	276	290	15	19	26	45	98
Metallurgists and metallurgical, ceramic, and materials engineers . . . . .	19	19	20	20	2	5	10	1	6
Mining engineers, including mine safety engineers . . . . .	3	3	3	3	-22	-18	-12	-1	1
Nuclear engineers . . . . .	15	15	15	16	1	4	8	1	5
Petroleum engineers . . . . .	14	12	11	13	-11	-21	-8	-3	4
All other engineers . . . . .	292	353	367	387	21	26	33	75	136
Architects and surveyors . . . . .	200	209	215	222	4	7	11	14	70
Architects, except landscape and marine . . . . .	91	104	106	109	14	17	20	15	35
Landscape architects . . . . .	14	16	16	16	16	17	18	2	5
Surveyors . . . . .	96	89	92	97	-7	-3	1	-3	30
Life scientists . . . . .	186	222	230	239	20	24	29	44	94
Agricultural and food scientists . . . . .	26	30	31	31	16	19	22	5	12
Biological scientists . . . . .	82	100	103	107	21	25	30	21	43
Foresters and conservation scientists . . . .	41	47	49	50	15	18	22	8	18
Medical scientists . . . . .	36	45	47	49	25	31	38	11	21
All other life scientists . . . . .	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	0	0
Computer, mathematical, and operations research occupations . . . . .	917	1,629	1,696	1,781	78	85	94	779	863
Actuaries . . . . .	17	18	18	18	2	4	6	1	4
Computer systems analysts, engineers and scientists . . . . .	828	1,519	1,583	1,663	84	91	101	755	819
Computer engineers and scientists . . . . .	345	626	655	691	82	90	101	310	338
Computer engineers . . . . .	195	355	372	394	82	90	102	177	191
All other computer scientists . . . . .	149	271	283	297	81	89	99	134	147
Systems analysts . . . . .	483	893	928	972	85	92	101	445	481
Statisticians . . . . .	14	14	15	15	1	3	5	0	3
Mathematicians and all other mathematical scientists . . . . .	14	14	15	15	1	5	10	1	3
Operations research analysts . . . . .	44	65	67	69	46	50	56	22	35
Physical scientists . . . . .	209	245	250	257	17	19	23	41	104
Chemists . . . . .	97	112	115	118	15	19	22	18	45



inspectors	56	62	62	62	11	11	11	6	17
Health assessment and treating									
occupations	2,563	3,212	3,294	3,425	25	29	34	731	1,101
Dietitians and nutritionists	53	62	63	65	17	19	23	10	24
Pharmacists	168	190	196	203	14	17	21	28	54
Physician assistants	56	69	69	70	23	23	24	13	22
Registered nurses	1,906	2,318	2,379	2,481	22	25	30	473	740
Therapists	380	573	586	606	51	54	60	207	262
Occupational therapists	54	91	93	95	69	72	77	39	47
Physical therapists	102	182	183	185	79	80	82	81	96
Recreational therapists	31	37	37	39	20	22	27	7	11
Respiratory therapists	73	96	99	104	32	36	44	26	37
Speech-language pathologists and audiologists	85	120	125	130	40	46	53	39	52
All other therapists	36	48	50	52	34	39	45	14	19
Writers, artists, and entertainers	1,612	1,938	1,975	2,016	20	22	25	363	680
Artists and commercial artists	273	336	336	339	23	23	24	64	117
Athletes, coaches, umpires, and related workers	38	46	46	46	20	20	21	8	19
Dancers and choreographers	24	30	30	30	24	24	24	6	11
Designers	301	377	384	393	25	28	31	84	130
Designers, except interior designers	238	308	314	322	29	32	35	76	113
Interior designers	63	69	70	71	11	12	14	8	17
Musicians	256	304	317	329	19	24	29	62	105
Photographers and camera operators	139	173	172	173	24	24	25	34	61
Camera operators, television, motion picture, video	18	19	19	19	5	6	6	1	5
Photographers	121	154	153	154	27	27	27	32	57
Producers, directors, actors, and entertainers	93	120	121	121	30	30	30	28	47
Public relations specialists and publicity writers	107	123	128	133	16	20	24	21	44
Radio and TV announcers and newscasters	50	49	51	52	-3	1	4	0	21
Reporters and correspondents	59	55	57	58	-6	-4	-1	-2	13
Writers and editors, including technical writers	272	324	332	340	19	22	25	59	111
All other professional workers	822	1,097	1,142	1,194	33	39	45	319	494
Technicians and related									
support occupations	4,439	5,161	5,316	5,526	16	20	24	876	1,798
Health technicians and technologists	2,197	2,754	2,815	2,905	25	28	32	618	1,024
Cardiology technologists	14	17	17	18	18	22	29	3	6
Clinical laboratory technologists and technicians	274	300	307	317	10	12	16	33	86
Dental hygienists	127	182	180	178	43	42	40	53	74
Electroneurodiagnostic technologists	6	8	8	9	25	28	34	2	3
EKG technicians	16	11	11	12	-31	-30	-27	-5	3
Emergency medical technicians	138	178	187	197	29	36	43	49	72
Licensed practical nurses	702	882	899	927	26	28	32	197	341
Medical records technicians	81	125	126	130	54	56	60	45	59
Nuclear medicine technologists	13	16	16	17	22	26	32	3	5
Opticians, dispensing and measuring	63	75	76	76	20	21	22	13	28
Pharmacy technicians	81	98	101	104	21	24	28	20	33
Psychiatric technicians	72	78	80	84	8	11	16	8	18



and investigators . . . . .	162	189	192	196	17	19	21	30	45
Insurance claims clerks . . . . .	119	133	135	137	12	13	15	16	27
Insurance policy processing clerks . .	179	165	168	171	-8	-6	-5	-12	20
Welfare eligibility workers and interviewers . . . . .	104	101	108	116	-3	4	12	4	16
All other adjusters and investigators . . . .	41	38	40	43	-6	-1	6	0	4
Communications equipment operators . . . .	319	259	266	275	-19	-17	-14	-53	83
Telephone operators . . . . .	310	253	260	268	-18	-16	-14	-50	81
Central office operators . . . . .	48	14	14	15	-71	-70	-69	-34	12
Directory assistance operators . . . . .	33	10	10	10	-71	-70	-69	-24	8
Switchboard operators . . . . .	228	230	236	243	1	3	6	7	62
All other communications equipment operators . . . . .	9	6	6	6	-33	-31	-30	-3	2
Computer operators and peripheral equipment operators . . . . .	289	169	175	182	-41	-39	-37	-114	62
Computer operators, except peripheral equipment . . . . .	259	157	162	168	-40	-38	-35	-98	56
Peripheral EDP equipment operators . . . .	30	13	13	14	-57	-55	-52	-16	6
Information clerks . . . . .	1,477	1,790	1,832	1,879	21	24	27	355	699
Hotel desk clerks . . . . .	136	161	163	165	18	20	22	27	84
Interviewing clerks, except personnel and social welfare . . . . .	69	80	83	87	16	20	26	14	36
New accounts clerks, banking . . . . .	114	112	116	121	-2	2	6	2	40
Receptionists and information clerks .	1,019	1,311	1,337	-367	29	31	34	318	508
Reservation and transportation ticket agents and travel clerks . . . . .	139	126	133	139	-9	-4	0	-6	31
Mail clerks and messengers . . . . .	260	249	256	265	-4	-2	2	-4	70
Mail clerks, except mail machine operators and postal service . . . . .	127	113	116	120	-11	-8	-5	-10	35
Messengers . . . . .	133	136	140	145	2	5	8	7	35
Postal clerks and mail carriers . . . . .	474	459	481	504	-3	1	6	7	126
Postal mail carriers . . . . .	320	305	320	335	-5	0	5	-1	85
Postal service clerks . . . . .	154	154	161	169	0	5	10	7	41
Material recording, scheduling, dis- patching, and distributing occupations .	3,556	3,559	3,688	3,836	0	4	8	132	863
Dispatchers . . . . .	224	244	258	273	9	15	22	34	65
Dispatchers, except police, fire, and ambulance . . . . .	141	162	168	175	14	19	24	27	46
Dispatchers, police, fire, and ambulance . . . . .	83	83	90	98	0	8	18	7	18
Meter readers, utilities . . . . .	57	43	46	50	-25	-19	-13	-11	13
Order filers, wholesale and retail sales . . . . .	215	225	231	239	5	8	11	16	63
Procurement clerks . . . . .	57	50	52	54	-12	-9	-6	-5	13
Production, planning, and expediting clerks . . . . .	239	241	251	263	1	5	10	12	56
Stock clerks . . . . .	1,759	1,743	1,800	1,863	-1	2	6	41	443
Traffic, shipping, and receiving clerks .	798	798	827	861	0	4	8	29	150
Weighers, measurers, checkers, and samplers, recordkeeping . . . . .	45	44	46	48	-2	3	7	1	12
All other material recording, scheduling, and distribution workers . . . . .	161	171	177	184	6	10	14	16	47
Records processing occupations . . . . .	3,733	3,338	3,438	3,559	-11	-8	-5	-294	877

Advertising clerks	17	18	18	19	2	5	8	1	5
Brokerage clerks	73	71	73	75	-2	1	4	1	9
Correspondence clerks	29	26	27	28	-10	-8	-5	-2	6
File clerks	278	232	236	241	-17	-15	-13	-42	102
Financial records processing									
occupations	2,757	2,438	2,506	2,591	-12	-9	-6	-250	573
Billing, cost, and rate clerks	323	321	328	336	0	2	4	5	98
Billing, posting, and calculating									
machine operators	96	32	32	33	-67	-67	-66	-64	40
Bookkeeping, accounting, and									
auditing clerks	2,181	1,946	2,003	2,073	-11	-8	-5	-178	400
Payroll and timekeeping clerks	157	139	144	150	-12	-9	-5	-14	35
Library assistants and bookmobile									
drivers	121	117	127	139	-3	5	15	7	57
Order clerks, materials, merchandise,									
and service	310	327	337	348	6	9	12	27	95
Personnel clerks, except payroll									
and timekeeping	123	95	98	101	-23	-21	-18	-26	27
Statement clerks	25	15	16	16	-40	-38	-35	-9	3
Secretaries, stenographers, and typists	4,100	4,123	4,276	4,457	1	4	9	175	1,230
Secretaries	3,349	3,605	3,739	3,898	8	12	16	390	1,102
Legal secretaries	281	341	350	358	21	24	27	68	128
Medical secretaries	226	280	281	282	24	24	25	55	103
Secretaries, except legal and									
medical	2,842	2,983	3,109	3,258	5	9	15	267	871
Stenographers	105	99	102	107	-6	-3	1	-3	22
Typists and word processors	646	418	434	452	-35	-33	-30	-212	106
Other clerical and administrative									
support workers	7,740	7,921	8,253	8,638	2	7	12	513	2,582
Bank tellers	559	391	407	423	-30	-27	-25	-152	244
Clerical supervisors and managers	1,340	1,550	1,600	1,658	16	19	24	261	613
Court clerks	51	54	59	64	5	15	26	8	12
Credit authorizers, credit checkers, and									
loan and credit clerks	258	261	267	274	1	4	6	9	49
Credit authorizers	15	18	19	19	21	24	28	4	5
Credit checkers	40	34	35	36	-16	-14	-12	-6	3
Loan and credit clerks	187	192	196	201	3	5	8	10	37
Loan interviewers	16	17	17	18	7	10	12	2	4
Customer service representatives,									
utilities	150	171	179	187	14	19	24	29	61
Data entry keyers, except composing	395	359	370	383	-9	-6	-3	-25	17
Data entry keyers, composing	19	6	6	7	-68	-67	-65	-13	1
Duplicating, mail, and other office									
machine operators	222	160	166	172	-28	-25	-23	-56	99
General office clerks	2,946	2,959	3,071	3,204	0	4	9	126	908
Municipal clerks	22	19	21	23	-11	-3	7	-1	2
Proofreaders and copy makers	26	20	20	21	-23	-20	-18	-5	7
Real estate clerks	24	22	25	28	-5	5	20	1	8
Statistical clerks	75	65	68	72	-13	-10	-5	-7	11
Teacher aides and educational									
assistants	932	1,211	1,296	1,393	30	39	49	364	480
All other clerical and administrative									
support workers	721	672	698	729	-7	-3	1	-23	69
Service occupations	20,239	24,465	24,832	25,318	21	23	25	4,593	9,813
Cleaning and building service occupa-									
tions, except private household	3,450	3,935	4,071	4,235	14	18	23	621	1,293



ticket takers . . . . .	59	77	77	77	30	29	29	17	33
Private household workers . . . . .	808	697	682	664	-14	-16	-18	-126	245
Child care workers, private household . . . . .	283	284	278	270	0	-2	-4	-5	139
Cleaners and servants, private household . . . . .	496	396	387	378	-20	-22	-24	-108	100
Cooks, private household . . . . .	9	5	5	4	-48	-49	-51	-4	2
Housekeepers and butlers . . . . .	20	13	12	12	-36	-37	-39	-7	4
Protective service occupations . . . . .	2,381	3,017	3,199	3,410	27	34	43	818	1,514
Firefighting occupations . . . . .	284	301	328	359	6	16	27	44	169
Fire fighters . . . . .	219	237	258	283	8	18	29	40	138
Fire fighting and prevention supervisors . . . . .	52	51	56	61	-2	7	18	4	24
Fire inspection occupations . . . . .	13	13	14	15	-2	7	18	1	6
Law enforcement occupations . . . . .	992	1,210	1,316	1,439	22	33	45	324	610
Correction officers . . . . .	310	430	468	513	39	51	65	158	194
Police and detectives . . . . .	682	780	848	927	14	24	36	166	416
Police and detective supervisors . . . . .	87	86	93	102	-1	7	16	6	45
Police detectives and investigators . . . . .	66	75	80	85	13	20	29	13	40
Police patrol officers . . . . .	400	469	511	560	17	28	40	112	271
Sheriffs and deputy sheriff . . . . .	86	101	110	121	18	29	41	25	42
Other law enforcement occupations . . . . .	43	49	54	59	15	25	37	11	19
Other protective service workers . . . . .	1,106	1,506	1,554	1,612	36	41	46	449	735
Detectives, except public . . . . .	55	17	79	80	42	44	47	24	35
Guards . . . . .	867	1,248	1,282	1,322	44	48	53	415	580
Crossing guards . . . . .	58	55	60	66	-5	3	13	2	17
All other protective service workers . . . . .	126	125	133	143	-1	6	14	8	104
All other service workers . . . . .	1,020	1,234	1,259	1,290	21	23	27	240	462
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and related occupations . . . . .	3,762	3,635	3,650	3,676	-3	-3	-2	-112	988
Animal breeders and trainers . . . . .	16	15	15	15	-5	-5	-5	-1	3
Animal caretakers, except farm . . . . .	125	157	158	160	26	26	28	33	62
Farm workers . . . . .	906	871	870	868	-4	-4	-4	-36	263
Gardening, nursery, and greenhouse and lawn service occupations . . . . .	844	971	986	1,006	15	17	19	142	271
Gardeners and groundskeepers, except farm . . . . .	569	609	623	641	7	9	13	54	128
Lawn maintenance workers . . . . .	96	127	127	127	32	32	32	31	43
Lawn service managers . . . . .	36	48	47	47	33	33	33	12	18
Nursery and greenhouse managers . . . . .	19	26	26	26	38	37	37	7	11
Nursery workers . . . . .	83	107	109	111	29	31	34	26	50
Pruners . . . . .	26	34	34	34	32	32	32	8	14
Sprayers/applicators . . . . .	15	20	20	20	32	32	32	5	7
Farm operators and managers . . . . .	1,327	1,057	1,050	1,048	-20	-21	-21	-277	221
Farmers . . . . .	1,276	1,011	1,003	1,002	-21	-21	-21	-273	211
Farm managers . . . . .	51	47	46	46	-9	-9	-9	-5	10
Fishers, hunters, and trappers . . . . .	49	48	47	47	-3	-4	-5	-2	11
Captains and other officers, fishing vessels . . . . .	7	6	6	6	-10	-11	-12	-1	2
Fishers, hunters, and trappers . . . . .	42	41	41	41	-2	-3	-4	-1	9
Forestry and logging occupations . . . . .	124	116	118	120	-6	-5	-3	-6	34
Forest and conservation workers . . . . .	42	41	42	44	-1	1	4	1	12







precision	13	19	19	20	40	44	48	6	8
Textile, apparel, and furnishings									
workers, precision	240	211	219	229	-12	-9	-4	-21	40
Custom tailors and sewers	84	63	63	64	-25	-25	-24	-21	10
Patternmakers and layout workers, fabric and apparel	17	21	23	25	22	31	41	5	7
Shoe and leather workers and repairers, precision	24	16	17	19	-34	-28	-19	-7	2
Upholsterers	63	62	64	69	-2	1	8	1	9
All other precision textile, apparel, and furnishings workers	51	49	51	53	-4	0	3	0	11
Woodworkers, precision									
Cabinetmakers and bench carpenters	131	145	151	161	11	15	23	20	45
Furniture finishers	38	39	40	43	3	6	13	2	12
Wood machinists	50	56	59	65	13	19	30	10	19
All other precision woodworkers	22	25	26	28	13	19	28	4	10
Other precision workers									
Dental laboratory technicians, precision	49	47	47	47	-5	-5	-4	-2	11
Optical goods workers, precision	19	21	22	22	8	12	16	2	7
Photographic process workers, precision	14	16	16	16	15	15	15	2	6
All other precision workers	117	114	119	125	-2	2	7	3	28
Plant and system occupations									
Chemical plant and system operators	37	35	36	37	-6	-3	-2	-1	8
Electric power generating plant operators, distributors, and dispatchers	43	39	42	44	-9	-3	3	-1	10
Power distributors and dispatchers	18	15	15	16	-17	-14	-10	-2	4
Power generating and reactor plant operators	26	25	26	28	-3	4	11	1	6
Gas and petroleum plant and system occupations	31	30	28	29	-4	-10	-6	-3	7
Stationary engineers	30	26	27	28	-14	-10	-6	-3	7
Water and liquid waste treatment plant and system operators	95	96	104	114	1	9	19	9	30
All other plant and system operators	93	94	97	102	1	5	10	4	25
Operators, fabricators, and laborers									
Machine setters, set-up operators, operators, and tenders	4,779	4,304	4,505	4,749	-10	-6	-1	-274	1,353
Numerical control machine tool operators and tenders, metal and plastic	75	90	94	103	20	26	38	20	34
Combination machine tool setters, set-up operators, operators, and tenders	106	116	123	133	10	16	26	17	38
Machine tool cut and form setters, operators, and tenders, metal and plastic	709	563	593	638	-21	-16	-10	-116	175
Drilling and boring machine tool setters and set-up operators, metal and plastic	45	28	30	32	-38	-35	-30	-16	9
Grinding machine setters and set-up operators, metal and plastic	64	50	52	56	-22	-18	-12	-12	13
Lathe and turning machine tool setters and set-up operators, metal and plastic	71	47	47	50	54	-34	-31	-25-22	14



related materials . . . . .	77	74	76	78	-5	-1	-1	-1	19
Sewing machine operators, garment . . .	531	367	391	412	-31	-26	-22	-140	106
Sewing machine operators, nongarment . . . . .	129	111	117	127	-14	-9	-2	-12	26
Textile bleaching and dyeing machine operators and tenders . . . . .	30	34	37	39	13	24	32	714	
Textile draw-out and winding machine operators and tenders . . . . .	190	132	143	153	-31	-25	-20	-47	38
Textile machine setters and set-up operators . . . . .	39	33	36	39	-14	-6	-0	-2	8
Woodworking machine setters, operators, and other related workers . . . . .	125	92	97	105	-27	-23	-17	-29	32
Head sawyers and sawing machine operators and tenders, setters and set-up operators . . . . .	62	45	47	51	-28	-24	-18	-15	16
Woodworking machine operators and tenders, setters and set-up operators . . . . .	64	48	50	54	-26	-22	--15	-14	16
Other machine setters, set-up operators, operators, and tenders . . . . .	1,779	1,741	1,799	1,865	-2	1	5	20	554
Boiler operators and tenders, low pressure . . . . .	18	12	12	13	-35	-32	-29	-6	4
Cement and gluing machine operators and tenders . . . . .	36	24	25	27	-34	-30	-25	-11	9
Chemical equipment controllers, operators and tenders . . . . .	75	65	67	68	-13	-11	-9	-8	28
Cooking and roasting machine operators and tenders, food and tobacco . . . . .	28	30	30	30	8	8	7	2	9
Crushing and mixing machine operators and tenders . . . . .	137	131	136	141	-4	-1	3	-1	36
Cutting and slicing machine setters, operators and tenders . . . . .	92	99	103	108	7	12	17	11	29
Dairy processing equipment operators, including setters . . . . .	14	14	14	14	-2	-1	-1	0	5
Electronic semiconductor processors . . .	33	32	34	38	-2	4	16	1	10
Extruding and forming machine setters, operators, and tenders . . . . .	102	91	95	99	-11	-8	-3	-8	27
Furnace, kiln, or kettle operators and tenders . . . . .	28	23	24	25	-17	-13	-8	-4	5
Laundry and dry cleaning machine operators and tenders, except pressing .	175	195	198	203	11	13	15	23	68
Motion picture projectionists . . . . .	8	4	4	4	-46	-47	-48	-4	2
Packaging and filling machine operators and tenders . . . . .	329	351	359	367	7	9	12	30	119
Painting and coating machine operators . . . . .	155	151	159	169	-3	2	9	3	47
Coating, painting, and spraying machine operators, tenders, setters, and set-up operators . . . . .	111	104	110	119	-6	-1	7	-1	31
Painters, transportation equipment . . . . .	45	47	49	50	5	9	13	4	16
Paper goods machine setters and set-up operators . . . . .	51	40	42	44	-20	-16	-14	-8	13
Photographic processing machine operators and tenders . . . . .	43	49	49	50	5	9	13	4	16
Separating and still machine operators an tenders . . . . .	20	19	19	19	-8	-6	-4	-1	8



operators .....	88	95	100	107	8	13	21	11	31
Grader, dozer, and scraper operators .....	108	107	113	122	0	5	14	6	27
Hoist and winch operators .....	9	8	9	9	-9	-5	2	0	2
Industrial truck and tractor operators .....	464	474	493	515	2	6	11	29	132
Operating engineers .....	146	145	154	165	-1	5	13	7	37
All other material moving equipment operators .....	201	214	219	229	7	9	14	18	59
All other transportation and material moving equipment operators .....	145	154	161	170	6	11	17	16	44
Helpers, laborers, and material movers, hand .....	4,799	5,078	5,270	5,502	6	10	15	471	2,056
Freight, stock, and material movers, hand .....	765	707	728	754	-8	-5	-1	-36	306
Hand packers and packagers .....	942	1,070	1,102	1,137	14	17	21	160	429
Helpers, construction trades .....	513	549	581	630	7	13	23	68	240
Machine feeders and offbearers .....	262	232	242	253	-11	-8	-3	-20	80
Parking lot attendants .....	64	75	76	77	18	20	21	13	25
Refuse collectors .....	111	107	115	123	-3	4	12	4	31
Service station attendants .....	167	143	148	151	-15	-12	-10	-20	67
Vehicle washers and equipment cleaners .....	249	290	299	306	16	20	23	50	133
All other helpers, laborers, and material movers, hand .....	1,727	1,905	1,980	2,070	10	15	20	253	744

<sup>a</sup>Total job openings represent the sum of employment increases and net replacements. If employment change is negative, job openings due to growth are zero and total job openings equal net replacements.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

**Table D-12. Employment by Industry, 1983, 1994, and projected 2005**

Industry Title	Total Employment (in thousands)					Annual Rate of Growth	
	1983	1994	2005			Employment 1994-2005	Output 1994-1995
			Low	Moderate	High		
Nonfarm wage and salary <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	89,734	113,340	125,631	130,185	135,729	1.3	--
Mining . . . . .	952	601	450	439	509	-2.8	-4
Metal mining . . . . .	56	49	38	42	44	-1.5	1.4
Coal mining . . . . .	194	112	63	70	77	-4.3	.2
Crude petroleum, natural gas, and gas liquids . . . . .	265	168	138	105	124	-4.2	-1.9
Oil and gas field services . . . . .	333	168	127	136	173	-1.9	3.2
Nonmetallic minerals, except fuels . . .	104	104	85	88	91	-1.5	.9
Construction . . . . .	3,946	5,010	5,193	5,500	5,966	.9	1.5
Manufacturing . . . . .	18,430	18,304	16,218	16,991	18,000	-7	2.0
Durable manufacturing . . . . .	10,707	10,431	8,803	9,290	10,045	-1.0	2.2
Lumber and wood products . . . . .	670	752	649	685	729	-9	.9
Logging . . . . .	83	82	73	74	75	-9	.6
Sawmills and planing mills . . . . .	193	189	140	150	161	-2.1	.1
Millwork, plywood, and structural members . . . . .	207	271	236	250	269	-7	1.3
Wood containers and miscellaneous wood products . . . . .	119	138	133	139	147	.0	2.2
Wood buildings and mobile homes . .	69	73	67	72	78	-1	.0
Furniture and fixtures . . . . .	448	502	486	515	581	-2	1.3
Household furniture . . . . .	279	284	264	280	327	-1	1.0
Partitions and fixtures . . . . .	59	80	83	88	95	.9	1.2
Office and miscellaneous furniture and fixtures . . . . .	110	138	138	146	159	.5	1.6
Stone, clay, and glass products . . . . .	541	533	413	434	463	-1.8	.5
Glass and glass products . . . . .	165	153	118	125	133	-1.8	.4
Hydraulic cement . . . . .	25	18	14	14	14	-2.2	.2
Stone, clay, and miscellaneous mineral products . . . . .	167	164	115	124	136	-2.5	.2
Concrete, gypsum, and plaster products . . . . .	184	198	166	172	180	-1.3	.9
Primary metal industries . . . . .	832	699	508	532	565	-2.5	.1
Blast furnaces and basic steel products . . . . .	341	239	150	155	163	-3.9	-5
Iron and steel foundries . . . . .	139	125	88	92	99	-2.7	-1.2
Primary nonferrous smelting and refining . . . . .	50	41	32	36	39	-1.2	2.3
All other primary metals . . . . .	41	44	40	40	40	-8	1.8
Nonferrous rolling and drawing . . .	184	167	130	135	141	-1.9	.0
Nonferrous foundries . . . . .	78	84	68	74	82	-1.2	-2
Fabricated metal products . . . . .	1,368	1,387	1,114	1,181	1,271	-1.5	.5
Metal cans and shipping containers . . . . .	60	42	27	27	27	-3.9	.9
Cutlery, hand tools, and hardware . .	138	129	85	90	97	-3.2	-2
Plumbing and nonelectric heating equipment . . . . .	62	60	46	48	52	-1.9	-3
Fabricated structural metal products . . . . .	416	409	299	315	339	-2.3	.4

Screw machine products, bolts, rivets, etc. ....	86	96	73	78	84	-1.8	.5
Metal forgings and stampings ....	224	234	183	194	211	-1.7	.2
Metal coating, engraving, and allied services ....	96	124	134	140	150	1.1	2.5
Ordnance and ammunition ....	67	54	49	51	51	-5	-8
Miscellaneous fabricated metal products ....	219	241	218	238	260	-1	.9
Industrial machinery and equipment	2,052	1,985	1,687	1,769	1,904	-1.0	3.9
Engines and turbines ....	104	90	69	70	73	-2.2	.2
Farm and garden machinery and equipment ....	107	105	84	87	91	-1.7	1.6
Construction and related machinery ....	245	210	182	188	204	-1.0	1.6
Metalworking machinery and equipment ....	298	322	283	291	304	-9	-4
Special industry machinery ....	151	155	149	150	151	-3	1.8
General industrial machinery and equipment ....	234	243	228	235	250	-3	-4
Computer and office equipment ...	474	351	240	263	293	-2.6	7.3
Refrigeration and service industry machinery ....	158	190	181	192	210	.1	1.1
Industrial machinery, n.e.c. ....	282	319	273	292	329	-8	1.7
Electronic and other electric equipment ....	1,704	1,571	1,347	1,408	1,524	-1.0	3.5
Electric distribution equipment ....	103	82	69	70	71	-1.5	.1
Electrical industrial apparatus ....	190	156	115	116	118	-2.7	.3
Household appliances ....	138	123	92	98	109	-2.1	1.5
Electric lighting and wiring equipment ....	187	176	148	155	167	-1.2	1.3
Household audio and video equipment ....	87	89	55	55	54	-4.2	1.2
Communications equipment ....	279	244	200	210	225	-1.3	3.8
Electronic components and accessories ....	563	544	522	553	620	.1	5.5
Miscellaneous electrical equipment	157	156	146	151	159	-3	1.9
Transportation equipment ....	1,731	1,749	1,455	1,567	1,744	-1.0	1.8
Motor vehicles and equipment ....	754	899	715	775	883	-1.3	1.6
Aerospace ....	702	587	517	552	605	-6	2.2
Ship and boat building and repairing ....	183	159	120	131	140	-1.8	-1.0
Railroad equipment ....	30	35	34	35	36	-1	3.6
Miscellaneous transportation equipment ....	62	69	69	75	81	.8	3.5
Instruments and related products ....	990	863	771	798	836	-7	2.9
Search and navigation equipment ..	311	180	126	132	141	-2.8	.5
Measuring and controlling devices .	300	284	234	248	273	-1.2	1.9
Medical equipment, instruments, and supplies ....	198	265	305	306	307	1.3	5.7
Ophthalmic goods ....	38	37	36	37	38	-1	3.9
Photographic equipment and supplies ....	128	89	66	70	72	-2.2	2.1
Watches, clocks, and parts ....	16	8	4	5	5	-5.3	-5
Miscellaneous manufacturing industries ....	370	391	374	404	428	.3	1.8
Jewelry, silverware, and plated ware ....	54	51	43	44	44	-1.5	-1.0
Toys and sporting goods ....	106	115	120	135	143	1.4	2.8
Manufactured products, n.e.c. ....	211	224	211	225	240	.0	1.9

Nondurable manufacturing	7,723	7,873	7,415	7,700	7,955	-2	1.8
Food and kindred products	1,612	1,680	1,693	1,696	1,696	.1	1.3
Meat products	346	451	514	515	513	1.2	1.2
Dairy products	164	149	132	133	133	-1.0	1.9
Preserved fruits and vegetables	220	245	252	260	264	.5	1.4
Grain mill products and fats and oils	170	160	166	161	158	.0	1.4
Bakery products	220	213	196	195	194	-.8	.4
Sugar and confectionery products	103	99	89	90	90	-.9	.4
Beverages	222	178	130	132	134	-2.7	.8
Miscellaneous food and kindred products	165	185	213	211	210	1.2	2.3
Tobacco products	68	42	28	26	26	-4.2	-4
Textile mill products	742	673	521	568	608	-1.5	.2
Weaving, finishing, yarn, and thread mills	432	358	253	281	303	-2.2	-.2
Knitting mills	207	199	157	173	187	-1.2	.0
Carpets and rugs	49	64	64	65	68	.1	1.0
Miscellaneous textile goods	55	52	47	49	51	-.6	1.3
Apparel and other textile products	1,163	969	723	772	815	-2.1	.5
Apparel	990	755	512	547	577	-2.9	-4
Miscellaneous fabricated textile products	173	215	211	225	238	.4	2.6
Paper and allied products	654	691	674	708	730	.2	2.5
Pulp, paper, and paperboard mills	249	232	211	218	222	.6	2.7
Paperboard containers and boxes	191	213	216	230	240	.7	1.8
Converted paper products except containers	214	246	247	260	267	.5	2.9
Printing and publishing	1,298	1,542	1,576	1,627	1,676	.5	2.5
Newspapers	426	450	400	413	424	.8	-.4
Periodicals	100	135	156	163	169	1.7	2.1
Books	98	120	125	130	134	.8	2.7
Miscellaneous publishing	56	84	84	85	86	.1	3.6
Commercial printing and business forms	480	597	653	675	699	1.1	3.3
Greeting cards	23	29	33	32	32	1.0	4.7
Blank books and bookbinding	65	70	75	77	80	.8	2.6
Service industries for the printing trade	49	57	51	53	54	-.7	2.6
Chemicals and allied products	1,043	1,061	1,032	1,067	1,089	.1	2.0
Industrial chemicals	314	277	253	259	260	-.6	.9
Plastics materials and synthetics	177	162	138	143	145	-1.1	1.4
Drugs	201	263	309	325	337	1.9	4.0
Soap, cleaners, and toilet goods	142	153	164	165	166	.7	2.5
Paints and allied products	60	58	46	48	51	-1.6	1.4
Agricultural chemicals	61	55	39	43	44	-2.3	1.2
Miscellaneous chemical products	89	93	83	85	87	-.9	.9
Petroleum and coal products	196	149	142	140	137	-.5	2.1
Petroleum refining	158	109	105	103	98	-.5	2.2
Miscellaneous petroleum and coal products	37	40	37	38	39	-.5	.9
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	743	952	972	1,030	1,100	.7	2.9
Tires and inner tubes	94	80	59	60	63	-2.5	.2
Rubber products and plastic hose and footwear	171	182	158	170	185	-.6	1.9
Miscellaneous plastics products, n.e.c.	478	690	755	800	853	1.4	3.4
Leather and leather products	205	114	54	65	79	-4.9	-1.9

Footwear, except rubber and plastic . . . . .	136	61	20	29	40	-6.7	-5.0
Luggage, handbags, and leather products, n.e.c. . . . .	69	53	34	37	39	-3.3	-3
Transportation, communications, utilities . . . . .	4,958	6,006	6,145	6,431	6,723	.6	3.2
Transportation . . . . .	2,748	3,775	4,060	4,251	4,438	1.1	4.0
Railroad transportation . . . . .	376	241	172	186	199	-2.3	1.3
Local and inter-urban passenger transit . . . . .	257	410	474	490	499	1.6	.0
Trucking and warehousing . . . . .	1,222	1,797	1,903	2,000	2,099	1.0	5.0
Water transportation . . . . .	189	169	158	165	175	-.2	2.0
Air transportation . . . . .	455	748	830	870	910	1.4	3.7
Pipelines, except natural gas . . . . .	20	18	14	15	16	-1.6	-.2
Transportation services . . . . .	229	393	509	525	541	2.7	6.5
Passenger transportation arrangement . . . . .	120	197	237	255	272	2.4	6.2
Miscellaneous transportation services . . . . .	109	195	272	270	269	3.0	6.7
Communications . . . . .	1,324	1,305	1,190	1,235	1,279	-.5	3.1
Electric, gas, and sanitary services . . . . .	887	927	895	945	1,007	.2	2.0
Electric utilities . . . . .	560	516	465	485	517	-.6	2.2
Gas utilities . . . . .	224	197	159	160	164	-1.9	1.5
Water and sanitation . . . . .	102	213	272	300	327	3.2	2.7
Wholesale trade . . . . .	5,283	6,140	6,389	6,559	6,765	.6	2.2
Retail trade . . . . .	15,587	20,438	22,781	23,094	23,417	1.1	2.4
Retail trade except eating and drinking places . . . . .	10,549	13,369	14,523	15,005	15,495	1.1	2.7
Eating and drinking places . . . . .	5,038	7,069	8,258	8,089	7,922	1.2	1.1
Finance, insurance, and real estate . . . . .	5,466	6,933	7,076	7,373	7,721	.6	2.3
Depository institutions . . . . .	2,048	2,076	1,812	1,886	1,961	-.9	2.0
Nondepository; holding and investment offices . . . . .	385	730	968	970	973	2.6	3.0
Security and commodity brokers . . . . .	308	518	679	700	719	2.8	7.0
Insurance carriers . . . . .	1,229	1,551	1,597	1,633	1,668	.5	1.9
Insurance agents, brokers, and services . . . . .	499	686	696	702	709	.2	2.6
Real estate . . . . .	997	1,373	1,324	1,482	1,691	.7	2.2
Royalties . . . . .	--	--	--	--	--	.0	2.6
Owner-occupied dwellings . . . . .	--	--	--	--	--	.0	.7
Services <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	19,242	30,729	42,072	42,810	43,678	3.0	3.0
Hotels and other lodging places . . . . .	1,172	1,618	1,875	1,899	1,926	1.5	1.5
Personal services . . . . .	869	1,139	1,372	1,374	1,373	1.7	1.0
Laundry, cleaning, and shoe repair . . . . .	356	428	487	500	510	1.4	.5
Personal services, n.e.c. . . . .	118	225	331	314	299	3.1	2.3
Beauty and barber shops . . . . .	323	397	455	460	462	1.3	.6
Funeral service and crematories . . . . .	72	89	98	100	102	1.1	-1.0
Business services . . . . .	2,948	6,239	9,796	10,032	10,313	4.4	4.5
Advertising . . . . .	171	224	250	250	250	1.0	1.4
Services to buildings . . . . .	559	855	1,325	1,350	1,379	4.2	3.6
Miscellaneous equipment rental and leasing . . . . .	111	216	319	325	332	3.8	.3
Personnel supply services . . . . .	619	2,254	3,507	3,564	3,635	4.3	6.0
Computer and data processing services . . . . .	416	950	1,516	1,611	1,725	4.9	4.9
Miscellaneous business services . . . . .	1,074	1,741	2,880	2,932	2,992	4.9	4.7
Auto repair, services, and garages . . . . .	619	971	1,304	1,345	1,368	3.0	2.3
Automotive rentals, without drivers . . . . .	126	174	222	227	231	2.4	2.6

Automobile parking, repair, and services . . . . .	493	796	1,082	1,119	1,137	3.1	2.0
Miscellaneous repair shops . . . . .	287	334	393	400	407	1.7	2.2
Electrical repair shops . . . . .	91	105	123	125	127	1.6	1.8
Watch, jewelry, and furniture repair . . . . .	28	26	25	25	25	-0.5	3.2
Miscellaneous repair services . . . . .	169	202	245	250	255	1.9	2.2
Motion pictures . . . . .	268	471	588	591	596	2.1	3.1
Motion pictures . . . . .	214	333	433	426	419	2.2	3.0
Video tape rental . . . . .	54	138	155	165	177	1.7	3.2
Amusement and recreation services . . . . .	853	1,344	1,846	1,844	1,848	2.9	2.4
Producers, orchestras, and entertainers . . . . .	94	148	197	200	204	2.8	3.0
Bowling centers . . . . .	97	85	73	73	73	-1.5	-1.8
Commercial sports . . . . .	76	106	147	137	131	2.4	1.1
Amusement and recreation services, n.e.c. . . . .	586	1,005	1,431	1,434	1,441	3.3	2.6
Health services . . . . .	5,986	9,001	11,985	12,075	12,321	2.7	2.9
Offices of health practitioner . . . . .	1,503	2,546	3,560	3,525	3,472	3.0	3.4
Nursing and personal care facilities . . . . .	1,106	1,649	2,377	2,400	2,474	3.5	3.1
Hospitals, private . . . . .	3,037	3,774	4,175	4,250	4,451	1.1	1.6
Health services, n.e.c. . . . .	341	1,032	1,873	1,900	1,925	5.7	6.2
Legal services . . . . .	602	927	1,240	1,270	1,300	2.9	2.9
Educational services . . . . .	1,225	1,822	2,336	2,400	2,437	2.5	2.8
Social services . . . . .	1,188	2,181	3,637	3,639	3,623	4.8	3.3
Individual and miscellaneous social services . . . . .	464	779	1,273	1,314	1,335	4.9	3.8
Job training and related services . . . . .	190	298	443	425	411	3.3	.7
Child day care services . . . . .	284	502	840	800	766	4.3	1.0
Residential care . . . . .	251	602	1,082	1,100	1,111	5.6	5.4
Museums, botanical, zoological gardens . . . . .	43	79	112	112	112	3.2	4.7
Membership organizations . . . . .	1,510	2,059	2,156	2,336	2,488	1.2	2.6
Engineering, management, and related services . . . . .	1,673	2,607	3,431	3,494	3,565	2.7	2.5
Engineering and architectural services . . . . .	576	775	1,008	1,044	1,086	2.7	2.0
Research and testing services . . . . .	384	563	743	745	747	2.6	5.0
Management and public relations . . . . .	327	716	1,037	1,049	1,062	3.5	1.7
Accounting, auditing, and other services . . . . .	387	553	642	656	670	1.6	1.4
Government . . . . .	15,870	19,117	19,307	20,990	22,951	.9	1.0
Federal government . . . . .	2,774	2,870	2,607	2,635	2,667	-8	.2
Federal enterprises . . . . .	890	1,017	898	935	976	-8	2.3
U.S. Postal Service . . . . .	685	818	726	760	797	-7	2.8
Federal electric utilities . . . . .	43	27	24	25	27	-9	.5
Federal government enterprises, n.e.c. . . . .	162	172	148	150	152	-1.2	2.2
Federal general government . . . . .	1,884	1,853	1,709	1,700	1,691	-8	-7
State and local government . . . . .	13,096	16,247	16,701	18,355	20,284	1.1	1.4
State and local enterprises . . . . .	782	941	1,073	1,113	1,146	1.5	2.2
Local government passenger transit . . . . .	180	214	249	260	266	1.8	-.1
State and local electric utilities . . . . .	73	86	102	100	98	1.3	1.6
State and local government enterprises, n.e.c. . . . .	529	641	722	753	782	1.5	2.7
State and local general government . . . . .	12,314	15,306	15,628	17,242	19,138	1.1	1.2
State and local government							

hospitals . . . . .	1,115	1,081	994	1,090	1,202	.1	-.2
State and local government							
education . . . . .	6,589	8,365	9,058	10,000	11,108	1.6	1.8
State and local general							
government, n.e.c. . . . .	4,610	5,860	5,576	6,152	6,829	.4	.4
Agriculture <sup>4</sup> . . . . .	3,508	3,623	3,431	3,399	3,361	-.6	1.0
Agricultural production . . . . .	2,727	2,326	1,813	1,799	1,783	-2.3	.9
Agricultural services <sup>5</sup> . . . . .	699	1,197	1,528	1,514	1,494	2.2	2.2
Forestry, fishing, hunting, and							
trapping . . . . .	82	100	90	87	84	-1.3	-2.3
Private households wage and salary . . .	1,247	966	818	800	779	-1.7	.4
Nonagricultural self-employed and							
unpaid family <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	7,914	9,085	10,382	10,324	10,343	1.2	--
Total <sup>6</sup> . . . . .	102,404	127,014	140,261	144,708	150,212	1.2	2.2

<sup>1</sup>Rates are based on moderate scenario.

<sup>2</sup>Comparable estimate of output growth is not available.

<sup>3</sup>Excludes SIC 074,5,8 (agricultural services) and 99 (nonclassifiable establishments). The data, therefore are not exactly comparable with data published in *Employment and Earnings*.

<sup>4</sup>Excludes government wage and salary workers, and includes private SIC 08,09 (forestry and fisheries).

<sup>5</sup>Excludes SIC 08,09 (forestry and fisheries).

<sup>6</sup>Employment for wage and salary workers are from the Current Employment Statistics (payroll) survey, which counts jobs, whereas self-employee, unpaid family worker, agricultural, and private household data are from the Current Population Survey (household survey), which counts workers. These totals for 1983 and 1994, therefore, differ from the official employment estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Note: Dash indicates data not available. n.e.c. = not elsewhere classified.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Historical output data are from the Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce.

**Table E-1. Number of participants served under JTPA  
Titles II-A, II-C, and III by State: Program Year 1993**

State	Title II-A <sup>a</sup>	Title II-C	Title III
U.S. Total	529,304	280,275	306,340
Alabama	12,542	5,096	3,820
Alaska	903	531	540
Arizona	3,729	2,620	5,440
Arkansas	7,620	4,058	4,450
California	61,108	24,654	26,250
Colorado	7,809	3,995	3,650
Connecticut	3,359	1,717	4,580
Delaware	1,692	752	560
District of Columbia	3,477	634	670
Florida	54,969	21,599	14,230
Georgia	10,185	4,723	8,180
Hawaii	1,152	752	670
Idaho	1,604	1,180	710
Illinois	21,194	11,796	23,020
Indiana	8,249	7,711	5,510
Iowa	3,647	1,514	4,390
Kansas	2,778	1,603	1,400
Kentucky	8,356	5,497	7,390
Louisiana	13,974	14,318	3,800
Maine	2,618	1,087	1,840
Maryland	11,029	6,777	7,830
Massachusetts	16,856	7,815	14,460
Michigan	21,361	12,914	9,340
Minnesota	9,811	4,890	6,700
Mississippi	8,212	3,979	3,590
Missouri	9,922	4,531	10,230
Montana	1,808	795	2,280
Nebraska	1,857	1,067	890
Nevada	1,984	826	1,320
New Hampshire	3,310	1,810	2,220
New Jersey	12,140	5,877	6,000
New Mexico	4,278	967	3,540
New York	30,520	15,337	16,600
North Carolina	7,746	4,678	5,280
North Dakota	5,063	809	420
Ohio	20,570	11,328	7,640
Oklahoma	4,253	2,541	2,940
Oregon	4,370	2,657	5,040
Pennsylvania	32,736	11,734	13,160
Rhode Island	2,762	947	1,530
South Carolina	5,493	3,415	5,440
South Dakota	2,136	1,903	390
Tennessee	8,737	5,398	5,200

Texas .....	31,088	21,837	19,650
Utah .....	2,188	1,121	890
Vermont .....	1,588	845	1,200
Virginia .....	8,415	5,402	10,950
Washington .....	8,543	4,505	8,930
West Virginia .....	3,455	2,363	2,200
Wisconsin .....	9,401	5,910	6,650
Wyoming .....	732	383	180
Puerto Rico .....	5,975	9,077	2,590

---

aData include II-A participants enrolled under the basic program and under special State set-asides. These set-asides represent 22 percent of total funding and are used for: (1) coordination with State education programs (eight percent of total funds); (2) incentive grants for programs exceeding performance standards or technical assistance for programs that fail to meet standards (six percent); (3) training programs for older workers (three percent); (4) State administrative responsibilities, including support for the State Job Training Coordinating Council (five percent).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Note: Data may not add to total due to rounding or minor reporting deficiencies.

**Table E-2. Number of participants served under JTPA  
Titles II-A, II-C, and III by State: Program Year 1994**

State	Title II-A <sup>a</sup>	Title II-C	Title III
U.S. Total	535,928	264,968	410,440
Alabama	11,721	4,236	5,490
Alaska	979	499	720
Arizona	4,641	2,722	6,270
Arkansas	5,821	2,631	4,440
California	65,080	28,344	39,240
Colorado	7,175	3,471	6,820
Connecticut	0	0	9,400
Delaware	1,596	663	620
District of Columbia	2,299	483	1,200
Florida	39,639	17,503	23,470
Georgia	12,009	5,133	11,780
Hawaii	1,289	796	1,710
Idaho	1,369	1,025	1,150
Illinois	20,538	11,257	23,000
Indiana	7,807	4,077	6,500
Iowa	2,945	1,259	3,710
Kansas	2,095	1,173	1,870
Kentucky	10,523	5,093	6,790
Louisiana	12,920	13,098	4,660
Maine	2,418	1,006	2,410
Maryland	12,396	6,648	11,650
Massachusetts	16,678	7,580	13,680
Michigan	19,609	10,496	9,630
Minnesota	8,826	4,800	6,390
Mississippi	6,709	3,607	4,390
Missouri	6,650	4,171	8,930
Montana	1,440	617	2,230
Nebraska	1,979	1,012	870
Nevada	2,579	1,246	1,320
New Hampshire	2,059	1,279	1,530
New Jersey	15,339	6,870	44,610
New Mexico	7,508	1,826	2,390
New York	35,604	16,318	19,890
North Carolina	9,381	5,208	6,050
North Dakota	3,468	800	770
Ohio	20,706	10,725	11,160
Oklahoma	4,144	2,274	3,480
Oregon	4,614	2,669	5,780
Pennsylvania	39,917	13,463	16,790
Rhode Island	2,505	1,012	2,760
South Carolina	5,611	3,313	8,140
South Dakota	2,169	2,021	350
Tennessee	9,243	5,828	4,910
Texas	33,852	21,313	26,050
Utah	2,000	887	2,370

Vermont .....	1,594	911	1,150
Virginia .....	17,000	4,697	6,900
Washington .....	9,024	4,511	11,870
West Virginia .....	3,226	1,928	3,800
Wisconsin .....	8,850	4,789	6,200
Wyoming .....	857	307	260
Puerto Rico .....	7,527	7,373	2,940

---

aData include II-A participants enrolled under the basic program and under special State set-asides. These set-asides represent 22 percent of total funding and are used for: (1) coordination with State education programs (eight percent of total funds); (2) incentive grants for programs exceeding performance standards or technical assistance for programs that fail to meet standards (six percent); (3) training programs for older workers (three percent); (4) State administrative responsibilities, including support for the State Job Training Coordinating Council (five percent).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Note: Data may not add to total due to rounding or minor reporting deficiencies.

**Table E-3. Number of participants served under JTPA  
Title II-B, Calendar Years 1994 and 1995**

State	CY 1994	CY 1995
U.S. Total	568,326	495,288
Alabama	9,574	6,794
Alaska	925	640
Arizona	6,820	5,965
Arkansas	6,146	3,768
California	69,806	72,137
Colorado	4,753	3,405
Connecticut	5,890	4,230
Delaware	1,516	1,361
District of Columbia	2,981	2,981
Florida	26,346	20,153
Georgia	11,245	9,674
Hawaii	940	880
Idaho	1,386	740
Illinois	24,198	19,840
Indiana	7,460	5,497
Iowa	2,382	1,923
Kansas	1,720	1,924
Kentucky	9,095	7,636
Louisiana	14,386	11,142
Maine	2,111	1,845
Maryland	9,000	6,448
Massachusetts	15,056	10,811
Michigan	20,653	14,922
Minnesota	6,789	6,789
Mississippi	7,218	4,332
Missouri	8,527	6,474
Montana	1,433	1,127
Nebraska	1,428	1,122
Nevada	2,013	1,910
New Hampshire	1,577	1,341
New Jersey	19,607	14,976
New Mexico	4,334	3,871
New York	52,543	46,439
North Carolina	9,366	6,933
North Dakota	1,376	1,165
Ohio	20,716	17,849
Oklahoma	5,312	5,171
Oregon	4,787	3,318
Pennsylvania	26,352	22,916
Rhode Island	1,881	1,619
South Carolina	7,853	7,132
South Dakota	1,715	626
Tennessee	3,522	8,119
Texas	38,726	37,211
Utah	1,589	1,205

Vermont .....	1,709	1,172
Virginia .....	9,016	7,334
Washington .....	7,517	6,224
West Virginia .....	5,560	5,820
Wisconsin .....	5,401	3,857
Wyoming .....	541	510
Puerto Rico .....	55,493	54,010

---

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Note: Data may not add to total due to rounding or minor reporting deficiencies.

**Table E-4. Expenditures under JTPA Titles II-A and II-C by State: Program Year 1993**

State	Title II-A	Title II-C
U.S. Total	\$809,931,638	\$540,887,994
Alabama	17,748,578	10,488,451
Alaska	1,649,276	1,339,596
Arizona	11,365,038	8,436,940
Arkansas	9,107,210	6,528,378
California	112,885,243	63,601,586
Colorado	8,604,906	5,635,005
Connecticut	8,179,404	5,595,615
Delaware	2,045,054	1,574,200
District of Columbia	1,817,099	704,577
Florida	50,714,804	27,975,075
Georgia	17,104,438	11,103,508
Hawaii	1,998,729	1,461,613
Idaho	3,064,815	2,325,539
Illinois	39,014,580	26,306,643
Indiana	13,628,695	10,078,721
Iowa	6,424,503	3,018,089
Kansas	3,969,558	2,645,616
Kentucky	9,828,570	8,451,187
Louisiana	22,904,789	20,018,183
Maine	4,396,279	3,136,183
Maryland	10,879,750	8,876,106
Massachusetts	17,838,433	14,159,814
Michigan	34,528,906	24,561,411
Minnesota	8,098,994	5,109,713
Mississippi	10,001,501	8,413,878

Missouri	14,795,334	10,536,974
Montana	3,160,607	2,232,016
Nebraska	2,455,168	1,272,204
Nevada	2,395,448	2,015,490
New Hampshire	4,079,489	3,161,226
New Jersey	23,111,515	13,314,696
New Mexico	4,842,556	3,737,750
New York	65,061,738	44,310,053
North Carolina	13,813,641	10,451,674
North Dakota	2,277,947	1,561,719
Ohio	25,243,245	13,435,544
Oklahoma	9,421,037	5,284,478
Oregon	8,427,435	6,319,106
Pennsylvania	37,541,132	17,354,968
Rhode Island	2,561,288	2,028,155
South Carolina	8,902,134	6,413,067
South Dakota	2,530,826	1,687,220
Tennessee	10,966,522	7,782,756
Texas	55,936,161	47,120,319
Utah	2,879,622	1,809,325
Vermont	1,937,572	1,161,345
Virginia	15,130,620	10,609,759
Washington	13,384,962	9,947,302
West Virginia	9,584,640	6,315,625
Wisconsin	11,480,072	7,731,413
Wyoming	1,935,872	1,483,953
Puerto Rico	28,275,903	20,264,230

---

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-5. Expenditures under JTPA Titles II-A and II-C by State: Program Year 1994**

State	Title II-A	Title II-C
U.S. Total	\$787,444,137	\$547,924,690
Alabama	14,191,607	11,235,924
Alaska	1,836,124	1,900,162
Arizona	11,365,038	8,436,940
Arkansas	7,269,197	5,303,628
California	111,564,894	83,473,994
Colorado	8,265,436	5,981,290
Connecticut	8,520,040	6,308,703
Delaware	1,960,038	1,415,279
District of Columbia	2,211,760	1,686,239
Florida	46,102,579	28,990,292
Georgia	16,505,168	11,403,908
Hawaii	2,090,940	1,424,733
Idaho	2,838,166	2,003,217
Illinois	35,979,808	25,205,239
Indiana	12,605,281	9,235,875
Iowa	4,349,611	3,002,407
Kansas	3,236,759	1,757,161
Kentucky	13,385,861	10,503,947
Louisiana	19,615,584	16,480,812
Maine	3,943,042	2,561,800
Maryland	13,448,523	9,746,577
Massachusetts	15,826,416	10,698,932
Michigan	31,399,504	20,741,435
Minnesota	8,058,639	4,938,640

Mississippi	11,653,670	9,174,499
Missouri	12,648,984	9,806,797
Montana	2,832,763	1,906,146
Nebraska	1,941,867	1,349,224
Nevada	3,780,410	3,322,646
New Hampshire	3,313,514	2,249,265
New Jersey	24,183,955	14,477,927
New Mexico	4,736,667	4,147,581
New York	62,902,641	41,847,651
North Carolina	14,610,376	9,954,816
North Dakota	2,074,104	1,572,492
Ohio	28,321,091	18,742,538
Oklahoma	8,894,628	5,571,775
Oregon	8,453,978	6,323,242
Pennsylvania	40,983,073	21,650,999
Rhode Island	3,345,548	1,771,993
South Carolina	8,230,584	5,999,690
South Dakota	1,851,892	1,633,165
Tennessee	10,572,345	6,062,821
Texas	55,429,840	43,018,000
Utah	3,072,899	2,057,056
Vermont	1,962,302	1,497,629
Virginia	14,782,218	9,615,411
Washington	14,881,734	9,973,891
West Virginia	8,457,363	5,775,228
Wisconsin	9,090,503	6,128,600
Wyoming	479,480	661,688
Puerto Rico	27,385,693	17,196,786

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-6. Expenditures under JTPA Title II-B by State: Calendar Years 1994 and 1995**

State	CY 1994	CY 1995
<b>U.S. Total</b>	\$788,508,327	\$674,493,023
Alabama	13,526,656	8,334,295
Alaska	1,900,818	1,621,037
Arizona	9,637,586	9,725,205
Arkansas	7,744,388	6,033,189
California	118,343,729	106,927,109
Colorado	8,465,691	6,622,855
Connecticut	8,855,860	6,166,420
Delaware	1,641,212	1,596,016
District of Columbia	3,572,715	2,667,853
Florida	42,132,321	32,071,964
Georgia	17,495,015	14,105,381
Hawaii	2,150,259	1,865,267
Idaho	2,873,113	1,307,567
Illinois	33,880,132	27,422,194
Indiana	11,607,194	9,860,423
Iowa	4,334,370	3,466,910
Kansas	1,965,109	4,162,112
Kentucky	10,862,991	10,471,680
Louisiana	20,567,355	13,981,965
Maine	3,675,543	3,359,387
Maryland	10,690,805	9,675,255
Massachusetts	20,376,711	9,718,794
Michigan	29,641,091	22,878,685
Minnesota	8,406,535	7,387,176
Mississippi	9,395,363	6,402,571
Missouri	12,890,308	10,788,877
Montana	2,684,156	1,826,152

Nebraska	2,092,398	1,575,449
Nevada	3,244,215	5,478,781
New Hampshire	3,208,091	2,593,143
New Jersey	24,484,276	22,892,541
New Mexico	4,623,158	4,369,109
New York	60,712,223	56,207,025
North Carolina	14,004,624	11,559,812
North Dakota	2,182,216	1,757,382
Ohio	29,922,527	22,780,466
Oklahoma	8,466,569	8,480,095
Oregon	9,024,650	6,869,465
Pennsylvania	26,425,267	33,892,751
Rhode Island	3,456,155	2,530,570
South Carolina	9,315,692	9,869,933
South Dakota	2,182,175	887,910
Tennessee	12,825,714	11,283,758
Texas	59,581,830	51,342,728
Utah	2,866,023	2,274,583
Vermont	2,125,633	1,679,460
Virginia	13,259,699	12,981,303
Washington	14,513,031	12,854,597
West Virginia	9,029,746	8,416,513
Wisconsin	10,061,656	7,287,030
Wyoming	2,127,950	1,826,185
Puerto Rico	39,455,783	32,356,095

-

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-7. Formula and discretionary expenditures under  
JTPA Title III by State: Program Year 1993**

State	PY 1993	
	Formula	Discretionary
U.S. Total	\$417,907,000	\$125,838,000
Alabama	6,226,000	0
Alaska	1,095,000	148,000
Arizona	4,465,000	3,760,000
Arkansas	3,530,000	650,000
California	62,464,000	20,946,000
Colorado	3,684,000	32,000
Connecticut	5,724,000	4,133,000
Delaware	872,000	0
District of Columbia	1,302,000	0
Florida	23,471,000	11,477,000
Georgia	7,948,000	525,000
Hawaii	457,000	1,673,000
Idaho	1,213,000	180,000
Illinois	23,027,000	10,763,000
Indiana	6,282,000	2,465,000
Iowa	2,106,000	14,865,000
Kansas	1,334,000	3,552,000
Kentucky	7,090,000	334,000
Louisiana	7,256,000	151,000
Maine	2,467,000	219,000
Maryland	7,342,000	189,000
Massachusetts	16,280,000	769,000
Michigan	22,647,000	1,437,000
Minnesota	4,437,000	6,083,000

Mississippi	4,294,000	424,000
Missouri	7,569,000	9,841,000
Montana	1,212,000	1,899,000
Nebraska	560,000	934,000
Nevada	1,529,000	302,000
New Hampshire	2,494,000	454,000
New Jersey	15,539,000	2,660,000
New Mexico	2,106,000	986,000
New York	31,403,000	145,000
North Carolina	7,584,000	19,000
North Dakota	411,000	421,000
Ohio	16,914,000	840,000
Oklahoma	3,767,000	2,365,000
Oregon	4,227,000	4,690,000
Pennsylvania	20,349,000	4,991,000
Rhode Island	2,596,000	81,000
South Carolina	4,862,000	0
South Dakota	315,000	683,000
Tennessee	6,241,000	25,000
Texas	26,261,000	0
Utah	1,171,000	923,000
Vermont	782,000	144,000
Virginia	8,270,000	474,000
Washington	7,016,000	6,031,000
West Virginia	5,085,000	264,000
Wisconsin	4,670,000	1,724,000
Wyoming	468,000	0
Puerto Rico	7,490,000	167,000

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-8. Formula and discretionary expenditures under  
JTPA Title III by State: Program Year 1994**

U.S. Total	\$797,495,000	\$123,851,000
Alabama	13,156,000	185,000
Alaska	1,744,000	430,000
Arizona	9,427,000	2,073,000
Arkansas	6,000,000	1,351,000
California	141,967,000	14,071,000
Colorado	6,637,000	529,000
Connecticut	13,486,000	6,114,000
Delaware	1,170,000	0
District of Columbia	2,217,000	0
Florida	37,597,000	6,155,000
Georgia	15,714,000	5,143,000
Hawaii	1,472,000	875,000
Idaho	2,343,000	119,000
Illinois	42,989,000	2,577,000
Indiana	11,507,000	1,513,000
Iowa	3,041,000	7,658,000
Kansas	3,343,000	3,037,000
Kentucky	9,931,000	126,000
Louisiana	13,045,000	82,000
Maine	4,832,000	700,000
Maryland	14,901,000	165,000
Massachusetts	24,704,000	5,741,000
Michigan	30,444,000	323,000
Minnesota	7,773,000	11,078,000
Mississippi	6,915,000	0
Missouri	11,221,000	6,624,000
Montana	2,168,000	1,061,000

Nebraska	1,083,000	87,000
Nevada	3,179,000	107,000
New Hampshire	4,667,000	0
New Jersey	34,841,000	559,000
New Mexico	3,966,000	123,000
New York	63,605,000	14,085,000
North Carolina	10,446,000	81,000
North Dakota	746,000	623,000
Ohio	28,605,000	2,299,000
Oklahoma	6,991,000	1,766,000
Oregon	9,352,000	4,664,000
Pennsylvania	39,396,000	3,654,000
Rhode Island	4,531,000	459,000
South Carolina	9,060,000	0
South Dakota	438,000	101,000
Tennessee	10,198,000	0
Texas	54,526,000	109,000
Utah	1,976,000	3,449,000
Vermont	1,733,000	422,000
Virginia	12,777,000	290,000
Washington	17,622,000	9,207,000
West Virginia	9,034,000	3,497,000
Wisconsin	7,274,000	450,000
Wyoming	762,000	71,000
Puerto Rico	20,945,000	18,000

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-9. Characteristics of individuals served by the Employment Service by State: Program Year 1993**

State	Total Applications	Women	Veterans	Economically disadvantaged
U.S. Total	20,195,029	8,640,380	2,572,098	3,425,566
Alabama	459,497	221,376	52,233	89,399
Alaska	111,316	45,057	16,126	2,344
Arizona	330,494	134,813	44,704	62,676
Arkansas	298,212	135,463	34,988	15,228
California	1,186,067	478,621	163,195	46,420
Colorado	287,409	116,964	44,674	23,466
Connecticut	239,093	93,882	30,112	46,029
Delaware	42,183	17,345	7,612	19
District of Columbia	90,271	43,231	6,764	21,983
Florida	1,274,398	556,914	160,983	15,619
Georgia	624,799	287,406	90,192	227,161
Guam	--	--	--	--
Hawaii	64,070	27,233	11,114	6,411
Idaho	145,534	62,722	16,731	6,676
Illinois	855,333	348,093	105,170	113,054
Indiana	370,291	154,304	57,912	66,205
Iowa	288,118	129,760	27,982	30,396
Kansas	198,133	82,196	24,602	18,246
Kentucky	433,532	191,378	53,885	93,495
Louisiana	355,985	155,308	42,809	18,451
Maine	132,626	52,792	19,992	4,701
Maryland	267,428	117,000	35,808	17,489
Massachusetts	237,707	97,165	25,581	67,302
Michigan	1,180,580	485,315	157,280	874,858
Minnesota	295,995	122,967	39,891	16,896
Mississippi	326,573	159,553	30,758	62,489
Missouri	606,986	265,643	73,760	241,922
Montana	105,171	45,332	13,824	3,859
Nebraska	118,078	50,714	16,291	11,924
Nevada	108,748	40,010	26,035	587
New Hampshire	60,972	24,941	10,167	9,892
New Jersey	276,956	119,364	32,906	41,389
New Mexico	156,516	62,200	22,331	17,370
New York	1,015,516	430,118	109,364	143,002
North Carolina	778,752	380,707	86,035	38,863
North Dakota	94,238	45,100	8,055	17,008
Ohio	536,775	217,182	88,637	120,311
Oklahoma	295,808	125,498	42,724	35,606

--

**Table E-9. Characteristics of individuals served by the Employment  
Service by State: Program Year 1993 (continued)**

Oregon .....	370,467	144,713	55,002	32,591
Pennsylvania .....	684,162	275,114	99,194	105,754
Puerto Rico .....	221,619	89,976	8,929	187,622
Rhode Island .....	68,889	29,505	9,056	2,397
South Carolina .....	432,647	205,936	52,481	48,139
South Dakota .....	97,809	46,917	8,819	18,772
Tennessee .....	440,057	200,112	52,829	23,949
Texas .....	1,731,158	740,129	188,363	161,335
Utah .....	232,100	104,060	17,751	26,160
Vermont .....	73,496	30,047	8,084	11,058
Virgin Islands .....	15,359	7,043	811	5,312
Virginia .....	505,494	216,949	82,935	18,651
Washington .....	426,843	167,478	70,347	40,831
West Virginia .....	198,442	74,232	27,984	87,200
Wisconsin .....	367,899	153,689	47,532	21,513
Wyoming .....	78,428	30,813	10,754	5,536

—

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-10. Characteristics of individuals served by the Employment Service by State: Program Year 1994**

State	Total Applications	Women	Veterans	Economically Disadvantaged
U.S. Total .....	18,809,907	8,234,914	2,299,155	2,943,696
Alabama .....	453,380	222,254	49,322	76,405
Alaska .....	102,013	41,161	14,182	1,324
Arizona .....	293,244	123,949	37,737	47,983
Arkansas .....	275,574	127,211	31,362	10,963
California .....	1,041,640	435,464	137,842	169,718
Colorado .....	267,167	111,027	40,108	21,074
Connecticut .....	206,388	84,571	23,754	40,400
Delaware .....	40,885	17,304	6,589	14
District of Columbia .....	80,733	39,587	6,014	19,715
Florida .....	1,247,309	551,023	155,055	10,983
Georgia .....	601,469	282,747	86,317	219,588
Guam .....	4,571	1,709	232	3,035
Hawaii .....	69,443	29,895	11,295	6,970
Idaho .....	142,133	61,386	15,799	5,631
Illinois .....	710,077	295,106	87,997	95,861
Indiana .....	340,750	143,783	52,428	57,867
Iowa .....	279,200	128,976	25,251	35,436
Kansas .....	194,499	80,977	23,059	17,810
Kentucky .....	428,314	189,447	50,387	70,229
Louisiana .....	343,255	151,277	40,606	15,585
Maine .....	128,894	52,547	18,794	3,517
Maryland .....	264,452	120,166	31,524	12,420
Massachusetts .....	207,729	87,788	22,148	54,266
Michigan .....	732,123	302,286	95,044	360,046
Minnesota .....	265,448	113,015	35,357	13,815
Mississippi .....	310,318	154,292	26,739	57,948
Missouri .....	654,206	291,690	71,493	244,239
Montana .....	105,862	46,317	13,375	3,819
Nebraska .....	114,423	48,946	15,393	9,270
Nevada .....	93,126	34,821	20,508	790
New Hampshire .....	52,205	21,968	8,535	7,005
New Jersey .....	279,084	124,552	29,951	42,050
New Mexico .....	150,002	60,416	20,420	13,024
New York .....	874,234	380,513	95,848	113,781
North Carolina .....	780,905	388,854	83,063	49,145
North Dakota .....	86,870	42,092	7,303	13,252
Ohio .....	570,429	235,857	88,963	230,794
Oklahoma .....	278,031	121,137	39,226	30,527
Oregon .....	361,467	145,197	48,656	40,846
Pennsylvania .....	640,876	266,010	88,475	96,336
Puerto Rico .....	232,687	99,254	8,281	197,048
Rhode Island .....	60,965	26,718	8,188	1,798
South Carolina .....	427,779	207,015	49,702	45,954

South Dakota .....	98,990	48,268	8,451	17,766
Tennessee .....	394,593	181,939	46,588	20,594
Texas .....	1,643,411	718,083	172,060	130,551
Utah .....	245,635	111,776	16,771	20,613
Vermont .....	70,291	30,000	7,491	8,821
Virgin Islands .....	15,443	6,774	334	6,704
Virginia .....	466,123	206,470	74,698	17,632
Washington .....	421,397	170,912	66,463	37,647
West Virginia .....	198,840	76,582	26,463	83,746
Wisconsin .....	384,337	163,884	46,992	25,832
Wyoming .....	76,688	29,921	10,522	5,509

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-11. Selected services provided to applicants by the  
Employment Service by State: Program Year 1993**

State	Referred to Jobs	Placed in Jobs	Referred to Training	Placed in Training	Counseled
U.S. Total . . . . .	8,094,603	2,734,265	363,759	102,864	629,862
Alabama . . . . .	231,076	91,941	5,355	792	967
Alaska . . . . .	45,584	22,049	153	92	4,898
Arizona . . . . .	150,451	37,378	5,245	677	4,133
Arkansas . . . . .	147,947	57,266	193	118	981
California . . . . .	467,158	194,388	6,263	2,151	6,206
Colorado . . . . .	137,993	42,392	8,167	626	2,716
Connecticut . . . . .	49,231	8,774	5,619	1,086	5,985
Delaware . . . . .	12,411	3,248	531	305	1,180
District of Columbia . . . . .	29,899	17,807	4,288	3,005	12,029
Florida . . . . .	597,268	151,187	16,801	3,586	15,728
Georgia . . . . .	294,656	96,144	1,418	1,354	39,505
Guam . . . . .	--	--	--	--	--
Hawaii . . . . .	21,835	4,252	1,860	589	964
Idaho . . . . .	93,938	31,184	373	372	1,433
Illinois . . . . .	239,981	107,978	10,595	1,683	2,783
Indiana . . . . .	124,997	36,703	14,097	3,711	5,135
Iowa . . . . .	159,680	54,183	18,497	1,961	7,165
Kansas . . . . .	100,782	31,957	9,932	1,524	8,820
Kentucky . . . . .	198,406	79,765	7,745	4,156	32,376
Louisiana . . . . .	126,673	40,076	6,568	1,085	2,188
Maine . . . . .	53,009	12,266	7,307	1,126	1,107
Maryland . . . . .	95,787	29,428	4,707	2,674	156,915
Massachusetts . . . . .	99,537	33,571	7,058	2,865	13,480
Michigan . . . . .	148,585	70,330	2,691	852	18,983
Minnesota . . . . .	135,842	47,626	1,296	919	3,226
Mississippi . . . . .	160,298	69,247	10,079	7,143	5,643
Missouri . . . . .	264,514	76,067	11,963	5,899	9,317
Montana . . . . .	58,568	20,219	4,043	396	5,957
Nebraska . . . . .	74,754	25,553	2,172	576	5,723
Nevada . . . . .	54,416	13,828	3,956	2,687	2,668
New Hampshire . . . . .	27,788	9,050	583	418	3,102
New Jersey . . . . .	66,166	15,896	23,262	10,046	28,566
New Mexico . . . . .	60,506	23,631	4,007	2,177	1,552
New York . . . . .	195,297	63,005	10,617	3,934	85,911
North Carolina . . . . .	482,171	160,280	4,081	2,515	14,285
North Dakota . . . . .	72,462	27,774	1,779	1,008	3,225
Ohio . . . . .	142,466	59,900	5,517	953	4,607
Oklahoma . . . . .	133,944	57,189	50,935	4,334	4,123
Oregon . . . . .	163,778	43,836	6,345	1,630	--
Pennsylvania . . . . .	261,649	88,346	9,799	3,519	3,390
Puerto Rico . . . . .	36,578	22,195	1,246	366	8,669
Rhode Island . . . . .	15,158	4,297	1,013	76	3,830
South Carolina . . . . .	240,301	68,251	5,273	1,980	2,990
South Dakota . . . . .	69,772	30,433	915	712	4,116

Tennessee .....	189,289	60,647	3,504	1,250	737
Texas .....	734,000	261,226	17,121	5,327	43,549
Utah .....	154,095	55,638	302	284	11,336
Vermont .....	28,009	8,260	287	19	1,606
Virgin Islands .....	3,502	1,562	1,125	211	743
Virginia .....	189,338	46,520	1,078	636	1,981
Washington .....	175,344	51,014	26,186	2,456	12,350
West Virginia .....	77,032	21,700	5,902	3,656	4,186
Wisconsin .....	152,099	30,717	2,334	410	5,177
Wyoming .....	48,583	16,091	1,576	937	1,620

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-12. Selected services provided to applicants by the  
Employment Service by State: Program Year 1994**

State	Referred to Jobs	Placed in Jobs	Referred to Training	Placed in Training	Counseled
U.S. Total . . . . .	8,217,656	2,681,839	405,187	102,876	676,343
Alabama . . . . .	246,312	99,182	5,833	682	1,003
Alaska . . . . .	40,630	18,595	183	58	3,892
Arizona . . . . .	143,317	37,693	4,924	596	4,080
Arkansas . . . . .	146,922	56,875	158	145	664
California . . . . .	448,257	172,222	5,598	2,107	5,756
Colorado . . . . .	137,841	42,994	7,210	671	9,368
Connecticut . . . . .	49,608	8,670	4,576	351	5,151
Delaware . . . . .	13,024	3,447	532	375	1,685
District of Columbia . . . . .	28,887	18,480	2,275	1,843	14,388
Florida . . . . .	555,767	135,640	21,875	2,722	17,367
Georgia . . . . .	299,504	96,290	2,386	1,406	45,672
Guam . . . . .	567	268	76	2	1
Hawaii . . . . .	26,594	4,287	3,326	1,253	1,311
Idaho . . . . .	95,633	29,362	295	505	1,362
Illinois . . . . .	208,166	96,793	10,365	1,844	3,103
Indiana . . . . .	121,922	33,644	11,556	3,959	3,927
Iowa . . . . .	168,094	56,237	16,342	1,612	5,490
Kansas . . . . .	103,217	32,282	10,884	1,122	9,866
Kentucky . . . . .	216,563	80,356	5,147	3,163	20,037
Louisiana . . . . .	132,232	41,310	6,598	1,025	1,686
Maine . . . . .	57,656	12,197	8,679	1,235	1,365
Maryland . . . . .	100,172	28,431	9,439	3,085	158,786
Massachusetts . . . . .	95,741	30,959	9,290	3,671	10,983
Michigan . . . . .	147,340	64,561	3,017	945	17,368
Minnesota . . . . .	123,533	42,346	1,120	1,160	3,318
Mississippi . . . . .	161,046	69,938	13,889	7,500	6,697
Missouri . . . . .	271,460	79,657	12,621	5,143	9,695
Montana . . . . .	60,211	12,141	4,020	375	4,888
Nebraska . . . . .	74,532	24,272	1,763	221	5,919
Nevada . . . . .	51,924	14,962	4,866	2,877	2,880
New Hampshire . . . . .	23,104	7,553	1,313	314	2,668
New Jersey . . . . .	71,670	17,568	30,851	8,266	38,290
New Mexico . . . . .	60,780	21,922	3,915	1,442	1,437
New York . . . . .	201,454	59,312	17,525	4,136	123,233
North Carolina . . . . .	512,555	177,374	4,356	3,452	14,125
North Dakota . . . . .	70,321	26,435	1,899	958	2,668
Ohio . . . . .	192,538	57,316	13,917	1,538	3,366
Oklahoma . . . . .	149,422	55,391	51,244	4,804	2,809
Oregon . . . . .	163,332	41,035	7,440	931	-
Pennsylvania . . . . .	265,988	93,277	9,380	3,738	2,791
Puerto Rico . . . . .	42,550	24,883	2,827	1,084	10,150
Rhode Island . . . . .	12,260	3,368	674	260	4,316
South Carolina . . . . .	259,713	73,425	8,401	2,756	2,638
South Dakota . . . . .	71,221	31,149	1,015	788	4,139

Tennessee .....	174,843	55,486	3,443	1,195	539
Texas .....	769,911	245,751	19,058	4,777	40,326
Utah .....	177,579	67,290	1,853	280	17,534
Vermont .....	28,676	8,146	1,570	1,477	1,692
Virgin Islands .....	2,594	898	1,105	359	773
Virginia .....	183,720	37,726	2,012	465	1,955
Washington .....	179,031	51,127	24,005	2,005	10,069
West Virginia .....	80,878	22,645	5,834	4,277	6,608
Wisconsin .....	150,382	25,399	1,362	1,177	4,565
Wyoming .....	46,392	15,292	1,345	744	1,944

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-13. Regular State unemployment insurance benefit data: U.S. Totals, FY 1985-1995, and by State for 12 months ending September 30, 1995**

Fiscal Year and State	Initial Claims	Average Weekly Unemployment	Percent of Covered Employment	Total Beneficiaries	Average Weekly Beneficiaries	Average Weekly Wage
1985	20,701,024	2,588,603	2.8	8,376,620	2,263,027	358.80
1986	20,092,257	2,644,602	2.8	8,383,137	2,330,927	374.91
1987	17,774,662	2,425,974	2.5	7,519,192	2,138,008	389.88
1988	16,320,306	2,111,770	2.1	6,929,646	1,840,253	409.75
1989	16,410,001	2,096,697	2.0	7,089,977	1,820,297	424.51
1990	18,889,811	2,387,234	2.2	8,091,439	2,109,745	442.20
1991	23,269,783	3,226,114	3.1	10,147,281	2,879,863	461.38
1992	22,443,506	3,330,717	3.2	9,645,930	2,955,968	479.75
1993	17,966,930	2,795,441	2.6	7,817,045	2,466,206	497.07
1994	17,859,276	2,730,188	2.5	8,162,246	2,417,477	511.61
1995	18,010,376	2,547,335	2.3	7,893,172	2,257,445	523.73
Alabama	314,103	29,371	1.7	139,583	25,051	454.97
Alaska	99,926	12,931	5.5	46,521	13,125	620.65
Arizona	158,322	25,236	1.5	73,539	20,327	476.20
Arkansas	216,483	25,523	2.5	85,946	18,994	406.57
California	3,424,753	454,255	3.7	1,229,777	406,736	583.72
Colorado	139,018	22,094	1.3	71,689	17,578	509.48
Connecticut	250,139	44,617	2.9	142,331	43,919	665.86
Delaware	48,852	5,974	1.7	23,245	5,907	551.84
District of Columbia	36,482	8,823	2.1	24,220	9,127	724.54
Florida	483,041	91,875	1.6	270,986	75,139	465.92
Georgia	391,491	38,403	1.2	189,377	33,880	494.77
Hawaii	94,651	14,969	3.0	42,505	14,089	510.62
Idaho	117,033	14,417	3.1	48,141	11,249	426.81
Illinois	673,340	117,178	2.2	331,122	105,848	570.24
Indiana	252,396	29,828	1.1	117,247	23,362	485.44
Iowa	134,036	18,137	1.4	74,412	16,384	433.29
Kansas	122,145	16,617	1.5	57,018	15,091	445.55
Kentucky	274,975	28,019	1.8	117,716	25,688	443.90
Louisiana	189,037	27,393	1.6	77,953	22,167	450.65
Maine	110,914	15,087	2.9	49,881	13,216	432.43
Maryland	234,885	43,572	2.2	114,245	35,033	540.23
Massachusetts	383,915	74,602	2.6	205,165	64,793	611.73
Michigan	751,998	86,481	2.1	357,701	77,330	582.49
Minnesota	209,343	35,307	1.6	115,394	31,605	518.10
Mississippi	181,177	20,186	2.0	68,601	15,611	395.18
Missouri	372,811	42,803	1.8	142,816	35,832	483.41
Montana	58,231	9,496	2.9	27,278	7,415	381.18
Nebraska	55,162	6,989	0.9	26,317	5,793	422.26
Nevada	114,611	16,148	2.1	54,787	14,439	502.21
New Hampshire	46,375	5,758	1.1	21,955	4,338	502.09
New Jersey	578,648	104,886	3.1	299,710	98,663	656.08
New Mexico	58,156	11,088	1.8	27,767	8,800	426.18

New York	1,153,012	226,576	3.0	588,296	220,058	664.37
North Carolina	741,071	45,179	1.3	216,933	35,605	461.48
North Dakota	28,051	3,918	1.4	14,259	3,330	384.70
Ohio	549,193	79,481	1.6	250,825	66,877	510.07
Oklahoma	113,789	15,567	1.3	46,243	12,278	424.77
Oregon	342,086	44,289	3.2	135,906	41,105	485.46
Pennsylvania	1,116,702	161,383	3.2	464,880	146,790	527.89
Puerto Rico	241,950	55,540	6.1	125,821	45,994	292.20
Rhode Island	129,162	19,347	4.6	57,376	16,832	498.92
South Carolina	311,035	26,882	1.7	103,286	21,424	439.40
South Dakota	18,605	2,162	0.7	7,997	1,579	371.84
Tennessee	396,862	39,353	1.7	156,992	33,213	470.15
Texas	735,913	123,425	1.6	366,942	109,010	507.50
Utah	55,144	8,028	1.0	29,944	6,669	439.55
Vermont	43,703	7,143	2.8	22,425	6,180	446.78
Virgin Islands	4,824	1,035	2.4	2,705	1,015	433.54
Virginia	328,272	28,948	1.0	114,098	23,494	497.32
Washington	550,843	89,177	3.9	235,970	83,768	516.76
West Virginia	96,739	18,023	2.8	58,440	15,568	442.05
Wisconsin	451,128	49,966	2.0	206,412	46,904	477.12
Wyoming	25,843	3,854	1.9	12,279	3,274	421.86

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

**Table E-13. Regular State unemployment insurance benefit data: U.S. Totals, FY 1985-1995, and by State for 12 months ending September 30, 1995 (continued)**

Fiscal Year and State	Average Weekly Benefit	Percent Average Weekly Wage	Potential Weeks of Benefits	Actual Weeks of Benefits	Exhaustees Weeks of Benefits	Number of Exhaustees	Exhaustees as Percent of Recipients
1985	126.78	35.3	24.0	14.0	22.7	2,539,888	31.5
1986	134.05	35.8	23.9	14.5	22.9	2,635,724	31.7
1987	139.67	35.8	23.8	14.8	22.8	2,563,655	31.5
1988	144.26	35.2	23.9	13.8	22.7	2,040,548	28.9
1989	149.37	35.2	24.4	13.4	22.9	1,913,937	28.0
1990	159.56	36.1	23.8	13.6	23.1	2,192,132	28.4
1991	168.54	36.5	25.3	14.8	23.2	3,187,381	33.5
1992	172.72	36.0	25.7	15.9	23.3	3,875,452	39.6
1993	178.54	35.9	23.9	16.4	23.4	3,300,695	39.1
1994	181.51	35.5	23.8	15.4	23.3	3,059,288	37.6
1995	186.15	35.5	24.1	14.9	23.2	2,690,365	34.6
Alabama	137.14	30.1	24.0	9.3	23.0	26,970	21.2
Alaska	172.30	27.8	20.9	14.7	20.4	20,018	42.3
Arizona	148.26	31.1	23.0	14.4	22.0	25,723	34.4
Arkansas	166.20	40.9	23.0	11.5	21.3	24,232	30.5
California	153.80	26.3	25.2	17.2	24.0	541,682	42.2
Colorado	200.65	39.4	23.0	12.8	16.2	27,754	38.9
Connecticut	213.08	32.0	26.0	16.0	26.0	46,423	31.9
Delaware	188.35	34.1	25.8	13.2	26.0	4,449	20.1
District of Columbia	229.12	31.6	25.8	19.6	25.3	12,546	51.7
Florida	171.02	36.7	21.2	14.4	20.0	122,444	44.2
Georgia	159.98	32.3	21.5	9.3	21.0	51,765	28.0
Hawaii	270.11	52.9	26.0	17.2	26.0	15,717	38.5
Idaho	173.84	40.7	20.2	12.2	17.1	15,153	32.4
Illinois	205.95	36.1	26.0	16.6	26.0	113,741	35.8
Indiana	174.81	36.0	21.0	10.4	18.5	31,523	30.2
Iowa	192.01	44.3	22.7	11.4	20.6	14,776	21.6
Kansas	193.66	43.5	23.0	13.8	22.0	17,454	29.9
Kentucky	164.81	37.1	26.0	11.3	26.0	20,367	20.1
Louisiana	120.81	26.8	26.0	14.8	26.0	21,705	27.8
Maine	165.24	38.2	20.0	13.8	21.4	16,180	32.3
Maryland	183.17	33.9	26.0	15.9	26.0	37,233	32.6
Massachusetts	242.52	39.6	27.4	16.4	26.5	75,196	35.8
Michigan	219.13	37.6	22.0	11.2	20.4	87,626	27.2
Minnesota	226.66	43.7	23.2	14.2	21.4	33,125	28.9
Mississippi	132.30	33.5	23.8	11.8	22.4	15,817	27.1
Missouri	152.04	31.5	22.0	13.0	21.0	42,472	30.2
Montana	158.88	41.7	20.5	14.1	18.6	9,343	34.3
Nebraska	154.06	36.5	23.0	11.4	16.9	6,878	26.9
Nevada	189.35	37.7	23.0	13.7	22.6	17,149	32.3
New Hampshire	148.42	29.6	26.0	10.3	26.0	3,465	14.2
New Jersey	251.68	38.4	24.0	17.1	22.7	136,969	46.6
New Mexico	151.93	35.6	26.0	16.5	25.0	9,738	35.3
New York	207.02	31.2	26.0	19.5	26.0	247,208	42.5

North Carolina	187.78	40.7	24.0	8.5	21.7	31,468	16.2
North Dakota	165.23	42.9	19.5	12.1	16.2	4,889	35.6
Ohio	195.13	38.3	26.0	13.9	25.0	62,392	25.1
Oklahoma	172.18	40.5	21.7	13.8	21.0	17,225	36.9
Oregon	182.63	37.6	25.0	15.7	25.0	45,584	33.2
Pennsylvania	217.60	41.2	26.0	16.4	26.0	133,881	29.5
Puerto Rico	91.03	31.2	20.0	19.0	20.0	66,798	50.9
Rhode Island	224.49	45.0	21.2	15.3	19.7	24,481	42.7
South Carolina	159.61	36.3	23.3	10.8	21.3	23,953	24.6
South Dakota	143.79	38.7	24.7	10.3	22.6	808	10.7
Tennessee	149.30	31.8	22.0	11.0	22.5	43,115	29.2
Texas	186.81	36.8	21.0	15.4	20.2	164,562	44.8
Utah	191.24	43.5	21.0	11.6	18.9	8,145	27.4
Vermont	164.74	36.9	26.0	14.3	26.0	4,208	19.1
Virgin Islands	176.79	40.8	24.0	19.5	24.0	1,647	54.3
Virginia	169.69	34.1	21.2	10.7	20.5	29,618	26.4
Washington	203.52	39.4	26.0	18.5	24.5	82,307	34.7
West Virginia	170.23	38.5	26.0	13.9	26.0	12,813	23.1
Wisconsin	197.50	41.4	24.5	11.8	21.7	36,060	18.8
Wyoming	178.48	42.3	22.2	13.8	20.1	3,570	29.5

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.