

# Community Jobs Outcomes Assessment and Evaluation

---

## Appendix Table of Contents

<b>A: Methodology .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>B: Wage Data Tables .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>C: Survey Forms .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>D: Crosstabulation Table .....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>E: Focus Group Protocols .....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>F: Focus Group Attendance by Site .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>G: Community Jobs Scope of Work.....</b>	<b>69</b>



# Community Jobs Outcomes Assessment and Evaluation

---

## Appendix A: Methodology

The data for this analysis was generated from multiple sources, including unemployment insurance wage data, surveys, focus groups, and the CJ Management Information System (MIS). These multiple sources and types of data were selected to produce the diverse qualitative and quantitative data necessary to evaluate the Community Jobs Program.<sup>1</sup> The quantitative information is intended to clearly evaluate the employment and wage outcomes of the program. The qualitative data is intended to evaluate the program by telling the contextual story behind the quantitative data. Both types of data are useful in a continuous improvement process designed to improve outcomes for future CJ participants.

### Unemployment Insurance (UI) Wage Data

The UI data system provides payroll information that all employers covered by unemployment insurance must report on a quarterly basis. Information for this assessment was collected on the employment pattern and wages reported for the quarter that an individual left Community Jobs and the quarters thereafter. The information was compiled in a database and analyzed (see the Outcomes section of this report). The researchers received all data with no identifying information.

The UI system incorporates a two-quarter lag in reporting. Because Community Jobs has only been in operation for two years and because of the nine months of program duration, wage data could only be reported for participants who left or completed CJ and began employment during the third quarter of 1998 through the first quarter of 2000.

UI wage data was analyzed for the participants served by the five Phase I contractors who offer CJ in the following areas: 1) King County, 2) Pierce County, 3) Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties, 4) Spokane, Ferry, Stevens, Pend Orielle, and Okanagon Counties, and 5) Thurston, Lewis and Mason counties. Only these five contractors had been in operation long enough to graduate participants who could have worked for a full year after leaving the program. Data from these early graduates allow analysis of wage progression and employment patterns over time. In addition, these five contractors represent both rural and urban areas with varied regional economic trends and employment opportunities.

These five Phase I Community Jobs contractors submitted the names, social security numbers, and the date of program exit for all participants that exited Community Jobs from the start of the program in July 1998 through August 2000. A total of 1406 names were submitted and of these 922 were matched in the UI system.<sup>2</sup> The two-quarter lag in UI reporting resulted in wage data being available for only the individuals who exited CJ through the first quarter of 2000 - 728 of the 922 individuals originally matched in the UI system. UI wage data then enabled analysis of the post-CJ employment status, number of jobs, and wages for these participants on a quarterly basis.

There were several limitations to how the data was reported that resulted in the exclusion of important outcome measures. A reason for leaving Community Jobs was not provided by all the contractors<sup>3</sup>; therefore no analysis could be conducted on the wages of those completing the CJ experience compared with those who left the program for any reason. This analysis should be conducted in the future. The data also did not include the type of employer providing the wages, therefore no conclusions could be drawn about the type of industries CJ graduates are entering. Employers are classified by industry group at Employment Security, and this information should be incorporated in future outcome evaluations. Inherent difficulties exist in the UI system for reporting hours worked for each quarter of wages reported. To the extent that this problem can be mitigated a future evaluation should also attempt to determine the full-time/part-time nature of work for participants after exiting CJ as well as hourly wages.

## Surveys

Surveys were designed to gather important qualitative data from participants and worksites. Survey questions were generally designed to assess the perception of program quality and job readiness of participants.

Three types of surveys were developed to achieve this goal: worksite supervisor surveys, participant six-month surveys, and participant exit surveys.<sup>4</sup> These survey types were designed to coordinate with the contractor payment points already in place for the CJ program. By coordinating survey distribution with receipt of payment points, this strategy attempted to survey as large a participant and worksite group as possible.<sup>5</sup>

These three types of surveys were distributed to all 17 Community Jobs contractors beginning in February 2000. At the outset of the assessment process contractors were provided a packet that included:

- A memo explaining the purpose and nature of the assessment
- A set of instructions for appropriately distributing surveys
- Verification forms to document completion of the surveys while insuring confidentiality for respondents
- OTED self-addressed envelopes so survey respondents could mail surveys or return them to the contractor in a sealed envelope
- Hard-copy and disk survey forms

Due to contractor, worksite, and administrator concerns that the reading level of surveys was too complex, a decision was made to redesign the participant surveys. The revised six month and exit participant surveys were introduced to contractors in March and April 2000 during five regional CJ trainings.<sup>6</sup> Only the results from the revised survey are presented and analyzed in this evaluation.<sup>7</sup>

The surveys included two types of questions designed to gather qualitative information about worksite supervisor and participant experiences with CJ:

1. Specific, closed ended questions with a defined list of four or five answers from which to choose. This question type focuses the respondent on answering questions about a particular aspect of a CJ component.<sup>8</sup>
2. Open-ended questions with blank spaces for comments. This type allows the respondent to answer broader questions about CJ components in whatever way they choose.

*Confidentiality:* The assessment process attempted to prevent contractors from seeing any surveys directly to avoid influencing respondent answers. Contractors were provided the materials and instructed to ensure confidentiality to the participant and worksite supervisor during the administration of the surveys. Both participants and administrators were asked to seal their completed surveys in the self-addressed stamped envelopes provided that were sent directly to the OTED Community Jobs administrators. In addition, both groups were asked to sign verification forms to be submitted to their contractor to record the completion of the assessment.

**Survey Totals** There were 57 six-month surveys and 68 exit surveys submitted by contractors. Participants may have completed both six month and participant surveys. As identifying number or names were not included, it is impossible to determine if there was overlap in the responses. There were 136 worksite supervisor surveys submitted by contractors.

Surveys were received from 13 of the 17 contractors (77%). Because of the survey participation rate and the incomplete contractor representation, these findings may not be representative of all of the CJ participants and supervisors.<sup>9</sup> They do, however, provide an important look at how these supervisors and participants view key CJ components.

### **Worksite Surveys**

Contractors distributed worksite surveys to worksite supervisors at the time their CJ participant reached six months or exited CJ. The survey included two major sections 1) working with Community Jobs contractor and 2) working with the Community Jobs participant. Questions about the CJ contractor were designed to address the quality of the relationship and communication between the worksite supervisor and the CJ contractor.

### **Participant Six-Month and Exit Surveys**

The participant six-month survey was to be administered to every participant after they had been working six months in the CJ program. This point in time was chosen because six months of participation marked a substantial enough length of time in the program to answer questions about the experience but allowed sufficient time for a changed perspective at the time of exit. Contractors were authorized to utilize support services funding to aid participants with low literacy levels, low English proficiency, or other needed accommodations in completing the written survey format.

Questions in the six-month survey were divided into five main sections:

- 1) working with the CJ practitioner;
- 2) questions about the worksite;
- 3) questions about participant's Individual Development Plan;

- 4) readiness for employment; and
- 5) overall program ratings and comments.

The exit survey was administered to CJ participants at any point they left the program. In order to be able to compare findings at the six month and exit points, the exit survey included all of the questions found in the six-month survey. In addition, it also included a short set of questions designed to address future employment and plans for self-support.

## **Focus Groups**

A total of 13 focus groups were conducted over the course of 5 months beginning January 2000 and ending in May 2000. The focus group strategy was designed to gather qualitative data from key CJ stakeholders in the field that operate in diverse areas throughout the State.<sup>10</sup>

Six focus group sites were selected as a representative mix of Phase I and Phase II<sup>11</sup> CJ contractors, smaller and larger sites as well as rural and urban: Bellingham (Northwest Development Council), Spokane (Career Path Services), Tacoma (Tacoma Pierce County Employment and Training Consortium), Walla Walla (Blue Mountain Action Council), Wenatchee (Chelan Douglas Community Action Center), Everett (Service Alternatives for Washington). At each of these locations, with the exception of Wenatchee<sup>12</sup>, one focus group was held with DSHS case managers and one with CJ worksite supervisors. Participant focus groups were also conducted at two locations: Bellingham and Everett.

Protocols for the focus group discussions are provided in Appendix D. Questions were designed to both ascertain program quality and focus on previously identified concerns for CJ in the following areas:

- Overall experience and reaction to Community Jobs
- Perception of the quality of service received from CJ contractors
- Quality of work experience
- Ability of CJ to prepare individuals for work

Within the focus groups, participants, supervisors and DSHS case managers were able to have a conversation about their experiences with CJ. Although there were specific questions asked within each group, this more flexible and interactive dynamic elicited a different type of qualitative information than what is gathered through surveys.

## **CJ Management Information System (MIS) Data**

The CJ Management Information System (MIS) serves as the primary database for the Community Jobs program and is operated by the OTED Community Jobs staff. This database includes information on all participants who have entered the Community Jobs program and provided the overall demographic information to describe the population. MIS also supplied the identifying numbers and dates of participation in the program for all participants to determine participation rates for the survey and the information needed to request Unemployment Insurance (UI) Wage Data.<sup>13</sup>

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the concerns presented in this text, please contact the Economic Opportunity Institute for an exhaustive discussion of possible limitations of the data.

<sup>2</sup> Approximately 85% of all employees are covered under unemployment insurance. Therefore, this discrepancy may be because individuals are employed but not covered by UI, unemployed, employed in the underground economy, or error in reporting social security numbers. Please see Appendix B for complete UI wage data tables.

<sup>3</sup> Pierce County did not include codes indicating the reason participants left CJ.

<sup>4</sup> Please see Appendix B for survey questionnaires.

<sup>5</sup> Random selection strategy for respondents was not possible at this time. There also was not an appropriate control group available for comparison.

<sup>6</sup> At this time, EOI staff provided training for how to implement all three types of surveys, clarified the reasons for revision, and answered questions. In addition, new hard copy and disk forms of the survey were sent to all of the contractors. The instructions for implementing the survey remained the same.

<sup>7</sup> For the purposes of this assessment, results from the first version of the participant six-month survey have been discarded and will not be discussed. For copies of the original survey forms, please contact the Economic Opportunity Institute.

<sup>8</sup> Closed-ended survey questions from the worksite supervisor surveys were designed using a five point Likert Scale of strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree. When presenting findings, agree and strongly agree are considered positive responses, neutral is considered a neutral response, and disagree and strongly disagree are considered negative responses. Many closed ended questions in the participant surveys were asked using a five point Likert Scale for answers. For these questions, responses were categorized into positive, neutral, and negative responses. Full text of surveys are available in Appendix B.

<sup>9</sup> As many as 1297 people could have completed a six month or exit survey during the implementation period, this total represents a 10% participation rate for participants.

<sup>10</sup> Please see Appendix D for focus group protocols and Appendix E for focus group attendance information.

<sup>11</sup> Please see the Community Jobs Program Overview section for an explanation of the development of the CJ program.

<sup>12</sup> The Wenatchee DSHS office declined to be included in the focus group strategy.

<sup>13</sup> EOI and Northwest Policy Center staff maintain strict confidentiality with the data provided through the MIS system.

# Community Jobs Outcomes Assessment and Evaluation

---

## Appendix B: Wage Data Tables

**Contractor 1:** King County

**Contractor 2:** Pierce County

**Contractor 3:** Grays Harbor and Pacific County

**Contractor 4:** Spokane, Ferry, Stevens, Pend Orielle, and Okanogan Counties

**Contractor 5:** Thurston, Lewis, and Mason Counties

**Table 1: Participants submitted, matched, and wage data collected by contractor**

	<b>Contractor 1</b>	<b>Contractor 2</b>	<b>Contractor 3</b>	<b>Contractor 4</b>	<b>Contractor 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Participants submitted</b>						
	<b>174</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>1406</b>
<b>Participants matched in UI System</b>						
Count	158	232	219	213	100	<b>922</b>
Percent of those submitted	91%	77%	62%	70%	36%	<b>66%</b>
<b>Participants with wage data available through 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2000<sup>1</sup></b>						
Count	123	227	155	151	72	<b>728</b>
Percent of those submitted	71%	76%	44%	50%	26%	<b>52%</b>

---

<sup>1</sup> Wage data was only available for participants that completed CJ before April 2000. Second and third quarters of 2000 completions were too recent for wage data to be submitted.

**Table 2: Employment and number of jobs for participants with wage data available**

	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3	Contractor 4	Contractor 5	TOTAL
<b>Participants with wage data available</b>						
	123	227	155	151	72	728
<b>Participants employed<sup>2</sup></b>						
Count	112	136	98	90	43	479
Percent of those with wage data	91%	60%	63%	60%	60%	66%
<b>One job<sup>3</sup></b>						
Count	70	100	76	63	38	347
Percent of those employed	63%	74%	78%	70%	88%	72%
<b>More than one job<sup>4</sup></b>						
Count	42	36	22	27	5	132
Percent of those employed	38%	26%	22%	30%	12%	28%

**Table 3: Fourth qtr. and continuous employment for participants who could have worked for at least 1 year**

	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3	Contractor 4	Contractor 5	TOTAL
<b>Participants that could have worked for one year<sup>5</sup></b>						
	59	45	53	48	11	216
<b>Worked in the fourth quarter</b>						
Count	31	28	27	24	5	115
Percent of those who could work one year	53%	62%	51%	50%	45%	53%
<b>Worked four quarters continuously</b>						
Count	19	16	15	12	2	64
Percent of those who could work one year	32%	36%	28%	25%	18%	30%

<sup>2</sup> Participants were employed during at least one quarter.

<sup>3</sup> According to the UI wage data, these participants held only one job during any quarter they worked.

<sup>4</sup> According to the UI wage data, these participants held more than one job during at least one of the quarters they worked.

<sup>5</sup> Only participants that left CJ in the second quarter of 1999 and before could have four quarters of wages reported.

**Table 4: First quarter of post-CJ employment for participants who could have worked for at least one year**

	<b>Contractor 1</b>	<b>Contractor 2</b>	<b>Contractor 3</b>	<b>Contractor 4</b>	<b>Contractor 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Participants who could have worked for one year<sup>6</sup></b>						
	<b>59</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>216</b>
<b>Did not work</b>						
Count	7	3	7	4	2	<b>23</b>
Percent of those who could work one year	12%	7%	13%	8%	18%	<b>11%</b>
<b>Began working in the 1st quarter</b>						
Count	46	22	25	21	5	<b>119</b>
Percent of those who could work one year	78%	49%	47%	44%	45%	<b>55%</b>
<b>Began working in the 2nd quarter</b>						
Count	3	11	12	17	3	<b>46</b>
Percent of those who could work one year	5%	24%	23%	35%	27%	<b>21%</b>
<b>Began working in the 3rd quarter</b>						
Count	2	4	5	4	1	<b>16</b>
Percent of those who could work one year	3%	9%	9%	8%	9%	<b>7%</b>
<b>Began working in the 4th quarter or after</b>						
Count	1	5	4	2	0	<b>12</b>
Percent of those who could work one year	2%	11%	8%	4%	0%	<b>6%</b>

<sup>6</sup> Only participants that left CJ in the second quarter of 1999 and before could have four quarters of wages reported.

**Table 5: Percent of post-CJ time worked for participants who could have worked for at least one year<sup>7</sup>**

	Contractor 1	Contractor 2	Contractor 3	Contractor 4	Contractor 5	TOTAL
<b>Participants who could have worked for one year<sup>8</sup></b>						
	59	45	53	48	11	216
<b>Did not work</b>						
Count	7	3	7	4	2	23
Percent of those who could work one year	12%	7%	13%	8%	18%	11%
<b>Worked up to one-third (33%) of the time after CJ</b>						
Count	10	10	13	8	1	42
Percent of those who could work one year	17%	22%	25%	17%	9%	19%
<b>Worked between one and two-thirds (34 - 67%) of the time after CJ</b>						
Count	12	7	16	14	4	53
Percent of those who could work one year	20%	16%	30%	29%	36%	25%
<b>Worked more than two-thirds (67 - 100%) of the time after CJ</b>						
Count	30	25	17	22	4	98
Percent of those who could work one year	51%	56%	32%	46%	36%	45%

<sup>7</sup> Percent of time worked after CJ is computed relative to the participants' exit dates from the program. This figure is a proportion based on the number of quarters with wages out of the number of quarters they could have worked from their program exit dates through the first quarter of 2000 (the last quarter for which UI data was available.)

<sup>8</sup> Only participants that left CJ in the second quarter of 1999 and before could have four quarters of wages reported.

**Table 6: Participants earning over \$2500 for the first four quarters**

	<b>Contractor 1</b>	<b>Contractor 2</b>	<b>Contractor 3</b>	<b>Contractor 4</b>	<b>Contractor 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Worked in the first quarter<sup>9</sup></b>						
	<b>103</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>352</b>
<b>Earning more than \$2500 in first quarter</b>						
Count	10	16	5	7	5	<b>43</b>
Percent of those working in 1 <sup>st</sup> qtr	10%	17%	7%	13%	16%	<b>12%</b>
<b>Worked in the second quarter<sup>10</sup></b>						
	<b>59</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>281</b>
<b>Earning more than \$2500 in second quarter</b>						
Count	17	30	14	19	10	<b>90</b>
Percent of those working 2 <sup>nd</sup> qtr	29%	40%	24%	31%	37%	<b>32%</b>
<b>Worked in the third quarter<sup>11</sup></b>						
	<b>43</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>188</b>
<b>Earning more than \$2500 in third quarter</b>						
Count	15	24	10	15	8	<b>72</b>
Percent of those working in 3 <sup>rd</sup> qtr	35%	53%	23%	34%	62%	<b>38%</b>
<b>Worked in the fourth quarter<sup>12</sup></b>						
	<b>31</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>Earning more than \$2500 in fourth quarter</b>						
Count	10	17	6	11	3	<b>47</b>
Percent of those working 4 <sup>th</sup> qtr	32%	61%	22%	46%	60%	<b>41%</b>

<sup>9</sup> In order to have wage data reported, participants must have worked in their first quarter and left CJ during the first quarter of 2000 or before.

<sup>10</sup> In order to have wage data reported, participants must have worked in their second quarter and left CJ during the fourth quarter of 1999 or before.

<sup>11</sup> In order to have wage data reported, participants must have worked in their third quarter and left CJ during the third quarter of 1999 or before.

<sup>12</sup> In order to have wage data reported, participants must have worked in their fourth quarter and left CJ during the second quarter of 1999 or before.

**Table 7: Mean wages for the first four quarters by contractor**

	<b>Contractor 1</b>	<b>Contractor 2</b>	<b>Contractor 3</b>	<b>Contractor 4</b>	<b>Contractor 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>1st qtr.</b>	\$1,310	\$1,402	\$1,220	\$1,007	\$1,450	\$1,285
<b>2nd qtr.</b>	\$1,786	\$2,157	\$1,758	\$1,766	\$3,382	\$2,028
<b>3rd qtr.</b>	\$1,788	\$2,519	\$1,754	\$2,125	\$2,825	\$2,106
<b>4th qtr.</b>	\$2,141	\$2,936	\$1,709	\$2,353	\$3,081	\$2,318

**Table 8: Median Wages for first four quarters by contractor**

	<b>Contractor 1</b>	<b>Contractor 2</b>	<b>Contractor 3</b>	<b>Contractor 4</b>	<b>Contractor 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>1st qtr.</b>	\$1,140	\$958	\$796	\$516	\$956	\$914
<b>2nd qtr.</b>	\$1,160	\$2,078	\$ 1,597	\$ 1,430	\$ 1,317	\$1,571
<b>3rd qtr.</b>	\$1,359	\$2,854	\$ 1,473	\$ 1,613	\$ 3,300	\$1,724
<b>4th qtr.</b>	\$1,916	\$3,163	\$ 1,142	\$ 2,153	\$ 2,909	\$2,172

**Table 9: Mean wages for participants who worked at least four consecutive quarters**

	<b>Contractor 1</b>	<b>Contractor 2</b>	<b>Contractor 3</b>	<b>Contractor 4</b>	<b>Contractor 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>1st qtr.</b>	\$1,405	\$1,125	\$1,226	\$1,163	\$1,756	\$1,271
<b>2nd qtr.</b>	\$1,533	\$2,670	\$2,188	\$2,865	\$4,063	\$2,295
<b>3rd qtr.</b>	\$2,047	\$2,935	\$2,197	\$3,440	\$4,622	\$2,653
<b>4th qtr.</b>	\$2,762	\$3,487	\$2,261	\$2,118	\$4,979	\$2,774

**Table 10: Median wages for participants who worked at least four consecutive quarters**

	<b>Contractor 1</b>	<b>Contractor 2</b>	<b>Contractor 3</b>	<b>Contractor 4</b>	<b>Contractor 5</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>1st quarter</b>	\$1,470	\$962	\$976	\$929	\$1,756	\$1,179
<b>2nd quarter</b>	\$1,160	\$3,069	\$1,792	\$2,853	\$4,063	\$1,872
<b>3rd quarter</b>	\$2,012	\$3,101	\$1,659	\$2,785	\$4,622	\$2,448
<b>4th quarter</b>	\$2,256	\$3,633	\$1,990	\$1,739	\$4,979	\$2,413

# Community Jobs Outcomes Assessment and Evaluation

---

## Appendix C: Survey Forms

### Worksite Supervisor Survey<sup>1</sup>

#### Work with Community Jobs Contractor

Do you agree or disagree that you received adequate orientation and information at the start of your participation as a Community Jobs Host Worksite

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that you receive adequate support from the Community Jobs Contractor

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that you are in frequent contact with the Community Jobs Contractor?

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that the Community Jobs Contractor is quickly responsive to your concerns

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

What have your concerns been regarding the Community Jobs Contractor?

Other Comments?

#### Working with the Community Jobs Participant

Do you agree or disagree that the CJ participant is well matched with your organization?

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that participant difficulties at the worksite or in their personal lives are quickly addressed to facilitate learning in the workplace

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that you are able to adequately resolve issues with the CJ participant

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that you communicate frequently with the CJ participant

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that participants are well prepared and receive continuous support for adding value to your workplace.

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that the combination of work skills learned at your site and additional training is preparing participants well for unsubsidized work

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that CJ participants add value to your organization

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

Do you agree or disagree that concerns regarding CJ participants are responded to quickly

Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

What have been your concerns regarding CJ participants

What are your overall comments about the Community Jobs program?

How would you improve the program?

# Participant Survey Forms<sup>2</sup>

## Six Month Survey

Please fill out the survey below. The goal of this survey is to learn about the quality of your experience in Community Jobs. Information from this survey will be used to improve the program experience for you and for other Community Jobs participants. Thank you!

### Working with your Employment Specialist

Please think about your first meeting with your employment specialist (the person who worked with you at (name of CBO)).

1. How long did your first meeting last?

Less than an hour     1 hour     1-2 hours     Half a day     All day

2. After you first met with your Community Jobs employment specialist, how long was it before you started your first day of work on a job site?

During the first meeting     During the first week  
 During the second week     After the second week

3. Did you feel you were a partner in choosing your career interests and worksite?

Not at all     Somewhat  
 Very slightly a partner     Quite a bit     Definitely a partner

4. Do you feel that your employment specialist understands your needs and interests both for your employment and in other areas of your life?

Not at all     Understands a little     Understands  
 Understands well     Understands completely

5. Do you feel you were a partner in choosing other services to be provided for you and for creating a plan to achieve career goals?

Not at all     Somewhat a partner  
 Very slightly     Quite a bit     Definitely a partner

6. How often do you meet and/or talk to your employment specialist now?

Every month     Every week  
 Every other week     2-3 times a week     Daily

7. Do you feel that your employment specialist is working with you to provide a quality employment experience?

Not at all     Very slightly     Somewhat     Quite a bit     Definitely

8. How do you feel about talking with your employment specialist

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very difficult to talk to      | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes difficult to talk to | <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to talk to |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very easy to talk to           |  |

9. Do you feel your employment specialist is easy to contact and responds quickly to your needs?

- |   |
|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all easy to contact/ doesn't respond quickly          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes easy to contact/ sometimes doesn't respond quickly |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Usually easy to contact/usually responds quickly             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Always easy to contact/ always responds quickly              |

10. Comments about your employment specialist:

**Worksite**

11. Were you referred to any other Community Jobs worksites before you came to your current worksite?

- |                             |                              |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|

12. If you were sent to other sites that did not work out, please describe in the box below what happened and why you needed to leave that site:

13. Overall how satisfied are you with your current job

- |   |                                     |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very unhappy     | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unhappy | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied  | <input type="checkbox"/> Very satisfied |

14. How satisfied are you with your job duties

- |   |                                     |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very unhappy     | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unhappy | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfied  | <input type="checkbox"/> Very satisfied |

15. Do you feel your supervisor is providing opportunities to learn skills

- |   |                                     |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all         | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some opportunities | <input type="checkbox"/> Often      | <input type="checkbox"/> Very frequently |

16. How do you feel about talking with your supervisor

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very difficult to talk to      | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes difficult to talk to | <input type="checkbox"/> Easy to talk to |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very easy to talk to           |  |

17. Would you like to continue in this type of work

- YES  NO

18. Comments about your worksite and job:

### Individual Development Plan

19. Do you agree with the plan you signed to achieve your career goals?

- Completely disagree  No opinion  
 Disagree with parts of it  Agree with most of it  
 Agree with all of it

20. In this first six months of the program have you been actively working toward achieving the goals set in your plan both for employment and other life issues

- Not at all  Working on at least half of the goals  
 Working on a few of the goals  Working on two thirds of the goals  
 Working on all of the goals

### Readiness for Employment

21. Have you held a job in the past?

- Never had a job  A few different jobs for shorter lengths of time  
 Not for many years  I have worked continuously in the past

22. Has your Community Jobs experience helped you to get ready for employment?

- No, not at all  No opinion  
 Not very much  Yes, somewhat  Yes, definitely

23. Which aspects of the Community Jobs program have been the most helpful?

- Help and counsel provided by you employment specialist  
 Job experience  
 Help and advice provided by your worksite supervisor or co-workers  
 Training or education programs you participated in at the same time as your community job  
 Other (please describe in the box below)

**Overall**

24. Please rate your overall Community Jobs experience

poor

fair

good

very good

excellent

25. What did you like about this experience?

26. How do you feel your experience could be improved?

## Exit Survey

The Exit Survey contained all of the questions included in the Six Month Survey with the addition of the following four questions. These questions were inserted after question number 23, and became questions 24 – 27. The Overall section of the Six Month Survey (formerly questions 24 – 26) followed these questions in the survey format and were renumbered questions 28 – 30 for the Exit Survey.

**24.** Has your Community Jobs caseworker or your worksite supervisor helped you in searching for a permanent job?

- Not at all
- A little
- In several ways
- In quite a few ways
- Very often and thoroughly

**25.** Do you have a job lined up right now?

- Yes
- No

**26.** Do you have a plan and any necessary help with things like childcare or transportation that might make it difficult for you to get to a job regularly and on time?

- Yes
- No

**27.** What do you feel you need right now to be successful in finding and keeping a job that Community Jobs has not helped you with? (Please describe what you need in the box below)

---

<sup>1</sup> Only one version of this survey was implemented during the evaluation. All worksite supervisor survey results presented within the report were gathered using this instrument.

<sup>2</sup> This is the revised version of the six month survey used in the evaluation. Participant results presented within the report were gathered using these revised six month and exit participant survey instruments.

# Community Jobs Outcomes Assessment and Evaluation

---

## Appendix D: Cross-tabulation Table

Table 1: Cross-tabulation of Participant Overall CJ Experience and Post-CJ Job

		Overall CJ experience					Total
		Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	
Have job lined up now?	No	1	3	2	13	11	<b>30</b>
	Yes	2		3	9	8	<b>22</b>
	Total	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>52</b>

# Community Jobs Outcomes Assessment and Evaluation

---

## Appendix E: Focus Group Protocols

### DSHS Focus Group Protocol

**Goals:** To obtain information on both the DSHS process for implementing the Community Jobs program and the perceived effectiveness of the program in meeting DSHS goals for Community Jobs participants.

**Timeline and Process:** The evaluation process will involve meetings with small groups of case managers at 6 DSHS Community Service Offices who are placing TANF clients in the Community Jobs programs. These meetings will be scheduled approximately one per month beginning in January 2000. If possible, the timing of the meetings will be coordinated with worksite supervisor and Community Jobs participant focus groups.

At each meeting, case managers who regularly refer clients to Community Jobs should be convened for a 2 hour discussion. This session should be held at the CSO if possible to minimize the time required of case managers. It can be scheduled at a time in the day most convenient for the CSO. The evaluation team of Paul Sommers of the University of Washington and Annette Case of the Economic Opportunity Institute would ideally meet with case managers only. All discussions would be kept confidential; that is no individual case managers of Community Jobs clients would be identified in the summary of the discussions drafted by Sommers and Case and sent back to the Community Jobs office. Unless very unusual and significant issues are raised at particular CSOs, the report will reflect discussions held at all five CSOs rather than each office individually.

### Questions:

#### **General**

Please tell me what you know about Community Jobs and how it operates?

What has your involvement been with the program?

Please tell us how you feel about the process of working on CJ with issues such as prospective budgeting, referral, completion, etc.

#### **Client Related Questions**

How do you select TANF clients for referral to Community Jobs?

How do you talk with participants about Community Jobs?

Please tell us about your relationship with your Community Jobs participants?

How do you feel participants fare during their experience in Community Jobs?

How well do you feel the program prepares individuals for unsubsidized employment?

**Contractor Questions**

Please tell us about your relationship with the Community Jobs contractor?

Have you had clients referred back by the contractor, and if so, is it clear why?

Is there anything you or the contractor could do to minimize refer-backs?

Does the contractor make timely decisions about clients you have referred?

Are you pleased with the types of job placements contractors are arranging for your clients?

Does the contractor keep you adequately informed about what is going on with your clients while they are in Community Jobs?

Are there any problems in your working relationship with the contractor?

Please tell us your general experience about what happens with participants at the end of their Community Jobs experience?

Are your clients succeeding in getting unsubsidized employment?

Do your clients require continuing services from DSHS after they get an unsubsidized job?

Is ESD providing appropriate assistance to your clients as they re-enter the job market?

**Summary**

Overall please tell us your impressions of the program – What is positive and what is not?

What do you think would improve the program?

## **Community Jobs Worksites**

**Goals:** To evaluate worksite quality as well as perceived effectiveness of the Community Jobs program.

**Timeline and Process :** Worksites in five of the local communities hosting Community Jobs participants will participate. One site visit will be conducted each month beginning January 2000. At each of these sites, the local Community Jobs contractor will be asked to convene a group of 5-10 worksite supervisors who have supervised one or more Community Jobs participant. A 2-3 hour focus group will be convened, in the contractor's offices if possible, or in other space arranged by the contractor or the evaluation team.

Contractor staff and Community Jobs staff will not participate in these sessions. The participants in the meeting will be the evaluation team, consisting of Paul Sommers of the University of Washington and Annette Case of the Economic Opportunity Institute, plus the worksite supervisors. All of the discussions at these meetings will be kept confidential; that is no specific names of organizations or individuals will be communicated back to the local contractor or the CJ program in Olympia. A summary report reflection the evaluation team's summary of the major issues raised in the discussions will be drafted and sent to both the local contractor and the CJ program office.

### **Questions:**

How long have you been working with the Community Jobs Program?

How many Community Jobs participants have you hosted at this worksite?

What kinds of jobs have they performed?

Have you been happy with their performance?

What sorts of problems arose and how did you deal with them?

Did you need support from the CJ contractor in resolving these problems, if so did you receive adequate support?

Please tell us about your relationship with the CJ contractor (including orientation to the program and its participants, training, support, and frequency of communication).

Do you offer training aside from the day-to-day work at the site, if so please describe the training?

How well do you feel CJ prepares individuals for unsubsidized employment?

Do you feel you benefit from the work of the CJ participant?

Would you hire this individual, why or why not?

What are your overall impressions of CJ – what is working and what is not?

How would you improve the program?

## Community Jobs Participants

**Goals:** To evaluate program quality as well as perceived effectiveness of the Community Jobs program.

**Timeline and Process:** Participants in two of the local communities hosting Community Jobs participants will be involved in the focus groups. At each of these sites, the local Community Jobs contractor will be asked to convene a group of 5-10 CJ participants who have been actively involved in the program for at least one month. A 2 hour focus group will be convened, in the contractor's offices if possible, or in other space arranged by the contractor or the evaluation team.

Contractor staff and Community Jobs staff will not participate in these sessions. The participants in the meeting will be the evaluation team, consisting of Paul Sommers of the University of Washington and Annette Case of the Economic Opportunity Institute, plus the CJ Participants. All of the discussions at these meetings will be kept confidential; that is no specific names will be communicated back to the local contractor or the CJ program in Olympia. A summary report reflecting the evaluation team's summary of the major issues raised in the discussions will be drafted and sent to both the local contractor and the CJ program office, as well as included in the program evaluation.

## Questions

How long have you been in Community Jobs?

Please talk about the events that led you to be in CJ (referral process)?

Please talk about your employment specialist

How often do you talk with them or see them

Are you comfortable talking with them?

Do you feel they provide you with all the support necessary to succeed in the program and obtain employment?

Where do you work?

What are your job duties?

Do you enjoy your work, does it match your interests

How do you feel about your supervisor?

Do you feel comfortable talking to them?

Do you feel supported by them in your work?

If there have been difficulties at your worksite does your employment specialist help you with them?

Has your employment specialist told you about training opportunities?

Have you participated in any type of additional educational, training, or activity on top of your work with CJ?

Would you want to work more hours or fewer hours?

Are there other activities you think would be more helpful, if so what are they and has your employment specialists talked about them with you?

Do you feel like this program is helping you in terms of gaining skills and good experience?

Do you feel like this program will be helpful for gaining permanent employment?

Has job search been helpful?

What do you like most about the program?

What do you like least about the program?

What would you change about the program?

# Community Jobs Outcomes Assessment and Evaluation

---

## Appendix F: Focus Group Attendance by Site

### 1. Walla Walla --- February 15, 2000

DSHS Case Managers: 5 attended

Worksite Supervisors: 7 attended

### 2. Spokane --- February 16, 2000

DSHS Case Managers: 12 attended

Worksite Supervisors: 6 attended

### 3. Chelan Douglas --- March 7, 2000

Worksite Supervisors: 10 attended

### 4. Pierce --- April 13, 2000

DSHS Case Managers: 13 attended

Worksite Supervisors: 8 attended

### 5. Bellingham --- May 10, 2000

DSHS Case Managers: 20 attended

Worksite Supervisors: 8 attended

Participants: 7 attended

### 6. Snohomish --- May 11, 2000

DSHS Case Managers: 8 attended

Worksite Supervisors: 6 attended

Participants: 5 attended

# Community Jobs Outcomes Assessment and Evaluation

---

## Appendix G: Community Jobs Scope of Work

This scope of work was developed by the Community Jobs Program, Office of Trade and Economic Development. The scope of work defines the program requirements for the CJ Contractors.

<b>ACTIVITY/TASKS</b>
-----------------------

### Administrative/Management Development

Provide administrative and management of project
Establish participant payroll system and Management Information System
Track and monitor participants', employers' and contract components
Submit completed invoice including documentation of: Wages and Benefits, Support Services and Management Information System data by the 10 <sup>th</sup> of each month
Market and outreach to local Community Services Offices, Work First Participants, Employment Security, Community/Technical Colleges and Non profit, Tribal and Government agency employers

### Participant Engagement and IDP Development

Receive DSHS/Referral, Signed Participant Individual Responsibility Plan and Participant Employability Evaluation
Notify DSHS WorkFirst case manager of participant/referral status within ten days of receipt of referral
Engage and assess participants, to include but not limited to, skill level and workplace behavior
Identify barriers and develop plan for removal or reduction
Orient participant to Community Jobs program elements, including Wages, TANF disregards, program expectations and policies.
Initiate Readiness to Participate and/or Behavioral Management Services as needed
Negotiate job activity and worksite
<b><i>Identify and initiate interpersonal and/or vocational training goals both on the job and off the job, including CTC, ABE, GED, ESL, etc</i></b>
<b><i>Develop &amp; sign Individual Development Plan</i></b>
<b><i>Forward copy of Individual Development Plan to DSHS WorkFirst case manager</i></b>

## **Worksite Development and Participant Enrollment**

Negotiate job activity and host work-site
Develop job descriptions for/with work site supervisors and participants
Sign Worksite agreements with participants, host work-site supervisor and Community Jobs Practitioner
Update training and support materials for/with host work-site employers
<b><i>Establish each participant on payroll</i></b>
Enroll participants and send WorkFirst case manager an Enrollment Confirmation form.
<b><i>Provide frequent and regular contact with participant through intensive case management services</i></b>

## **Participant 6 Months Benchmark, Review and update IDP or Early Completion Due to Unsubsidized Employment**

Review, and update Individual Development Plan at six month bench mark
Document significant progress in Individual Development Plan goals
Participant completes "customer satisfaction" survey
Host work-sites/employers complete "customer satisfaction" survey
Encourage and support job search activities with/for participants throughout the remainder of Community Jobs assignment
If early completion due to unsubsidized employment refer to final payment point requirements

## **Completion of CJ program or Early Completion Due to Unsubsidized Employment**

Complete Individual Development Plan goals
Assist in unsubsidized employment
Achieve satisfactory participant evaluation
Achieve strong level of community satisfaction

## Community Jobs Standards

### **Participants File Contents**

Participants file contents shall include but not limited to:

DSHS Referral Form

Referral Response Form

Enrollment Conformation Form

Signed Individual Responsibility Form

(participant and WorkFirst Case Manager/Social Worker)

Signed Individual Development Plan

(participant and Community Jobs practitioner)

Signed Work-site Agreement

(Participant, Community Jobs Practitioner and host site employer)

### **Participants Assessments**

### **Support Services Log and Documentation**

Monthly Attendance/ Activity Documentation

Copy of Time Cards

Monthly (or more frequent) participant evaluation

### **Emergency/Sick /Personnel Leave**

Shall be made available to each Community Jobs Participant as follows

- 20 hours shall be automatically awarded on date of enrollment
- 8 hours shall accrue each month there after
- Any unused accrued leave shall not be paid out to the participant at the end of Community Jobs assignment

### *Monthly Status Reports*

### **Contractors shall report status of each participant monthly to**

- **DSHS WorkFirst case manager, using locally agreed format**
- **Community, Trade and Economic Development -Community Jobs**

### **Support Services**

Contractors will provide support services such as assistance with transportation, work clothing and other work preparation expenses to enrolled Community Jobs participants (following DSHS guidelines) When exception is required Contractor shall request exception from CTED Community Jobs staff

### **Advanced Earned Income Credit**

Contractors and partners are required to participate in the Advanced Earned Income Tax Credit program and encourage CJ participants to enroll

### **Community Jobs Participant Work Hours**

All Community Jobs participants shall not exceed twenty hours per week on the job. Any request for hours to exceed twenty must have prior approval from CTED Community Jobs staff.

### **Host Work-site Visits**

Contractor and partners are required to conduct monthly or more frequent site visits

Filename: CJAppendices2000.doc  
Directory: C:\Program Files\Adobe\Acrobat  
4.0\Acrobat\plug\_ins\OpenAll\Transform\temp  
Template: C:\WINDOWS\Application Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot  
Title: Introduction  
Subject:  
Author: annette  
Keywords:  
Comments:  
Creation Date: 9/25/00 3:25 PM  
Change Number: 2  
Last Saved On: 9/25/00 3:25 PM  
Last Saved By: Maria Sanders  
Total Editing Time: 2 Minutes  
Last Printed On: 9/25/00 5:00 PM  
As of Last Complete Printing  
Number of Pages: 31  
Number of Words: 6,637 (approx.)  
Number of Characters: 33,850 (approx.)