

Department of Health and Human Services

**OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL**

**PARTICIPANTS RATE THE JOBS
PROGRAM 1994**



**JUNE GIBBS BROWN
Inspector General**

**MARCH 1995
OEI-06-93-00560**

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The mission of the Office of Inspector General (OIG), as mandated by Public Law 95-452, as amended, is to protect the integrity of the Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) programs as well as the health and welfare of beneficiaries served by those programs. This statutory mission is carried out through a nationwide network of audits, investigations, and inspections conducted by three OIG operating components: the Office of Audit Services, the Office of Investigations, and the Office of Evaluation and Inspections. The OIG also informs the Secretary of HHS of program and management problems and recommends courses to correct them.

OFFICE OF AUDIT SERVICES

The OIG's Office of Audit Services (OAS) provides all auditing services for HHS, either by conducting audits with its own audit resources or by overseeing audit work done by others. Audits examine the performance of HHS programs and/or its grantees and contractors in carrying out their respective responsibilities and are intended to provide independent assessments of HHS programs and operations in order to reduce waste, abuse, and mismanagement and to promote economy and efficiency throughout the Department.

OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

The OIG's Office of Investigations (OI) conducts criminal, civil, and administrative investigations of allegations of wrongdoing in HHS programs or to HHS beneficiaries and of unjust enrichment by providers. The investigative efforts of OI lead to criminal convictions, administrative sanctions, or civil money penalties. The OI also oversees State Medicaid fraud control units which investigate and prosecute fraud and patient abuse in the Medicaid program.

OFFICE OF EVALUATION AND INSPECTIONS

The OIG's Office of Evaluation and Inspections (OEI) conducts short-term management and program evaluations (called inspections) that focus on issues of concern to the Department, the Congress, and the public. The findings and recommendations contained in these inspection reports generate rapid, accurate, and up-to-date information on the efficiency, vulnerability, and effectiveness of departmental programs. This report was prepared in the Dallas regional office under the direction of Chester Slaughter, Acting Regional Inspector General. Project staff:

REGION

Elsie Chaisson
Carol Cockrell
Carolyn Neuwirth
Sarah Taylor

HEADQUARTERS

Ann O'Connor

For additional copies of this report, please contact the Dallas Regional Office at (214) 767-3310.

Department of Health and Human Services

**OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL**

**PARTICIPANTS RATE THE JOBS
PROGRAM 1994**



JUNE GIBBS BROWN
Inspector General

MARCH 1995
OEI-06-93-00560

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE

This report provides information about the experiences, opinions and attitudes of Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program participants.

BACKGROUND

The Family Support Act (P.L. 100-485) required all States to establish the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program to assure that needy families with children obtain the education, training and employment that will help them avoid long-term welfare dependency.

Between April and June 1994, we completed a total of 183 face-to-face interviews with participants who were located at eight sites: Eugene and Cottage Grove, Oregon; Minneapolis and Chisago, Minnesota; New Orleans and Hahnville, Louisiana; and, Wilmington and Georgetown, Delaware. Fifty-six participants had completed their participation in the JOBS program, 74 were currently active and, at that time, 53 had dropped out. This report reflects experiences with the JOBS program as seen from the unique perspective of the participants themselves.

This is our second report on this subject. We conducted a similar survey between October 1991 and February 1992 and issued a report, "Participants Rate the JOBS Program" (OEI-06-90-00150), in September 1993. In that survey we found a majority of the surveyed participants gave the JOBS program high ratings. They believed the program would help them get off welfare. Nevertheless, some respondents experienced problems and voiced complaints about insufficient information on program activities and services, not receiving needed support services, and unsatisfactory case manager services and attitudes.

FINDINGS

MOST OF THE PARTICIPANTS SURVEYED GAVE HIGH MARKS TO THE OVERALL 'JOBS' PROGRAM, ITS ACTIVITIES AND SUPPORT SERVICES.

As in our previous survey, a majority of the respondents gave the JOBS program high marks.

Seventy percent graded the overall JOBS program A or B.

Ninety-two percent said they would recommend the JOBS program to a family member or friend.

Sixty-nine percent believed the JOBS program would help them get off welfare.

Sixty-eight percent gave high grades to their case managers.

Respondents generally gave high grades to those JOBS program activities in which they participated and the support services they received: orientation, assessment, developing an employment/education plan, education, life skills training, job skills (vocational/technical) training, job search, transportation, child care, transitional child care and medical services.

NEVERTHELESS, MANY RESPONDENTS SAID THEY DID NOT RECEIVE, OR HAD PROBLEMS UTILIZING, NEEDED SERVICES AND EXPERIENCED WHAT THEY VIEWED AS SERIOUS PARTICIPATION PROBLEMS.

In the aggregate, over half of the respondents cited needed activities or support services which they did not receive. Services mentioned most often were transportation (34 percent), child care (21 percent), education (19 percent) and vocational/technical training (14 percent).

Sixty-eight percent said they experienced problems which affected their participation in and completion of the JOBS program. Out of the 145 people who answered this question, 48 percent reported there were times they felt like dropping out of the program.

Approximately one out of every five participants cited problems in utilizing each of the following key services: transportation, child care and education or training. Problems cited included: access barriers, services not available when needed, breakdown in services, transition problems, difficulty paying for services and inadequate quality of training/education.

Eighty percent suggested needed improvements to achieve self-sufficiency and improve support services, e.g., more emphasis should be placed on education and training.

AGENCY COMMENTS

We reviewed our report at an exit conference with staff from the Administration For Children and Families. They provided informal comments and requested additional information. Some of their comments have been incorporated in this report; some of the additional information requested will be addressed in supplemental reports. Since this report contains no recommendations, it is being issued directly in final.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
INTRODUCTION	1
FINDINGS	4
● Participants' Rating of the JOBS Program	4
● Problems Experienced	8
CONCLUSIONS	13
 APPENDICES	
A: Methodology	A-1
B: Profile Of Survey Respondents	B-1
C: Participants' Grades for Activities, Services, Teachers and Case Managers	C-1

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

This report provides information about the experiences, opinions and attitudes of Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program participants.

BACKGROUND

The Family Support Act (P.L. 100-485) required all States to establish the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program to assure that needy families with children obtain the education, training and employment that will help them avoid long-term welfare dependency. To accomplish this, the JOBS program and related provisions of the Family Support Act are intended to: (1) encourage, assist and require applicants for and recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) to fulfill their responsibilities to support their children by preparing for, accepting, and retaining employment; (2) provide individuals with the opportunity to acquire the education and the skills necessary to qualify for employment; (3) provide necessary support services so that individuals can participate in JOBS. Additionally, states are required to provide transitional child care and transitional medical assistance to enable individuals who have completed JOBS to accept and retain employment; (4) promote coordination of services at all levels of government in order to make a wide range of services available, especially for individuals at risk of long-term welfare dependency; and (5) emphasize accountability for both participants and service providers.

Where State resources permit, all AFDC recipients living in a subdivision covered by a JOBS program and for whom the State IV-A (welfare) agency has guaranteed child care (in accordance with the provisions of the child care laws and regulations) shall be required to participate in JOBS unless the recipient is exempt from participation.

Federal regulations provide that a State JOBS program must include the following four components: (1) educational activity (which shall include high school or high school equivalency training; basic and remedial education that will provide a literacy level equivalent to at least grade 8.9, and education in English proficiency); (2) job skills training; (3) job readiness activities; and, (4) job development/job placement. States are also required to include at least two of the following components: (1) on-the-job training, (2) work supplementation, (3) community work experience, (4) group and individual job search. Additionally, under certain conditions, a state's JOBS program may include referral of a participant to post secondary education. States are required to guarantee child care, and provide transportation and other support services if the State agency determines these services are necessary for an individual in the family to accept employment, remain employed, or to participate in an education or training component. This is our second report on this subject. We conducted a similar survey between October 1991 and February 1992 and issued a report, "Participants Rate The JOBS

Program" (OEI-06-90-00150), in September 1993. In that survey we found a majority of the surveyed participants gave the JOBS program high ratings. They believed the program would help them get off welfare. Nevertheless, some respondents experienced problems and voiced complaints about insufficient information on program activities and services, not receiving needed support services, and unsatisfactory case manager services and attitudes.

METHODOLOGY

We contacted the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) program managers and solicited their input about sampling, methodological issues and the survey instrument that we had refined. We incorporated their suggestions, and we made the following decisions and took these actions regarding the methodology and sampling.

Between April and June 1994, we interviewed current and former JOBS participants in person, using telephone interviews as a last resort.

We selected a purposive sample of four states Oregon, Minnesota, Louisiana, and Delaware. State-level officials in each of our four states selected an urban site and a rural site. Local-level officials at each site sent us a list of JOBS program participants who completed the program (completers), dropped out of the program (dropouts), or were active in the program (actives). We drew independent random samples of completers, dropouts and actives at each site. At every urban site, we wanted fifteen participants in each status (for a total of 45). At every rural site, we wanted five participants in each status (for a total of 15). We were able to complete a total of 183 interviews which included 56 completers, 53 dropouts and 74 actives.

The findings from this study are purely descriptive and cannot be considered generalizable to any other JOBS program sites either within the sampled states or within non-sampled states. See Appendix A for more details.

Respondent Characteristics (See Appendix B for a more detailed profile.)

- Fifty-four percent were African American and 42 percent were white.
- Forty-one percent had children age three or younger.
- Sixty-seven percent had a high school diploma or more when they entered JOBS (45 percent had only a high school diploma).
- Twenty-four percent were self-initiators (i.e., participants who were already in an education or training activity before they entered the JOBS program).
- Sixty-one percent worked in the two years prior to their participating in the JOBS program. Their employment appeared stable, lasting an average of 14 months out of the 24 month period about which we inquired. Occupations were primarily clerical and service work (e.g., secretaries, fast-food restaurant cooks, janitors,

housekeepers at hotels and cashiers). The average hourly wage from employment was \$5.76.

- Before JOBS, only 17 percent had any type of job-related benefits; these were usually health or life insurance.
- At the time of the survey, 91 percent were receiving food stamps; 36 percent were receiving public housing assistance; and only 22 percent were receiving child support payments.

This report contains information on participants' understanding of the program's services and requirements, positive and negative experiences in the program, and suggestions for program improvement. This report reflects experiences with the JOBS program, as seen from the unique perspective of the participants themselves.

We conducted our study in accordance with the *Quality Standards for Inspections* issued by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

FINDINGS

MOST OF THE PARTICIPANTS SURVEYED GAVE HIGH MARKS TO THE OVERALL JOBS PROGRAM, ITS ACTIVITIES AND SUPPORT SERVICES.

A majority of the respondents (70 percent) gave the JOBS program high grades, as in our prior survey, "Participants Rate The JOBS Program" (OEI 06-90-00150).

We asked JOBS participants to give a grade of A, B, C, D or F to the JOBS program overall. As shown in table 1, of the 177 individuals who responded to the question, 70 percent graded the program A or B.

Since mandatory participants do not have a choice about participating in JOBS, we were especially interested in their attitudes towards the program. We found mandatory participants appeared to have positive feelings about the program, with 70 percent giving the program overall a grade of A or B. Further, 48 percent of the mandatory participants said they were participating in the JOBS program not only because this was required, but also to obtain education or training.

Table 1: JOBS Participants Gave High Marks To The JOBS Program

Factors Rated	Grades					
	A	B	C	D	F	n
JOBS Program Overall	33%	37%	23%	5%	2%	177
JOBS As A Means To Get Off Welfare	43%	26%	17%	9%	5%	176
Case Manager's Efforts To Assist Participants	44%	24%	18%	7%	7%	178

Ninety-two percent of the respondents said they would recommend the JOBS program to a family member or friend.

A majority of the respondents believed the JOBS program would help them get off welfare.

As shown in table 1, 69 percent of the respondents believed the JOBS program could help them get off welfare and graded the program's efforts A or B. A majority of the mandatory participants (68 percent) also believed the program could help them get off welfare.

More than two-thirds of the respondents gave high grades to their case managers.

As shown in table 1, 68 percent of the respondents graded the assistance provided by their case managers as A or B. When we asked participants what, or who, helped them the most to stay in or complete the JOBS program, 19 percent (26/138) cited the help received from their JOBS case manager.

Welfare benefits were greatly reduced for JOBS completers who were working when surveyed.

At the time of our survey 75 percent (42/56) of the completers reported they were currently employed and were either completely off AFDC (57 percent) or receiving a reduced grant (18 percent). Twenty-three percent (13/56), despite prior employment, were not working and had returned to AFDC. One completer was not working and was in the process of reapplying for AFDC. Fifteen percent of the completers reported they had not worked in the two years prior to participating in JOBS.

The post-JOBS employment of completers shows a sizeable gain in work-related benefits, plus a modest increase in average hourly wages.

As shown in table 2, the number of completers who were employed following JOBS and were receiving work-related benefits such as health and life insurance more than tripled, increasing from 6 to 22. Median hourly wages of post-JOBS employment increased by 23 percent, rising from \$5.00 to \$6.16 per hour. The median number of hours worked per week increased by two hours.

Table 2: JOBS Completers' Employment History

Employment Information	Pre-JOBS Employment ** (n = 35)	Post-JOBS Employment (n = 56)
Number of Participants With:		
One Job	16 (46%)	31 (55%)
Two Jobs	11 (31%)	23 (41%)
Three Jobs	6 (17%)	1 (2%)
Four Jobs	2 (6%)	1 (2%)
Number of Hours Worked Per Week*	37	39
Number of Months Employed*	24	10
Hourly Wage*	\$5.00	\$6.16
Participants With Work-Related Benefits	6 (17%)	22 (39%)

* Medians are shown because of the range of extreme values in this variable. For example, wages ranged from \$2.15 to \$20 an hour.

** Pre-JOBS Employment refers to respondents' work history two years prior to their participation in the JOBS program.

The number of individuals working 40 hours a week increased 14 percent after participating in JOBS. The most frequent types of occupations individuals obtained after participating in JOBS were clerical, building maintenance, janitorial, cashier, fast-food restaurant cook and nurse aide. Of those employed when surveyed, about half did not consider it likely that their employment would be permanent due to such reasons as the job pays low wages, the work is temporary in nature, the job does not provide medical benefits, and the participants' desire to obtain more education.

JOBS program completers who were working, and not receiving AFDC payments, continued to rely on some government services:

- Food Stamps 78 percent
- Transitional Medicaid 90 percent
- Housing Assistance 24 percent
- Transitional Child Care 39 percent

Dropouts were less educated, were more apt to have a history of welfare assistance, had fewer self-initiated plans, and experienced more service problems than completers. Their ratings of the overall JOBS program were noticeably lower than those of completers.

In our sample, 56 respondents were JOBS program completers and 53 were dropouts. Dropouts and completers had differences in background experiences which may have affected their program participation outcomes. Thirty percent of the dropouts had a history of welfare assistance (received AFDC as a child), versus 20 percent of the completers. Thirty-four percent of the dropouts, as contrasted with 18 percent of the completers, had less than a high school education. A higher proportion of completers (36 percent) than dropouts (15 percent) had self-initiated development plans. Further, dropouts' grades are noticeably lower than the grades given by completers as shown in table 3.

Table 3: Completers And Dropouts Gave Fairly High Marks To The JOBS Program

Activities	A	B	C	D	F	n
JOBS Program Overall						
Completers	37.0%	33.3%	25.9%	1.9%	1.9%	54
Dropouts	18.0%	34.0%	30.0%	14.0%	4.0%	50
JOBS As A Means To Get Off Welfare						
Completers	50.9%	18.9%	18.9%	5.7%	5.6%	53
Dropouts	32.7%	16.3%	18.4%	20.4%	12.2%	49
Case Manager's Efforts To Assist Participants						
Completers	46.3%	20.4%	20.3%	7.4%	5.6%	54
Dropouts	38.0%	22.0%	18.0%	6.0%	16.0%	50

Dropouts (54.9 percent), somewhat more than completers (50 percent), reported not receiving needed services. A higher proportion of dropouts (75 percent) than completers (35.7 percent) said their participation was limited because of not receiving needed services.

**Respondents generally gave high grades to those component activities in which they participated and the support services they received.
(See Appendix C for details.)**

Most respondents participated in the initial activities of the JOBS program: orientation, assessment, and preparing the employment development plan. Orientation and assessment can be a group or one-on-one activity. Participants were then assigned to other JOBS program components as determined by the case manager and/or participant. Most respondents were assigned to the following components: education, job skills (vocational/technical school) training, job search and life skills training. The support services most often used were child care, transitional child care, and transportation assistance.

Orientation. Eighty-nine percent of respondents participated in a JOBS orientation. About 3 of 4 participants graded the orientation session A or B for providing complete information. Almost 80 percent graded the orientation worker A or B, with 75 percent saying the explanation of program activities and services was clear and understandable.

Assessment. Eighty-seven percent of respondents participated in an assessment, most often with their case managers. Eighty-one percent gave their assessment a grade of A or B in regard to its completeness.

Employment Development Plan (EDP). The EDP states the participant's education, training, work goals, and support services needed to complete the JOBS program. Of those who participated in this activity, 89 percent said they helped the case manager develop their EDP. Four of five said their EDP contained their own personal employment and education goals. About 87 percent thought their EDP would help them achieve what they wanted in the JOBS program. A little over two-thirds of the participants graded their EDP A or B and 74 percent gave the case manager's efforts an A or B.

Education Component. About 89 percent of the participants gave the education component an A or a B in terms of helping them get a job. Similarly, over 90 percent gave their instructor(s) an A or B.

Job Skills (Vocational/Technical School) Training Component. About two-thirds of participants in this component gave the training either an A or B, and an even higher proportion (87 percent) gave the instructor(s) an A or a B.

Job Search Component. Eighty-five percent of the participants in this activity thought their job search training was sufficient to enable them to find work. Sixty-seven percent graded the component A or B. Eighty-two percent gave their instructors an A or a B.

Life Skills Training. About three of four participants in this component gave the training an A or B. Eighty-six percent graded the instructors A or B.

Child-Care Assistance. About 60 percent of respondents received child-care assistance and 89 percent gave this service an A or B grade.

Transitional Child Care Assistance (TCC). Almost 40 percent of JOBS completers received TCC assistance and over two-thirds graded the service A or B.

Transportation Assistance. Seventy-four percent of our survey participants received transportation assistance and 79 percent graded the assistance A or B.

NEVERTHELESS, MANY RESPONDENTS SAID THEY DID NOT RECEIVE, OR HAD PROBLEMS UTILIZING, NEEDED SERVICES AND EXPERIENCED WHAT THEY VIEWED AS SERIOUS PARTICIPATION PROBLEMS.

Sixty-eight percent (125/183) of the respondents reported experiencing problems which they claim affected their participation or successful completion of the JOBS program. Out of the 145 people who answered this question, 48 percent reported there were times they felt like dropping out of the program. Of those who gave a reason for considering dropping out of JOBS (64/69), the most often cited problems were agency workers/teachers (19 percent, 12/64), training (17 percent, 11/64), child care (16 percent, 10/64) and lack of available jobs (12 percent, 8/64). Fifty-one percent of the respondents surveyed reported there were services they needed but did not receive. Thirty-two percent (57/178) of the respondents were not satisfied with their case managers. They reported case managers were condescending, not available, and did not provide needed services. Of respondents grading the orientation "C" or below, 31 of 39 reported not receiving sufficient information about the program activities and services.

In the aggregate, over half of all respondents cited needed activities and support services which they did not receive.

Fifty-one percent (92/181) of respondents reported there were certain services they needed but did not receive. The services mentioned most often were transportation (34 percent), child care (21 percent), education (19 percent) and job skills training (14 percent). Of the 28 completers who reported not receiving needed services, 7 said they did not receive transitional child care (TCC) and 6 said they did not receive transitional Medicaid. These are services essential to gain or maintain employment. Further, states are required to provide payment or reimbursement for child care, transportation, TCC and transitional Medicaid services and other work-related expenses, including support services, that the States determine are necessary to enable an individual to participate in the JOBS program or maintain employment. Table 4 shows the services and activities most respondents said they needed but did not receive.

Table 4: Percent And Number Of Respondents Reporting Not Receiving Needed Services Or Activities

Service or Activities Not Received	Not Receiving (n=92)	
	Percent	Number
Transportation	33.7	31
Car Repair	13.0	12
Child Care	20.7	19
Transitional Child Care	7.6	7
Education	18.5	17
Vocational/Technical Training	14.1	13
Dental	13.0	12
Transitional Medicaid	6.5	6
Financial Assistance with tuition, books, uniforms, etc.	8.7	8
Job Search/Help with finding employment	7.6	7

Respondents gave multiple reasons for not receiving the services they needed. As table 5 shows, the most mentioned reason was the case manager refused or was disinterested.

Table 5: Reasons Why Services And Training Not Provided

Reported Reason Service(s) Not Provided	Not Receiving (n=92)	
	Percent	Number
Case Manager Disinterest *	42.4	39
Agency Did Not Provide	26.1	24
Respondent Did Not Know About or Did Not Ask For The Service	21.7	20
Service Not Available In Community	20.7	19
State Did Not Provide	13.0	12

* Also includes case manager refusals.

Approximately one out of every five participants cited problems in utilizing each of the following key services: transportation, child care and job skills training. Problems cited included access barriers, services not available when needed, breakdown in services, transition problems, difficulty paying for services and inadequate quality of training.

Transportation. About 19 percent (25/135) of those who used transportation assistance said they had problems obtaining the service. Most of these 25 participants explained there was a lack of available transportation when they needed it and that they had problems paying for it.

Child Care. Twenty-two percent (24/109) of those participants who received child care assistance said they had problems obtaining or keeping child care. Most of those offering an explanation told us they had difficulties paying for services or that there was a lack of available child care at the time they needed it. Three participants in the job skills (vocational/technical school) component had problems obtaining child care at the times their courses were offered, particularly in the evening. Additionally, 24 percent of the 71 respondents in the jobs skills component and 11 percent (8/71) in the education component said they had breakdowns in their child-care arrangements.

Three respondents said they had problems changing from AFDC child care to transitional child care (TCC) assistance. Nine completers told us they had problems paying for their part of TCC. This was especially the case for six mandatory participants. One completer reported, "I quit working. I could not afford to pay \$190 a month for child care."

Jobs Skills Training. About 23 percent (16/71) of the participants taking vocational/technical training said they experienced problems in the training they needed. Of these, 5 had problems with the quality of the courses and/or the instruction, saying they did not get what they wanted out of the training and that the training did not prepare them for the real world. Four had problems paying the tuition.

We found some differences in problems experienced by participants based on race.

African Americans generally were satisfied with JOBS and gave the overall program high grades. A higher proportion of African Americans (24 percent, 11/45) than whites (19 percent, 8/43) said they needed but did not receive child care. Of the 27 program completers who reported they did not receive needed services, 14 were African American and 13 were white. Forty-three percent (6/14) of the African Americans and 8 percent (1/13) of the whites said they needed but did not receive transitional child care. In addition, 36 percent (5/14) of the African Americans and eight percent of the whites said they needed but did not receive transitional Medicaid.

We also found differences in the reasons participants gave for not receiving needed services. A higher proportion of African Americans (28 percent, 13/45) than whites (12 percent, 5/43) said that services were not received because the worker refused. More whites (23 percent, 10/43) than African-Americans (nine percent, 8/45) reported needed

services were not received because the services were not available. Eighteen percent (8/45) of the African Americans but only seven percent (3/42) of the whites did not know about the availability of the services they needed. Related to this finding, two percent (1/45) of the African Americans but 19 percent (8/43) of the whites said they did not ask for the service.

While most participants said they helped the case manager to develop their employment development plan, some said they did not help and that their personal goals were not included.

Eighty-nine percent (126/142) of the respondents with an employment development plan said they helped to develop their plan, and 82 percent (116/142) said the plan contained their goals. Although states are required by Federal regulations to develop the EDP in consultation with the participant (including a participant in a self-initiated activity) and to the maximum extent possible include the preferences of the participants in their EDP, 11 percent reported they did not help to develop their plan and 18 percent said their goals were not included in their plan. Of those respondents grading their employment development plan C, D or F, 68 percent (30/44) reported they were told by the case manager to set different goals. For example, they were required to seek employment at their present skill level rather than participate in education or job skills training. Other respondents reported they wanted immediate employment but were required to participate in education or training.

About one-third (57/178) of the respondents graded their case manager C, D or F and were not satisfied with the case managers' assistance and attitudes.

Respondents experiencing problems reported case managers were not helpful and sometimes not available (40 percent, 23/57), condescending (39 percent, 22/57), and sometimes refused to provide needed services (20 percent, 11/57). Even some participants grading the case managers A and B reported case managers were not helpful. Forty-two percent (39/92) of the respondents who said they did not receive needed services attributed this to either the manager's lack of interest or refusal to provide the service. Additionally, 11 percent reported case managers caused them the most problems with participating in the JOBS program.

About one-fourth of those receiving an orientation graded it low due to unclear or insufficient information; eleven percent said they received no orientation at all.

Twenty participants reported they did not participate in an orientation. Of those who participated in an orientation 24 percent (39/163) graded it C or below. Twenty-five percent (41/163) of the respondents said the information provided was unclear. However, the major criticism was that insufficient program information was provided, with 24 (62 percent) of the 39 respondents grading the orientation C or below stating this view.

Eighty percent (146/183) of the respondents suggested needed JOBS program improvements to achieve self-sufficiency and improve support services.

- Twenty-six percent (38/146) suggested placing more emphasis on education and training to prepare participants for a career which would increase their earning capacity above the minimum-wage level. Some believed minimum wages would force them to remain on welfare or to return to the public assistance rolls because their wages would not be sufficient to replace lost medical, AFDC, and/or Food Stamp benefits.
- Twenty percent (29/146) suggested identifying and linking participants with good paying jobs in the community.
- Five percent (7/146) suggested allowing participants a trial work period and let them receive their first pay check before terminating benefits.
- Fourteen percent (20/146) suggested providing and extending beyond a year transitional services (child care, medical) to participants whose AFDC benefits will be terminated due to earned income.
- Thirty-six percent (52/146) suggested improving key support services, such as child care and transportation. This would include assisting participants to find quality, affordable child care and transportation services. Some respondents suggested child care should be provided during all phases of the program (e.g., orientation, assessment, job search training, etc.).

CONCLUSIONS

This survey was conducted to gain some insight into the ideas and opinions of those individuals participating in the JOBS program. We believe this information could be useful to program managers and line workers in their work with participants.

Many participants are attracted to the JOBS program because of the promise of obtaining an education or skills that will enable them to obtain a good paying job and get off welfare. Most participants rated the overall JOBS program high and would recommend the program to friends and relatives.

Nevertheless, many participants experienced problems in going through the program. Many participants did not receive services they needed, and some felt like dropping out. These are problems which need to be addressed. Availability and easy access to key support services, for example child care, are critical to an individual's successful completion of JOBS and, ultimately, to the success of the program.

The experiences of JOBS completers offer hopeful signs of the program's promise to help individuals move from dependency to work. Seventy-five percent of the completers were working and were either completely off AFDC (57 percent) or were receiving a reduced grant (18 percent). The median hourly wages of completers increased 23 percent and the number of participants with work-related benefits tripled. However, many completers continue to receive government benefits, such as food stamps and Medicaid. Further, many completers noted that low-paying jobs available to them will not be enough to enable them to become self-sufficient over the long term.

An obvious key to JOBS program success is the availability of good paying jobs in the community. Strengthening linkages between the program and job sources, including job development and marketing of JOBS participants, will be a major continuing challenge.

The roles played by JOBS case managers and teachers/trainers seem to be vital ingredients of a successful program. This supports the need for continuing efforts to strengthen the training of these workers to provide positive support and assistance to participants.

We believe interviews of JOBS program participants can provide useful insights into the problems and successes of the program. We would encourage the Administration for Children and Families to continue such direct participant feedback activities through future surveys at other states and sites.

AGENCY COMMENTS

We reviewed our report at an exit conference with staff from the Administration For Children and Families. They provided informal comments and requested additional information. Some of their comments have been incorporated in this report; some of the additional information requested will be addressed in supplemental reports. Since this report contains no recommendations, it is being issued directly in final.

APPENDIX A

METHODOLOGY

For this second JOBS participants' survey, much of the background work and relevant literature review had been accomplished in the first survey, "Participants Rate the JOBS Program" (OEI-06-90-00150, September 1993). We contacted the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) program managers and solicited their input about sampling, methodological issues and the survey instrument that we had refined. We incorporated their suggestions, and we made the following decisions and took these actions regarding the methodology and sampling:

- Between April and June 1994, we interviewed current and former JOBS participants in person, using telephone interviews as a last resort.
- We pretested the structured interview guide at a local site in Dallas, Texas, and made appropriate changes and corrections to the interview guide. Like the previous study's guide, this guide included both closed-ended and open-ended questions.
- We selected a purposive sample of four states from a list of twelve ACF program managers gave to us. The twelve states were geographically diverse, a mix of smaller and larger states, and different program types (e.g., human capital development vs. intensive job search). The four states we selected were: Oregon, Minnesota, Louisiana, and New Jersey. The state of New Jersey withdrew from the study at the last moment, so we replaced it with Delaware.
- We briefed state-level officials in each of our four states about the study and asked them to select an urban site and a rural site (within an hour's drive of the urban site) for the study. We asked officials not to choose the best or the worst programs. They selected the following sites (urban site followed by rural site): Eugene and Cottage Grove, Oregon; Minneapolis and Chisago, Minnesota; New Orleans and Hahnville (St. Charles Parish), Louisiana; and, Wilmington and Georgetown, Delaware.
- We then contacted local-level officials at each site and asked them to send us a list of those who had participated in JOBS sometime during 1993, indicating also the status of each participant in terms of completing the program (completers), dropping out of the program (dropouts), or still currently active in the program (actives).
- To maximize our learning from participants who might have different experiences in the JOBS program, we drew independent random samples of completers, dropouts and actives at each site. At every urban site, we wanted to end up with fifteen participants in each status (for a total of 45),

so we oversampled by two, sometimes three, times the number we wanted. At every rural site, we wanted to interview at least five participants in each status (for a total of 15), so we oversampled by three times the desired number. Based on the lists of randomly-selected participants we sent to the sites, local-level managers and case managers telephoned participants and set up a schedule of face-to-face interviews for us. We interviewed participants from April 1994 to June 1994. Also, at every site we talked with at least one administrator and supervisor about activities and services available and program operations to get a "feel" for the JOBS program there.

- We planned to obtain 240 face-to-face interviews, 60 per state. With oversampling and diligent effort, we were able to complete 183 interviews 76 percent of our goal. This included 56 participants who had completed their participation in the JOBS program, 74 were currently active and at the time 53 had dropped out. Telephone interviews comprised about ten percent of the sample and were conducted when participants did not appear for the in-person interview.
- The findings from this study are purely descriptive and cannot be considered generalizable to any other JOBS program sites either within the sampled states or within non-sampled states.

We conducted our study in accordance with the *Quality Standards for Inspections* issued by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

APPENDIX B

PROFILE OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

(N = 183)

VARIABLES	n	%	average
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AGE: average for all participants 			30.0 years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for mandatory participants 	126	68.8	31.4 years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for volunteer participants 	57	31.1	27.0 years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEENAGE PARENTS (19 years or younger) 	10	5.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GENDER: females 	166	90.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RACE/ETHNICITY: African Americans 	99	54.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whites 	77	42.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MARITAL STATUS: single, never married 	106	57.9	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> currently married 	23	12.6	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> separated/divorced 	52	28.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHILDREN: average # on AFDC grant per participant 			1.9 children
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> parents with children age 3 and under 	75	41.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RESIDENCE: urban 	137	74.9	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDUCATION - Before JOBS: average years completed 			11.8 years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDUCATION - During/After JOBS: average years completed 			12.2 years
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43	23.5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enrolled in training/education (self-initiators) 	59	32.2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> less than a high school education 	82	44.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	38	20.8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	4	2.1	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	42	23.0	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high school diploma or equivalent 	85	46.4	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some college-level course-work 	48	26.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed a college degree or more 	8	4.3	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> average # of months worked 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> worked in two-year period before JOBS 	111	60.7	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMPLOYMENT - Before JOBS 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> degrees of more 	43		

VARIABLES	n	%	average
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● EMPLOYMENT - After JOBS had employment or currently working average # of months worked average # of hours worked per week average hourly wage work-related benefits 	91	49.7	6.9 months 31.0 hours \$6.45
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● WELFARE HISTORY/CURRENT STATUS received AFDC assistance as a child average # of years on welfare received AFDC for 36 of the preceding 60 months currently receiving AFDC currently receiving Unemployed Parents assistance currently receiving child support payments currently receiving public housing assistance currently receiving food stamps while in JOBS, one or more benefits were terminated while in JOBS, benefits were reduced (sanction status) custodial parents under the age of 24 who, at the time of application, were not enrolled in high school and had little or no work experience youngest child ineligible for AFDC within 2 years 	51	27.9	5.8 years
	89	48.6	
	146	79.8	
	12	6.6	
	41	22.4	
	65	35.5	
	166	90.7	
	12	6.6	
	31	16.9	
	29	15.8	
	1	0.5	

APPENDIX C

Participants' Grades For Activities/Services, Teachers and Case Managers

Activities/Services	A	B	C	D	F	No Response	n
Orientation Worker	30.7% 46.6%	43.6% 32.5%	17.2% 10.4%	4.9% 7.4%	1.8% 0.6%	1.8% 2.5%	163
Assessment*	43.4%	37.1%	13.2%	4.4%	1.3%	0.6%	159
Employment Development Plan Case Manager	38.0% 48.6%	30.3% 25.3%	15.5% 12.7%	9.9% 8.4%	5.6% 4.2%	0.7% 0.8%	142
Education Teacher	54.9% 63.8%	33.8% 27.7%	8.5% 2.1%	1.4% 0.0%	0.0% 4.2%	1.4% 2.2%	71
Jobs Skills Training** Teacher	45.1% 54.9%	22.5% 32.4%	18.3% 8.4%	4.2% 2.8%	4.2% 0.0%	5.7% 1.5%	71
Job Search Training Teacher	37.7% 50.8%	29.5% 31.1%	19.7% 6.5%	4.9% 4.9%	4.8% 3.3%	3.4% 3.4%	61
Life Skills Training Teacher	41.9% 62.8%	32.5% 23.3%	18.6% 4.6%	0.0% 2.3%	2.3% 2.3%	4.7% 4.7%	43
Child Care*	67.0%	22.0%	9.2%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	109
Transitional Child Care Case Manager	40.9% 59.1%	27.3% 18.2%	22.7% 13.6%	4.5% 4.5%	0.9% 0.0%	3.7% 4.6%	22
Transportation*	60.7%	17.8%	13.3%	3.7%	1.5%	3.0%	135

* A case manager grade was not obtained for this activity.

** Jobs Skills Training = Training received from a vocational/technical school or community college.