

2001 Annual
Statistical Report on
The Annie E. Casey
Foundation's
Jobs Initiative



Employment Placement and Retention in the AECF Jobs Initiative

Abt Associates Inc.
Anne St. George
Jessica Bonjorni
Barbara Epstein
Scott Hebert

October 29, 2001

Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Executive Summary	1
Chapter One: Characteristics of the AECF Jobs Initiative through March 31, 2001	4
I. Demographic characteristics of enrollees, placed, and non-placed participants (see Tables 1, 1a).....	4
II. Placement wages and benefits pre- and post-JI (see Tables 2, 2a)	6
III. Labor market participation pre- and post-JI for people placed in employment (see Table 3).....	7
IV. Demographic characteristics of participants retained versus not retained (see Table 4).....	8
V. Characteristics of employers providing initial placement (see Table 5).....	10
VI. Wage variation by industry sector at initial placement (Table 5)	11
VII. Changes in wage and health care benefits over time for participants achieving 12-month retention, by industry (see Table 6).....	11
VIII. Eligibility and attainment of various retention milestones, by industry, for participants eligible for 12-month retention (see Table 7)	12
IX. Achievement of various milestones by project (see Table 8)	13
X. Characteristics of individuals eligible for the 12-month milestone: retained versus not retained (Table 9).....	16
XI. Yearly retention rates, by site (see Table 11).....	16
XII. Wage changes by project (see Tables 10, 13).....	17
XIII. Difficult to serve populations (see Table 12).....	18
Chapter Two: Regression Analysis: Modeling Barriers to Retention.....	19
I. Introduction.....	19
II. Regression Methodology	21
III. Results.....	26
IV. Summary of Regression Analysis Findings	28

Acknowledgements

This report is the product of a team effort involving staff at Abt Associates and Metis Associates. The project team would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the important contributions of these individuals and to express our thanks.

Metis Associates project staff included Bob Harrington and Simon Rah. We would like to thank Bob Harrington and the staff of Metis Associates for providing the JI consolidated MIS data and for their responsiveness and assistance with resolving data issues.

Abt Associates' project team members included Anne St. George, Jessica Bonjorni, and Barbara Epstein. Beyond the project team, we would like to thank Abt Associates' staff member Scott Hebert, Project Director of the Annie E. Casey Jobs Initiative Evaluation, who contributed his advice and expertise to this project.

We would also like to thank staff at the Foundation who provided input on the scope of work for this report, and in particular, Tom Kelly and Susan Gewirtz

Executive Summary

The 2001 Annual Statistical Report provides analysis of site-collected MIS data with a focus on issues pertaining to Jobs Initiative participants' labor force retention patterns. This report is based on data from six Jobs Initiative (JI) sites spanning the commencement of the Initiative through March 31, 2001.¹ As such, it reflects the majority of experience and data collected pertaining to JI enrollees, placed participants, and labor force retainees from the Capacity Building Phase through the first year of systems reform.

This report focuses on employment barriers, training and placement services provided, and retention issues. It is organized into two chapters. The first chapter reports retention findings using descriptive statistics, such as frequency distributions, cross-tabulations, and means. Chapter Two presents findings from regression analyses to determine the relationship of barriers to employment retention.

Like previous retention reports², the retention portion of this report focuses on five different, though overlapping, participant populations. These groups are: (1) people enrolled in the JI, and among JI enrollees, those (2) placed in employment, (3) not placed in employment, (4) retained in employment at different milestones, and (5) not retained in employment at various milestones. The report also examines key demographic characteristics, employment outcomes, and employment industry sectors associated with each of these groups.³ In addition to these retention analyses, this report incorporates regression analyses that examine the relationship of barriers to employment across the six JI sites. In Seattle, it was possible to complete analyses examining the relationship between retention and training.

The Annual Statistical Report represents a preliminary analysis of the relationships among these factors and outcomes, which will be explored in greater detail in an upcoming analytic report⁴. It

¹ The original six sites were Denver, Milwaukee, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Seattle and St. Louis. Denver was involved through the Capacity Building Phase but subsequently withdrew from the Initiative.

² See the 1999 Annual Statistical Report and the June 2000 Retention Analysis presented at the Annie E. Casey JI Retention Conference (incorporating data reported through March 31, 2000).

³ These analyses are limited by the completeness and robustness of the data on which they are based. While some data are very consistently collected, others are limited (such as Impact Community residence, JI service delivery information, and post-placement employment and wage information). In some cases, participants' current status is unclear. For example, of those 6,787 enrollees not placed, 40% were recorded in the MIS to have "exited" prior to placement. Of the remaining 60%, 1,700 were enrolled since March 31, 2000 and therefore may still be current active participants. The remaining 2,356 appear to be inactive records from people whose status has not been updated recently.

⁴ In December 2001, Abt will complete an analytic report (December 2001 Retention Analysis) that more closely examines the relationships among barriers, training and services, and retention. (During the same time period the New School will be developing another analytic report that focuses on the Frictional Systems Reform in the Jobs Initiative).

includes findings that reinforce what we already know about Jobs Initiative retention. It also presents some new trends and emerging issues.

Key findings include the following:

- *The number of enrollees in the Jobs Initiative increased by nearly 2,800 participants since the last report, from 9,774 enrollees as of March 31, 2000 to 12,570 as of March 31, 2001. Of the total enrollees, 5,783 (46 percent) have been placed in employment and 6,787 (54 percent) have not.*
- *The trends of placing enrollees in smaller firms and of most firms hiring three or fewer JI participants continue.*
- *In a new development over the past year, Hispanics have achieved the highest placement rates, followed closely by Asian-American/Pacific Islanders.*
- *Participants who report limited English proficiency still have higher placement rates than those whose primary language is English.*
- *Older participants, married participants, and those with two to four years of college education are more likely to be placed than younger, unmarried or separated, or less educated participants respectively.*
- *The average hourly wage for participants with prior work experience increased substantially after JI employment placement.*
- *Seventy-six percent of those people eligible⁵ reached the 3-month retention milestone, 62.9 percent of those eligible reached the 6-month retention milestone, and 50.7 percent of those eligible reached the 12-month retention milestone. These numbers are slightly lower for all retention milestones than in the June 2000 Retention Analysis.*
- *Women have a higher rate of achievement than men of the 12-month retention milestone.*
- *Participants with higher levels of education and training are more likely to achieve retention.*
- *Although in past years, the cumulative analysis showed participants with prior work experience increased the weeks worked per year after placement in the Jobs Initiative, the data through March 31, 2001 shows these participants maintaining but not increasing the number of weeks worked per year.*
- *Asian-Americans show retention rates 20-30% higher than any other ethnic group at all milestones.*
- *For the first time, F.I.R.E.⁶ is the leader among industry sectors in retention rates at all milestones and shows relatively high initial wages as well. This suggests that in sites where*

⁵ “Eligible” means the individual had been placed early enough to have the potential to have achieved a given milestone.

⁶ “F.I.R.E.” refers to Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate

the market niche exists and where training requirements can be met, F.I.R.E. can offer a high return on investment for workforce development programs.

- *The Hotel industry shows the greatest change in retention, moving from the leadership position at 3 months last year to the lowest rate this year, and dropping in 6-month retention performance as well.*
- *The Health industry continues its poor retention showing, coming in last among all sectors at the 6- and 12-month milestones.*
- *For those achieving 12-month retention, the Construction industry had the best starting wage and reported wage increase. The Construction industry also provided the highest rate of access to employer-sponsored health coverage.*
- *Seattle leads the sites in 3- and 6-month job retention rates (88.8 percent and 80.8 percent, respectively), but Philadelphia holds the lead for 12-month retention (63.7 percent). St. Louis has only slightly fewer participants than Philadelphia (61.6 percent) who reached the 12-month retention milestone.⁷*
- *In the period through March 2001, New Orleans exceeded its retention achievements of the period through March 2000 at all milestones.*
- *Within the last year Seattle included four new projects which achieved very high retention rates, while some existing projects established improvement in retention.*
- *Denver continued to have the lowest reported retention rates through this period.*

Cross-site and Seattle regression analyses further confirmed findings from the above cross-tabulations.

- *Higher education, Asian ethnicity, and participation in the Seattle programs are all predictors of the likelihood of achieving retention milestones.*
- *Other expected employment barriers are confirmed by the regression analyses: transportation problems and homelessness for the cross-site model and gender and criminal history in the Seattle model.*
- *Surprisingly, in Seattle, where the following data were collected, substance abuse, lack of day care, and disabilities did not turn out to be statistically significant barriers to retention.*
* * *

The following chapter examines placement, wages and benefits, and retention, with regard to demographic characteristics of JI participants, characteristics of employers, industry sectors, and individual site experiences.

⁷ In this report, we no longer tracked eligibility or achievement of the 9-month milestone because this data was not gathered by all of the sites. Neither Milwaukee nor Philadelphia monitored 9-month retention and none of the sites provided 9-month eligibility information.

Chapter One: Characteristics of the AECF Jobs Initiative through March 31, 2001

I. Demographic characteristics of enrollees, placed, and non-placed participants (see Table 1)

Enrollees

The number of enrollees in the Jobs Initiative increased by nearly 2,800 participants since the last report, from 9,774 enrollees as of March 31, 2000 to 12,570 as of March 31, 2001. *The increase in the number of enrollees is worth noting, given that four of the six Jobs Initiative sites were increasingly shifting their focus from jobs projects to systems reform over the past year.*⁸

Unless otherwise noted, the following data reflects characteristics for all participants enrolled through March 31, 2001.

The gender divide stayed nearly equal, with women enrolled at only a slightly higher rate (51 percent) than men (49 percent). The age of enrollees is fairly consistent with the previous year's report findings. Enrollees between 18 and 35 years old comprise 63 percent of the total. The remaining 36 percent is chiefly those older than 35 years, with participants younger than 18 years contributing a mere 0.7 percent.

The majority of Jobs Initiative enrollees (53.1 percent) had a child residing with them. Of those who reported the number of children, 42.6 percent had only one child, 30.5 percent had two children, and 22.2 percent had 3-4 children. Only 4.3 percent of participants had five or more children.

There do not appear to be any significant changes to household income, ethnicity, or marital status of enrollees, compared with the data reported in 2000.

Placed vs. Non-Placed Enrollees

Less than half of enrollees (5,783 of 12,570, or 46 percent) were placed in employment as of March 31, 2001, which was also the case through March 2000. A number of significant demographic distinctions exist between those people who were placed in employment and those

⁸ There were no 'standard' enrollees for Philadelphia from 4/1/2000 and through 3/31/2001. There were twelve enrollees to two employer-based projects, the City and the ACCA projects, during this year. However, these projects and their participants are excluded from the Consolidated JI database and our analysis because they collect insufficient enrollment data.

who were not. However, it is important to note that these distinctions do not necessarily reflect causal relationships between participant characteristics and outcomes.

Continuing patterns and some new trends are:

As we saw in the 2000 report, the older a participant, the more likely he or she is to have been placed by the Jobs Initiative. In addition, the placement rate of participants under age 18 has increased significantly from 26.6 percent to 40.2 percent.

Hispanic participants now have the greatest placement rates, at a rate of 52.6 percent. In prior years Asians had the highest placement rate. This change is primarily due to a higher placement rate for the 308 new Hispanic enrollees during the past year; 206, or 66.9 percent, were placed. Participants who identify as Asian or Pacific Islander were more likely to be placed (51.7 percent) than not, and were rated second behind Hispanics in placement rates.

The relative placement success of these two sub-populations may be attributable to several influences. Each group shows high rates of prior work experience. There also may be cultural attitudes that have an effect on success, such as the work ethic of immigrants or employers' expectations for the performance of different ethnic groups.

Further, taking into account that the majority of the Hispanic participants come from Milwaukee and Seattle, and that 98.8 percent of the new Asian enrollees are from Seattle, it also seems likely that training and placement services provided by different jobs projects play a role in placement success. For example, when comparing the prior and the current year's placements by project for these two subgroups, placements increased by 44 percentage points for Hispanics in Milwaukee's Manufacturing Job Connection project (from 15 to 59 percent). In Seattle, Asian placement increased by 14 percentage points in the Office Occupations project (from 4 to 18 percent). These dramatic increases may be due to efforts by the projects' program staff to recruit suitable employers and prepare their participants for placement.

Overall, American Indians/Native Americans and those who classified themselves as "multi-ethnic" had the lowest placement rates, as was true in the period through 2000.

As in the previous report, when distinguishing participants by language spoken, participants whose first language is Vietnamese had the highest placement rate (56.2 percent), while native English-speakers had the lowest placement rate (of 42.9 percent).

It is important to note that all recent Vietnamese-speaking enrollees are from Seattle, while the English-speaking enrollees are evenly distributed among all sites. ***The success in placing Vietnamese-speaking enrollees, and in achieving a higher placement rate for primarily Spanish-speaking enrollees than for English-speaking participants, suggests that some Jobs Initiative sites have done a good job in finding providers and employers who can accommodate the needs of this population.***

Participants married and living with a spouse are have a higher placement rate (54.4 percent) than their single or separated peers (47.3 percent and 44.5 percent, respectively), which is consistent with findings for previous years. This may be a reflection of greater maturity or

motivation on the part of those who are married or living with a spouse, and/or employers' perceptions of such attributes.

Participants with two to four years of college education have a higher placement rate (roughly 52.5 percent) than those with less than two years or with more than 4 years of college education, which is also consistent with the 2000 report. The finding regarding those with no college experience is not unexpected. However, the experience of enrollees with more than 4 years of college is somewhat surprising, and may suggest that these individuals are more selective about job placements or have other attributes that increase the difficulty of placement. Initial placements of participants with more than a college degree were primarily in the Service industry (40%), followed by Retail trade (15%), Manufacturing (12.5%) and Health industries (10%), respectively.

In this report, we also considered the average weekly and yearly wages and weeks per year worked for both placed and non-placed enrollees prior to their participation in the Jobs Initiative program.

The average weekly and yearly earnings prior to JI enrollment are significantly lower for non-placed enrollees than for placed enrollees. The average self-reported yearly earnings for a non-placed enrollee prior to the JI were about \$7,670, while the average yearly earnings for a placed enrollee were roughly \$8,737, more than \$1,000 more.

Non-placed enrollees also have a history of working fewer weeks out of the year before they joined the JI than those who were placed (26 weeks per year for non-placed enrollees and 28 weeks per year for placed enrollees). ***These statistics suggest that non-placed enrollees were more likely to be in unskilled jobs or did not work as consistently prior to the Jobs Initiative, making them harder to place once they started in the JI.***

II. Placement wages and benefits pre- and post-JI (see Tables 2, 2a)

Wages

As reported in the Capacity Building Report (CBR), placed participants with prior job experience had significant hourly wage increases and earnings increases compared to their pre-JI earnings. There were no significant changes in this area between the period through March 2000 and the period through March 2001. Before entering the JI, the average recorded wage was \$8.11 per hour. Upon initial placement, the wage jumped by an average of \$1.09 to \$9.20 per hour for those with prior work experience, while the average initial placement wage for all JI participants was \$9.15. It is worth noting that the hourly wage differential between placed participants with prior paid work experience and those without such experience is quite small.

For a full-time employee, the \$1.09 hourly wage increase represents an annual gross salary increase of roughly \$2,300.

Except in the Construction industry, enrollees with more than a college education earn higher wages at initial placement. Starting wages in other sectors through the most recent period were: Services (\$11.14 per hour), Retail Trade (\$9.49 per hour), Manufacturing (\$10.58 per hour), and Health (\$10.56 per hour).

As participants continued employment, their average wage (as measured by data on their last known job) increased to \$9.55, a \$0.40 per hour increase on average. The hourly wage increase corresponded to the weekly wage increase that we see of \$16.00, from \$359.63 to \$375.69. ***In total, when compared to average pre-Jobs Initiative weekly wages of \$300, the \$76 average increase in wages per week realized by placed participants translates into an increase in gross wages of approximately \$4,000 per year.***

Benefits

Placed participants were much more likely to receive medical coverage from their employers than they were before they enrolled in the JI. While only 32.7 percent of people had access to medical benefits through employers prior to the JI, the rate more than doubled to 82.8 percent upon initial JI employment placement. Although this number drops slightly to 80.8 percent at the most recent reported job, this dip most likely is due to the high number of unknown or missing values for most recent benefit status, which amounted to 26 percent of the total.

III. Labor market participation pre- and post-JI for people placed in employment (see Table 3)

Participants with prior work experience increased the number of hours they worked per week after placement in the Jobs Initiative. The average number of weekly hours worked in pre-JI positions was 36 hours, whereas, after being placed in employment by the Jobs Initiative, participants both with and without prior paid experience worked an average of 39 hours per week. This is consistent with the June 2000 Retention Analysis.

The data through March 2001 also indicate an interesting relationship between wage levels and hours of work per week. *Participants with higher wages worked a greater number of weeks after joining the JI.* Fifty-nine percent of participants earning more than \$12.00 per hour in their last known job were employed for more than 40 weeks, while that percentage dropped to 48 percent for workers in the next wage category of \$10.00-\$11.99 per hour. For participants earning \$7.00-\$7.99 per hour, only 24 percent worked at least 40 hours.

Participants with prior work experience maintained a consistent number of weeks worked per year (around 27.5 weeks) both before enrollment and after initial placement in the JI. This is a departure from prior reports, however, which found a marked increase in the number of weeks worked after joining the JI for those with prior work experience. In the June 2000 Retention Analysis, for example, the number of weeks worked per year for a participant with prior work experience jumped from 26.2 weeks prior to the JI to 31.1 weeks after placement in the JI. It is difficult to determine the causes for the changes in number of weeks worked after initial

placement. It may be due to economic slowdown, improvement in JI sites' collection of job end dates data, or conversely, lack of job end dates for participants who were known to have achieved 12-month retention.⁹

Participants without prior work experience worked slightly fewer weeks per year in post-enrollment jobs (26.9 weeks) than the average of all placed participants (28.6 weeks).¹⁰

IV. Demographic characteristics of participants retained versus not retained (see Table 4)

The Jobs Initiative aims not only to place people in employment, but more importantly, to help them maintain their participation in the labor force over the long term. "Retention" is therefore measured as labor force participation in steady or improving quality of jobs over a specific period,¹¹ rather than remaining in any specific job.

Characteristics of those eligible for and achieving 3-month, 6-month, and 12-month milestones did not differ markedly from those of the 2000 report. Those achieving 3-month retention milestones stayed steady at 78.3 percent in 2001, compared to 77.9 percent in 2000 (not a statistically significant difference). The percentage of participants achieving 6-month milestones dropped by 2 percent, from 68.3 percent to 66.3 percent. Twelve-month milestone achievement percentages also dropped by 2.7 percent, from 54.1 percent to 51.4 percent.

In general, the higher the level of pre-JI education attained, the more likely a participant was able to reach retention milestones. By the 12-month milestone, those with a high school diploma or above were more likely than not to still be employed, while those without a high school diploma

⁹ Data collection of job end dates practically doubled between the period through 2000 and the past year of data collection. For example, in 2000 there was cumulative data available on weeks worked after placement for 950 JI participants. By 2001 the total number was 1793. Individuals who are eligible for 12 month retention but who do not have job end dates in their MIS records are excluded from this analysis, because the actual number of weeks worked cannot be calculated. If the minimum 12-month retention standard of 36 weeks were applied to those JI participants who were lacking job end dates but who had been determined through other means to have achieved 12-month retention, then the average number of weeks worked post-JI would increase to 32.

¹⁰ The average of all placed participants includes the 125 participants for which we had no information on prior work experience. These participants had an average of 42.1 weeks worked after placement through the JI. The inclusion of these 125 participants explains why the mean number of weeks worked for all participants is higher than the mean number of weeks worked for participants both with and without work experience.

¹¹ This labor force participation is expected to occur without gaps of 30 days per quarter.

were more likely to be unemployed. As was found in the Extending Ladders report¹² and will be further explored in the December 2001 Retention Analysis, more training and services are also correlated to greater retention.

Contrary to what was seen in the 2000 report, in which participants with children at home were consistently more likely to remain employed, the data through 2001 indicates that the presence of children at home did not influence either the 3-month or 6-month milestones. ***However, by the 12-month milestone, participants with children at home were more likely to still be employed (54.8 percent of those with children at home versus 47.5 percent of those without children).***

Consistent with the 2000 report, participants receiving public assistance were less likely to achieve retention milestones than those who were not receiving assistance. For this population, reduction in accustomed supports and the demands of self-reliance may intensify the challenges of retaining employment.

Also consistent with last year's report were the higher retention rates for participants married and living with their spouses. The retention rates of these participants was between 5 and 18.5 percentage points higher than their unmarried or separated peers.

There were significant differences in retention among participants from different ethnic groups. As with the previous report, among all racial categories, participants of Asian or Pacific Island descent were the most likely to achieve retention milestones. At every milestone, participants of Asian descent were between 4 and 40 percentage points above other ethnic groups in retention rates.

Although language does not seem to be a barrier to retention, education and previous job experience in part may account for these achievements. Eighty-three percent of Asian-Americans had prior work experience, in addition to which, this group had the highest rates of high school diplomas and 4-year college completion.

Of concern is the fact that though American Indian or Alaskan Natives had roughly the average retention percentages for both 3-month and 6-month milestones, by the 12-month milestone, their retention rate had dropped to only 36.3 percent, roughly 10-20 percentage points below the other ethnic groups. This is consistent with the June 2000 Retention Analysis. Education may be the determining variable, for although 93 percent of the Native Americans who achieved 12-month retention had prior work experience, 73 percent had a high school education or less.

Also consistent with the previous report, the older a participant is, the more likely he or she is to reach the various retention milestones. Participants under the age of 18 years old, however, have different retention characteristics. Though they are the least likely age group to achieve 3- and 6-month retention milestones, they are more likely to reach the 12-month retention milestone (62.5 percent) than any other group. This is in contrast to the June 2000 Retention Analysis, where

¹² "JI Experience shows that programs that include job readiness, job training, and job retention services lead to better retention rates than job search alone." Fleischer, Wendy, *Extending Ladders*, prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation, September 2001, P. 12.

placed participants in the under-18 age category were either the most likely or second most likely to achieve the 3 and 6-month milestones, but were less likely to achieve the 12-month milestone. Of the 10 people in this age group eligible for 12-month retention through March 2001, half were in Construction, and four are in the St. Louis Construction Project.

V. Characteristics of employers providing initial placement (see Table 5)

Employer industry information was recorded concerning 2,017 employers associated with initial placements and 2,033 employers associated with most recent placements. Though there was an increase of 445 employers in 2001, we saw no major shifts in the distribution of initial placement employers or most recent employers. The distribution of placements by industry remained fairly steady in the last year, with nearly half of the employers in service or retail industries. Fifteen and one half percent of initial placement employers are in the manufacturing industry and 11.5 percent are in construction.

Most JI initial placement employers are smaller firms (<50 employees), though nearly 9 percent are large firms (>500 employees). Over half of the employers have 50 or fewer employees, and 83.8 percent have fewer than 250 employees.

However, compared to the general population of US firms, which are predominantly small, the Jobs Initiative has actually engaged a substantial number of large employers. Nationwide, 86 percent of firms has fewer than 20 employees and only 0.26 percent has 500 or more employees.¹³ Among the JI employers, 23.8 percent has fewer than 20 employees, and 8.67 percent has more than 500 employees.

Seventy percent of firms hired only one JI employee. This is not a significant change from the data for the period through 2000. Only 13.4 percent of firms hired 4 or more JI employees. Thirty-four employers (1.6 percent) hired 21 or more JI participants. These employers are listed in **Table 5a** of the Appendix.

With regard to starting wages, no differences are seen between placements in smaller firms and those in larger firms. This raises a question about why sites are targeting smaller employers, when economies of scale might be realized by placing groups of participants with larger firms. It may be that JI sites have exhausted possibilities for forming new relationships with larger employers in their areas. In addition, smaller firms could be utilizing Jobs Initiative organizations as a resource for recruitment, since they probably do not have human resources departments to assist with recruitment as the larger firms do. The topic of engaging small versus large employers should be explored in the next round of evaluation site visits and in 2002 data collection activities focused on employers.

¹³ 1999 County Business Patterns, US Census Bureau.

VI. Wage variation by industry sector at initial placement (Table 5)

Construction and public sector jobs commanded the highest initial placement wage levels. Construction jobs paid an average of \$12.40 per hour and public sector jobs paid \$10.37. Two other industries commanded wages of \$9.00 per hour or higher. F.I.R.E. and Manufacturing, offered average initial placement hourly wages of \$9.56 and \$9.60, respectively. The lowest wage for a known industry was \$7.80 per hour in Hotel Services. These figures are not significantly different from the figures in the June 2000 Retention Analysis; *however, it is important to note that the average initial placement wage for all industries was well above the \$7.00 per hour standard, even for industries perceived to pay low wages.*

VII. Changes in wage and health care benefits over time for participants achieving 12-month retention, by industry (see Table 6)

It seems appropriate to examine what starting wages, wage increases, and access to benefits are associated with individuals who reach the 12-month retention milestone. Such information, while not fully explaining why workers were able to achieve such milestones, does provide some insight into the compensation and benefits that can help motivate individuals to maintain employment over the long term.

Wages

For individuals achieving the 12-month retention milestone, Construction commanded both the highest initial placement salary and the largest wage change, whereas the lowest starting wage and smallest wage change were in the Hotel industry. Those in Construction who achieved the 12-month retention milestone had an average starting wage of \$11.83, which rose by \$1.27 to \$13.09 at the last known wage. Manufacturing and Retail Trade also had significant wage changes - participants in the Manufacturing industry started at \$9.78 per hour and saw a \$1.07 increase to \$10.85, while Retail Trade employees started at \$8.85 per hour and saw a \$0.82 increase to \$9.67. By contrast, participants reaching the 12-month retention milestone who had been placed in the Hotel industry started at an average of \$8.11 per hour and had a wage increase after one year of only \$0.29 to \$8.40. All these results are consistent with the previous findings of the 2000 Retention Analysis.

Benefits

Employer-sponsored medical coverage was provided at initial placement to more than 80 percent of JI participants who achieved the 12-month milestone. The highest coverage

percentage was in Construction, with 96.6 percent of participants covered. The Services industry had the lowest percentage of covered participants, at 80.3 percent.

At the last known job, these numbers increased or stayed the same in all but one industry, and that drop was very small (Manufacturing dropped from 92.3 percent covered to 91.7 percent covered). Construction was again the industry with the highest percentage of employees receiving medical coverage, 97.3 percent. The Services industry again showed the lowest level of participants covered in their last known jobs, at 82.4 percent. It will be important to explore further whether the overall increase in benefits is due to workers qualifying for coverage within the same job after a probationary period or to workers migrating to new jobs that provide health coverage.

VIII. Eligibility and attainment of various retention milestones, by industry, for participants eligible for 12-month retention (see Table 7)

The F.I.R.E. and Retail industries led the sectors in retention at the three-month milestone, with 87.9 percent and 82.9 percent respectively, whereas the Hotel industry had the lowest retention, 72.5 percent. Although the Hotel industry had the highest 3-month retention rate through March 2000, 82.1 percent, this presents an inadequate basis for comparison, because some projects had just started and the enrollment was still very low. F.I.R.E.'s retention performance has been consistently strong, with 81.9 percent retained through March 2000. The 3-month retention rate for the Manufacturing industry dropped 6.3 percentage points from 79.6 percent as of 2000 to 73.3 percent retained as of 2001. The other industries showed retention rates fairly consistent with those reported in the June 2000 Retention Analysis.

The decline in retention rate of the Hotel industry appears in large part to be due to the performance of the Milwaukee Hospitality Prototype, which accounted for 80 percent of the retention failure at the 3-month milestone through this period.¹⁴ Last year when the project was new, it had fewer enrollees, and more of them achieved retention (6 out of 11 eligible, or 56.5 percent). Now, in its second year, with higher enrollment, fewer of its participants are achieving retention.

At the six-month point, F.I.R.E. increased its retention lead over other industries, with 77.4 percent of JI participants retained, while Hotels and Health continued to show significantly lower results. F.I.R.E. was more than 8 percentage points higher than the closest follower, Retail Trade, at 69.1 percent retained. At this 6-month milestone, the Health industry had the lowest retention rate at 57.4 percent retained. There are several possible explanations for this outcome. It could be a reflection of the generally poor wages, working conditions, and/or opportunities for advancement in entry-level health care positions, which results in this industry generally having a

¹⁴ Of 149 people employed in the Hotels industry who were eligible for 3-month retention, 108 were retained. Of the remaining 41, 33 were from the Milwaukee Hospitality Prototype.

very high turnover rate in such jobs. Since some JI sites have directed former TANF recipients toward entry-level health care positions, it also may be a reflection of the difficulties that former recipients face in acclimating themselves to the demands of a regular job.

Hotels continued its poor showing of the 3-month milestone with the second lowest reported retention after 6 months, 60.7 percent. Through March 2000, the Hotel industry had 71.4 percent retained at 6-months, followed by F.I.R.E (70.5 percent), Manufacturing (69.7 percent), and Retail Trade (69.1 percent).

The F.I.R.E. and Health industries were in the first and last retention positions respectively at the last (12-month) milestone. F.I.R.E. was still the industry leader in retention by the 12-month milestone at 62.5 percent retained. At the same point, the Health industry again had the lowest retention rate, at 42.3 percent. These results are consistent with the previous report, as the Health industry had only a 44.1 percent retention rate (the lowest) and F.I.R.E. had a 66.7 percent retention rate (the highest) by the 12-month milestone.

After its disappointing showing at earlier milestones, the Hotel industry had the second highest 12-month retention performance, owing to the drop in retention by the other industries. Its rate stayed relatively stable at 58.8% while the rates in other industries dropped. The 12-month retention performance of the Hotel industry also reflects the smaller number of participants eligible compared to the other industries. Hotel workers eligible for 12-month retention in 2001 were largely the same individuals achieving the relatively high 3- and 6-month retention rates reported in 2000.

Sites considering program development should bear in mind the strong showing in retention and initial wages by the F.I.R.E. industry. Construction and manufacturing offer top wages, but retention is not as certain, owing to the seasonal nature of the work and the vulnerability of these sectors to the economy. However, F.I.R.E. employment may not be available in every locality, and it requires certain skills and education. Nonetheless, where the market niche exists and the workforce has the prerequisites or the site has the training capacity, F.I.R.E. may offer a strong return for investment in workforce development.

IX. Achievement of various milestones by project (see Table 8)

Variation by site and project in achieving 3-month milestone

*At the 3-month milestone, Seattle had the highest retention percentage at 88.8 percent retained (a 5.3 percentage point increase over last year). Philadelphia followed close behind at 84.4 percent retained. Denver had the lowest 3-month retention percentage, at 62.8 percent, though its retention rate was up 3 percentage points from the June 2000 Retention Analysis. Overall, the percentages are similar to the results reported in 2000, except that *New Orleans significantly improved its 3-month retention rates, from 70.7 percent retained to 79.0 percent retained.**

Key project-specific results are:

- The Denver Non-DWI project¹⁵ had the highest 3-month retention rate at that site at 80.0 percent, while the Denver-Assembly project had the lowest rate at 46.5 percent retained. This is consistent with the June 2000 report.
- In Milwaukee, the Printing Industry Project had the highest 3-month retention rate at 74.5 percent, while the Hospitality Prototype had the lowest retention rate at 37.7 percent. In the previous report, Manufacturing Jobs had the highest 3-month retention rate in Milwaukee, at 81.4 percent. This figure dropped to 67.1 percent in the cumulative data through March 2001.
- New Orleans' projects all had fairly high 3-month retention rates, with the Health Care project at 100% retained (though only 2 workers are represented). The Job Readiness project also increased its retention rate from 60 percent last year to 84 percent this year.
- Philadelphia's 3-month retention rates for each industry were all above 75 percent, with the Campus Boulevard Corporation-Medical Office Administration (CBC-MOA) project the highest among Philadelphia projects at 93.3 percent retained. There were no other significant changes to the retention rate performance in Philadelphia, with the exception of the Partnership for Self-Sufficiency project, which increased its retention rate from 72.2 percent to 83.3 percent.
- Seattle had the highest average 3-month retention rate, 88.8 percent, and high rates across all its projects. Four new Seattle projects had 100% retention rates: the Branch Villa project, the Fred Hutchinson project,¹⁶ Immunex, and the Stabilization Project. In addition, two projects dramatically increased their placement and retention rates since the June 2000 Retention Analysis -- the Brownfields Project improved 3-month retention from 0 percent to 90 percent, while the Conservation Corps project improved retention from 57.1 percent to 91.7 percent.
- In St. Louis, 3-month retention was also fairly high, except for the Call Center (which represented only 2 workers) at 50.0 percent retained and Health Careers, with only 55.1 percent retained. The Health Careers project showed a significant drop in retention since the June 2000 report when 75.9 percent achieved the 3-month milestone. Two other projects showed significant improvement in retention--Work Link improved 3-month retention from 69.7 percent to 80.1 percent and Work Link - Downtown improved retention from 0 percent to 74.3 percent.

Variation by site and project in achieving 6-month milestone

As it had in the June 2000 Retention Analysis, Seattle again led the sites in retention rates at the 6-month milestone, with 80.8 percent retained. Philadelphia followed, with 73.1 percent retained, while Denver achieved only 42.2 percent retention at the 6-month mark. In the June 2000 report, New Orleans had the lowest 6-month retention rate, 41.7 percent, but achieved some improvement through this year, with 49.5 percent retained.

¹⁵ "Non-DWI project" refers to Denver's direct placements rather than sector-based job placements.

¹⁶ The Fred Hutchinson project and the Stabilization Project had only 2 and 1 placements, respectively.

Overall, the 6-month retention rates seen in the period through 2001 showed variable performance compared to the retention rates through 2000. All the sites showed significant dips in retention rates from the 3-month milestone to the 6-month milestone. Key results are:

- Denver, Philadelphia, and Seattle showed declines of less than 5 percentage points in 6-month retention rates compared to the June 2000 Retention Analysis. In the other three sites, the 6-month retention rates through 2001 rose over the rates through March 2000
- In Denver, the Assembly project's retention rate was the lowest at 27.1 percent, while the Non-DWI project increased its 6-month rate from 60.0 percent to 80.0 percent retained.
- Milwaukee's Hospitality Prototype's retention rates at the 3-month and six-month milestones (38 percent and 29 percent) were significantly lower than the rates at these milestones for the period through 2000 (54.5 percent and 60 percent). Manufacturing Jobs also had significant drops in 6-month retention, decreasing from 76.3 percent retained through 2000 to 58.3 percent retained through 2001.
- In both Philadelphia and Seattle, 6-month retention percentages increased from the level of the June 2000 Retention Analysis to above 60 percent for all industries, despite a small decline from the 3-month milestone. In the June 2000 Retention Analysis, many projects showed a retention rate below 60 percent in these two cities.
- St. Louis' Health Careers project had a decline from the 3-month retention milestone to 44.8 percent at 6-months, whereas Pathways To Construction increased 10 percentage points to 100 percent retention between 3- and 6-months.

Variation by site and project in achieving 12-month milestone

Philadelphia had the highest overall retention percentage at the 12-month milestone, 63.7 percent, followed closely by St. Louis at 61.6 percent. Seattle achieved a 57.5 percent retention rate, while only 23 percent of New Orleans' eligible workers were retained. All sites declined in 12-month retention rates compared with their 6-month rates.

Retention rates for four sites, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Seattle, St. Louis, were slightly higher in this cumulative period than in the period through 2000. By contrast, *Milwaukee experienced a decrease of 10 percentage points in the 12-month retention rate during the latest period.* The following are some other key results:

- All projects in Philadelphia remained strong, with all but one project remaining above the 50 percent level for 12-month retention. The Philadelphia Area Manufacturing Education (PhAME) and CBC-MOA projects were particularly strong, with 12-month retention rates of 80.8 percent and 75.6 percent, respectively. This is a significant improvement for the PhAME project, which had a retention rate of only 54.2 percent at the 12-month milestone for the period through 2000..
- In Seattle, the new Branch Villa project had the highest retention rate across all sites at 86.7 percent.

- The Business Services project in St. Louis also remained strong with 86.4 percent of participants retained at the 12-month milestone. This was a marked improvement over the retention rate through 2000 of only 50.0 percent.

Further analysis of training and industry retention in the December 2001 Retention Analysis may yield some interesting findings about which project models might provide the highest chances for retention success among the various populations of job-seekers.

X. Characteristics of individuals eligible for the 12-month milestone: retained versus not retained (Table 9)

By the 12-month milestone, noticeable differences were seen in the retention rates among different sub-populations of participants who had held one or more jobs since JI placement. The percentage of men achieving the 12-month milestone was lower (49.9 percent) than the percentage of women (52.9 percent). Participants of Asian descent were between 4 and 40 percentage points above other ethnic groups in retention rates. In addition to Asian enrollees (79 percent), Multiethnic participants (57.8 percent), or those classified as ‘Other’ (58.6 percent) were more likely to reach the 12-month milestone than black (49.4 percent), Hispanic (48.2 percent), or white participants (46.8 percent). The success of Asian participants is also reflected in the fact that participants whose first language is Vietnamese had a 77.9 percent 12-month retention rate, compared with a rate of only 47.6 percent for native English speakers. The majority of Vietnamese-speaking participants, and Asian participants in general, are from Seattle.

As seen in the earlier milestones, participants who are married and living with a spouse were much more likely to be retained than their single or separated peers. Participants with children at home were also more likely to be retained than those without children. The more education a participant had, the more likely he or she was to be retained. Neither paid work experience nor living in an impact community had any statistical effect on the likelihood of a participant being retained.

XI. Yearly retention rates, by site (see Table 11)

The yearly retention rates for various milestones have changed over time. As shown in Table 11, the overall cross-site percentage of JI participants retained has generally declined with each year and with each milestone. However, there are significant variations by site that can account for some of this decline, as some sites began their programs later than other sites and have had less time to refine their programs. Accordingly, some of the observed decline is undoubtedly due to adding more varied (and perhaps more challenging) jobs projects to the mix. Related to this, the JI participant population has become increasingly “difficult to serve” over time, as will be discussed in more detail in Section XIII. Moreover, as mentioned above, it is important to note that individual Jobs Initiative sites have actually improved their retention rates during the past

program year. The difficulty in maintaining contact with participants and gathering data also makes it possible that we do not have complete information on all JI participants and their retention status.

For enrollees within the last year, April 2000 to March 2001, the 3-month retention rate is 70.4 percent, the 6-month retention rate is 46.2 percent, and the 12-month retention rate is only 10.0 percent. The low 12-month retention rate may be explained by the fact that, of those enrolled during this year, there were only 10 eligible participants for 12-month retention, and we may not have complete data. These rates are comparable to rates of the previous year (April 1999 to March 2000) for 3- and 12-month retention, but the 6-month rate is lower than last year (56 percent). Overall this year, Seattle had the highest 3- and 6-month retention rates at 97.5 percent and 73.3 percent, respectively. The lowest retention rates were in Milwaukee, with only 41.6 percent retention at the 3-month milestone and 27.2 percent retained at the 6-month milestone.

For the entire length of the program, the 3-month retention rate was 76.9 percent, 62.9 percent for the 6-month milestone, and 50.7 percent for the 12-month milestone.

XII. Wage changes by project (see Tables 10, 13)

Changes in hourly wages by site and project

This section discusses changes in wages from three perspectives: 1) initial placement wages for the period through 2001 compared to the period through 2000; 2) retention wages (at last known job) in the period through 2001 compared to the period through 2000; and 3) changes from initial placement wages to retention wages.

The cumulative initial placement wages for each site have increased on average since the June 2000 Retention Analysis, with the exception of Milwaukee, where the average placement wages have decreased by \$0.37 per hour from hourly wages of \$11.04 to \$10.67. Among the increased initial placement wages, the site-level changes ranged from an increase of only \$0.07 per hour in St. Louis (from an hourly wage of \$7.61 to \$7.68) to as much as \$0.46 per hour in New Orleans (from an hourly wage of \$7.11 to \$7.57).

In this report, we refer to the wages reported for the last known jobs of participants as their “retention wages.” Compared with the data reported in the June 2000 Retention Analysis, the retention wage on average increased in four of six JI sites for the period through 2001. However, there were decreases in both Milwaukee, which was down \$0.45 per hour from \$11.42 to \$10.97, and St. Louis, which was down only \$0.04 per hour from \$7.98 to \$7.94. For the other sites, increases ranged from only \$0.15 per hour in Denver to an increase of \$0.62 per hour in New Orleans.

The wage changes between initial placement wages and retention wages also varied significantly by site. Wages increased from initial to retention wage by an average of \$0.54 per hour in Denver and \$0.50 per hour in Seattle, but only \$0.15 per hour in New Orleans. Additionally, a few individual projects had marked changes between average placement wages and average

retention wages for the period through March 2001. For example, the average wage for a JI participant in the Philadelphia PhAME project increased by \$1.22 per hour. Although there were only two JI participants at the Fred Hutchinson project in Seattle, their wages increased by \$1.87 per hour, a significant amount. In the June 2000 Retention Analysis, only JI participants in the Construction industry in St. Louis experienced a wage increase of a similar magnitude, at \$1.25 per hour.

Direct vs. Sectoral Placements

The patterns in the relative wage levels of direct placements versus sectoral placements have not changed from those previously presented in the Capacity Building Report. Direct placements continue to provide a lower starting wage and retention wage than sectoral placements. Average direct placement wages went up from \$8.60 per hour to \$8.97 per hour, whereas average sectoral placement wages increased from \$9.50 to \$9.92 per hour.

XIII. Difficult to serve populations (see Table 12)

As discussed in the Capacity Building Report, the JI population has seen an increase in the proportion of participants that can be characterized as “harder to employ.” For example, the percentage of new enrollees with no prior work experience increased by 15 percentage points from the beginning of the JI to March 31, 2001. New enrollees also show a lower level of education attained. The percentage of enrollees with less than a high school diploma has increased by 23 percentage points since the beginning of the JI.

Chapter Two: Regression Analysis: Modeling Barriers to Retention

I. Introduction

Findings from statistical frequencies or cross-tabulations (such as those in the preceding chapter) can be difficult to interpret because they may or may not reflect a causal relationship. However, regression analysis can help to confirm patterns observed in the cross-tabulations, allowing us to measure the reliability of empirical findings.

In our regression analyses, we assume certain variables are held constant for all participants as we try to measure how other variables influence retention. For example, when educational attainment and English proficiency for Asian-Americans are the same as those for Caucasians and African-Americans, why are Asian-Americans retained at a higher rate than other ethnicities? In order to sort out some of the causal relationships, we performed regression analyses concerning a variety of possible influences on employment retention. The variables examined included JI site, ethnicity, language proficiency, education, prior work experience, public assistance, age, children, and transportation. We chose these variables primarily because they had the most complete data for all sites.

In order to determine which factors may restrict JI participants from attaining retention milestones, we constructed a participant level model to assess the effect of various barriers on retention at the 3-, 6-, and 12-month milestones. We created both a cross-site model, which includes participants from all sites, and a separate model for Seattle participants only. Seattle had both a high number of participants and also gathered additional barrier variables that were not as consistently recorded at other sites, such as childcare, substance abuse, training, US citizenship, disabilities, and prior criminal convictions.

Both models were constructed to provide comparisons to a hypothetical base case. The base case is compared to all other participants in the model with different criteria. In the cross-site model, the base case was a person with the Seattle JI who was white, lacked a high school degree, was 22 years old or younger, and had no children at home. The base case is considerably different from the typical JI participant, who is a minority female aged 21-35, with a child at home and a 12th grade education or less. This model captured 5,235 placed participants out of a total 12,570 enrollees. In the Seattle model, the base case was the same, but was only being compared to other participants in the Seattle JI. This model captured 1,969 placed participants out of 5,041 enrollees.

Compared to the base case, out of the 11 categories of barriers included in our cross-site model, five were found to be statistically significant. These included site, educational level, homelessness, ethnicity, and difficult commute. In fact, three of these variables, homelessness, ethnicity, and difficult commute, were significant across both models, indicating they do have something important to tell us. The following trends found in the regressions are statistically significant unless otherwise noted.

Compared to the base case, the following regression results confirmed our cross-tabulation results:

- ***The cross-site regression demonstrated that at all milestones Asian-American/Pacific Islanders are over two times more likely to retain employment than whites.*** Cross-tabulations previously showed that Asians achieved retention milestones at a higher rate than other races (96.4 percent retained at 3 months, 90.1 percent retained at 6 months, and 79.3 percent retained at 12 months).
- ***The regression analysis confirms the cross-tabulation results that participants from Seattle were more likely to be retained at the 3-month and 6-month milestones than participants at all other sites. At the 12-month milestone, participants from Philadelphia were the most likely to be retained.*** As we saw previously, the 3- and 6-month retention rates were highest in Seattle (88.8 percent and 80.8 percent, respectively), but Philadelphia took the lead by the 12-month milestone (63.7 percent retained).
- ***Participants with higher education are more likely to achieve 6- and 12-month retention milestones.*** Regression analysis shows that participants with high school diplomas had a 40 percent greater retention rate at the 6-month milestone than those without, and the probability of retention increased with more education. As shown previously in Table 4, the general trend is for those with higher levels of educational attainment to be more likely to achieve retention milestones.

The cross-site and Seattle regression analyses gave us certainty about factors that are typically expected to be barriers to employment.

- ***A difficult commute¹⁷ is one of the key barriers to employment retention across all sites.***
- ***Participants who are homeless are less likely to achieve retention milestones across all sites.***
- ***In Seattle, women are much more likely to achieve all retention milestones than men.*** This is a confirmation of what we showed in Table 4, where women achieved twelve-month retention at a slightly higher rate (53.0 percent) than men (49.9 percent). Because the number of Seattle participants is so great, this higher retention rate for women across all sites most likely is due to the higher retention rate of Seattle women.
- ***In Seattle, a history of criminal convictions is a barrier to retention.***
- ***Contrary to expectations, disabilities, lack of day care, and substance abuse were not found to be statistically significant barriers to retention.***

A more detailed explanation of the regression analyses is provided below. This explanation provides details of our hypotheses for different possible barriers to retention. It also indicates why we chose certain variables and how we expect them to affect the achievement of retention

¹⁷ If the participant does not drive or get a ride to work consistently, we assume that commuting is difficult.

milestones. A discussion of how to interpret the more technical aspects of the regression analysis is also provided.

II. Regression Methodology

Data File

We created six separate data files: an eligibility file for 3-, 6-, and 12-month retention milestones for all sites and separate eligibility files for 3-, 6-, and 12-month milestones for Seattle. The data file **elig3mo** contained only participants eligible for the 3-month milestone at all sites, while the **seattle_elig3mo** contained only participants from Seattle eligible for the 3-month milestone. The same methodology was applied to the 6- and 12-month milestone barrier analysis files.

Interpretation

These models all use bivariate logistic regression analysis, from which we examine both the coefficient estimates and the odds ratio estimates. The coefficients are interpreted using their sign and magnitude. A large negative coefficient indicates that the variable causes the predicted outcome (in this case, retention at various milestones) to be less likely. For example, the variable **Denver**, which indicates a participant is from Denver, has a coefficient of -1.447 in the 3-month cross-site model. This indicates that Denver participants are less likely to be retained at the 3-month milestone than Seattle participants. A large positive coefficient indicates that the variable causes retention to be more likely (e.g. the variable **asian** in the cross-site 3-month retention milestone has a coefficient of 1.0603 , indicating Asians are more likely to be retained than whites).

The odds ratio estimates signify the percent increase in the likelihood of retention for a one-unit increase in the variable. For example, if a statistically significant variable has an odds ratio estimate of 1.095 , a one-unit increase in that variable translates into a 9.5 percent increase in the probability of retention. For example, if the variable were **age2**, which indicates the participant is between 23 and 28 years old, a one-unit increase would move the variable up to **age3**, indicating a participant is between 29 and 34 years old. In this example, participants aged 29-34 would be 9.5 percent more likely to achieve the retention milestone than participants' aged 23-28.

To determine the statistical significance of the coefficient estimates, we looked at the p-value. The p-value is a measure of the likelihood that the results of the regression are showing an actual relationship when compared to the null hypothesis (that attaining the retention milestones is equally likely for the base case and the test cases). A low p-value for a statistical test presents the evidence necessary to gauge confidence in coefficients. We set the cut-off for the p-value at the 10-percent level, or a p-value ≤ 0.1 . An example of a statistically significant variable is **asian**, which had a p-value of 0.01 in the cross-site 3-month model, indicating it was significant at the 1-percent level.

Variables

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in these models is a dummy¹⁸ variable indicating whether the participant attained the 3-, 6-, and 12-month milestones any time between the beginning of the JI and March 31, 2001. Each of these milestones is modeled separately. For example, in the cross-site 3-month retention barriers model, the variable *retain3mo* is equal to 1 if the participant attained the 3-month milestone and is equal to zero if the participant was eligible to achieve the 3-month milestone but did not achieve it.

Explanatory Variables

The explanatory variables are the independent variables in our model and can be organized into the following groups: education characteristics, personal characteristics, possible barriers, and site indicators. For each variable, we will present a description of how the variable was created, our hypothesis on why we thought the variable would have an effect on barriers to retention, and an initial expectation of the variable's direction in the model.

We looked at eleven (11) possible explanatory variables.

Unemployment Compensation

A person who received unemployment compensation in the last year was not working consistently and may have a spotty employment history. Since we are unsure what caused their previous spotty employment history, we must assume that it will continue in the JI.

The variable **ui** is a dummy variable assigned to 1 if the participant ever received unemployment compensation in the year prior to enrollment in the JI. Otherwise, the variable is equal to zero. We expect this variable to have a negative coefficient, which would indicate a participant who received unemployment compensation was less likely to achieve retention milestones.

Language Barriers

We used two variables to capture the difficulty a participant might face in finding and retaining a job if they have difficulty speaking or reading the English language. The first, **notprof**, is a dummy variable indicating that a participant is not proficient in English. This variable is assigned to 1 if the participant indicated they had a problem with English or if the participant took an English as a Second Language (ESL) course. The other variable used to indicate language difficulties was **lang**, which was assigned a value of 1 if the participant indicated their first language was something other than English. These two variables are different measures of the same barrier, and are used separately in the models. We expect the coefficient on either of the variables to be negative, indicating that difficulty with the English language is a barrier to

¹⁸ A dummy variable is assigned a value of 1 if the condition is true and a 0 otherwise. For example, in the variable **asian**, the variable is assigned to 1 if the participant is Asian; otherwise, **asian**=0.

employment. However, it is important to note that whether or not a person has difficulty with English is a self-reported variable and is therefore subjective.¹⁹

Commuting Difficulty

If a participant does not drive or get a ride to work on a consistent basis, we assume that commuting is more difficult and may pose a barrier to retention. The dummy variable **hardcommute** is used to indicate whether a participant did not have an easy method of transportation to and from their jobs in the last 12 months and in their current jobs. The variable **hardcommute** is assigned to 1 if the participant listed their mode of transportation as bus, public transit, walk, bike, taxi, or a mode of transportation other than a car. We expect this variable to be negative, indicating a difficult commute to and from a job is a barrier to retention.

Work Experience

Based on our data presented in the first chapter of this report, it appears JI participants with prior work experience are placed in higher-paying jobs than those without any work experience prior to the JI.²⁰ This might also seem to indicate that these participants might be more likely to stay in their jobs, since they are getting a higher wage. The dummy variable **nowork** is assigned a value of 1 if the participant has no prior work experience before enrolling in the JI. We expect this variable to be negative, indicating lack of work experience makes it more difficult to be retained in a job.

Difficult Housing Situations

A participant's living situation is likely to have an effect on whether or not the participant is able to maintain a stable home life, and therefore a stable work life. We posit that if a participant has unstable or uncertain conditions in housing, they are more likely to have difficulty retaining a job. We capture difficult housing situations in two variables of differing severity: **homeless** is assigned to 1 if the participant is homeless, while **probhous** indicates problematic housing and is assigned a value of 1 if the participant lives in a group shelter, halfway house, public housing, transitional housing, or is living with someone temporarily. We expect both of these variables to be negative, indicating barriers to employment retention.

¹⁹ There are many cases where participants list their first language as something other than English, but do not indicate that they have a problem with English. Forty-nine percent of participants who indicated Spanish as their first language indicated that they had an English problem, while 69.0 percent of the Vietnamese-speakers had difficulty with English. However, only 47.0 percent of those who took ESL courses indicated that they had a problem with English.

²⁰ The average initial placement wage for a participant with prior work experience is \$9.20 per hour, in contrast to the wage for someone who had not worked before the JI, \$8.75 per hour. The overall average placement wage (including enrollees who did not report whether they had had prior work experience) is \$9.15.

Site Indicators

We used six dummy variables to indicate sites of the JI programs. Seattle is the control variable for the cross-site analysis and acts as the base case because it makes up a large percentage of the total placements. We expect the sites with higher retention rates (Seattle, Philadelphia) to have positive coefficients, indicating participants from those sites are more likely to be retained.

Age of the Participant

We stratified the age of the participants into 5 different age categories, **age1-age5**.²¹ These age ranges are different than the age ranges given in the previous portion of the report because we wanted them to represent five categories with relatively equal numbers. We expect older people to be more likely to be retained, so coefficients will become increasingly positive and larger as age increases. The youngest age group, **age1**, which represents participants 22 years old and younger, is our reference variable representing the base case.

Sex of the Participant

From the earlier portions of this report, we saw that females were slightly more likely than males to be retained by the 12-month milestone. A dummy indicating the sex of the participant, **female**, is assigned to 1 if the participant is female. We expect this variable to be positive for the 12-month retention model, but have no strong indications for what it would be for the other two milestones.

Education Levels

Lack of education is generally considered a barrier to gainful employment and we make the same assumption here. We created two types of education barriers: the first, **abe**, is assigned to 1 if the participant was ever enrolled in an Adult Basic Education (ABE) course. The second set of variables is based on the participant's highest grade completed. These range from no high school diploma (**nodiploma**) to more than a four-year college degree (**morecoll**). We left **nodiploma** out of the model as our reference variable. We expect the variables to become increasingly positive and larger as the amount of education increases, indicating retention is more likely the more education an individual has.

Ethnicity

We would like to determine if one ethnicity is more likely to attain the various milestones than others. It is possible that minorities would have more difficulty attaining retention milestones for discriminatory reasons, so we left the variable **white** out of our model as the base case. Based on earlier findings in this report, we expect the variable **asian** to be positively associated with retention.

²¹ Age categories were split up as follows: **age1**=aged ≤ 22, **age2**= aged 23-28, **age3**= aged 29-34, **age4**= aged 35-41, **age5**= aged ≥ 42.

Presence of Children at Home

We expect that the difficulty of finding daycare and caring for a family larger than just oneself may make employment retention more difficult. However, earlier in the report, we saw that participants with children were more likely to be retained than those without children. We thought this relationship might be better explained if we considered the age of the child at home. We created 5 age range variables for children at home, ranging from infants aged 0-3 (**kid0_3**) to adult children aged 19 and older (**kid19**).²² We left **kid19** out of the model as the reference variable because an older child at home would not require daycare and may therefore not be a barrier to employment.

Additional Variables for Seattle

As noted above, the comparatively richer Seattle database allowed us to look at additional explanatory variables in that site. We were able to assess the influence of the following six variables.

Substance Abuse

Seattle collected information on whether or not a participant reported using drugs within the last 12 months or was in a drug treatment program within the last 12 months. The dummy variable **drugs** is assigned to 1 if the participant indicated they had used drugs within the last 12 months or were in counseling for drug abuse. We expect this variable to be negative, indicating drug usage is a barrier to retention.

Criminal Convictions

Though it is commonly thought that it is more difficult for people convicted of crimes to later obtain jobs, it is unclear whether this status also impedes their ability to maintain employment. The variable **conviction** is assigned to 1 if the participant had a prior criminal conviction. We have no expectations for the sign of this variable.

Training

Completion of a training course in any field would seem to improve an employees ability to retain employment, simply because they have more skills than an untrained peer. We used data from the Seattle Training file to create the variable **training**, which is assigned to 1 if the participant took some form of training course and completed that course. We expect this variable to positive, indicating training leads to retention.

²² Children at home were divided into 5 different age categories as follows: **kid0_3** = a child at home aged birth to 3 years, **kid4_5** = a child at home aged 4-5 years, **kid6_12** = a child at home aged 6-12 years, **kid13_18** = a child at home aged 13-18 years, **kid19** = a child at home aged 19 or older. Even when we performed the regression on families with children age 5 years old or less at home, day care still did not emerge as a significant barrier.

Childcare

For participants with children, the lack of adequate childcare may present a serious impediment to maintaining a consistent work schedule. If a participant had a problem with childcare, meaning they had children under the age of 13 and had no daycare provisions, we assigned the variable **childcare** to 1. We expect this variable to be negatively associated with retention, meaning problems with childcare prevents employment retention.

U.S. Citizenship

For participants who are not U.S. citizens, it may be difficult to obtain and maintain some jobs, depending on resident alien status and the ability to get work permits. If a participant was listed as either a refugee or a registered alien, we assigned the variable **notcitizen** to 1. We expect lack of U.S. citizenship to be a barrier to retention.

Disabilities

Disabled participants might find it more difficult to find a job suited to their abilities and may also find many typical JI jobs (such as construction and manufacturing) to be difficult to perform. We assign the variable **disability** to 1 if the participant has a disability.²³ We expect disabilities to be a barrier to retention

III. Results

Of the various barriers we examined, several were found to significantly effect job retention. These findings are provided below by 3-, 6-, and 12-month retention milestones. In the following analysis, we will consider only variables that were statistically significant.

Evaluation of the 3-month Retention Barriers Models

The cross-site model produced a reasonable percentage of concordant records at 71.3 percent concordance.²⁴ As noted above, five of our explanatory variables proved statistically significant. Key results include:

- The probability of being retained at the 3-month milestone is decreased by *a difficult commute*. The coefficient on **hardcommute** is negative and the odds ratio estimate is 0.593, meaning a participant with a difficult commute is only 59.3 percent as likely to be retained as someone with an easy commute.

²³ These disabilities may include physical, cognitive, emotional, or sensory disabilities.

²⁴ Concordance is a measure of the goodness-of-fit of the entire model and can range in value from 0 to 100, with a value of 100 being a perfect model. All of our models had concordance levels in the high sixties to low seventies, which is a reasonable degree of confidence.

- **Homeless participants** are less likely (they are 64.8 percent as likely) to be retained than those with adequate housing.
- Participants at **Denver, Milwaukee, and St. Louis** JI sites are less likely to be retained at the 3-month milestone than those from Seattle.
- **Asian** participants are 2.89 times more likely to be retained than white participants (our reference group). The fact that the number of Asian participants in the JI is a relatively small percentage makes this fact even more meaningful.

The Seattle 3-month model had a concordance of 71.6 percent. There was a slight change in the statistically significant variables from the cross-site model. Key results include:

- As we found in the cross site analysis, a **difficult commute** is a barrier to employment to a Seattle participant, who was only 51.7 percent as likely to be retained at the 3-month milestone than someone who had an easy commute.
- **Women** are more likely to be retained at the 3-month milestone than men, by a rate of 84.4 percent.
- **Homeless participants** are only 56.3 percent as likely to be retained as participants with adequate housing.
- **Asians** are again more likely to be retained, at a rate of 2.79 times more likely than whites at the 3-month milestone.

Evaluation of the 6-month Retention Barriers Models

The 6-month cross-site model had a concordance percentage of 68.8 percent. In addition to some of the same statistically significant variables we saw in the 3-month model, such as **hardcommute** and **homeless**, we see here the addition of some education variables. Key results include:

- In addition to the previous statistically significant site dummies, **New Orleans** also proved statistically significant in this model, showing that participants from New Orleans were only 42.6 percent as likely as Seattle participants to be retained at the 6-month milestone.
- Participants with a **high school diploma** have almost a forty percent (37.8 percent) greater chance of being retained than a participant who has not graduated from high school (our reference group). Participants with some college coursework improved their probability of retention further, at a rate of 65.7 percent more likely than a participant without a high school diploma.
- **Asian** participants are again more likely to be retained than whites, at this milestone at a rate of 2.14 times more likely.

The Seattle-specific 6-month model had a concordance of 68.9 percent. The three statistically significant explanatory variables in this model were **hardcommute**, **female**, and **homeless**, which again had negative coefficients. Seattle participants who had a difficult commute were 60.5 percent as likely as a participant with an easy commute to achieve the 6-month milestone, while

women were 40 percent more likely than men to achieve the 6-month retention milestone. Homeless participants were 60.5 percent as likely to achieve the retention milestone as a participant with adequate housing.

Evaluation of the 12-month Retention Barriers Models

The 12-month cross-site model had 69.6 percent concordance. Most findings here were not significantly different from the findings in the previous two models. One key result was at the 12-month milestone, *Philadelphia* was statistically significant and had a positive coefficient. This means Philadelphia was more likely to have retained participants at the 12-month milestone than Seattle at a rate of 73.6 percent.

The Seattle-specific 12-month model had 72.9 percent concordance. The variables **hardcommute**, **homeless**, and **asian** all gave similar results in this model as we saw in previous milestone models. A new result is the statistical significance of the variable **conviction**, which has a negative coefficient. This tells us that Seattle participants with a prior criminal conviction are only 51.3 percent as likely as participants without a criminal conviction to attain the 12-month retention milestone.

IV. Summary of Regression Analysis Findings

JJ participants with the following characteristics are correlated with lower retention rates at the 3-month milestone: non-Asian, homeless, a difficult commute, living in Denver, Milwaukee, or St. Louis. In Seattle, the factors correlated with lower 3-month retention rates are homelessness, a difficult commute, being a male, being non-Asian.

At the 6-month milestone, the 3-month barriers apply, with the added caveat that participants without a high school diploma or those living in New Orleans are less likely to achieve the milestone than the base case. In Seattle, the same characteristics that are barriers to 3-month retention are also barriers to 6-month retention.

At the 12-month milestone, participants not living in Philadelphia, those with a hard commute, and those who are homeless have a more difficult time being retained than the base case. In Seattle, the same barriers again apply, but we learned that a prior criminal conviction is also a barrier to 12-month retention.

The statistical significance of the successful retention performance of Seattle overall and of Philadelphia at 12 months suggests that additional analysis of these sites would be worthwhile. If we can determine which programmatic features of these sites or of the specific projects within them contribute to the strong retention results, these strategies can more readily be replicated in other sites seeking to improve retention.

This analysis provides insights into barriers that effect job retention and shows the value of collecting barrier information on participants. With this information, sites can begin to identify

barriers that hinder job retention and develop strategies to assist individuals to overcome them during participation in the Jobs Initiative programs and after initial job placement.

2000 Retention Analysis Tables

TABLE 1

AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
Characteristics of Non-placed and Placed Enrollees - as Percentage of Total Enrollees
Enrolled Through March 31, 2000

	<u>Enrollees</u>		<u>Non-placed</u>		<u>Placed</u>	
	N=	9774	N=	5441	N=	4288
	#		#	%	#	%
<u>Gender</u>	N=	9701	N=	5368	N=	4288
Male	4816	49.6%	2700	56.1%	2111	43.8%
Female	4885	50.4%	2668	54.6%	2177	44.6%
Unknown/Missing	73		73		0	
<u>Age (at enrollment)</u>	N=	9136	N=	4887	N=	4176
< 18 yrs	64	0.7%	45	70.3%	17	26.6%
18-20 yrs	1079	11.8%	626	58.0%	441	40.9%
21-25 yrs	1776	19.4%	965	54.3%	800	45.0%
26-35 yrs	2922	32.0%	1515	51.8%	1388	47.5%
>35 yrs	3295	36.1%	1736	52.7%	1530	46.4%
Unknown/Missing	638		554		112	
Mean age (years)	32		32		32	
<u>Ethnicity</u>	N=	9454	N=	5143	N=	4266
American Indian/Alaskan Native	242	2.6%	144	59.5%	94	38.8%
Other	66	0.7%	37	56.1%	29	43.9%
Asian or Pacific Islander	728	7.7%	351	48.2%	382	52.5%
Black	5877	62.2%	3203	54.5%	2632	44.8%
Hispanic	1090	11.5%	554	50.8%	535	49.1%
Multiethnic	147	1.6%	100	68.0%	48	32.7%
White	1304	13.8%	754	57.8%	546	41.9%
Unknown/Missing	320		298		22	
<u>Indication of difficulty with English proficiency at enrollment</u>	N=	9450	N=	5181	N=	4224
Yes	1378	14.6%	728	52.8%	658	47.8%
No	8072	85.4%	4453	55.2%	3566	44.2%
Unknown/Missing	324		260		64	
<u>Primary Language</u>	N=	7934	N=	4560	N=	3398
Other	846	10.7%	449	53.1%	405	47.9%
English	6558	82.7%	3837	58.5%	2737	41.7%
Spanish	392	4.9%	213	54.3%	179	45.7%
Vietnamese	138	1.7%	61	44.2%	77	55.8%
Unknown/Missing	1840		881		890	
<u>Marital Status</u>	N=	9075	N=	4843	N=	4187
Married, living with spouse	1402	15.4%	650	46.4%	754	53.8%
Married, not living with spouse	703	7.7%	389	55.3%	316	45.0%
Non-married partner	668	7.4%	410	61.4%	252	37.7%
Single, never married	4956	54.6%	2647	53.4%	2271	45.8%
Widowed, Divorced, Legally Separate	1346	14.8%	747	55.5%	594	44.1%
Unknown/Missing	699		598		100	

(Continues)

<i>(Continued)</i>	<u>Enrollees</u>		<u>Non-placed</u>		<u>Placed</u>	
<u>Children at Home</u>	N=	9364	N=	5103	N=	4219
Yes	5013	53.5%	2572	51.3%	2399	47.9%
No Children	4351	46.5%	2531	58.2%	1820	41.8%
Unknown/Missing	410		338		69	
<u>Family Income (Annual)</u>	N=	9048	N=	4741	N=	4197
Under \$3,000	2239	24.7%	1280	57.2%	932	41.6%
\$ 3,000 - \$ 6,000	1645	18.2%	886	53.9%	727	44.2%
\$ 6,001 - \$ 9,000	1246	13.8%	634	50.9%	593	47.6%
\$ 9,001 - \$12,000	1041	11.5%	526	50.5%	508	48.8%
\$12,001 - \$15,000	819	9.1%	383	46.8%	428	52.3%
\$15,001 - \$20,000	846	9.4%	414	48.9%	426	50.4%
\$20,001 - \$25,000	514	5.7%	249	48.4%	260	50.6%
Over \$25,000	698	7.7%	369	52.9%	323	46.3%
Unknown/Missing	725		624		93	
<u>Public Assistance</u>	N=	9701	N=	5368	N=	4288
Yes Public Assistance	4325	44.6%	2392	55.3%	1887	43.6%
No Public Assistance	5376	55.4%	2976	55.4%	2401	44.7%
Unknown/Missing	73		73		0	
<u>Highest Grade Completed</u>	N=	9364	N=	5075	N=	4244
Less Than High School Diploma	3176	33.9%	1859	58.5%	1296	40.8%
12th (Last yr. high school)	3791	40.5%	1999	52.7%	1782	47.0%
Some College	1256	13.4%	678	54.0%	568	45.2%
Two-year College	632	6.7%	289	45.7%	338	53.5%
16th Grade (end of 4 yr. Coll)	355	3.8%	168	47.3%	187	52.7%
More than College	154	1.6%	82	53.2%	73	47.4%
Unknown/Missing	410		366		44	
<u>Paid Work Experience (Ever Had)</u>	N=	9141	N=	5029	N=	4067
Yes	8075	88.3%	4377	54.2%	3661	45.3%
No	1066	11.7%	652	61.2%	406	38.1%
Unknown/Missing	633		412		221	

TABLE 2

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
Wage and Health Care Benefit Comparison Information
For Initial Placements Through March 31, 2000**

	N= 3661 <u>Pre JI Wage*</u>	N= 4288 <u>Initial Placement Wage</u>	N= 4288 <u>Last Known (Retention) Wage</u>
<u>Hourly Wage Statistics:</u>	N= 3471	N= 4254	N= 4204
Mean Wage	\$8.07	\$9.14	\$9.56
Median Wage	\$7.50	\$8.50	\$9.00
	<u>Pre JI Wage</u>	<u>Initial Placement Wage</u>	<u>Last Known (Retention) Wage</u>
<u>Weekly Earnings Statistics:</u>	N= 3416	N= 4240	N= 4174
Mean Weekly Earnings	\$300.16	\$359.41	\$374.88
Median Weekly Earnings	\$280.00	\$340.00	\$350.00
	<u>Pre JI Weekly Hours</u>	<u>Initial Placement Weekly Hours</u>	<u>Last Known (Retention) Weekly Hours</u>
<u>Weekly Hours Statistics:</u>	N= 3229	N= 4240	N= 4183
Mean Hours	36	39	39
Median Hours	40	40	40
	<u>Pre JI Benefits</u>	<u>Initial Placement Benefits</u>	<u>Last Known (Retention) Benefits</u>
<u>Health Benefits</u> (Employer Contributes)	N= 3396	N= 4177	N= 4093
	#	#	#
	%	%	%
Yes	1076 31.7%	3509 84.0%	3442 84.1%
No	2320 68.3%	668 16.0%	651 15.9%
Unknown/Missing	249	111	195

* Pre-JI wage information is only for JI enrollees with previous work experience.

TABLE 3

**AECF Jobs Initiative
All JI Sites, Except Milwaukee
JI Placed Participants Eligible for 12-month Retention
Retention Through March 31, 2000**

	<i>Pre-JI</i>	<i>Post-JI</i>		
	<i>Participants with Prior Work Experience</i> ¹	<i>All Placed Participants</i> ²	<i>Participants with Prior Work Experience</i> ³	<i>Participants Without Prior Work Experience</i> ⁴
N	1044	950	754	77
Mean Weeks	26.20	32.44	31.09	30.92
Median Weeks	25	34.5	32.57143	31.28571

¹ Numbers are based on the **1044** placed participants who had prior work experience and were eligible for 12-month retention, excluding Milwaukee.

² Numbers are based on the **950** placed participants who were eligible for 12-month retention, and for whom start and end dates for all jobs within the first year were available, excluding Milwaukee.

³ Numbers are based on the **754** placed participants who had prior work experience, were eligible for 12-month retention, and for whom start and end dates for all jobs within the first year were available, excluding Milwaukee.

⁴ Numbers are based on the **77** placed participants who did not have prior work experience, were eligible for 12-month retention, and for whom start and end dates for all jobs within the first year were available, excluding Milwaukee.

TABLE 4

AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
Enrollee Characteristics - Achieved Quarterly Retention Milestones
Retention Through March 31, 2000

	<u>3 MONTHS</u>			<u>6 MONTHS</u>			<u>9 MONTHS</u>			<u>12 MONTHS</u>		
	# Eligible	# Achieved	%	# Eligible	# Achieved	%	# Eligible	# Achieved	%	# Eligible	# Achieved	%
Total:	3688	2872	77.9%	3314	2264	68.3%	2810	1523	54.20%	2219	1200	54.08%
<u>Gender</u>												
Male	1811	1394	77.0%	1661	1135	68.3%	1401	752	53.68%	1140	585	51.32%
Female	1877	1478	78.7%	1653	1129	68.3%	1409	771	54.72%	1079	615	57.00%
Unknown/Missing	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
<u>Age (at enrollment)</u>												
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
< 18 yrs	14	11	78.6%	13	10	76.9%	9	5	55.56%	8	4	50.00%
18-20 yrs	338	244	72.2%	291	179	61.5%	235	109	46.38%	159	72	45.28%
21-25 yrs	680	533	78.4%	599	408	68.1%	518	264	50.97%	396	199	50.25%
26-35 yrs	1228	963	78.4%	1106	744	67.3%	941	522	55.47%	746	412	55.23%
>35 yrs	1369	1078	78.7%	1256	890	70.9%	1059	601	56.75%	869	494	56.85%
Unknown/Missing	59	43		49	33		48	22		41	19	
<u>Ethnicity</u>												
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	80	57	71.3%	76	44	57.9%	68	27	39.71%	63	22	34.92%
Other	27	23	85.2%	27	21	77.8%	22	15	68.18%	21	14	66.67%
Asian or Pacific Islander	346	318	91.9%	325	284	87.4%	285	229	80.35%	249	190	76.31%
Black	2213	1700	76.8%	1949	1299	66.6%	1636	830	50.73%	1224	638	52.12%
Hispanic	467	366	78.4%	434	290	66.8%	356	196	55.06%	286	154	53.85%
Multiethnic	43	39	90.7%	40	31	77.5%	30	17	56.67%	23	12	52.17%
White	497	358	72.0%	448	288	64.3%	399	205	51.38%	342	167	48.83%
Unknown/Missing	15	11		15	7		14	4		11	3	
<u>Primary Language</u>												
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
Other	362	328	90.6%	320	268	83.8%	265	200	75.47%	220	160	72.73%
English	2320	1752	75.5%	2048	1319	64.4%	1750	844	48.23%	1376	672	48.84%
Spanish	163	132	81.0%	154	104	67.5%	129	66	51.16%	103	48	46.60%
Vietnamese	74	67	90.5%	70	61	87.1%	63	49	77.78%	56	41	73.21%
Unknown/Missing	769	593		722	512		603	364		464	279	
<u>Marital Status</u>												
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
Married, living with spouse	673	555	82.5%	624	471	75.5%	528	351	66.48%	427	294	68.85%
Married, not living with spouse	276	214	77.5%	231	159	68.8%	181	105	58.01%	139	81	58.27%
Non-married partner	199	154	77.4%	166	109	65.7%	131	71	54.20%	100	55	55.00%
Single, never married	1927	1476	76.6%	1729	1143	66.1%	1478	743	50.27%	1135	563	49.60%
Widowed, Divorced, Legally Separated	525	398	75.8%	484	315	65.1%	412	202	49.03%	342	162	47.37%
Unknown/Missing	88	75		79	67		80	51		76	45	

AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
Enrollee Characteristics - Achieved Quarterly Retention Milestones
Retention Through March 31, 2000

	<u>3 MONTHS</u>			<u>6 MONTHS</u>			<u>9 MONTHS</u>			<u>12 MONTHS</u>		
<i>(Continued)</i>												
<u>Children at Home</u>		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
Yes	2058	1634	79.4%	1832	1278	69.8%	1543	899	58.26%	1197	723	60.40%
No	1573	1194	75.9%	1436	952	66.3%	1224	598	48.86%	985	454	46.09%
Unknown/Missing	57	44		46	34		43	26		37	23	
<u>Family Income (Annual)</u>		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
\$ 3,000 - \$ 6,000	625	479	76.6%	568	381	67.1%	488	253	51.8%	392	195	49.7%
\$ 6,001 - \$ 9,000	510	397	77.8%	464	318	68.5%	397	213	53.7%	324	171	52.8%
\$ 9,001 - \$12,000	432	345	79.9%	388	277	71.4%	323	183	56.7%	248	139	56.0%
\$12,001 - \$15,000	364	304	83.5%	319	232	72.7%	272	166	61.0%	211	135	64.0%
\$15,001 - \$20,000	365	294	80.5%	331	246	74.3%	280	169	60.4%	218	129	59.2%
\$20,001 - \$25,000	227	173	76.2%	208	139	66.8%	165	92	55.8%	111	72	64.9%
Over \$25,000	283	215	76.0%	257	171	66.5%	202	113	55.9%	142	87	61.3%
Under \$3,000	807	608	75.3%	715	459	64.2%	623	309	49.6%	524	250	47.7%
Unknown/Missing	76	57	75.0%	64	41	64.1%	60	25	41.7%	49	22	44.9%
<u>Public Assistance</u>		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
Yes Public Assistance	1633	1238	75.8%	1445	945	65.4%	1222	637	52.13%	975	513	52.62%
No Public Assistance	2055	1634	79.5%	1869	1319	70.6%	1588	886	55.79%	1244	687	55.23%
Unknown/Missing	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
<u>Highest Grade Completed</u>		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
Less Than High School Diploma	1053	779	74.0%	938	575	61.3%	779	374	48.01%	591	289	48.90%
12th (Last yr. high school)	1562	1233	78.9%	1403	983	70.1%	1201	660	54.95%	938	517	55.12%
Some College	489	389	79.6%	436	311	71.3%	353	199	56.37%	276	156	56.52%
Two-year College	315	250	79.4%	296	212	71.6%	261	159	60.92%	220	125	56.82%
16th Grade (end of 4 yr. coll)	176	144	81.8%	166	126	75.9%	146	91	62.33%	129	79	61.24%
More than College	65	58	89.2%	59	46	78.0%	53	34	64.15%	50	29	58.00%
Unknown/Missing	28	19		16	11		17	6		15	5	
<u>Prior Work Experience</u>		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
Yes	3126	2400	76.8%	2801	1865	66.6%	2337	1220	52.20%	1802	945	52.44%
No	341	266	78.0%	292	199	68.2%	252	144	57.14%	197	111	56.35%
Unknown/Missing	221	206		221	200		221	159		220	144	

Table 5

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative - All JI Sites
Employer Characteristics
Retention through March 31, 2000**

	Initial Placement Employer 1693		Last Known Placement Employer 1868		Initial Placement Avg. Starting Wage 4258	
Number of Employers by SIC Code (2 Digits)	N=		N=		N=	
Automotive	54	3.4%	61	3.9%	82	\$8.28
Construction	187	11.9%	183	11.6%	408	\$12.57
F.I.R.E.	80	5.1%	79	5.0%	182	\$9.20
Health	151	9.6%	152	9.6%	494	\$8.23
Manufacturing	250	15.9%	245	15.5%	988	\$9.53
Public Sector	37	2.4%	37	2.3%	59	\$10.43
Retail Trade	290	18.4%	287	18.1%	570	\$8.16
Services*	363	23.1%	373	23.6%	906	\$8.57
Hotel Services	41	2.6%	42	2.7%	124	\$7.95
Transport, Communications, Utilities, etc.	117	7.4%	119	7.5%	280	\$8.64
Other-Unclassified Establishments	2	0.1%	4	0.3%	2	\$8.50
Unknown/Missing	121		286		163	\$9.15
Number of Employees at Location	N=		N=			
1-10	156	15.7%	140	14.7%		
11-50	378	38.0%	364	38.3%		
51-250	291	29.3%	288	30.3%		
251-500	80	8.0%	75	7.9%		
501-1,000	33	3.3%	30	3.2%		
1,001-5,000	50	5.0%	46	4.8%		
5,001-10,000	5	0.5%	6	0.6%		
Over 10,000	1	0.1%	1	0.1%		
Unknown/Missing	699		918			
Number of JI Participant Placements per Emp	N=		N=			
1	1167	69.0%	1346	72.1%		
2-3	296	17.5%	296	15.9%		
4-6	124	7.3%	128	6.9%		
7-10	52	3.1%	45	2.4%		
11-15	21	1.2%	21	1.1%		
16-20	9	0.5%	8	0.4%		
21-50	19	1.1%	19	1.0%		
50+	4	0.2%	4	0.2%		
Unknow/Missing	1		1			

* "Services" refers to non-health, non-hotel, non-automotive services.

TABLE 6

AECF Jobs Initiative
Initial Placement Wage and Health Care Benefits - By Industry
JI Participants Who Achieved 12-month Retention Since Initial Placement in Same Industry, One job Since Initial Placement
Retention through March 31, 2000

Wage Information	N	Average Initial Placement Starting Wage	Average Last Known (Retention) Wage	Wage Change
Construction	115	\$11.32	\$12.76	\$1.44
Manufacturing	224	\$9.75	\$10.83	\$1.08
Other*	70	\$9.25	\$10.10	\$0.85
Retail Trade	147	\$8.76	\$9.57	\$0.81
F.I.R.E.	48	\$9.31	\$9.98	\$0.67
Hotels	22	\$7.61	\$8.21	\$0.60
Services*	211	\$9.38	\$10.24	\$0.85
Health	75	\$8.28	\$8.93	\$0.65
(missing)	32	\$9.90	\$10.17	\$0.27

*Other and Services are weighted averages of component industries.

Health Care Benefits	N	Initial Placement Benefit Status # Confirmed Yes	%	N	Last Known Benefit Status # Confirmed Yes	%
Construction	112	106	94.6%	81	76	93.8%
Manufacturing	223	209	93.7%	201	187	93.0%
Other	67	52	77.6%	70	57	81.4%
Retail Trade	146	121	82.9%	146	122	83.6%
F.I.R.E.	48	42	87.5%	48	42	87.5%
Hotels	22	20	90.9%	21	20	95.2%
Services	209	171	81.8%	206	176	85.4%
Health	74	53	71.6%	74	57	77.0%
(missing)	44			98		

Table 7

AECF Jobs Initiative
Eligibility and Attainment of Different Milestones, by Industry
Milestone Attainment for Participants in Only One Job* Since Initial Placement
Retention through March 31, 2000

	N=2953			N=2242			N=2610			N=1731		
	# Eligible for 3-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 3-mo	%	# Eligible for 6-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 6-mo	%	# Eligible for 6-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 6-mo	%	# Eligible for 6-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 6-mo	%
Construction	329	244	74.2%	311	205	65.9%	311	205	65.9%	311	205	65.9%
Manufacturing	681	542	79.6%	624	435	69.7%	624	435	69.7%	624	435	69.7%
Other	251	187	74.5%	224	147	65.6%	224	147	65.6%	224	147	65.6%
Retail Trade	399	314	78.7%	362	250	69.1%	362	250	69.1%	362	250	69.1%
F.I.R.E.	144	118	81.9%	122	86	70.5%	122	86	70.5%	122	86	70.5%
Hotels	95	78	82.1%	77	55	71.4%	77	55	71.4%	77	55	71.4%
Services	704	495	70.3%	600	373	62.2%	600	373	62.2%	600	373	62.2%
Health	350	264	75.4%	290	180	62.1%	290	180	62.1%	290	180	62.1%
Missing	105	77		101	65		101	65		101	65	

	N=2180			N=1144			N=1717			N=913		
	# Eligible for 9-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 9-mo	%	# Eligible for 12-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 12-mo	%	# Eligible for 12-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 12-mo	%	# Eligible for 12-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 12-mo	%
Construction	266	145	54.5%	216	115	53.2%	216	115	53.2%	216	115	53.2%
Manufacturing	508	278	54.7%	388	224	57.7%	388	224	57.7%	388	224	57.7%
Other	185	96	51.9%	142	71	50.0%	142	71	50.0%	142	71	50.0%
Retail Trade	325	186	57.2%	275	147	53.5%	275	147	53.5%	275	147	53.5%
F.I.R.E.	106	62	58.5%	72	48	66.7%	72	48	66.7%	72	48	66.7%
Hotels	44	26	59.1%	37	22	59.5%	37	22	59.5%	37	22	59.5%
Services	515	245	47.6%	417	211	50.6%	417	211	50.6%	417	211	50.6%
Health	231	106	45.9%	170	75	44.1%	170	75	44.1%	170	75	44.1%
Missing	98	41		93	32		93	32		93	32	

*For individuals employed 12 months with same employer

Table 8

AECF Jobs Initiative
Retention by Project - - Achievement of 3-, 6-, 9-, and 12-month Labor Force Retention Milestones
Through March 31, 2000

Project	Eligible for 3-mo	Achieved 3-month	3-mo. retention rate	Eligible for 6-mo	Achieved 6-month	Retention rate	Eligible for 9-mo	Achieved 9-month	Retention rate	Eligible for 12-mo	Achieved 12-month	Retention rate
Denver-Assembly	76	33	43.4%	57	17	29.8%	42	12	28.6%	36	7	19.4%
Denver-Health Care	166	102	61.4%	132	60	45.5%	103	32	31.1%	65	13	20.0%
Denver-Manufacturing	167	99	59.3%	153	62	40.5%	131	47	35.9%	94	38	40.4%
Denver-Non-DWI	5	4	80.0%	5	3	60.0%	5	3	60.0%	5	3	60.0%
Denver-Teleservice	194	125	64.4%	177	87	49.2%	140	57	40.7%	90	38	42.2%
Denver Totals	608	363	59.7%	524	229	43.7%	421	151	35.9%	290	99	34.1%
Milwaukee-Printing Industry Project	109	84	77.1%	97	61	62.9%	69	38	55.1%	32	21	65.6%
Milwaukee-Central City Workers	281	206	73.3%	274	184	67.2%	246	134	54.5%	204	114	55.9%
Milwaukee-Hospitality Prototype	11	6	54.5%	10	6	60.0%	9	5	55.6%	9	4	44.4%
Milwaukee-Manufacturing Jobs	318	259	81.4%	299	228	76.3%	235	160	68.1%	179	116	64.8%
Milwaukee Totals	719	555	77.2%	680	479	70.4%	559	337	60.3%	424	255	60.1%
New Orleans-Construction	15	12	80.0%	15	6	40.0%	13	4	30.8%	13	3	23.1%
New Orleans-Job Readiness-WtW	10	6	60.0%	0	0	-	2	0	0.0%	0	0	-
New Orleans-Manufacturing	16	11	68.8%	9	4	44.4%	7	1	14.3%	2	0	0.0%
New Orleans Totals	41	29	70.7%	24	10	41.7%	22	5	22.7%	15	3	20.0%
Philadelphia-CBC-MOA	45	43	95.6%	44	37	84.1%	33	20	60.6%	26	20	76.9%
Philadelphia-CITY	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
Philadelphia-GPF-DI	47	40	85.1%	47	35	74.5%	43	26	60.5%	28	22	78.6%
Philadelphia-HCA-CS	28	24	85.7%	28	19	67.9%	28	18	64.3%	25	16	64.0%
Philadelphia-Home Care Associates	38	35	92.1%	38	27	71.1%	38	19	50.0%	30	15	50.0%
Philadelphia-PASS	54	39	72.2%	12	7	58.3%	10	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%
Philadelphia-PhAME	89	81	91.0%	81	67	82.7%	53	15	28.3%	24	13	54.2%
Philadelphia-STRIVE	184	142	77.2%	155	92	59.4%	138	58	42.0%	95	54	56.8%
Philadelphia Totals	485	404	83.3%	405	284	70.1%	343	156	45.5%	229	140	61.1%
Seattle-AOP-Family Wage Placement	16	13	81.3%	16	11	68.8%	16	10	62.5%	16	9	56.3%
Seattle-Apprenticeship Placement	51	47	92.2%	51	45	88.2%	51	37	72.5%	51	30	58.8%
Seattle-Automotive	34	31	91.2%	28	24	85.7%	21	14	66.7%	13	6	46.2%
Seattle-Brownfields Project	1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%
Seattle-Conservation Corps	7	4	57.1%	7	2	28.6%	3	0	0.0%	0	0	-
Seattle-DM-CNC	69	57	82.6%	68	52	76.5%	67	35	52.2%	65	29	44.6%
Seattle-DM-Electronics Assembly	81	76	93.8%	79	66	83.5%	76	55	72.4%	67	46	68.7%
Seattle-DM-General	17	15	88.2%	16	9	56.3%	11	7	63.6%	7	6	85.7%
Seattle-Direct Placements	1064	877	82.4%	980	738	75.3%	876	517	59.0%	792	434	54.8%
Seattle-Health Care	67	58	86.6%	62	46	74.2%	50	28	56.0%	45	21	46.7%
Seattle-Office Occupations	110	96	87.3%	94	72	76.6%	74	48	64.9%	64	41	64.1%
Seattle-Prep Employment	50	35	70.0%	45	34	75.6%	41	24	58.5%	37	21	56.8%
Seattle-Reactive	7	5	71.4%	7	4	57.1%	7	3	42.9%	7	2	28.6%
Seattle-Unknown	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%
Seattle Totals	1575	1315	83.5%	1455	1104	75.9%	1295	779	60.2%	1166	646	55.4%
St. Louis-Business Services	23	19	82.6%	19	15	78.9%	14	9	64.3%	8	4	50.0%
St. Louis-Construction	88	82	93.2%	88	76	86.4%	75	60	80.0%	55	42	76.4%
St. Louis-Health Careers	29	22	75.9%	24	14	58.3%	12	7	58.3%	5	3	60.0%
St. Louis-Work Link	119	83	69.7%	95	53	55.8%	69	19	27.5%	27	8	29.6%
St. Louis Work Link - Downtown	1	0	0.0%	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-
St. Louis Totals	260	206	79.2%	226	158	69.9%	170	95	55.9%	95	57	60.0%
JOBS INITIATIVE TOTAL	3688	2872	77.9%	3314	2264	68.3%	2810	1523	54.2%	2219	1200	54.1%

Table 9

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Wage Changes of Enrollees and Placed Participants, by Project
For Initial Placements through March 31, 2000**

Project	Number Enrolled	Number Placed	Average Initial Placement Wages for Placed Participants	N	Missing	Average Last Known (Retention) Wages for Enrollees	N	Missing	Wage Change
Denver-Assembly	106	101	\$5.94	101	0	\$6.20	94	7	\$0.27
Denver-Health Care	418	189	\$7.55	189	0	\$7.93	183	6	\$0.38
Denver-Manufacturing	481	179	\$8.10	178	1	\$8.73	171	8	\$0.63
Denver-Non-DWI	79	5	\$7.96	5	0	\$7.72	5	0	(\$0.24)
Denver-Other Service Industry	30	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denver-Teleservice	604	214	\$8.91	214	0	\$9.55	200	14	\$0.64
Denver-Transportation	4	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denver Totals/Weighted Average	1722	688	\$7.88	687	1	\$8.39	653	35	\$0.51
Milwaukee-Printing Industry Project	149	114	\$8.84	114	0	\$9.14	114	0	\$0.30
Milwaukee-Central City Workers	929	285	\$13.49	284	1	\$14.03	282	3	\$0.53
Milwaukee-Hospitality Prototype	52	13	\$7.62	13	0	\$8.06	12	1	\$0.43
Milwaukee-Manufacturing Jobs	432	415	\$10.07	413	2	\$10.35	406	9	\$0.28
Milwaukee Totals/Weighted Average	1562	827	\$11.04	824	3	\$11.42	814	13	\$0.38
New Orleans-Construction	74	31	\$8.08	30	1	\$8.08	30	1	\$0.00
New Orleans-Job Readiness-WtW	37	33	\$5.87	33	0	\$5.87	33	0	\$0.00
New Orleans-Manufacturing	19	17	\$7.82	17	0	\$7.82	17	0	\$0.00
New Orleans Totals/Weighted Average	130	81	\$7.11	80	1	\$7.11	80	1	\$0.00
Philadelphia-CBC-MOA	68	46	\$9.85	45	1	\$10.63	45	1	\$0.78
Philadelphia-CITY	10	10	\$7.45	10	0	\$7.45	10	0	\$0.00
Philadelphia-GPF-DI	84	48	\$7.94	47	1	\$8.42	47	1	\$0.48
Philadelphia-HCA-CS	41	28	\$7.44	28	0	\$7.52	28	0	\$0.08
Philadelphia-Home Care Associates	49	38	\$7.31	38	0	\$7.33	38	0	\$0.03
Philadelphia-PASS	71	54	\$7.74	54	0	\$7.84	54	0	\$0.10
Philadelphia-PhAME	372	104	\$10.64	102	2	\$11.11	102	2	\$0.47
Philadelphia-PhAME-PWT	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Philadelphia-STRIVE	342	198	\$7.79	195	3	\$7.82	196	2	\$0.03
Philadelphia Totals/Weighted Average	1038	526	\$8.47	519	7	\$8.71	520	6	\$0.23
Seattle-AOP-Family Wage Placement	19	16	\$12.24	16	0	\$13.07	16	0	\$0.83
Seattle-Apprenticeship Placement	81	52	\$11.84	51	1	\$11.92	51	1	\$0.07
Seattle-Automotive	117	38	\$8.91	38	0	\$9.27	38	0	\$0.36
Seattle-Brownsfields Project	11	1	\$7.00	1	0	-	-	1	-
Seattle-Conservation Corps	58	8	\$12.53	8	0	\$12.53	8	0	\$0.00
Seattle-DM-CNC	118	69	\$9.64	69	0	\$9.97	69	0	\$0.33
Seattle-DM-Electronics Assembly	167	83	\$8.11	82	1	\$8.58	82	1	\$0.47
Seattle-DM-General	163	17	\$9.25	17	0	\$9.87	17	0	\$0.62
Seattle-Direct Placements	1748	1162	\$9.35	1147	15	\$9.88	1146	16	\$0.53
Seattle-Health Care	185	69	\$9.33	69	0	\$9.96	69	0	\$0.63
Seattle-Office Occupations	548	123	\$9.63	122	1	\$9.98	121	2	\$0.35
Seattle-Prep Employment	161	58	\$9.88	56	2	\$9.97	55	3	\$0.08
Seattle-Reactive	7	7	\$9.09	7	0	\$9.09	7	0	\$0.00
Seattle-Unknown	490	1	\$7.00	1	0	\$7.00	1	0	\$0.00
Seattle Totals/Weighted Average	3873	1704	\$9.44	1684	20	\$9.92	1680	24	\$0.48
St. Louis-Business Services	45	23	\$8.65	23	0	\$8.64	23	0	(\$0.01)
St. Louis-Construction	222	88	\$10.09	88	0	\$11.35	88	0	\$1.25
St. Louis-Health Careers	163	41	\$8.19	41	0	\$8.27	41	0	\$0.08
St. Louis-Work Link	591	301	\$6.74	299	2	\$6.90	297	4	\$0.16
St. Louis-Work Link-Downtown	57	9	\$7.17	9	0	\$7.22	9	0	\$0.06
St. Louis Totals/Weighted Average	1078	462	\$7.61	460	2	\$7.98	449	4	\$0.37
Unassigned	367								
TOTALS	9770	4288		4254	34		4196	83	

Table 10

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Retention Over Time, by Enrollment Year & Site
Retention through March 31, 2000**

Site/Enrollment Year												
	# eligible 3-mo.	# attained 3-mo.	% retained	# eligible 6-mo.	# attained 6-mo.	% retained	# eligible 9-mo.	# attained 9-mo.	% retained	# eligible 12-mo.	# attained 12-mo.	% retained
April 1996 - March 1997												
Denver	27	24	88.9%	27	20	74.1%	27	17	63.0%	27	17	63.0%
Milwaukee	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
New Orleans	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
Philadelphia	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
Seattle	62	58	93.5%	62	58	93.5%	62	45	72.6%	62	41	66.1%
St. Louis	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
Total	89	82	92.1%	89	78	87.6%	89	62	69.7%	89	58	65.2%
April 1997 - March 1998												
Denver	78	58	74.4%	78	44	56.4%	78	39	50.0%	78	32	41.0%
Milwaukee	142	120	84.5%	142	113	79.6%	142	98	69.0%	142	85	59.9%
New Orleans	11	9	81.8%	11	6	54.5%	9	4	44.4%	9	3	33.3%
Philadelphia	42	37	88.1%	42	32	76.2%	42	27	64.3%	42	24	57.1%
Seattle	525	450	85.7%	525	437	83.2%	525	323	61.5%	525	285	54.3%
St. Louis	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
Total	798	674	84.5%	798	632	79.2%	796	491	61.7%	796	429	53.9%
April 1998 - March 1999												
Denver	183	113	61.7%	183	79	43.2%	183	59	32.2%	183	50	27.3%
Milwaukee	282	224	79.4%	282	210	74.5%	282	188	66.7%	282	170	60.3%
New Orleans	4	3	75.0%	4	0	0.0%	4	0	0.0%	4	0	0.0%
Philadelphia	185	161	87.0%	185	135	73.0%	185	116	62.7%	185	116	62.7%
Seattle	576	479	83.2%	576	436	75.7%	576	356	61.8%	576	320	55.6%
St. Louis	111	88	79.3%	110	80	72.7%	106	63	59.4%	95	57	60.0%
Total	1341	1068	79.6%	1340	940	70.1%	1336	782	58.5%	1325	713	53.8%
April 1999 - March 2000												
Denver	320	168	52.5%	236	86	36.4%	133	36	27.1%	2	-	-
Milwaukee	295	211	71.5%	256	156	60.9%	135	51	37.8%	0	-	-
New Orleans	26	17	65.4%	9	4	44.4%	9	1	11.1%	2	-	-
Philadelphia	258	206	79.8%	178	117	65.7%	116	13	11.2%	2	-	-
Seattle	414	328	79.2%	293	173	59.0%	133	55	41.4%	4	-	-
St. Louis	149	118	79.2%	116	78	67.2%	64	32	50.0%	0	-	-
Total	1462	1048	71.7%	1088	614	56.4%	590	188	31.9%	10	0	0.0%
Overall Totals	3690	2872	77.8%	3315	2264	68.3%	2811	1523	54.2%	2220	1200	54.1%

Table 11

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Direct vs. Sectoral Placements
Retention by Project - - Achievement of Various Milestones
Retention through March 31, 2000**

Project	Eligible for 3-mo	Retained 3-month	Retention rate	Eligible for 6-mo	Retained 6-month	Retention rate	Eligible for 9-mo	Retained 9-month	Retention rate	Eligible for 12-mo	Retained 12-month	Retention rate
Direct Placements												
Denver-Non-DWI	5	4	80.0%	5	3	60.0%	5	3	60.0%	5	3	60.0%
New Orleans-Job Readiness-WtW	10	6	60.0%	0	0	-	2	0	0.0%	0	0	-
Philadelphia-STRIVE	184	142	77.2%	155	92	59.4%	138	58	42.0%	95	54	56.8%
Seattle-Direct Placements	1064	877	82.4%	980	738	75.3%	876	517	59.0%	792	434	54.8%
Seattle-Reactive	7	5	71.4%	7	4	57.1%	7	3	42.9%	7	2	28.6%
St. Louis-Work Link	119	83	69.7%	95	53	55.8%	69	19	27.5%	27	8	29.6%
St. Louis Work Link - Downtown	1	0	0.0%	0	0	-	0		-	0		-
Subtotal	1390	1117	80.4%	1242	890	71.7%	1097	600	54.7%	926	501	54.1%
Sectoral Placements												
Denver-Assembly	76	33	43.4%	57	17	29.8%	42	12	28.6%	36	7	19.4%
Denver-Health Care	166	102	61.4%	132	60	45.5%	103	32	31.1%	65	13	20.0%
Denver-Manufacturing	167	99	59.3%	153	62	40.5%	131	47	35.9%	94	38	40.4%
Denver-Teleservice	194	125	64.4%	177	87	49.2%	140	57	40.7%	90	38	42.2%
Denver-Transportation	<i>No placements</i>											
Milwaukee-Printing Industry Project	109	84	77.1%	97	61	62.9%	69	38	55.1%	32	21	65.6%
Milwaukee-Central City Workers	281	206	73.3%	274	184	67.2%	246	134	54.5%	204	114	55.9%
Milwaukee-Hospitality Prototype	11	6	54.5%	10	6	60.0%	9	5	55.6%	9	4	44.4%
Milwaukee-Manufacturing Jobs	318	259	81.4%	299	228	76.3%	235	160	68.1%	179	116	64.8%
New Orleans-Construction	15	12	80.0%	15	6	40.0%	13	4	30.8%	13	3	23.1%
New Orleans-Manufacturing	16	11	68.8%	9	4	44.4%	7	1	14.3%	2	0	0.0%
Philadelphia-CBC-MOA	45	43	95.6%	44	37	84.1%	33	20	60.6%	26	20	76.9%
Philadelphia-CITY		0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
Philadelphia-GPF-DI	47	40	85.1%	47	35	74.5%	43	26	60.5%	28	22	78.6%
Philadelphia-HCA-CS	28	24	85.7%	28	19	67.9%	28	18	64.3%	25	16	64.0%
Philadelphia-Home Care Associates	38	35	92.1%	38	27	71.1%	38	19	50.0%	30	15	50.0%
Philadelphia-PASS	54	39	72.2%	12	7	58.3%	10	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%
Philadelphia-PhAME												
Philadelphia-PhAME-PWT												
Philadelphia-PhAME	89	81	91.0%	81	67	82.7%	53	15	28.3%	24	13	54.2%
Seattle-AOP-Family Wage Placement	16	13	81.3%	16	11	68.8%	16	10	62.5%	16	9	56.3%
Seattle-Apprenticeship Placement	51	47	92.2%	51	45	88.2%	51	37	72.5%	51	30	58.8%
Seattle-Automotive	34	31	91.2%	28	24	85.7%	21	14	66.7%	13	6	46.2%
Seattle-Brownfields Project	1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%
Seattle-Conservation Corps	7	4	57.1%	7	2	28.6%	3	0	0.0%	0	0	-
Seattle-DM-CNC	69	57	82.6%	68	52	76.5%	67	35	52.2%	65	29	44.6%
Seattle-DM-Electronics Assembly	81	76	93.8%	79	66	83.5%	76	55	72.4%	67	46	68.7%
Seattle-DM-General	17	15	88.2%	16	9	56.3%	11	7	63.6%	7	6	85.7%
Seattle-Health Care	67	58	86.6%	62	46	74.2%	50	28	56.0%	45	21	46.7%
Seattle-Office Occupations	110	96	87.3%	94	72	76.6%	74	48	64.9%	64	41	64.1%
Seattle-Prep Employment	50	35	70.0%	45	34	75.6%	41	24	58.5%	37	21	56.8%
Seattle-Unknown	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%
St. Louis-Business Services	23	19	82.6%	19	15	78.9%	14	9	64.3%	8	4	50.0%
St. Louis-Construction	88	82	93.2%	88	76	86.4%	75	60	80.0%	55	42	76.4%
St. Louis-Health Careers	29	22	75.9%	24	14	58.3%	12	7	58.3%	5	3	60.0%
Subtotal	2298	1755	76.4%	2072	1374	66.3%	1713	923	53.9%	1293	699	54.1%
Grand total	3688	2872	78%	3314	2264	68%	2810	1523	54%	2219	1200	54%

Table 12

AECF Jobs Initiative
Direct vs. Sectoral Placements
Wage Changes of Enrollees and Placed Participants, by Project
For Initial Placements through March 31, 2000

Project	Number Enrolled	Number Placed	Avg. Initial Placement Wage			Avg. Last Known (Retention) Wages for Enrollees			Wage Change
			N	Missing		N	Missing		
Direct Placements									
Denver-Non-DWI	79	5	\$7.96	5	0	\$7.72	5	0	-0.24
New Orleans-Job Readiness-WtW	37	33	\$5.87	33	0	\$5.87	33	0	0.00
Philadelphia-STRIVE	342	198	\$7.79	195	3	\$7.82	196	2	0.03
Seattle-Direct Placements	1748	1162	\$9.35	1147	15	\$9.88	1146	16	0.53
Seattle-Reactive	7	7	\$9.09	7	0	\$9.09	7	0	0.00
St. Louis-Work Link	591	301	\$6.74	299	2	\$6.90	297	4	0.16
St. Louis-Work Link-Downtown	57	9	\$7.17	9	0	\$7.22	9	0	0.06
Subtotal	2861	1715	\$8.62	1695	20	\$9.01	1693	22	0.39
Sectoral Placements									
Denver-Assembly	106	101	\$5.94	101	0	\$6.20	94	7	0.27
Denver-Health Care	418	189	\$7.55	189	0	\$7.93	183	6	0.38
Denver-Manufacturing	481	179	\$8.10	178	1	\$8.73	171	8	0.63
Denver-Other Service Industry	30	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denver-Teleservice	604	214	\$8.91	214	0	\$9.55	200	14	0.64
Denver-Transportation	4	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Milwaukee-Printing Industry Project	149	114	\$8.84	114	0	\$9.14	114	0	0.30
Milwaukee-Central City Workers	929	285	\$13.49	284	1	\$14.03	282	3	0.53
Milwaukee-Hospitality Prototype	52	13	\$7.62	13	0	\$8.06	12	1	0.43
Milwaukee-Manufacturing Jobs	432	415	\$10.07	413	2	\$10.35	406	9	0.28
New Orleans-Construction	74	31	\$8.08	30	1	\$8.08	30	1	0.00
New Orleans-Manufacturing	19	17	\$7.82	17	0	\$7.82	17	0	0.00
Philadelphia-CBC-MOA	68	46	\$9.85	45	1	\$10.63	45	1	0.78
Philadelphia-CITY	10	10	\$7.45	10	0	\$7.45	10	0	0.00
Philadelphia-GPF-DI	84	48	\$7.94	47	1	\$8.42	47	1	0.48
Philadelphia-HCA-CS	41	28	\$7.44	28	0	\$7.52	28	0	0.08
Philadelphia-Home Care Associates	49	38	\$7.31	38	0	\$7.33	38	0	0.03
Philadelphia-PASS	71	54	\$7.74	54	0	\$7.84	54	0	0.10
Philadelphia-PhAME	372	104	\$10.64	102	2	\$11.11	102	2	0.47
Philadelphia-PhAME-PWT	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seattle-AOP-Family Wage Placement	19	16	\$12.24	16	0	\$13.07	16	0	0.83
Seattle-Apprenticeship Placement	81	52	\$11.84	51	1	\$11.92	51	1	0.07
Seattle-Automotive	117	38	\$8.91	38	0	\$9.27	38	0	0.36
Seattle-Brownfields Project	11	1	\$7.00	1	0	-	-	1	-
Seattle-Conservation Corps	58	8	\$12.53	8	0	\$12.53	8	0	0.00
Seattle-DM-CNC	118	69	\$9.64	69	0	\$9.97	69	0	0.33
Seattle-DM-Electronics Assembly	167	83	\$8.11	82	1	\$8.58	82	1	0.47
Seattle-DM-General	163	17	\$9.25	17	0	\$9.87	17	0	0.62
Seattle-Health Care	185	69	\$9.33	69	0	\$9.96	69	0	0.63
Seattle-Office Occupations	548	123	\$9.63	122	1	\$9.98	121	2	0.35
Seattle-Prep Employment	161	58	\$9.88	56	2	\$9.97	55	3	0.08
Seattle-Unknown	490	1	\$7.00	1	0	\$7.00	1	0	0.00
St. Louis-Business Services	45	23	\$8.65	23	0	\$8.64	23	0	-0.01
St. Louis-Construction	222	88	\$10.09	88	0	\$11.35	88	0	1.25
St. Louis-Health Careers	163	41	\$8.19	41	0	\$8.27	41	0	0.08
Subtotal	6542	2573	\$9.49	2559	14	\$9.93	2512	61	\$0.43
Grand total	9403	4288	\$9.14	4254	34	\$9.56	4205	83	\$0.41

2001 Retention Analysis Tables

AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
Characteristics of Non-placed and Placed Enrollees - as a Percentage of Total Enrollees
Enrolled Through March 31, 2001

TABLE 1

	<u>Enrollees</u>		<u>Non-placed</u>		<u>Placed</u>	
	<i>N</i> =	12570	<i>N</i> =	6787	<i>N</i> =	5783
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<u>Gender</u>	<i>N</i> =	12570	<i>N</i> =	6787	<i>N</i> =	5783
Male	6162	49.0%	3280	53.2%	2882	46.8%
Female	6408	51.0%	3507	54.7%	2901	45.3%
Unknown/Missing	0		0		0	
<u>Age (at enrollment)</u>	<i>N</i> =	11991	<i>N</i> =	6312	<i>N</i> =	5679
< 18 yrs	82	0.7%	49	59.8%	33	40.2%
18-20 yrs	1426	11.9%	799	56.0%	627	44.0%
21-25 yrs	2349	19.6%	1219	51.9%	1130	48.1%
26-35 yrs	3825	31.9%	1951	51.0%	1874	49.0%
>35 yrs	4309	35.9%	2294	53.2%	2015	46.8%
Unknown/Missing	579		475		104	
Mean	32		32		32	
<u>Ethnicity</u>	<i>N</i> =	12280	<i>N</i> =	6530	<i>N</i> =	5750
American Indian/Alaskan Native	290	2.4%	184	63.4%	106	36.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	980	8.0%	473	48.3%	507	51.7%
Black	7686	62.6%	4103	53.4%	3583	46.6%
Hispanic	1400	11.4%	663	47.4%	737	52.6%
Multietnic	194	1.6%	131	67.5%	63	32.5%
White	1641	13.4%	925	56.4%	716	43.6%
Other	89	0.7%	51	57.3%	38	42.7%
Unknown/Missing	290		257		33	
<u>Indication of difficulty with English proficiency at Enrollment?</u>	<i>N</i> =	12455	<i>N</i> =	6688	<i>N</i> =	5767
Yes	1510	12.1%	785	52.0%	725	48.0%
No	10945	87.9%	5903	53.9%	5042	46.1%
Unknown/Missing	115		99		16	
<u>Primary Language</u>	<i>N</i> =	10455	<i>N</i> =	6785	<i>N</i> =	4030
English	8722	83.4%	4977	57.1%	3745	42.9%
Spanish	438	4.2%	239	54.6%	199	45.4%
Vietnamese	153	1.5%	67	43.8%	86	56.2%
Other	3253	31.1%	1502	46.2%	1751	53.8%
Unknown/Missing	4		2		2	
<u>Marital Status</u>	<i>N</i> =	11862	<i>N</i> =	6231	<i>N</i> =	5631
Married, living with spouse	1857	15.7%	846	45.6%	1011	54.4%
Married, not living with spouse	949	8.0%	501	52.8%	448	47.2%
Non-married partner	1039	8.8%	608	58.5%	431	41.5%
Single, never married	6328	53.3%	3338	52.7%	2990	47.3%
Widowed, Divorced, Legally Separated	1689	14.2%	938	55.5%	751	44.5%
Unknown/Missing	708		556		152	
<u>Children at Home</u>	<i>N</i> =	12183	<i>N</i> =	6501	<i>N</i> =	5682
Yes	6467	53.1%	3270	50.6%	3197	49.4%
No Children	5716	46.9%	3231	56.5%	2485	43.5%
Unknown/Missing	387		286		101	
<u>Number of Children</u>	<i>N</i> =	4816	<i>N</i> =	2572	<i>N</i> =	2244
No Children	17	0.4%	9	0.3%	8	0.4%
One child	2053	42.6%	1123	43.7%	930	41.4%
Two Children	1471	30.5%	772	30.0%	699	31.1%
Three Children	731	15.2%	386	15.0%	345	15.4%
Four Children	339	7.0%	181	7.0%	158	7.0%
Five or more Children	205	4.3%	101	3.9%	104	4.6%
Unknown/Missing	7754		4215		3539	

AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
Characteristics of Non-placed and Placed Enrollees - as a Percentage of Total Enrollees
Enrolled Through March 31, 2001

TABLE 1

	<u>Enrollees</u>		<u>Non-placed</u>		<u>Placed</u>	
	<i>N</i> =	12570	<i>N</i> =	6787	<i>N</i> =	5783
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<u>Family Income (Annual)</u>						
Under \$3,000	2969	25.0%	1717	57.8%	1252	42.2%
\$ 3,000 - \$ 6,000	2130	18.0%	1170	54.9%	960	45.1%
\$ 6,001 - \$ 9,000	1579	13.3%	827	52.4%	752	47.6%
\$ 9,001 - \$12,000	1396	11.8%	698	50.0%	698	50.0%
\$12,001 - \$15,000	1093	9.2%	528	48.3%	565	51.7%
\$15,001 - \$20,000	1120	9.4%	542	48.4%	578	51.6%
\$20,001 - \$25,000	686	5.8%	312	45.5%	374	54.5%
Over \$25,000	885	7.5%	429	48.5%	456	51.5%
Unknown/Missing	712		564		148	
<u>Public Assistance</u>						
Yes Public Assistance	5578	44.4%	3081	55.2%	2497	44.8%
No Public Assistance	6992	55.6%	3706	53.0%	3286	47.0%
Unknown/Missing	0		0		0	
<u>Highest Grade Completed</u>						
Less Than High School Diploma	4340	34.9%	2455	56.6%	1885	43.4%
12th (Last yr. high school)	4804	38.6%	2477	51.6%	2327	48.4%
Some College	1606	12.9%	856	53.3%	750	46.7%
Two-year College	774	6.2%	368	47.5%	406	52.5%
Four-year College	456	3.7%	216	47.4%	240	52.6%
More than College	189	1.5%	100	52.9%	89	47.1%
Unknown/Missing	401		315		86	
<u>Paid Work Experience (Ever Had)</u>						
Yes	10581	88.5%	5606	53.0%	4975	47.0%
No	1380	11.5%	796	57.7%	584	42.3%
Unknown/Missing	609		385		152	
<u>Pre JI Wages (Weekly) Ever Worked-Y</u>						
Mean	\$291.32		\$283.37		\$300.22	
Median	\$276.00		\$260.00		\$280.00	
Unknown/Missing	647		356		291	
<u>Pre JI Earnings (Previous Year) Ever Worked-Y</u>						
Mean	\$8,192.00		\$7,670.02		\$8,736.73	
Median	\$6,000.00		\$6,000.00		\$7,000.00	
Unknown/Missing	2201		1323		878	
<u>Pre JI Number of Weeks Worked (Previous Year) Ever Work=Y *footnote</u>						
Mean	27		26		28	
Median	26		24		28	
Unknown/Missing	1976		1180		796	
<u>Impact Community</u>						
No	5866	53.4%	3049	52.0%	2817	48.0%
Yes	5112	46.6%	2753	53.9%	2359	46.1%
Unknown/Missing	1592		985		607	

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
Wage and Health Care Benefit Comparison Information
For Initial Placements Through March 31, 2001**

TABLE 2

	N= 4974 <u>Pre JI Wage*</u>	N= 5782 <u>Initial Placement Wage</u>	N= 5782 <u>Last Known (Retention) Wage</u>
<u>Hourly Wage Statistics:</u>	N= 4720	N= 5758	N= 5683
Mean Wage	\$8.11	\$9.15	\$9.55
Median Wage	\$7.50	\$8.50	\$9.00
	<u>Pre JI Wage</u>	<u>Initial Placement Wage</u>	<u>Last Known (Retention) Wage</u>
<u>Weekly Earnings Statistics:</u>	N= 4683	N= 5715	N= 5553
Mean Weekly Earnings	\$300.23	\$359.63	\$375.69
Median Weekly Earnings	\$280.00	\$340.00	\$358.40
	<u>Pre JI Weekly Hours</u>	<u>Initial Placement Weekly Hours</u>	<u>Last Known (Retention) Weekly Hours</u>
<u>Weekly Hours Statistics:</u>	N= 4198	N= 5719	N= 5564
Mean Hours	36	39	39
Median Hours	40	40	40
	<u>Pre JI Benefits</u>	<u>Initial Placement Benefits</u>	<u>Last Known (Retention) Benefits</u>
<u>Health Benefits</u> (Employer Contributes)	N= 4633	N= 5637	N= 4580
	# %	# %	# %
Yes	1517 32.7%	4669 82.8%	3699 80.8%
No	3116 67.3%	968 17.2%	881 19.2%
Unknown/Missing	341	145	1202

* Pre-JI wage information is only for JI enrollees with previous work experience.

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
Wage and Health Care Benefit Comparison Information
JI Participants with Work Experience Prior to Jobs Initiative
For Initial Placements Through March 31, 2001**

TABLE 2A

	N= 4974		N= 4974		N= 4974
	<u>Pre JI Wage</u>		<u>Initial Placement Wage</u>		<u>Last Known Wage</u>
<u>Hourly Wage Statistics:</u>	N= 4720		N= 4956		N= 4885
Mean Wage	\$8.11		\$9.20		\$9.57
Median Wage	\$7.50		\$8.55		\$9.00
	<u>Pre JI Wage</u>		<u>Initial Placement Wage</u>		<u>Last Known (Retention) Wage</u>
<u>Weekly Earnings Statistics:</u>	N= 4683		N= 4920		N= 4768
Mean Weekly Earnings	\$300.23		\$361.92		\$377.05
Median Weekly Earnings	\$280.00		\$340.00		\$360.00
	<u>Pre JI Weekly Hours</u>		<u>Initial Placement Weekly Hours</u>		<u>Last Known (Retention) Weekly Hours</u>
<u>Weekly Hours Statistics:</u>	N= 4198		N= 4923		N= 4777
Mean Hours	36		39		39
Median Hours	40		40		40
	<u>Pre JI Benefits</u>		<u>Initial Placement Benefits</u>		<u>Last Known (Retention) Benefits</u>
<u>Health Benefits</u> (Employer Contributes)	N= 4633		N= 4861		N= 3869
	# %		# %		# %
Yes	1517 32.7%		4042 83.2%		3129 80.9%
No	3116 67.3%		819 16.8%		740 19.1%
Missing	341		100		1086

TABLE 3

AECF Jobs Initiative
All JI Sites, Except Milwaukee
JI Placed Participants Eligible for 12-month Retention
Retention Through March 31, 2001

	<i>Pre-JI</i>	<i>Post-JI</i>		
	<i>Participants with Prior Work Experience ¹</i>	<i>All Placed Participants ²</i>	<i>Participants with Prior Work Experience ³</i>	<i>Participants Without Prior Work Experience ⁴</i>
N	2169	1793	1512	156
Mean Weeks	27.42	28.57 ⁵	27.62	26.89
Median Weeks	26	27.86	26.14	24.79

¹ Numbers are based on the **2169** placed participants who had prior work experience and were eligible for 12-month retention, excluding Milwaukee.

² Numbers are based on the **1793** placed participants who were eligible for 12-month retention, and for whom start and end dates for all jobs within the first year were available, excluding Milwaukee.

³ Numbers are based on the **1512** placed participants who had prior work experience, were eligible for 12-month retention, and for whom start and end dates for all jobs within the first year were available, excluding Milwaukee.

⁴ Numbers are based on the **156** placed participants who did not have prior work experience, were eligible for 12-month retention, and for whom start and end dates for all jobs within the first year were available, excluding Milwaukee.

⁵ The average of all placed participants includes the **125** participants for which we had no information on prior work experience. These participants had an average of 42.1 weeks worked after placement through the JI. The inclusion of these 125 participants explains why the mean number of weeks worked for all participants is higher than the mean number of weeks worked for participants both with and without work experience.

AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative – All JI Sites
Enrollee Characteristics - Achieved Quarterly Retention Milestones
Retention Through March 31, 2001

TABLE 4

	<u>3 MONTHS</u>			<u>6 MONTHS</u>			<u>12 MONTHS</u>		
	# Eligible	# Achieved	%	# Eligible	# Achieved	%	# Eligible	# Achieved	%
Total:	5234	4099	78.3%	4924	3267	66.3%	4085	2101	51.4%
<u>Gender</u>									
Male	2607	2014	77.3%	2441	1613	66.1%	2025	1010	49.9%
Female	2627	2085	79.4%	2483	1654	66.6%	2060	1091	53.0%
Unknown/Missing	0	0		0	0		0	0	
<u>Age (at enrollment)</u>									
		#	%		#	%		#	%
< 18 yrs	30	20	66.7%	24	12	50.0%	16	10	62.5%
18-20 yrs	515	377	73.2%	486	286	58.8%	386	166	43.0%
21-24 yrs	1010	787	77.9%	936	608	65.0%	757	371	49.0%
25-35 yrs	1709	1352	79.1%	1613	1097	68.0%	1340	707	52.8%
>35 yrs	1868	1490	79.8%	1772	1213	68.5%	1518	814	53.6%
Unknown/Missing	103	73		94	51		68	33	
<u>Ethnicity</u>									
		#	%		#	%		#	%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	101	75	74.3%	98	59	60.2%	91	33	36.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	468	451	96.4%	436	393	90.1%	376	298	79.3%
Black	3178	2438	76.7%	2970	1911	64.3%	2441	1207	49.4%
Hispanic	689	511	74.2%	659	403	61.2%	531	256	48.2%
Multietnic	54	50	92.6%	51	39	76.5%	45	26	57.8%
White	681	523	76.8%	652	427	65.5%	551	258	46.8%
Other	34	30	88.2%	32	25	78.1%	29	17	58.6%
Unknown/Missing	29	21		26	10		21	6	
<u>Primary Language</u>									
		#	%		#	%		#	%
English	3285	2588	78.8%	3045	1973	64.8%	2549	1214	47.6%
Spanish	196	161	82.1%	193	132	68.4%	174	77	44.3%
Vietnamese	85	80	94.1%	85	74	87.1%	77	60	77.9%
Other	520	490	94.2%	512	455	88.9%	438	328	74.9%
Unknown/Missing	1148	780		1089	633		847	422	
<u>Marital Status</u>									
		#	%		#	%		#	%
Married, living with spouse	942	795	84.4%	891	667	74.9%	742	463	62.4%
Married, not living with spouse	413	328	79.4%	385	267	69.4%	312	165	52.9%
Non-married partner	364	276	75.8%	311	192	61.7%	231	106	45.9%
Single, never married	2672	2040	76.3%	2536	1617	63.8%	2116	1029	48.6%
Widowed, Divorced, Legally Separated	699	543	77.7%	667	439	65.8%	585	284	48.5%
Unknown/Missing	144	117		134	85		99	54	
<u>Children at Home</u>									
		#	%		#	%		#	%
Yes	2887	2260	78.3%	2715	1815	66.9%	2235	1225	54.8%
No	2251	1764	78.4%	2116	1400	66.2%	1781	846	47.5%
Unknown/Missing	96	75		93	52		69	30	

AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative – All JI Sites
Enrollee Characteristics - Achieved Quarterly Retention Milestones
Retention Through March 31, 2001

TABLE 4

	<u>3 MONTHS</u>			<u>6 MONTHS</u>			<u>12 MONTHS</u>		
	# Eligible	# Achieved	%	# Eligible	# Achieved	%	# Eligible	# Achieved	%
Total:	5234	4099	78.3%	4924	3267	66.3%	4085	2101	51.4%
<u>Family Income (Annual)</u>		#	%		#	%		#	%
Under \$3,000	1128	872	77.3%	1056	666	63.1%	890	395	44.4%
\$ 3,000 - \$ 6,000	863	672	77.9%	816	550	67.4%	682	334	49.0%
\$ 6,001 - \$ 9,000	686	522	76.1%	657	419	63.8%	550	279	50.7%
\$ 9,001 - \$12,000	634	507	80.0%	587	414	70.5%	495	266	53.7%
\$12,001 - \$15,000	521	428	82.1%	493	345	70.0%	413	232	56.2%
\$15,001 - \$20,000	520	422	81.2%	495	353	71.3%	413	240	58.1%
\$20,001 - \$25,000	332	267	80.4%	311	212	68.2%	250	148	59.2%
Over \$25,000	420	320	76.2%	389	252	64.8%	315	175	55.6%
Unknown/Missing	131	89	67.9%	121	56	46.3%	77	32	41.6%
<u>Public Assistance</u>		#	%		#	%		#	%
Yes Public Assistance	2238	1708	76.3%	2099	1350	64.3%	1757	884	50.3%
No Public Assistance	2996	2391	79.8%	2825	1917	67.9%	2328	1217	52.3%
Unknown/Missing	0	0		0	0		0	0	
<u>Highest Grade Completed</u>		#	%		#	%		#	%
Less Than High School Diploma	1629	1185	72.7%	1496	878	58.7%	1185	531	44.8%
12th (Last yr. high school)	2139	1710	79.9%	2032	1381	68.0%	1730	912	52.7%
Some College	690	564	81.7%	657	475	72.3%	546	303	55.5%
Two-year College	379	305	80.5%	364	256	70.3%	316	175	55.4%
Four-year College	232	205	88.4%	221	180	81.4%	196	122	62.2%
More than College	84	75	89.3%	80	68	85.0%	71	46	64.8%
Unknown/Missing	81	55		74	29		41	12	
<u>Prior Work Experience</u>		#	%		#	%		#	%
Yes	4492	3487	77.6%	4223	2757	65.3%	3482	1748	50.2%
No	520	406	78.1%	479	309	64.5%	381	196	51.4%
Unknown/Missing	222	206		222	201		222	157	

Table 5

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative - All JI Sites
Employer Characteristics
Retention through March 31, 2001**

	Initial Placement Employer		Last Known Placement Employer		Initial Placement Avg. Starting Wage	
Number of Employers by SIC Code (2 Digits)	N=		N=		N=	
Automotive	71	2017 3.5%	77	2033 3.8%	106	\$8.32
Construction	232	11.5%	224	11.0%	512	\$12.40
F.I.R.E.	97	4.8%	94	4.6%	231	\$9.56
Health	202	10.0%	207	10.2%	673	\$8.27
Manufacturing	312	15.5%	307	15.1%	1336	\$9.60
Public Sector	42	2.1%	40	2.0%	73	\$10.37
Retail Trade	400	19.8%	394	19.4%	820	\$8.30
Services*	465	23.1%	476	23.4%	1192	\$8.52
Hotel Services	62	3.1%	67	3.3%	209	\$7.80
Transport, Communications, Utilities, etc.	133	6.6%	144	7.1%	368	\$8.79
Other-Unclassified Establishments	1	0.0%	3	0.1%	1	\$7.00
Unknown/Missing	189		420		238	\$9.65
Number of Employees at Location	N=		N=			
1-10	214	1293 16.6%	192	1212 15.8%		
11-50	492	38.1%	460	38.0%		
51-250	369	28.5%	364	30.0%		
251-500	102	7.9%	91	7.5%		
501-1,000	46	3.6%	38	3.1%		
1,001-5,000	63	4.9%	59	4.9%		
5,001-10,000	6	0.5%	7	0.6%		
Over 10,000	1	0.1%	1	0.1%		
Unknown/Missing	913		1241			
Number of JI Participant Placements per Employer	N=		N=			
1	1553	2206 70.4%	1794	2452 73.2%		
2-3	360	16.3%	379	15.5%		
4-6	152	6.9%	147	6.0%		
7-10	63	2.9%	64	2.6%		
11-15	31	1.4%	23	0.9%		
16-20	13	0.6%	14	0.6%		
21-50	28	1.3%	25	1.0%		
Over 50	6	0.3%	6	0.2%		
Unknown/Missing	0		1			

* "Services" refers to non-health, non-hotel services.

TABLE 6

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Initial Placement Wage and Health Care Benefits - By Industry
JI Participants Who Achieved 12-month Retention Since Initial Placement in Same Industry, One job Since Initial Placement
Retention through March 31, 2001**

Wage Information	N	Average Initial Placement Starting Wage	Average Last Known (Retention) Wage	Wage Change
Construction	152	\$11.83	\$13.09	\$1.27
Manufacturing	366	\$9.78	\$10.85	\$1.07
Retail Trade	244	\$8.85	\$9.67	\$0.82
F.I.R.E.	85	\$9.39	\$10.05	\$0.65
Hotels	49	\$8.11	\$8.40	\$0.29
Services	352	\$9.16	\$9.83	\$0.68
Health	157	\$8.78	\$9.32	\$0.54
Other	135	\$9.59	\$10.34	\$0.76
(missing)	26	\$10.69	\$11.26	\$0.57

Health Care Benefits	N	Initial Placement Benefit Status # Confirmed Yes	%	N	Last Known Benefit Status # Confirmed Yes	%
Construction	147	142	96.6%	147	143	97.3%
Manufacturing	363	335	92.3%	363	333	91.7%
Retail Trade	241	205	85.1%	241	207	85.9%
F.I.R.E.	85	73	85.9%	85	73	85.9%
Hotels	49	41	83.7%	49	42	85.7%
Services	346	278	80.3%	347	286	82.4%
Health	155	128	82.6%	155	130	83.9%
Other	133	107	80.5%	135	110	81.5%
(missing)	26			26		

Table 7

AECF Jobs Initiative
Eligibility and Attainment of Different Milestones, by Industry
Milestone Attainment for Participants* in Only One Job Since Initial Placement
Retention through March 31, 2001

	N=4037			N=3074			N=3776			N=2416			N=3117			N=1569		
	# Eligible for 3-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 3-mo	%	# Eligible for 6-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 6-mo	%	# Eligible for 12-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 12-mo	%	# Eligible for 12-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 12-mo	%	# Eligible for 12-mo	# Eligible and Achieved 12-mo	%			
Construction	379	293	77.3%	360	229	63.6%	311	155	49.8%									
Manufacturing	948	695	73.3%	885	569	64.3%	691	369	53.4%									
Retail Trade	572	474	82.9%	537	371	69.1%	456	248	54.4%									
F.I.R.E.	173	152	87.9%	159	123	77.4%	136	85	62.5%									
Hotels	149	108	72.5%	135	82	60.7%	85	50	58.8%									
Services	953	705	74.0%	904	566	62.6%	796	363	45.6%									
Health	511	374	73.2%	472	271	57.4%	374	158	42.2%									
Other	352	273	77.6%	324	205	63.3%	268	141	52.6%									
Missing	148	99		129	75		90	28										

*For individuals employed 12 months with same employer

Table 8

AECF Jobs Initiative
Retention by Project -- Achievement of Various Milestones
Retention through March 31, 2001

Project	Milestone Achieved			Milestone Achieved			Milestone Achieved		
	Eligible for 3-mo	3-month	Retention rate	Eligible for 6-mo	6-month	Retention rate	Eligible for 12-mo	12-month	Retention rate
Denver-Assembly	129	60	46.5%	129	35	27.1%	109	17	15.6%
Denver-Health Care	246	164	66.7%	244	102	41.8%	202	48	23.8%
Denver-Manufacturing	219	142	64.8%	213	95	44.6%	182	59	32.4%
Denver-Non-DWI	5	4	80.0%	5	4	80.0%	5	3	60.0%
Denver-Teleservice	269	175	65.1%	254	121	47.6%	202	69	34.2%
Denver Totals	868	545	62.8%	845	357	42.2%	700	196	28.0%
Milwaukee-Printing Industry Project	161	120	74.5%	147	90	61.2%	114	59	51.8%
Milwaukee-Central City Workers	292	202	69.2%	292	183	62.7%	282	144	51.1%
Milwaukee-Hospitality Prototype	53	20	37.7%	49	14	28.6%	14	6	42.9%
Milwaukee-Manufacturing Jobs	607	407	67.1%	571	333	58.3%	417	209	50.1%
Milwaukee Totals	1113	749	67.3%	1059	620	58.5%	827	418	50.5%
New Orleans-Construction	123	92	74.8%	111	54	48.6%	35	10	28.6%
New Orleans-Health Care	2	2	100.0%	2	0	0.0%	2	0	0.0%
New Orleans-Job Readiness-WtW	94	79	84.0%	80	37	46.3%	33	4	12.1%
New Orleans-Manufacturing	24	19	79.2%	21	15	71.4%	17	6	35.3%
New Orleans Totals	243	192	79.0%	214	106	49.5%	87	20	23.0%
Philadelphia-CBC-MOA	45	42	93.3%	45	40	88.9%	45	34	75.6%
Philadelphia-GPF-DI	48	41	85.4%	48	36	75.0%	48	33	68.8%
Philadelphia-HCA-CS	29	24	82.8%	29	19	65.5%	29	18	62.1%
Philadelphia-Home Care Associates	38	33	86.8%	38	26	68.4%	38	21	55.3%
Philadelphia-PASS	54	45	83.3%	54	35	64.8%	54	26	48.1%
Philadelphia-PhAME	128	119	93.0%	121	102	84.3%	104	84	80.8%
Philadelphia-STRIVE	197	151	76.6%	197	131	66.5%	197	112	56.9%
Philadelphia Totals	539	455	84.4%	532	389	73.1%	515	328	63.7%
Seattle-AOP-Family Wage Placement	16	13	81.3%	16	11	68.8%	16	9	56.3%
Seattle-Apprenticeship Placement	52	46	88.5%	51	43	84.3%	51	30	58.8%
Seattle-Automotive	59	57	96.6%	55	50	90.9%	38	25	65.8%
Seattle-Branch Villa	19	19	100.0%	19	18	94.7%	15	13	86.7%
Seattle-Brownfields Project	10	9	90.0%	7	5	71.4%	-	-	-
Seattle-Conservation Corps	12	11	91.7%	11	7	63.6%	8	2	25.0%
Seattle-Direct Placements	1266	1108	87.5%	1193	947	79.4%	1107	622	56.2%
Seattle-DM-CNC	69	55	79.7%	69	50	72.5%	69	33	47.8%
Seattle-DM-Electronics Assembly	83	79	95.2%	82	71	86.6%	82	54	65.9%
Seattle-DM-General	24	22	91.7%	23	18	78.3%	17	8	47.1%
Seattle-Fred Hutchinson	2	2	100.0%	2	2	100.0%	2	1	50.0%
Seattle-Health Care	68	62	91.2%	68	56	82.4%	68	40	58.8%
Seattle-Immunex	4	4	100.0%	4	4	100.0%	4	1	25.0%
Seattle-Office Occupations	188	178	94.7%	175	153	87.4%	126	87	69.0%
Seattle-Prep Employment	67	55	82.1%	66	52	78.8%	55	32	58.2%
Seattle-Stabilization Project	1	1	100.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seattle-Unknown	3	2	66.7%	3	2	66.7%	3	1	33.3%
Seattle-W - Hotel	33	31	93.9%	33	27	81.8%	32	15	46.9%
Seattle-Xerox	7	6	85.7%	7	6	85.7%	7	4	57.1%
Seattle Totals	1983	1760	88.8%	1884	1522	80.8%	1700	977	57.5%
St. Louis-Business Services	23	21	91.3%	23	20	87.0%	22	19	86.4%
St. Louis-Call Center	2	1	50.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Louis-Construction	99	92	92.9%	99	82	82.8%	89	68	76.4%
St. Louis-Construction - PTC	10	9	90.0%	2	2	100.0%	-	-	-
St. Louis-Health Careers	78	43	55.1%	58	26	44.8%	29	12	41.4%
St. Louis-Work Link	256	205	80.1%	205	133	64.9%	123	63	51.2%
St. Louis-Work Link - Downtown	35	26	74.3%	15	10	66.7%	-	-	-
St. Louis Totals	503	397	78.9%	402	273	67.9%	263	162	61.6%
TOTAL	5249	4098	78.1%	4936	3267	66.2%	4092	2101	51.3%

AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
12-month Retention Participant Characteristics
Achievement of 12-month Retention For Participants in One or More Jobs Since Initial Placement
Retention through March 31, 2001

TABLE 9

	<u>Number Eligible with Known Milestone Status</u>	<u>12-MONTH Achieved</u>		<u>12-MONTH Not Achieved</u>	
	4085	N=	2099	N=	1986
<u>Gender</u>		#	%	#	%
Male	2025	1010	49.9%	1015	50.1%
Female	2060	1089	52.9%	971	47.1%
Unknown/Missing	0	0		0	
<u>Ethnicity</u>		#	%	#	%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	91	33	36.3%	58	63.7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	376	297	79.0%	79	21.0%
Black	2441	1206	49.4%	1235	50.6%
Hispanic	531	256	48.2%	275	51.8%
Multietnic	45	26	57.8%	19	42.2%
White	551	258	46.8%	293	53.2%
Other	29	17	58.6%	12	41.4%
Unknown/Missing	21	6		15	
<u>Primary Language</u>		#	%	#	%
English	2549	1213	47.6%	1336	52.4%
Spanish	174	77	44.3%	97	55.7%
Vietnamese	77	60	77.9%	17	22.1%
Other	1283	748	58.3%	535	41.7%
Unknown/Missing	2	1		1	
<u>Marital Status</u>		#	%	#	%
Married, living with spouse	742	463	62.4%	279	37.6%
Married, not living with spouse	312	164	52.6%	148	47.4%
Non-married partner	231	106	45.9%	125	54.1%
Single, never married	2116	1029	48.6%	1087	51.4%
Widowed, Divorced, Legally Separated	585	284	48.5%	301	51.5%
Unknown/Missing	99	53		46	
<u>Children at Home</u>		#	%	#	%
Yes	2235	1223	54.7%	1012	45.3%
No Children	1781	846	47.5%	935	52.5%
Unknown/Missing	69	30		39	
<u>Highest Grade Completed</u>		#	%	#	%
Less Than High School Diploma	1185	530	44.7%	655	55.3%
12th (Last yr. high school)	1730	911	52.7%	819	47.3%
Some College	546	303	55.5%	243	44.5%
Two-year College	316	175	55.4%	141	44.6%
Four-year College	196	122	62.2%	74	37.8%
More than College	71	46	64.8%	25	35.2%
Unknown/Missing	41	12		29	
<u>Paid Work Experience (ever had)</u>		#	%	#	%
Yes	3482	1748	50.2%	1734	49.8%
No	381	195	51.2%	186	48.8%
Unknown/Missing	222	156		66	
<u>Impact Community</u>		#	%	#	%
No	1938	977	50.4%	961	49.6%
Yes	1739	888	51.1%	851	48.9%
Unknown/Missing	408	234		174	

AECF Jobs Initiative
Cumulative -- All JI Sites
12-month Retention Participant Characteristics
Achievement of 12-month Retention For Participants in Only One Job Since Initial Placement
Retention through March 31, 2001

TABLE 9a

	<u>Number Eligible with Known Milestone Status</u>	<u>12-MONTH Achieved</u>		<u>12-MONTH Not Achieved</u>	
	3207	N=	1597	N=	1610
<u>Gender</u>		#	%	#	%
Male	1552	748	48.2%	804	51.8%
Female	1655	849	51.3%	806	48.7%
Unknown/Missing	0	0		0	
<u>Ethnicity</u>		#	%	#	%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	72	26	36.1%	46	63.9%
Asian or Pacific Islander	329	259	78.7%	70	21.3%
Black	1835	868	47.3%	967	52.7%
Hispanic	448	212	47.3%	236	52.7%
Multiethnic	33	21	63.6%	12	36.4%
White	446	191	42.8%	255	57.2%
Other	25	15	60.0%	10	40.0%
Unknown/Missing	17	5		12	
<u>Primary Language</u>		#	%	#	%
English	2105	948	45.0%	1157	55.0%
Spanish	153	69	45.1%	84	54.9%
Vietnamese	69	54	78.3%	15	21.7%
Other	352	262	74.4%	90	25.6%
Unknown/Missing	528	264		264	
<u>Marital Status</u>		#	%	#	%
Married, living with spouse	602	367	61.0%	235	39.0%
Married, not living with spouse	240	117	48.8%	123	51.3%
Non-married partner	182	84	46.2%	98	53.8%
Single, never married	1645	773	47.0%	872	53.0%
Widowed, Divorced, Legally Separated	456	218	47.8%	238	52.2%
Unknown/Missing	82	38		44	
<u>Children at Home</u>		#	%	#	%
Yes	1729	925	53.5%	804	46.5%
No Children	1418	646	45.6%	772	54.4%
Unknown/Missing	60	26		34	
<u>Highest Grade Completed</u>		#	%	#	%
Less Than High School Diploma	934	412	44.1%	522	55.9%
12th (Last yr. high school)	1360	693	51.0%	667	49.0%
Some College	421	230	54.6%	191	45.4%
Two-year College	240	124	51.7%	116	48.3%
Four-year College	164	98	59.8%	66	40.2%
More than College	52	30	57.7%	22	42.3%
Unknown/Missing	36	10		26	
<u>Paid Work Experience (ever had)</u>		#	%	#	%
Yes	2704	1317	48.7%	1387	51.3%
No	318	154	48.4%	164	51.6%
Unknown/Missing	185	126		59	
<u>Impact Community</u>		#	%	#	%
No	1490	729	48.9%	761	51.1%
Yes	1376	685	49.8%	691	50.2%
Unknown/Missing	341	183		158	

Table 10

AECF Jobs Initiative
Wage Changes of Enrollees and Placed Participants, by Project
For Initial Placements through March 31, 2001

Project	Average Initial Placement Wages for Placed Participants	N	Missing	Average Last Known (Retention) Wages for Enrollees	N	Missing	Wage Change
Denver-Assembly	\$5.97	129	0	\$6.41	129	0	0.44
Denver-Health Care	\$7.63	246	0	\$8.09	246	0	0.46
Denver-Manufacturing	\$8.33	220	0	\$8.88	220	0	0.56
Denver-Non-DWI	\$9.62	5	0	\$9.62	5	0	0.00
Denver-Teleservice	\$9.02	272	0	\$9.68	272	0	0.66
Denver Totals/Weighted Average	\$8.01	872	0	\$8.54	872	0	0.54
Milwaukee-Central City Workers	\$13.60	292	0	\$14.01	266	26	0.42
Milwaukee-Hospitality Prototype	\$7.67	63	0	\$7.80	61	2	0.14
Milwaukee-Manufacturing Jobs	\$10.12	665	3	\$10.42	631	37	0.30
Milwaukee-Printing Industry Project	\$8.82	161	0	\$9.22	153	8	0.40
Milwaukee Totals/Weighted Average	\$10.67	1181	3	\$10.97	1111	73	0.30
New Orleans-Construction	\$8.50	126	0	\$8.51	126	0	0.01
New Orleans-Health Care	\$5.15	2	0	\$5.15	2	0	0.00
New Orleans-Job Readiness-WtW	\$6.28	94	0	\$6.45	94	0	0.17
New Orleans-Manufacturing	\$7.88	33	0	\$8.39	33	0	0.51
New Orleans Totals/Weighted Average	\$7.57	255	0	\$7.73	255	0	0.15
Philadelphia-CBC-MOA	\$9.85	45	0	\$10.74	45	0	0.89
Philadelphia-GPF-DI	\$7.90	48	0	\$8.37	48	0	0.47
Philadelphia-HCA-CS	\$7.39	29	0	\$7.51	29	0	0.12
Philadelphia-Home Care Associates	\$7.31	38	0	\$7.33	38	0	0.03
Philadelphia-PASS	\$7.77	54	0	\$8.21	54	0	0.44
Philadelphia-PhAME	\$10.95	131	0	\$12.17	131	0	1.22
Philadelphia-STRIVE	\$7.79	195	2	\$7.83	196	1	0.04
Philadelphia Totals/Weighted Average	\$8.68	540	2	\$9.15	541	1	0.48
Seattle-AOP-Family Wage Placement	\$12.24	16	0	\$13.07	16	0	0.83
Seattle-Apprenticeship Placement	\$11.84	51	1	\$11.95	51	1	0.10
Seattle-Automotive	\$8.92	60	0	\$9.54	60	0	0.62
Seattle-Branch Villa	\$9.05	19	0	\$9.71	19	0	0.66
Seattle-Brownsfields Project	\$20.69	10	0	\$20.79	10	0	0.10
Seattle-Conservation Corps	\$12.40	13	0	\$12.40	13	0	0.00
Seattle-DM-CNC	\$9.64	69	0	\$10.14	69	0	0.50
Seattle-DM-Electronics Assembly	\$8.12	82	1	\$8.84	82	1	0.72
Seattle-DM-General	\$10.04	32	1	\$10.42	32	1	0.38
Seattle-Fred Hutchinson	\$11.54	2	0	\$13.41	2	0	1.87
Seattle-Health Care	\$9.37	68	0	\$10.30	68	0	0.93
Seattle-Immunex	\$10.38	4	0	\$10.55	4	0	0.16
Seattle-Individualized Placements	\$9.53	1350	6	\$10.06	1348	8	0.53
Seattle-Office Occupations	\$10.12	201	2	\$10.45	201	2	0.33
Seattle-Prep Employment	\$10.01	67	1	\$10.17	67	1	0.17
Seattle-Stabilization Project	\$0.00	0	1	\$0.00	0	1	0.00
Seattle-Unknown	\$0.00	0	3	\$0.00	0	3	0.00
Seattle-W - Hotel	\$8.37	33	0	\$8.60	33	0	0.23
Seattle-Xerox	\$9.96	7	0	\$10.37	7	0	0.41
Seattle Totals/Weighted Average	\$9.67	2044	16	\$10.17	2042	18	0.50
St. Louis-Business Services	\$8.74	22	1	\$8.72	23	0	-0.03
St. Louis-Call Center	\$7.86	18	0	\$7.80	18	0	-0.07
St. Louis-Construction	\$10.19	99	0	\$11.27	99	0	1.08
St. Louis-Construction - PTC	\$12.29	11	0	\$12.29	11	0	0.00
St. Louis-Health Careers	\$8.06	90	0	\$8.22	90	0	0.15
St. Louis-Work Link	\$7.06	519	1	\$7.21	519	1	0.15
St. Louis-Work Link-Downtown	\$7.18	65	0	\$7.41	65	0	0.23
St. Louis Totals/Weighted Average	\$7.68	824	2	\$7.94	825	1	0.26
Unassigned					3189		
TOTALS		5716	23		8835	93	

Table 11

AECF Jobs Initiative
Retention Over Time, by Enrollment Year & Site
Retention through March 31, 2001

Site/ Enrollment Year									
	# eligible 3-mo.	# attained 3-mo.	% retained	# eligible 6-mo.	# attained 6-mo.	% retained	# eligible 12-mo.	# attained 12-mo.	% retained
April 1996 - March 1997									
Denver	29	26	89.66%	29	19	65.52%	29	15	51.72%
Milwaukee	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
New Orleans	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
Philadelphia	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
Seattle	62	58	93.55%	62	56	90.32%	62	48	77.42%
St. Louis	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
<i>Total</i>	91	84	92.31%	91	75	82.42%	91	63	69.23%
April 1997 - March 1998									
Denver	79	60	75.95%	79	45	56.96%	79	31	39.24%
Milwaukee	141	91	64.54%	141	99	70.21%	141	82	58.16%
New Orleans	11	10	90.91%	11	7	63.64%	11	5	45.45%
Philadelphia	42	31	73.81%	42	27	64.29%	42	23	54.76%
Seattle	524	443	84.54%	524	420	80.15%	524	317	60.50%
St. Louis	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-
<i>Total</i>	797	635	79.67%	797	598	75.03%	797	458	57.47%
April 1998 - March 1999									
Denver	184	118	64.13%	184	83	45.11%	184	56	30.43%
Milwaukee	282	202	71.63%	282	191	67.73%	282	179	63.48%
New Orleans	4	4	100.00%	4	2	50.00%	4	1	25.00%
Philadelphia	187	162	86.63%	187	141	75.40%	187	128	68.45%
Seattle	575	503	87.48%	575	415	72.17%	575	346	60.17%
St. Louis	111	86	77.48%	111	84	75.68%	111	69	62.16%
<i>Total</i>	1343	1075	80.04%	1343	916	68.21%	1343	779	58.00%
April 1999 - March 2000									
Denver	400	221	55.25%	400	150	37.50%	400	94	23.50%
Milwaukee	404	280	69.31%	404	237	58.66%	404	157	38.86%
New Orleans	72	61	84.72%	72	35	48.61%	72	14	19.44%
Philadelphia	285	240	84.21%	285	211	74.04%	285	177	62.11%
Seattle	532	479	90.04%	532	361	67.86%	532	266	50.00%
St. Louis	207	171	82.61%	207	147	71.01%	207	92	44.44%
<i>Total</i>	1900	1452	76.42%	1900	1141	60.05%	1900	800	42.11%
April 2000 - March 2001									
Denver	176	120	68.18%	153	60	39.22%	8	0	-
Milwaukee	286	119	41.61%	232	63	27.16%	0	0	-
New Orleans	156	117	75.00%	127	62	48.82%	0	0	-
Philadelphia	25	22	88.00%	18	9	50.00%	1	0	-
Seattle	276	269	97.46%	180	132	73.33%	0	0	-
St. Louis	185	130	70.27%	84	41	48.81%	1	1	100.00%
<i>Total</i>	1104	777	70.38%	794	367	46.22%	10	1	10.00%
Overall Totals	5235	4023	76.85%	4925	3097	62.88%	4141	2101	50.74%

Table 12

Change in Percentage of Enrollees with Various Characteristics Over Time

Year Enrolled	4/1/1996-3/31/1997		4/1/1997-3/31/1998		4/1/1998- 3/31/1999		4/1/1999-3/31/2000		4/1/2000-3/31/2001		Change '96-01
	n=323		n=2076		n=3893		n=3482		n=2797		
	n	% of enrolled	n	% of enrolled	n	% of enrolled	n	% of enrolled	n	% of enrolled	
Primary language NOT English	19	9%	311	17%	563	18%	483	18%	195	8%	-1%
Indication of difficulty with English at time of enrollment	47	19%	274	14%	540	14%	517	15%	439	16%	-3%
No previous work experience prior to enrollment	1	1%	148	9%	501	13%	416	12%	379	16%	15%
Received public assistance in previous 12 months	71	22%	861	42%	1808	47%	1585	46%	1193	42%	20%
Less than 21 years of age	16	7%	168	10%	429	11%	530	16%	289	11%	3%
Non-white	229	83%	1571	82%	3310	87%	3040	88%	2453	88%	5%
Educational attainment less than high school diploma	46	18%	481	25%	1329	35%	1219	36%	1150	42%	23%
Male	130	40%	1029	50%	1936	50%	1721	50%	1351	48%	8%
Family income under \$9,000	140	65%	1081	63%	2171	57%	1805	52%	1481	55%	-10%

Table 13

AECF Jobs Initiative
Direct vs. Sectoral Placements
Wage Changes of Enrollees and Placed Participants, by Project
For Initial Placements through March 31, 2001

Project	Number Enrolled	Number Placed	Average Initial Placement Wages for Placed Participants	N	Missing	Average Last Known (Retention) Wages for Enrollees	N	Missing	Wage Change
Direct Placements									
Denver-Non-DWI	62	5	\$9.62	5	0	\$9.62	5	0	0.00
New Orleans-Job Readiness-WtW	94	94	\$6.28	94	0	\$6.45	94	0	0.17
Philadelphia-STRIVE	334	197	\$7.79	195	2	\$7.83	196	1	0.04
Seattle-Individualized Placements	2213	1356	\$9.53	1350	6	\$10.06	1348	8	0.53
St. Louis-Work Link	530	520	\$7.06	519	1	\$7.21	519	1	0.15
St. Louis-Work Link-Downtown	65	65	\$7.18	65	0	\$7.41	65	0	0.23
Total	3298	2237	\$8.60	2228	9	\$8.97	2227	10	
Sectoral Placements									
Denver-Assembly	129	129	\$5.97	129	0	\$6.41	129	0	0.44
Denver-Health Care	246	246	\$7.63	246	0	\$8.09	246	0	0.46
Denver-Manufacturing	220	220	\$8.33	220	0	\$8.88	220	0	0.56
Denver-Teleservice	272	272	\$9.02	272	0	\$9.68	272	0	0.66
Milwaukee-Central City Workers	294	292	\$13.60	292	0	\$14.01	266	26	0.42
Milwaukee-Hospitality Prototype	70	63	\$7.67	63	0	\$7.80	61	2	0.14
Milwaukee-Manufacturing Jobs	672	669	\$10.12	665	3	\$10.42	631	37	0.30
Milwaukee-Printing Industry Project	164	161	\$8.82	161	0	\$9.22	153	8	0.40
New Orleans-Construction	126	126	\$8.50	126	0	\$8.51	126	0	0.01
New Orleans-Health Care	3	2	\$5.15	2	0	\$5.15	2	0	0.00
New Orleans-Manufacturing	33	33	\$7.88	33	0	\$8.39	33	0	0.51
Philadelphia-CBC-MOA	68	45	\$9.85	45	0	\$10.74	45	0	0.89
Philadelphia-GPF-DI	86	48	\$7.90	48	0	\$8.37	48	0	0.47
Philadelphia-HCA-CS	42	29	\$7.39	29	0	\$7.51	29	0	0.12
Philadelphia-Home Care Associates	49	38	\$7.31	38	0	\$7.33	38	0	0.03
Philadelphia-PASS	70	54	\$7.77	54	0	\$8.21	54	0	0.44
Philadelphia-PhAME	363	131	\$10.95	131	0	\$12.17	131	0	1.22
Seattle-AOP-Family Wage Placement	19	16	\$12.24	16	0	\$13.07	16	0	0.83
Seattle-Apprenticeship Placement	80	52	\$11.84	51	1	\$11.95	51	1	0.10
Seattle-Automotive	143	60	\$8.92	60	0	\$9.54	60	0	0.62
Seattle-Branch Villa	27	19	\$9.05	19	0	\$9.71	19	0	0.66
Seattle-Brownsfields Project	43	10	\$20.69	10	0	\$20.79	10	0	0.10
Seattle-Conservation Corps	87	13	\$12.40	13	0	\$12.40	13	0	0.00
Seattle-DM-CNC	119	69	\$9.64	69	0	\$10.14	69	0	0.50
Seattle-DM-Electronics Assembly	166	83	\$8.12	82	1	\$8.84	82	1	0.72
Seattle-DM-General	256	33	\$10.04	32	1	\$10.42	32	1	0.38
Seattle-Fred Hutchinson	2	2	\$11.54	2	0	\$13.41	2	0	1.87
Seattle-Health Care	184	68	\$9.37	68	0	\$10.30	68	0	0.93
Seattle-Immunex	4	4	\$10.38	4	0	\$10.55	4	0	0.16
Seattle-Office Occupations	760	203	\$10.12	201	2	\$10.45	201	2	0.33
Seattle-Prep Employment	158	68	\$10.01	67	1	\$10.17	67	1	0.17
Seattle-Stabilization Project	93	1	\$0.00	0	1	\$0.00	0	1	0.00
Seattle-Unknown	458	3	\$0.00	0	3	\$0.00	0	3	0.00
Seattle-W - Hotel	33	33	\$8.37	33	0	\$8.60	33	0	0.23
Seattle-Xerox	7	7	\$9.96	7	0	\$10.37	7	0	0.41
St. Louis-Business Services	23	23	\$8.74	22	1	\$8.72	23	0	-0.03
St. Louis-Call Center	18	18	\$7.86	18	0	\$7.80	18	0	-0.07
St. Louis-Construction	99	99	\$10.19	99	0	\$11.27	99	0	1.08
St. Louis-Construction - PTC	11	11	\$12.29	11	0	\$12.29	11	0	0.00
St. Louis-Health Careers	90	90	\$8.06	90	0	\$8.22	90	0	0.15
Total	5787	3543	\$9.50	3528	14	\$9.92	3459	83	

2001 Regression Analyses

Regression Analysis #1

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Regression Analysis
Cross Site 3-month Retention Barriers
Retention Through March 31,2001**

Label	Variable	Coefficient Estimate	Odds Ratio Estimate
Intercept	Intercept	1.6958 *	
1 if received unemployment	ui	-0.1616	0.851
1 if eng_prob=1 or esl=1	notprof	0.1089	1.115
1 if commute is via public transport	hardcommute	-0.5228 *	0.593
1 if no prior work experience	nowork	-0.1567	0.855
1 if homeless	homeless	-0.4337 **	0.648
1 if living in shelter, trans. housing, public housing	probhous	0.0165	1.017
1 if from Denver	Denver	-1.447 *	0.235
1 if from Milwaukee	Milwaukee	-1.3838 *	0.251
1 if from New Orleans	NewO	-0.5129	0.599
1 if from Philadelphia	Philly	-0.1154	0.891
1 if from St. Louis	StLouis	-0.6783 *	0.508
1 if 23<=age<=28	age2	0.0912	1.095
1 if 29<=age<=34	age3	0.2282	1.256
1 if 35<=age<=41	age4	0.1129	1.12
1 if age>=42	age5	0.2273	1.255
1 if female	female	0.1513	1.163
1 if took Adult Basic Education course	abe	0.0471	1.048
1 if high school diploma is highest education	hsdiploma	0.2599	1.297
1 if attended some college	somecoll	0.3175	1.374
1 if graduated from two-year college	twocoll	0.2392	1.27
1 if graduated from four-year college	fourcoll	0.3617	1.436
1 if more than college	morecoll	0.4833	1.621
1 if we have no education info	noeducinfo	0.0695	1.072
1 if participant is African-American	black	0.1392	1.149
1 if participant is Hispanic	hispanic	0.3202	1.377
1 if participant is Asian/Pacific Islander	asian	1.0603 *	2.887
1 if participant is American Indian/Alaskan Native	amind	-0.2011	0.818
1 if participant is an unlisted race	otherrace	0.4298	1.537
1 if child aged 0-3 is at home	kids0_3	0.0135	1.014
1 if child aged 4-5 is at home	kids4_5	-0.1207	0.886
1 if child aged 6-12 is at home	kids6_12	0.0529	1.054
1 if child aged 13-18 is at home	kids13_18	0.0457	1.047

*Significant at the 1% level

**Significant at the 5% level

***Significant at the 10% level

5235 Participants

Percent Concordant 71.3

Percent Discordant 28.3

c 0.715

Regression Analysis #2

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Regression Analysis
Cross Site 6-month Retention Barriers
Retention Through March 31,2001**

Label	Variable	Coefficient Estimate	Odds Ratio Estimate
Intercept	Intercept	0.6758 *	
1 if received unemployment	ui	-0.096	0.908
1if eng_prob=1 or esl=1	notprof	0.2098	1.233
1 if commute is via public transport	hardcommute	-0.4474 *	0.639
1 if no prior work experience	nowork	-0.14	0.869
1 if homeless	homeless	-0.335 **	0.715
1 if living in shelter, trans. housing, public housing	probhous	-0.2054	0.814
1 if from Denver	Denver	-1.2773 *	0.279
1 if from Milwaukee	Milwaukee	-0.6533 *	0.52
1 if from New Orleans	NewO	-0.8543 *	0.426
1 if from Philadelphia	Philly	0.2092	1.233
1 if from St. Louis	StLouis	-0.1201	0.887
1 if 23<=age<=28	age2	0.0177	1.018
1 if 29<=age<=34	age3	0.1872	1.206
1 if 35<=age<=41	age4	-0.0293	0.971
1 if age>=42	age5	0.1529	1.165
1 if female	female	0.099	1.104
1 if took Adult Basic Education course	abe	-0.0898	0.914
1 if high school diploma is highest education	hsdiploma	0.3204 *	1.378
1 if attended some college	somecoll	0.5048 *	1.657
1 if graduated from two-year college	twocoll	0.3745	1.454
1 if graduated from four-year college	fourcoll	0.4774	1.612
1 if more than college	morecoll	0.958	2.607
1 if we have no education info	noeducinfo	0.098	1.103
1 if participant is African-American	black	0.1479	1.159
1 if participant is Hispanic	hispanic	0.3092	1.362
1 if participant is Asian/Pacific Islander	asian	0.761 *	2.14
1 if participant is American Indian/Alaskan Native	amind	-0.3117	0.732
1 if participant is an unlisted race	otherrace	0.538	1.713
1 if child aged 0-3 is at home	kids0_3	-0.1505	0.86
1 if child aged 4-5 is at home	kids4_5	0.1151	1.122
1 if child aged 6-12 is at home	kids6_12	0.00994	1.01
1 if child aged 13-18 is at home	kids13_18	0.1438	1.155

*Significant at the 1% level

**Significant at the 5% level

***Significant at the 10% level

4925 Participants

Percent Concordant 68.8

Percent Discordant 30.8

c 0.69

Regression Analysis #3

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Regression Analysis
Cross Site 12-month Retention Barriers
Retention Through March 31,2001**

Label	Variable	Coefficient Estimate	Odds Ratio Estimate
Intercept	Intercept	-0.1163	
1 if received unemployment	ui	0.1542	1.167
1if eng_prob=1 or esl=1	notprof	0.3256	1.385
1 if commute is via public transport	hardcommute	-0.3793 *	0.684
1 if no prior work experience	nowork	-0.0791	0.924
1 if homeless	homeless	-0.5956 *	0.551
1 if living in shelter, trans. housing, public housing	probhous	-0.2615	0.77
1 if from Denver	Denver	-1.1651 *	0.312
1 if from Milwaukee	Milwaukee	-0.00464	0.995
1 if from New Orleans	NewO	-1.2529 *	0.286
1 if from Philadelphia	Philly	0.5517 *	1.736
1 if from St. Louis	StLouis	0.4091	1.506
1 if 23<=age<=28	age2	0.0344	1.035
1 if 29<=age<=34	age3	0.1589	1.172
1 if 35<=age<=41	age4	0.0567	1.058
1 if age>=42	age5	0.2573	1.293
1 if female	female	0.1621	1.176
1 if took Adult Basic Education course	abe	-0.2156	0.806
1 if high school diploma is highest education	hsdiploma	0.21	1.234
1 if attended some college	somecoll	0.3668 ***	1.443
1 if graduated from two-year college	twocoll	0.3443	1.411
1 if graduated from four-year college	fourcoll	0.3364	1.4
1 if more than college	morecoll	0.6782	1.97
1 if we have no education info	noeducinfo	-0.5121	0.599
1 if participant is African-American	black	0.0332	1.034
1 if participant is Hispanic	hispanic	0.3163	1.372
1 if participant is Asian/Pacific Islander	asian	0.9594 *	2.61
1 if participant is American Indian/Alaskan Native	amind	-0.4044	0.667
1 if participant is an unlisted race	otherrace	0.2237	1.251
1 if child aged 0-3 is at home	kids0_3	0.0524	1.054
1 if child aged 4-5 is at home	kids4_5	-0.0598	0.942
1 if child aged 6-12 is at home	kids6_12	0.1161	1.123
1 if child aged 13-18 is at home	kids13_18	0.0614	1.063

*Significant at the 1% level

**Significant at the 5% level

***Significant at the 10% level

4085 Participants

Percent Concordant 69.6

Percent Discordant 30.1

c 0.698

Regression Analysis #4

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Regression Analysis
Seattle Jobs Initiative 3-month Retention Barriers
Retention Through March 31,2001**

Label	Variable	Coefficient Estimate	Odds Ratio Estimate
Intercept	Intercept	1.5573 *	
1 if received unemployment	ui	-0.3009	0.74
1if eng_prob=1 or esl=1	notprof	-0.0556	0.946
1 if commute is via public transport	hardcommute	-0.6592 *	0.517
1 if no prior work experience	nowork	-0.3038	0.738
1 if homeless	homeless	-0.5739 **	0.563
1 if living in shelter, trans. housing, public housing	probhous	0.2199	1.246
1 if 26<=age<=31	age2	0.1728	1.189
1 if 32<=age<=37	age3	0.2407	1.272
1 if 38<=age<=44	age4	0.1842	1.202
1 if age>=45	age5	0.4852	1.624
1 if female	female	0.6117 **	1.844
1 if took Adult Basic Education course	abe	-0.1771	0.838
1 if high school diploma is highest education	hsdiploma	0.0311	1.032
1 if attended some college	fourcoll	0.2008	1.222
1 if graduated from two-year college	twocoll	-0.2055	0.814
1 if graduated from four-year college	somecoll	-0.1308	0.877
1 if more than college	morecoll	-0.00612	0.994
1 if we have no education info	noeducinfo	-0.025	0.975
1 if participant is African-American	black	0.4747	1.608
1 if participant is Hispanic	hispanic	0.3142	1.369
1 if participant is Asian/Pacific Islander	asian	1.0267 **	2.792
1 if participant is American Indian/Alaskan Native	amind	-0.3701	0.691
1 if participant is an unlisted race	otherrace	0.2021	1.224
1 if child aged 0-3 is at home	kids0_3	-0.3716	0.69
1 if child aged 4-5 is at home	kids4_5	-0.3499	0.705
1 if child aged 6-12 is at home	kids6_12	-0.1165	0.89
1 if child aged 13-18 is at home	kids13_18	0.1236	1.132
1 if drug user	drugs	0.6396	1.896
1 if criminal conviction	conviction	-0.2079	0.812
1 if received training	training	0.2895	1.336
1 if childcare is a problem	childcare	0.7625	2.144
1 if not U.S. citizen	notcitizen	0.267	1.306
1 if disabled	disability	-0.3152	0.73

*Significant at the 1% level

**Significant at the 5% level

***Significant at the 10% level

1969 Participants

Percent Concordant 71.6

Percent Discordant 27.8

c 0.719

Regression Analysis #5

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Regression Analysis
Seattle Jobs Initiative 6-month Retention Barriers
Retention Through March 31,2001**

Label	Variable	Coefficient Estimate	Odds Ratio Estimate
Intercept	Intercept	1.0324 *	
1 if received unemployment	ui	-0.1484	0.862
1if eng_prob=1 or esl=1	notprof	0.2006	1.222
1 if commute is via public transport	hardcommute	-0.503 *	0.605
1 if no prior work experience	nowork	-0.336	0.715
1 if homeless	homeless	-0.5028 **	0.605
1 if living in shelter, trans. housing, public housing	probhous	-0.3162	0.729
1 if 26<=age<=31	age2	0.027	1.027
1 if 32<=age<=37	age3	0.0643	1.066
1 if 38<=age<=44	age4	0.0294	1.03
1 if age>=45	age5	0.2241	1.251
1 if female	female	0.3356 **	1.399
1 if took Adult Basic Education course	abe	-0.2953	0.744
1 if high school diploma is highest education	hsdiploma	0.3023	1.353
1 if attended some college	fourcoll	0.3075	1.36
1 if graduated from two-year college	twocoll	0.1152	1.122
1 if graduated from four-year college	somecoll	0.0895	1.094
1 if more than college	morecoll	0.7901	2.204
1 if we have no education info	noeducinfo	-0.1361	0.873
1 if participant is African-American	black	0.2263	1.254
1 if participant is Hispanic	hispanic	0.1335	1.143
1 if participant is Asian/Pacific Islander	asian	0.6201	1.859
1 if participant is American Indian/Alaskan Native	amind	-0.3519	0.703
1 if participant is an unlisted race	otherrace	0.3513	1.421
1 if child aged 0-3 is at home	kids0_3	-0.1351	0.874
1 if child aged 4-5 is at home	kids4_5	0.3126	1.367
1 if child aged 6-12 is at home	kids6_12	-0.1724	0.842
1 if child aged 13-18 is at home	kids13_18	0.0372	1.038
1 if drug user	drugs	-0.5662	0.568
1 if criminal conviction	conviction	-0.2518	0.777
1 if received training	training	-0.2004	0.818
1 if childcare is a problem	childcare	0.2759	1.318
1 if not U.S. citizen	notcitizen	0.0737	1.077
1 if disabled	disability	-0.2658	0.767

*Significant at the 1% level

**Significant at the 5% level

***Significant at the 10% level

1873 Participants

Percent Concordant 68.9

Percent Discordant 30.7

c 0.691

Regression Analysis #6

**AECF Jobs Initiative
Regression Analysis
Seattle Jobs Initiative 12-month Retention Barriers
Retention Through March 31,2001**

Label	Variable	Coefficient Estimate	Odds Ratio Estimate
Intercept	Intercept	0.2187	
1 if received unemployment	ui	-0.1305	0.878
1if eng_prob=1 or esl=1	notprof	0.3793	1.461
1 if commute is via public transport	hardcommute	-0.4326 **	0.649
1 if no prior work experience	nowork	-0.2076	0.812
1 if homeless	homeless	-0.763 *	0.466
1 if living in shelter, trans. housing, public housing	probhous	-0.3838	0.681
1 if 26<=age<=31	age2	0.0566	1.058
1 if 32<=age<=37	age3	0.1379	1.148
1 if 38<=age<=44	age4	0.0504	1.052
1 if age>=45	age5	0.4319	1.54
1 if female	female	0.3424 **	1.408
1 if took Adult Basic Education course	abe	-0.112	0.894
1 if high school diploma is highest education	hsdiploma	0.2348	1.265
1 if attended some college	fourcoll	0.1585	1.172
1 if graduated from two-year college	twocoll	0.1225	1.13
1 if graduated from four-year college	somecoll	0.1834	1.201
1 if more than college	morecoll	0.536	1.709
1 if we have no education info	noeducinfo	-2.2463	0.106
1 if participant is African-American	black	0.06	1.062
1 if participant is Hispanic	hispanic	-0.2292	0.795
1 if participant is Asian/Pacific Islander	asian	0.7492 *	2.115
1 if participant is American Indian/Alaskan Native	amind	-0.3492	0.705
1 if participant is an unlisted race	otherrace	-0.0242	0.976
1 if child aged 0-3 is at home	kids0_3	0.207	1.23
1 if child aged 4-5 is at home	kids4_5	-0.0533	0.948
1 if child aged 6-12 is at home	kids6_12	0.0958	1.101
1 if child aged 13-18 is at home	kids13_18	0.0526	1.054
1 if drug user	drugs	-0.3983	0.671
1 if criminal conviction	conviction	-0.6683 *	0.513
1 if received training	training	-0.2617	0.77
1 if childcare is a problem	childcare	0.3839	1.468
1 if not U.S. citizen	notcitizen	0.1484	1.16
1 if disabled	disability	0.0876	1.092

*Significant at the 1% level

**Significant at the 5% level

***Significant at the 10% level

1693 Participants

Percent Concordant 72.9

Percent Discordant 26.9

c 0.73

