

**Evidence Scan of Work Experience  
Programs**

May 19, 2010

Samina Sattar



**MATHEMATICA**  
Policy Research, Inc.

Submitted to:

**REDF**

Investing in Employment and Hope

Contract Number:  
Agreement dated 2/19/10

Mathematica Reference Number:  
06747-100

Submitted to:  
REDF  
631 Howard St., Suite 320  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Project Officer: Anna Martin

Submitted by:  
Mathematica Policy Research  
505 14th Street, Suite 800  
Oakland, CA 94612-1475  
Telephone: (510) 830-3700  
Facsimile: (510) 830-3701  
Project Director: Deborah Reed

## Evidence Scan of Work Experience Programs

May 19, 2010

Samina Sattar

**MATHEMATICA**  
Policy Research, Inc.

Submitted to:

**REDF**

Investing in Employment and Hope

## **ABOUT THE FUNDER**

REDF is a high-impact, hands-on, venture philanthropy and intermediary organization. They work with a portfolio of carefully selected nonprofits, providing funding and business assistance to support early stage social enterprises that intentionally employ people most disconnected from the workforce. Over the past decade, REDF-supported social enterprises have employed more than 5,000 people overcoming histories of incarceration, addiction, mental illness, homelessness, chronic poverty and joblessness. REDF builds bridges between for-profit businesses, nonprofits, socially-focused capital markets, and government agencies to create more durable job opportunities and entry points to the workforce and proactively shares their insights and lessons through publications and practice tools.

## EVIDENCE SCAN OF WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS

### A. Summary and Key Findings

This study, being conducted through the Center for Improving Research Evidence (CIRE) at Mathematica Policy Research for the venture philanthropy organization REDF, presents the evidence on the effectiveness of interventions that include work experience as a strategy to improve employment outcomes for populations with barriers to employment.<sup>1</sup> The study reviewed 26 years of rigorous research for studies of effectiveness, gathering information from 27 evaluations that are listed briefly in Appendix A and described in detail in Appendix B.

#### Key Findings:

- For adults, the strongest evidence was for both paid and unpaid work models with programs lasting up to 6 months or a year. There is moderate evidence for impacts on outcomes other than employment, such as criminal recidivism, as well as for access to on-the-job training.
- The evidence on work experience programs for youth is mixed; while some studies showed strong impacts, others did not.
- For youth, linking occupational learning with paid or unpaid work experience placements can have a positive impact on employment, earnings and academic outcomes.
- All youth programs that demonstrated strong impacts incorporated some level of academic and vocational training, job search and placement assistance, and other supports into the program model.
- Limited evidence is available on long-term impacts. More research to capture long-term effects on the employment and well-being of individuals and families would help inform further investment in work experience-based programs.
- Strength and consistency of implementation is an important consideration, as are local factors; several studies found impacts at some sites and not others.
- Most studies did not attempt to isolate the impact of work experience versus other components. The interventions studied included both work experience and other components such as counseling, job search assistance, or training.

---

<sup>1</sup> The author acknowledges helpful comments from Jill Berk, Sheena McConnell, and Debbie Reed at Mathematica and from Anna Martin at REDF.

- Studies indicate particular effectiveness of employment programs for women. These include studies of women on welfare as well as studies that compare the impacts for women to the impacts for men from the same intervention.

## B. Background

Work experiences provide participants with an opportunity to practice being in a work environment and applying general or specific skills relevant to holding a job that may help them eventually find independent and unsubsidized employment. We define work experience as a temporary, paid or unpaid job activity that occurs on site at an employer or simulates the workplace. We include on-the-job training (OJT) in this definition, which is often a trial period for an actual job and may or may not include a commitment from the employer to hire the trainee. Work experiences may provide hourly wages or stipends but can also be a condition of eligibility for public assistance such as cash benefits under state and federal welfare programs. Employers may share some of the cost of the wages for the participant, or they may be fully subsidized by the program sponsors. Work experience participants may receive training, counseling, financial and non-financial work supports, and other services in addition to their work experience. Depending on how they are designed, work experiences are referred to by different names, as follows:

- *Transitional or subsidized jobs* refer to paid, short-term work assignments that are usually accompanied by counseling and other supportive services. *Work crew experiences* are similar to transitional jobs but involve groups of work experience participants working together.
- *OJT* involves job-specific training in a particular vocation while at the worksite, and can be an opportunity for an employer to test out an employee before hiring him or her permanently.
- *Internships and job shadowing* are typically unpaid opportunities to learn more about a job by working alongside more experienced employees.
- *Work-based learning opportunities* incorporate occupational training with hands-on projects or job-specific tasks.

Program models that incorporate work experience do so based on the reasoning that one of the best ways to prepare for a job is to work. Short-term work experiences also give program staff an opportunity to address barriers to employment before a client enters the workforce independently.

## C. Study Approach

To compile the evidence for this study, we searched databases of academic and professional literature for contemporary research on the impact of program models involving work experience as a workforce development strategy. The search was limited to studies conducted in the United States from the mid-1980s onwards that were designed to estimate causal impacts on participants.<sup>2</sup> We reviewed 27 studies that met these criteria for details on study design and program model. Though we made every attempt to find relevant research that fit these parameters, it is possible that evaluations of programs incorporating work experience as a strategy were inadvertently missed. Complete details for the studies that we located are presented in Appendix B.

We gave each study an evidence rating according to the strength of its design in producing reliable impact estimates, as well as a designation for the demonstration of strong impacts on participants. Impacts could be strong for a subset of outcomes or a subset of the treatment sample. These ratings, described below, were applied according to the definitions specified by the Corporation for National and Community Service Social Innovation Fund (SIF).<sup>3</sup>

**Strong evidence** means evidence from studies whose designs can support causal conclusions (i.e., studies with high internal validity), and studies that in total include enough of the range of participants and settings to support scaling up to the state, regional, or national level (i.e., studies with high external validity). The following are examples of strong evidence: (1) more than one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study or well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study that supports the effectiveness of the practice, strategy, or program; or (2) one

---

<sup>2</sup> Fraker (2004) is the only exception; the study presents outcomes for participants and not measures of effectiveness, but is included because of its large sample size.

<sup>3</sup> Definitions of study evidence ratings are from the Notice of Federal Funds Availability for SIF grants, available at [http://www.nationalservice.gov/pdf/10\\_0219\\_sif\\_nofa\\_final.pdf](http://www.nationalservice.gov/pdf/10_0219_sif_nofa_final.pdf) (accessed on March 29, 2010).

large, well-designed and well-implemented randomized controlled, multisite trial that supports the effectiveness of the practice, strategy, or program.<sup>4</sup>

**Moderate evidence** means evidence from previous studies whose designs can support causal conclusions (i.e., studies with high internal validity) but have limited generalizability (i.e., moderate external validity), or studies with high external validity but moderate internal validity. The following would constitute moderate evidence: (1) at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study supporting the effectiveness of the practice, strategy, or program, with small sample sizes or other conditions of implementation or analysis that limit generalizability; (2) at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study that does not demonstrate equivalence between the intervention and comparison groups at program entry but that has no other major flaws related to internal validity; or (3) correlational research with strong statistical controls for selection bias and for discerning the influence of internal factors.

**Preliminary evidence** means evidence that is based on a reasonable hypothesis supported by research findings. Thus, research that has yielded promising results for the program will constitute preliminary evidence. Examples of research that meet the standards include: (1) outcome studies that track program participants through a service “pipeline” and measure participants’ responses at the end of the program; and (2) pre- and post-test research that determines whether participants have improved on an outcome of interest.

**Strong impact** means an impact with a substantial likelihood of yielding a major change in life outcomes for individuals or improvements in community standards of living. This definition will vary with context. To give examples, a mentoring program that cut youth crime by 2 percent over a

---

<sup>4</sup> This evidence review takes into account several aspects of study design as reported by authors including baseline equivalence of the intervention and comparison groups, sample attrition, and contamination. However, we did not apply systematic standards for these and other design elements in determining a “well-designed” study.

given period would not have a strong impact, but a program that cut such crime by 20 percent could. A program that increases earnings by \$50 per week for one month, and then fades out, would not have a strong impact. A program that increased earnings by this amount for a period of years would.

## D. Overview of the Literature

The research identified for this scan represents 26 years of some of the most rigorous studies of employment-related services. Of the 27 studies reviewed, 22 used randomized, controlled trials to estimate program impacts.<sup>5</sup> Another four studies compared participants to similar groups of individuals to establish how they might have fared in absence of the program, while the last study compares pre- and post-program measures for participants only. Three studies involved large samples of at least 10,000 individuals, and only three studies had samples smaller than 1,000. Sixteen of the 27 studies were conducted in multiple sites, more often than not in multiple states across the United States.

The research also covers a wide range of traditionally hard-to-employ populations that are of interest to policymakers, providing a broad snapshot of the utility of work experience programs in various contexts. Eleven studies looked at programs designed for different categories of in-school and/or out-of-school youth, and 12 studies focused on programs that targeted adults who were eligible for or beneficiaries of welfare and safety-net programs, including unemployment insurance.<sup>6</sup> Five studies looked at other demographic groups, including those with a history of incarceration, non-custodial fathers, and low-wage workers.

Though the search for evidence was limited to programs with work experience components, those components took on various forms. Work experience was provided in the form of paid

---

<sup>5</sup> Two studies have yet to release impact reports: see Martinez et al. (2010) and Joyce (2009).

<sup>6</sup> Orr et al. (1997) studied a program for both adults and youth eligible for welfare.

transitional jobs, OJT, unsubsidized jobs or internships, job shadowing, and work-based learning opportunities. They were designed in all cases to simulate the experience of competitive employment, and could last anywhere from two weeks to a year, depending on the program model.

It is important to note that work experiences were not always the central strategy for many of these programs. In several cases, work experience was only one offering of many designed to suit the individual client's needs. Where possible, we included information on what proportion of the sample was known to have participated specifically in work experience, or provided impact estimates for work experience subgroups. The interpretation of impact estimates for studies that did not focus on work experience solely is thus tempered by the knowledge that not all sample members were exposed to a work experience component. The programs that appeared to offer work experience as a central component of the program model include:

- American Conservation and Youth Service Corps (ACYSC)
- Career Academies
- Manufacturing Technology Partnership (MTP)
- Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP)
- Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Homemaker-Home Health Aide (HHHA) Demonstration
- Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO)
- Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment (PRIDE)
- Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration
- Transitional Work Corporation (TWC)

## E. Study Findings

Using the SIF guidelines, there is strong evidence for positive effects on participants of a number of interventions studied. Of these interventions, the programs targeted to youth that showed strong impacts on any outcome are below:

- ACYSC
- Career Academies

- Job Corps
- JOBSTART
- New Chance

Of the programs targeting youth, the findings from the evaluations of Career Academies and Job Corps suggest that linking occupational learning with paid or unpaid work experience placements can have a positive impact on employment, earnings, and academic outcomes for youth. These experiences ranged from one to several months, but because they vary by participant it is difficult to say how time spent in the work experience is related to outcomes. In addition, group projects were a feature of both the Job Corps and ACYSC programs, though participants in ACYSC engaged in mostly shorter 2-4 week long community service projects. The vocational training component of Job Corps involved youth in hands-on projects and workplace simulations for varying lengths of time in over 75 different trades.

Internships were offered in both the JOBSTART and New Chance programs, but JOBSTART provides stronger evidence for its education, training, and support services than for work experience, which was not a central component of the program. New Chance offered paid or unpaid internships that lasted between 2 weeks and 6 months, as well as Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) preparation courses, child care, counseling, and other support to young mothers who had dropped out of school. All of the youth programs that demonstrated strong impacts incorporated some level of academic and vocational training, job search and placement assistance, and other supports into the program model.

The evidence is complicated by the fact that a number of youth programs did not show strong impacts on participants, including the Teenage Parent Demonstration, Center for Employment Training (CET) Replication, MTP, and YIEPP. Participants in the Teenage Parent Demonstration took GED classes in the morning and attended work experiences in the afternoons. CET offered training and experiences in a simulated work environment, while MTP incorporated pre-

apprenticeship experiences into their program. Each of these programs offered occupational and on-the-job training along with intensive case management and support services. YIEPP offered subsidized employment during the school year and summer months, but also failed to show strong impacts. In addition, the Job Corps program showed initial impacts on youth but failed to show impacts after four years of follow-up.

The adult programs that offer strong evidence for positive impacts under the SIF guidelines and also showed strong impacts are listed below:

- PRIDE
- Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)
- AFDC HHHA Demonstration
- Texas Worker Adjustment Demonstration
- Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project (WRP)
- Work Advancement and Support Center (WASC)

Of the programs targeting adults, the evaluations of PRIDE and AFDC HHHA provide the strongest support for the effectiveness of actual job experience in improving employment and earnings outcomes and reducing dependence on public assistance. They provide evidence for both paid and unpaid work models, with programs lasting up to 6 months or a year. PRIDE also provided supplemental academic education and basic skills training to participants, while AFDC HHHA incorporated formal occupational training and practical experience as a prerequisite to work assignments. Graduates of the AFDC HHHA practicum were guaranteed up to 12-months of full-time, subsidized employment.

JTPA, Texas Worker Adjustment, and WASC used OJT and had a strong impact on participants (for the study of JTPA, the impacts were on a subsample of OJT participants), but because both Texas Worker Adjustment and WASC only used OJT as a second tier intervention (i.e. only when job search was unsuccessful), it would be difficult to attribute the impacts found to the use of OJT and not to the job search assistance, training, and other work supports offered more

consistently. Likewise, the strong impacts of the Vermont WRP could be attributed to other program elements, since a very small proportion (3%) of participants received work experience during the program.

Moderate evidence of positive impacts on participants can be found in the evaluations of:

- TWC
- New Hope
- Buffalo Worker Reemployment Demonstration
- CEO
- Community-based JTPA
- Fathers at Work

Evaluations of these programs showed strong impacts on certain outcomes, but do not constitute strong evidence because there was only one site in the study or the study participants were not randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. Though most of the studies do not provide generalizable results, they still offer some insight into promising program models.

TWC, CEO, and Fathers at Work all provided transitional, subsidized jobs to participants. Jobs lasted an average of 30 days in TWC and 8 weeks in CEO, which both placed participants mostly with government and nonprofit agencies. These programs both also offered job readiness classes, weekly professional development workshops, and job placement assistance. TWC significantly impacted employment and welfare receipt, while CEO only impacted criminal recidivism rates. Only some sites in the Fathers at Work evaluation offered transitional work in a variety of industries, and it is unclear how long these work experiences lasted. These sites and the remaining Fathers at Work sites offered job search assistance, skills training, fatherhood workshops, child care, and other supports. Fathers at Work participants across all sites had improved employment and earnings outcomes relative to comparison groups. The New Hope program offered community service jobs to participants, but only after 8 weeks of unsuccessful job searching. Participants that received

community service jobs received minimum wage and could work part-time or full-time for up to 12 months in a 3-year period.

There is some moderate evidence for the impact of access to OJT on adult participants. The Buffalo Worker Reemployment Demonstration and the Community-based JTPA programs both involved OJT, which lasted 9 weeks on average in the Buffalo program but was used by only 30% of participants. OJT participants in the Community-based JTPA program were found to have higher earnings gains than participants in other components of the program, such as vocational training.

A few studies suggest particular effectiveness of employment programs (if not work experience specifically) for women. Studies of New Chance for young mothers who dropped out of school and of adult women in JTPA both showed positive impacts for women in work experience programs. Studies of the Texas Worker Adjustment Demonstration and the Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project also found impacts mostly for women and single-parent families (which are commonly headed by females) respectively and rarely for men, though work experience was a less central component of these programs.

Studies that show impacts varying by site could be explained by differences in the strength of implementation across sites, differences in the local population or varying economic conditions. These are important considerations in evaluating study results. Two studies in the list found significant impacts in some sites but not others (AFDC Homemaker-Home Health Aide Demonstration and Work Advancement and Support Center [WASC]). The study of the WASC program was also unclear about how many participants were offered or participated in work experience or OJT, which is an additional issue in interpreting the strong findings for attachment to education and training, but poor impacts on employment.

Appendices A and B provide more information on each study included in this analysis.

## F. Suggestions for Future Research

Though the research described here was generally of a rigorous nature, many studies did not attempt to isolate the impact of the work experience component on participant outcomes. Work experience is rarely offered as a stand-alone program and is often accompanied by additional services including job search assistance, basic skills training, and work supports. The evidence base for work experience programs could be significantly improved by designing rigorous studies that isolate the effects of work experience on participants' employment-related outcomes, as well as provide differential estimates for work experience strategies versus other employment strategies (such as job search, skills training, and financial incentives).

Some studies indicate that women may benefit to a greater extent than men from programs that involve work experience (Bloom 1990; Nudelman 2000). The reasons for this remain unclear. Considering that many families on welfare are headed by single mothers, more in-depth research in this area would be useful to inform policies that seek to improve the career outcomes of women, especially in terms of promoting the participation of women in high salary industries that have not traditionally employed women such as construction and related trades.

The evidence is also limited by studies that only capture participant outcomes shortly after program completion or a few years after a program has ended. Conducting more studies that capture the long-term effects on the employment and well-being of individuals and families would help inform further investment in work experience and transitional jobs as a cost-effective strategy for supporting self-sufficiency and reducing poverty.

## G. Bibliography

- Bell, Stephen H., and Larry L. Orr. "Is Subsidized Employment Cost Effective for Welfare Recipients? Experimental Evidence from Seven State Demonstrations." *Journal of Human Resources*, vol. 29, no.1, 1994.
- Bloom, Dan, Cynthia Miller, and Gilda Azurdia. "Results from the Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment (PRIDE) Program in New York City." MDRC, July 2007.
- Bloom, Dan, Sarah Rich, Cindy Redcross, Erin Jacobs, Jennifer Yahner, and Nancy Pindus. "Alternative Welfare-to-Work Strategies for the Hard-to-Employ: Testing Transitional Jobs and Pre-Employment Services in Philadelphia." MDRC, October 2009.
- Bloom, Howard S. Back to Work: Testing Reemployment Services for Displaced Workers. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1990.
- Cave, George, Hans Bos, Fred Doolittle, and Cyril Toussaint. "JOBSTART: Final Report on a Program for School Dropouts." New York: MDRC, 1993.
- Corson, Walter, and Joshua Haimson. "The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project: Six-Year Summary and Follow-up Report Revised." Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, 1996.
- Corson, Walter, Sharon Long, and Rebecca Maynard. "An Impact Evaluation of the Buffalo Dislocated Worker Demonstration Program." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, 1985.
- Fraker, Thomas M., Dan M. Levy, Irma Perez-Johnson, Alan M. Hershey, Demetra S. Nightingale, Robert B. Olsen, and Rita A. Stapulonis. "The National Evaluation of the Welfare-to-Work Grants Program: Final Report." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, September 2004.
- Gueron, Judith. "Lessons from a Job Guarantee: The Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects." New York: MDRC, 1984.
- Heinrich, Carolyn J. "Returns to Education and Training for the Highly Disadvantaged: What Does It Take to Make an Impact?" *Evaluation Review*, vol. 22, no. 5, October 1998, pp. 637-667.
- Hollenbeck, Kevin. "An Evaluation of the Manufacturing Technology Partnership (MTP) Program." Upjohn Institute Technical Report No. 96-007, February 1996.
- Jastrzab, JoAnn, Julie Masker, John Blomquist, and Larry Orr. "Impacts of Service: Final Report on the Evaluation of the American Conservation and Youth Service Corps." Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1996.
- Kemple, James J., and Cynthia J. Willner. "Long-Term Impacts on Labor Market Outcomes, Educational Attainment, and Transitions to Adulthood." New York, NY: MDRC, 2008.

Kisker, Ellen E., Anu Rangarajan, and Kimberly Boller. "Moving Into Adulthood: Were the Impacts of Mandatory Programs for Welfare-Dependent-Teenage Parents Sustained after the Programs Ended?" Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, February 1998.

Martinez, John, Thomas Fraker, Michelle Manno, Peter Baird, Arif Mamun, Bonnie O'Day, Anu Rangarajan, and David Wittenburg. "The Social Security Administration's Youth Transition Demonstration Projects: Implementation Lessons from the Original Projects." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, February 2010.

Miller, Cynthia, Johannes Bos, Kristin Porter, Fannie Tseng, and Yasuyo Abe. "The Challenge of Repeating Success in a Changing World: Final Report on the Center for Employment Training Replication Sites." New York: MDRC, 2005.

Miller, Cynthia, Aletha C. Huston, Greg J. Duncan, Vonnie C. McLoyd, and Thomas S. Weisner. "New Hope for the Working Poor: Effects After Eight Years for Families and Children." New York: MDRC, July 2008.

Miller, Cynthia, Betsy L. Tessler, and Mark Van Dok. "Strategies to Help Low-Wage Workers Advance: Implementation and Early Impacts of the Work Advancement and Support Center (WASC) Demonstration." MDRC, June 2009.

Nudelman, Jodi. "The Impact of Job Training Partnership Act Programs for Adult Welfare Recipients." In *Improving the Odds: Increasing the Effectiveness of Publicly Funded Training*, edited by B. Barnow and C. King. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press, 2000.

Orr, Larry L., Howard S. Bloom, Stephen H. Bell, Fred Doolittle, Winston Lin, and George Cave. "Does Training for the Disadvantaged Work? Evidence from the National JTPA Study." Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1997.

Quint, Janet, Johannes Bos, and Denise Polit. "New Chance: Final Report on a Comprehensive Program for Young Mothers in Poverty and Their Children." New York: MDRC, 1997.

Redcross, Cindy, Dan Bloom, Gilda Azurdia, Janine Zweig, and Nancy Pindus. "Transitional Jobs for Ex-Prisoners Implementation, Two-Year Impacts, and Costs of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) Prisoner Reentry Program." MDRC, August 2009.

Schochet, Peter Z., John Burghardt, and Sheena McConnell. "Does Job Corps Work? Impact Findings from the National Job Corps Study." *American Economic Review*, vol. 98, no. 5, 2008, pp. 1864–86.

Scrivener, Susan, Richard Hendra, Cindy Redcross, Dan Bloom, Charles Michalopoulos, and Johanna Walter. "WRP: Final Report on Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project." New York: MDRC, September 2002.

Shapiro, Jonathan Z., Suzan N. Gaston, Janet C. Hebert, and Dewey J. Guillot. "The LSYOU Project Evaluation." Baton Rouge, LA: College of Education Administrative and Foundational Services, Louisiana State University, November 1986.

Spaulding, Shayne, Jean Baldwin Grossman, and Dee Wallace. “Working Dads: Final Report on the Fathers at Work Initiative.” P/PV, October 2009.

The Joyce Foundation. “Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration: Testing Strategies to Help Former Prisoners Find and Keep Jobs and Stay Out of Prison.” Author, July 2009.

**APPENDIX A**

**LIST OF STUDIES REVIEWED**

**Table A.1 Studies Reviewed for Evidence Scan of Work Experience Programs**

#	Intervention	Study Citation	Target Population	Strong Impact
14	AFDC Homemaker-Home Health Aide Demonstrations	Bell, Stephen H., and Larry L. Orr. "Is Subsidized Employment Cost Effective for Welfare Recipients? Experimental Evidence from Seven State Demonstrations." <i>Journal of Human Resources</i> , vol. 29, no. 1, 1994.	Heads of families with AFDC	Yes (for most sites)
1	American Conservation and Youth Service Corps	Jastrzab, JoAnn, Julie Masker, John Blomquist, and Larry Orr, "Impacts of Service: Final Report on the Evaluation of the American Conservation and Youth Service Corps." Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1996.	Out-of-school youth	Yes
21	Buffalo Worker Re-employment Demonstration	Corson, Walter, Sharon Long, and Rebecca Maynard. "An Impact Evaluation of the Buffalo Dislocated Worker Demonstration Program." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, 1985.	Dislocated workers	Yes
2	Career Academies	Kemple, James J., and Cynthia J. Willner. "Long-Term Impacts on Labor Market Outcomes, Educational Attainment, and Transitions to Adulthood." New York, NY: MDRC, 2008.	High school students in low-performing school districts, especially those at risk of dropping out	Yes
22	Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), site for Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ	Redcross, Cindy, Dan Bloom, Gilda Azurdia, Janine Zweig, and Nancy Pindus. "Transitional Jobs for Ex-Prisoners Implementation, Two-Year Impacts, and Costs of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) Prisoner Reentry Program." MDRC, August 2009.	Ex-prisoners	Yes (for recidivism outcome only)
8	Center for Employment Training (CET) Replication	Miller, Cynthia, Johannes Bos, Kristin Porter, Fannie Tseng, and Yasuyo Abe. "The Challenge of Repeating Success in a Changing World: Final Report on the Center for Employment Training Replication Sites." New York: MDRC, 2005.	Out-of-school youth	No
24	Fathers at Work	Spaulding, Shayne, Jean Baldwin Grossman and Dee Wallace. "Working Dads: Final Report on the Fathers at Work Initiative." P/PV, October 2009.	Noncustodial fathers (3 sites), and formerly incarcerated noncustodial fathers (2 sites)	Yes
3	Job Corps	Schochet, Peter Z., John Burghardt, and Sheena McConnell. "Does Job Corps Work? Impact Findings from the National Job Corps Study." <i>American Economic Review</i> , vol. 98, no. 5, 2008, pp. 1864–86.	Disadvantaged youth, ages 16-24	Yes
13	Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	Nudelman, Jodi. "The Impact of Job Training Partnership Act Programs for Adult Welfare Recipients." In <i>Improving the Odds: Increasing the Effectiveness of Publicly Funded Training</i> , edited by B. Barnew and C. King. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press, 2000.	Adult women receiving welfare	Yes

**Table A.1** (continued)

#	Intervention	Study Citation	Target Population	Strong Impact
16	Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	Orr, Larry L., Howard S. Bloom, Stephen H. Bell, Fred Doolittle, Winston Lin, and George Cave. Does Training for the "Disadvantaged Work? Evidence from the National JTPA Study." Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1997.	Welfare-eligible adults and out-of-school youth	<b>Yes</b> (for adults only)
23	Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) community-based service delivery	Heinrich, Carolyn J. "Returns to Education and Training for the Highly Disadvantaged: What Does It Take to Make an Impact?" <i>Evaluation Review</i> , vol. 22, no. 5, October 1998, pp. 637-667.	Highly disadvantaged adults eligible for JTPA	<b>Yes</b>
4	JOBSTART	Cave, George, Hans Bos, Fred Doolittle, and Cyril Toussaint. "JOBSTART: Final Report on a Program for School Dropouts." New York: MDRC, 1993.	High school dropouts	<b>Yes</b> (for academic attachment only)
6	Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited (LSYOU) program	Shapiro, Jonathan Z., Suzan N. Gaston, Janet C. Hebert, and Dewey J. Guillot. "The LSYOU Project Evaluation." Baton Rouge, LA: College of Education Administrative and Foundational Services, Louisiana State University, November 1986.	High school, ages 14-16, economically disadvantaged	<b>Yes</b>
9	Manufacturing Technology Partnership (MTP)	Hollenbeck, Kevin. "An Evaluation of the Manufacturing Technology Partnership (MTP) Program." Upjohn Institute Technical Report No. 96-007, February 1996.	11th and 12th grade students, priority minority and female	<b>No</b>
5	New Chance	Quint, Janet, Johannes Bos, and Denise Polit. "New Chance: Final Report on a Comprehensive Program for Young Mothers in Poverty and Their Children." New York: MDRC, 1997.	Young mothers who are high school dropouts	<b>Yes</b> (for academic attachment only)
20	New Hope	Miller, Cynthia, Aletha C. Huston, Greg J. Duncan, Vonnie C. McLoyd, and Thomas S. Weisner. "New Hope for the Working Poor: Effects After Eight Years for Families and Children." New York: MDRC, July 2008.	Low-income individuals	<b>Yes</b> (for subsample only)
25	New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project	Corson, Walter, and Joshua Haimson. "The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project: Six-Year Summary and Follow-up Report Revised." Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, 1996.	UI claimants	<b>No</b>
12	Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment (PRIDE)	Bloom, Dan, Cynthia Miller, and Gilda Azurdia. "Results from the Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment (PRIDE) Program in New York City." MDRC, July 2007.	Welfare recipients with work-limiting medical or mental health conditions	<b>Yes</b>
7	Teenage Parent Demonstration	Kisker, Ellen E., Anu Rangarajan, and Kimberly Boller. "Moving Into Adulthood: Were the Impacts of Mandatory Programs for Welfare-Dependent-Teenage Parents Sustained after the Programs Ended?" Princeton: Mathematica Policy Research, February 1998.	First-time teenage parents on welfare	<b>No</b>

**Table A.1** (*continued*)

#	Intervention	Study Citation	Target Population	Strong Impact
15	Texas Worker Adjustment Demonstration	Bloom, Howard S. "Back to Work: Testing Reemployment Services for Displaced Workers." Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1990.	Dislocated workers	Yes (for women only)
27	Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration (TJRD)	The Joyce Foundation. "Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration: Testing Strategies to Help Former Prisoners Find and Keep Jobs and Stay Out of Prison." Author, July 2009.	Ex-Offenders	N/A
19	Transitional Work Corporation (TWC), site for Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ	Bloom, Dan, Sarah Rich, Cindy Redcross, Erin Jacobs, Jennifer Yahner, and Nancy Pindus. "Alternative Welfare-to-Work Strategies for the Hard-to-Employ Testing Transitional Jobs and Pre-Employment Services in Philadelphia." MDRC, October 2009.	TANF recipients	Yes
17	Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project	Scrivener, Susan, Richard Hendra, Cindy Redcross, Dan Bloom, Charles Michalopoulos, and Johanna Walter. "WRP: Final Report on Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project." New York: MDRC, September 2002.	Welfare recipients nearing time limits	Yes (for single-parent families only)
26	Welfare-to-Work Grants Program	Fraker, Thomas M., Dan M. Levy, Irma Perez-Johnson, Alan M. Hershey, Demetra S. Nightingale, Robert B. Olsen, and Rita A. Stapulonis. "The National Evaluation of the Welfare-to-Work Grants Program: Final Report." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, September 2004.	Welfare recipients	No
18	Work Advancement and Support Center (WASC)	Miller, Cynthia, Betsy L. Tessler, and Mark Van Dok. "Strategies to Help Low-Wage Workers Advance: Implementation and Early Impacts of the Work Advancement and Support Center (WASC) Demonstration." MDRC, June 2009.	Low-wage workers	Yes (for one site only)
10	Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP)	Gueron, Judith. "Lessons from a Job Guarantee: The Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects." New York: MDRC, 1984.	Low-income high school youth	No
11	Youth Transition Demonstration (YTD)	Martinez, John, Thomas Fraker, Michelle Manno, Peter Baird, Arif Mamun, Bonnie O'Day, Anu Rangarajan, and David Wittenburg. "The Social Security Administration's Youth Transition Demonstration Projects: Implementation Lessons from the Original Projects." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, February 2010.	Youth with disabilities	N/A

**APPENDIX B**

**TABLES OF EVIDENCE**

The tables below provide additional details on the 27 studies reviewed for the evidence scan of work experience programs. For the reader's convenience, the studies have been sorted at three levels: 1) target population, 2) *Strong Impact*, and 2) *Evidence Rating*.

The studies have been divided into two broad groups; the first group looks at interventions for youth, while the second group looks at interventions for adult populations.

The *Strong Impact* column signifies whether a study reported strong impacts for the sample population. This column also notes whether the impacts were found only for a subsample of the population. More detail about the definition of a strong impact can be found on page 4 in the main text of this report.

The *Evidence Rating* column signifies the strength of the study design in providing reliable impact estimates. More information on the ratings used can be found on page 3 in the main text of this report.

**Table B.1 Studies Reviewed and Selected Fatures**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Evidence Rating	Strong Impact	Study Type	Study Dates	Sample Size	Study Features			Selected Author-Reported Impact Estimates/Findings	Study Citation
								Study Location	Target Population	Fidelity to Model		
<b>Youth Programs</b>												
1	Jastrzab et al. (1996)	American Conservation and Youth Service Corps	<b>Strong</b>	Yes	RCT	1993-1994	1,009	WA, NY, FL, CA (4 sites)	Out-of-school youth	Detail N/A	During 15 months post random assignment: More likely to be employed (+26 % points) and work more hours. Less likely to be arrested (-5 % points). Statistical significance not provided. Largest impacts for African-American males.	Jastrzab, JoAnn, Julie Masker, John Blomquist, and Larry Orr, "Impacts of Service: Final Report on the Evaluation of the American Conservation and Youth Service Corps." Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1996.
2	Kemple and Willner (2008)	Career Academies	<b>Strong</b>	Yes	RCT	Program: 1994-1998; Follow-up: 1999-2006	1,764	MD, CA, FL, PA, TX, DC (9 sites)	High school students in low-performing school districts, especially those at risk of dropping out	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Impacts 4 years after graduation: Earnings per month (\$) +132 sig.; Months employed +1.4 sig.; Hours worked per week +1.8 sig.; Hourly wages (\$) +0.57 sig. Impacts 8 years after graduation: Earnings per month (\$) +216 sig.; Months employed +0.9 n.s.; Hours worked per week +1.7 sig.; Hourly wages (\$) +0.7 n.s.	Kemple, James J., and Cynthia J. Willner. "Long-Term Impacts on Labor Market Outcomes, Educational Attainment, and Transitions to Adulthood." New York, NY: MDRC, 2008.
3	Schochet et al. (2008)	Job Corps	<b>Strong</b>	Yes	RCT	RA: 1994-1995	15,386	Nationwide	Disadvantaged youth, ages 16-24	Visits to 23 randomly selected sites confirmed implementation of the program model	4 years post-random assignment. Enrollment in education or training: +20.8 sig.; GED receipt (%): +15.0 sig.; HS diploma receipt (%): -2.2 sig.; Vocational certificate (%): +22.3 sig.; College degree (%): -0.2 n.s.; Average yearly earnings (\$) impact negative in years 1 and 2 (many still enrolled in program), but positive in years 3 and 4; year 4: +1,150 sig. Quarter 16 employment (%): +3.3 sig. No impact on earnings or employment after 1998. Significantly reduced arrest and conviction.	Schochet, Peter Z., John Burghardt, and Sheena McConnell. "Does Job Corps Work? Impact Findings from the National Job Corps Study." <i>American Economic Review</i> , vol.98, no. 5, 2008, pp. 1864-86.
4	Cave et al. (1993)	JOBSTART	<b>Strong</b>	Yes (for academic attachment only)	RCT	1985-1988	2,312	NY, GA, CA, CT, IL, PA, TX, CO, AZ (13 sites)	High school dropouts	Detail N/A	Year 3 of follow-up: GED or HS diploma receipt: +13.4% sig; Earnings: +\$400 n.s.; Ever employed: +1.3% n.s.; Hours worked: +40 n.s.; No difference in welfare receipt.	Cave, George, Hans Bos, Fred Doolittle, and Cyril Toussaint. "JOBSTART: Final Report on a Program for School Dropouts." New York: MDRC, 1993.

**Table B.1 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Evidence Rating	Study Features								Study Citation
				Strong Impact	Study Type	Study Dates	Sample Size	Study Location	Target Population	Fidelity to Model	Selected Author-Reported Impact Estimates/Findings	
5	Quint et al. (1997)	New Chance	<b>Strong</b>	Yes (for academic attachment only)	RCT	1989-1992	2,079	CA, CO, FL, IL, KY, MS, MN, NY, OR, PA (16 sites)	Young mothers who are high school dropouts	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Attained HS diploma or GED (%) +8.1 sig.; Ever employed (%) +3.3 n.s.; Total earnings (\$) -486 n.s.; Ever received welfare (%) +1 sig.;	Quint, Janet, Johannes Bos, and Denise Polit. "New Chance: Final Report on a Comprehensive Program for Young Mothers in Poverty and Their Children." New York: MDRC, 1997.
6	Shapiro et al. (1986)	Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited (LSYOU) comparison program	<b>Moderate</b>	Yes (employment offered to comparison group as well)	RCT	Summer 1986	145 (94 in treatment, 51 in control)	Louisiana (1 site)	High school, ages 14-16, economically disadvantaged	Detail N/A	Significant improvement in academic achievement indicators; significant improvement in career decision making maturity; significant pre-post improvement in intention to graduate.	Shapiro, Jonathan Z., Suzan N. Gaston, Janet C. Hebert, and Dewey J. Guillot. "The LSYOU Project Evaluation." Baton Rouge, LA: College of Education Administrative and Foundational Services, Louisiana State University, November 1986.
7	Kisker et al. (1998)	Teenage Parent Demonstration	<b>Strong</b>	No	RCT	1987-1991	5,297	NJ, IL (3 sites)	First-time teenage parents on welfare	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Impact 2 years after intake faded by 6-year follow-up. 6 years after intake: -Participated in any employment, education, or training activity (%): Camden -2.7 n.s.; Newark +6.6 sig.; Chicago -0.3 n.s. -HS/GED receipt (%): Camden +2.0 n.s.; Newark -2.0 n.s.; Chicago +3.2 n.s. -Employed in prior year (%): Camden +0.6 n.s.; Newark -8.4 sig.; Chicago +0.7 n.s.; -Earnings (\$): No significant findings.	Kisker, Ellen E., Anu Rangarajan, and Kimberly Boller. "Moving Into Adulthood: Were the Impacts of Mandatory Programs for Welfare-Dependent-Teenage Parents Sustained after the Programs Ended?" Princeton: Mathematica Policy Research, February 1998.
8	Miller et al. (2005)	Center for Employment Training (CET) Replication	<b>Strong</b>	No	RCT	1995-1999	1,485	NY, NJ, FL, IL, CA, NV, NC (12 sites)	Out-of-school youth	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Full sample: Ever worked by Year 5 (%) +2.2 n.s.; Months worked by Year 5 +0.2 n.s.; Earnings during 54-month follow-up (\$) -2,735 n.s.; Held 1 job during follow-up +3.6 sig.; Held 2 or 3 jobs -1.2 n.s.; Worked 35 hours or more (%) +5.6 sig. High-fidelity sites: Worked 35 hours or more (%) +11.4 sig. No other significant differences, though earnings impact in Year 5 is positive.	Miller, Cynthia, Johannes Bos, Kristin Porter, Fannie Tseng, and Yasuyo Abe. "The Challenge of Repeating Success in a Changing World: Final Report on the Center for Employment Training Replication Sites." New York: MDRC, 2005.
9	Hollenbeck (1996)	Manufacturing Technology Partnership (MTP)	<b>Moderate</b>	No (Small sample)	QED	1992-1994	178	Flint, Michigan	11th and 12th grade students, priority minority and female	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Cohort 1: % employed +8 n.s.; Avg. wage (\$) +4.24 sig.; Avg. hours +8 n.s. Cohort 2: % employed +4 n.s.; Avg. wage (\$) +.61 n.s.; Avg. hours +6 sig.	Hollenbeck, Kevin. "An Evaluation of the Manufacturing Technology Partnership (MTP) Program." Upjohn Institute Technical Report No. 96-007, February 1996.

**Table B.1 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Evidence Rating	Strong Impact	Study Type	Study Dates	Sample Size	Study Features			Selected Author-Reported Impact Estimates/Findings	Study Citation
								Program: MD, CO, OH, MS; Comparison: OH, AZ, KY, MS.	Low-income high school youth	Fidelity to Model		
10	Gueron (1984)	Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP)	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>No</b>	QED	1977-1981	3,765			Detail N/A	Post-program for subsample of 15-16 year old, Black youth (highest participation): Weekly earnings (\$) +10.48 sig.; Employment rate (%) +4.5 n.s.; Hours worked per week +2 n.s.; Hourly wage (\$) +0.2 n.s. No significant impacts on academic outcomes.	Gueron, Judith. "Lessons from a Job Guarantee: The Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects." New York: MDRC, 1984.
11	Martinez et al. (2010)	Youth Transition Demonstration (YTD)	Impact study not available	N/A	RCT	2005 -	Detail N/A	CO, NY, FL, MD, WV (6 sites)	Youth with disabilities	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	N/A	Martinez, John, Thomas Fraker, Michelle Manno, Peter Baird, Arif Mamun, Bonnie O'Day, Anu Rangarajan, and David Wittenburg. "The Social Security Administration's Youth Transition Demonstration Projects: Implementation Lessons from the Original Projects." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, February 2010.
<b>Adult Programs</b>												
12	Bloom et al. (2007)	Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment (PRIDE)	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Yes</b>	RCT	RA: 2001- 2002	2,648	NYC (4 sites)	Welfare recipients with work-limiting medical or mental health conditions	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Impacts 2 years after assignment: Single parents: Ever employed (%) +7.2 sig.; Avg quarterly employment (%) +2.9 sig.; Earnings (\$) +554 (not tested for significance); Cash assistance received (\$) -818 sig.; Food stamps received (\$) -130 n.s. Similar findings for childless recipients.	Bloom, Dan, Cynthia Miller, and Gilda Azurdia. "Results from the Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment (PRIDE) Program in New York City." MDRC, July 2007.
13	Nudelman (2000)	Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Yes</b>	RCT	See Orr et al. 1997	1,862	See Orr et al. 1997	Adult women receiving welfare	See Orr et al. 1997	For OJT/JSA subgroup in second post-program year: Mean earnings +\$2,598 sig.; AFDC payments -\$2,354 sig.; Months on AFDC -6.92 sig.	Nudelman, Jodi. "The Impact of Job Training Partnership Act Programs for Adult Welfare Recipients." In <i>Improving the Odds: Increasing the Effectiveness of Publicly Funded Training</i> , edited by B. Barnow and C. King. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press, 2000.

**Table B.1 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Evidence Rating	Strong Impact	Study Type	Study Dates	Sample Size	Study Features			Selected Author-Reported Impact Estimates/Findings	Study Citation
								Target Population	Fidelity to Model			
14	Bell and Orr (1994)	AFDC Homemaker-Home Health Aide Demonstrations	<b>Strong</b>	Yes (for most sites)	RCT	1983-1986	9,520	AR, KY, NJ, NY, OH, SC, TX (7 sites)	Heads of families with AFDC	Detail N/A	Year 2 impacts: Hours worked per month; Monthly earnings (\$); Average monthly welfare benefit - AFDC + FS (AFDC only in Ohio) (\$). Arkansas: +24 sig.; +101 sig.; -53 sig. Kentucky: +11 n.s.; +161 sig.; -38 sig. New Jersey: +23 sig.; +126 sig.; +4 n.s. New York: -10 ns.; +12 ns.; +10 ns. Ohio: +25 sig.; +105 sig.; -17 n.s. South Carolina: +2 n.s.; +22 ns.; -95 sig. Texas: +48 sig.; +215 sig.; +1 n.s. [KY, NJ, OH and SC had sig. gains in earnings in Year 1]	Bell, Stephen H., and Larry L. Orr. "Is Subsidized Employment Cost Effective for Welfare Recipients? Experimental Evidence from Seven State Demonstrations." <i>Journal of Human Resources</i> , vol. 29, no. 1, 1994.
15	Bloom (1990)	Texas Worker Adjustment Demonstration	<b>Strong</b>	Yes (for women only)	RCT	1984-1985	2,192	TX (3 sites)	Dislocated workers	Implementation monitored by on-site analysts, and study team interviewed staff by phone.	Impacts for all sample members after 1 year of follow-up: Earnings (\$): Men +471 n.s.; Women +987 sig.; Employed in 3rd or 4th survey quarter (%): Men +4 n.s.; Women +9 sig.; 30-week UI receipt (\$): Men -143 sig.; Women -193 sig.	Bloom, Howard S. "Back to Work: Testing Reemployment Services for Displaced Workers." Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1990.
16	Orr et al. (1997)	Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	<b>Strong</b>	Yes (for adults only)	RCT	1987-1994	15,981 (OJT/JSA subsample = 6,180)	IN, GA, TX, MS, RI, MO, NJ, OH, CA, NE, CO, FL, MN, MT, IL, IA (16 sites)	Welfare-eligible adults and out-of-school youth	Data on services received acquired from administrative records.	For OJT/JSA subgroup in months 19-30 post RA: Mean earnings: -Adult men +\$1,125 n.s. (sig at 10% level); -Adult women +\$1,021 n.s. (sig at 10% level) (sig for months 1-30); Impacts greater than for classroom training or other services. -Male youth non-arrestees -\$1,198 n.s.; -Female youth non-arrestees -\$899 n.s.	Orr, Larry L., Howard S. Bloom, Stephen H. Bell, Fred Doolittle, Winston Lin, and George Cave. Does Training for the "Disadvantaged Work? Evidence from the National JTPA Study." Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, 1997.
17	Scrivener et al. (2002)	Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project	<b>Strong</b>	Yes (for single-parent families only)	RCT	1994-2001	7,691	Vermont (6 sites)	Welfare recipients nearing time limits	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Single-parent families 6-year impacts: Avg. quarterly employment (%) +5.5 sig.; Months of cash assistance -1.5 sig.; Avg. annual earnings (\$) +508 sig. Two-parent families in Years 5-6: Avg. quarterly employment (%) +1.5 n.s.; Avg. annual earnings (\$) +117 n.s.	Scrivener, Susan, Richard Hendra, Cindy Redcross, Dan Bloom, Charles Michalopoulos, and Johanna Walter. "WRP: Final Report on Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project." New York: MDRC, September 2002.
18	Miller, Tessler, and Van Dok (2009)	Work Advancement and Support Center (WASC)	<b>Strong</b> (work experience not major part of program)	Yes (for one site only)	RCT	2005-2008	2,683	CA, OH, CT	Low-wage workers	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Receipt of food stamps (%): OH +5.5 sig.; CA +5.5 sig.; Participate in education/training activity (%): OH +22.9 sig.; CA +0.3 n.s.; Obtain a license/degree/certificate (%): OH +8.2 sig.; CA +3.8 n.s.; Employed 4 consecutive quarters (%): OH +1.1 n.s.; CA -6.5 sig.	Miller, Cynthia, Betsy L. Tessler, and Mark Van Dok. "Strategies to Help Low-Wage Workers Advance: Implementation and Early Impacts of the Work Advancement and Support Center (WASC) Demonstration." MDRC, June 2009.

**Table B.1 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Evidence Rating	Study Features								Study Citation
				Strong Impact	Study Type	Study Dates	Sample Size	Study Location	Target Population	Fidelity to Model	Selected Author-Reported Impact Estimates/Findings	
19	Bloom et al. (2009)	Transitional Work Corporation (TWC), site for Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Yes</b>	RCT	RA: 2004-2006, 1.5-year follow-up available	1,942 (includes treatment group in STEP program)	Philadelphia, PA (1 site)	TANF recipients	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	18-month impacts for TWC group: Employment in unsubsidized job (%) +9.9 sig.; Earnings from unsubsidized employment (\$) +502 n.s.; TANF receipt (\$) -596 sig; Food stamps receipt (\$) -139 n.s.	Bloom, Dan, Sarah Rich, Cindy Redcross, Erin Jacobs, Jennifer Yahner, and Nancy Pindus. "Alternative Welfare-to-Work Strategies for the Hard-to-Employ Testing Transitional Jobs and Pre-Employment Services in Philadelphia." MDRC, October 2009.
20	Miller et al. (2008)	New Hope	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Yes</b> (for subsample only)	RCT	1994-2002	1,357	Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Low-income individuals	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Impacts in year 8 for full sample: Quarters employed (%) +2.1 n.s.; Avg annual earnings (\$) +288 n.s. For sample with one barrier to employment (N=580): Quarters employed (%) +13.4 sig.; Avg annual earnings (\$) +3,012 sig.;	Miller, Cynthia, Aletha C. Huston, Greg J. Duncan, Vonnie C. McLoyd, and Thomas S. Weisner. "New Hope for the Working Poor: Effects After Eight Years for Families and Children." New York: MDRC, July 2008.
21	Corson et al. (1985)	Buffalo Worker Re-employment Demonstration	<b>Moderate</b> (high attrition and portion of sample not random)	<b>Yes</b>	RCT/QED	1982-1983	1,518	Buffalo, NY	Dislocated workers	Service receipt documented through telephone surveys and program Management Information System	For target plants after 6 months: Proportion of time employed +0.33 sig.; Probability of ever being employed +0.31 sig.; Avg. weekly hours +13.6 sig.; Avg. weekly earnings (\$) +115 sig. For non-target plants: Proportion of time employed +0.11 n.s.; Probability of ever being employed +0.06 n.s.; Avg. weekly hours +7.6 sig.; Avg. weekly earnings (\$) +96 sig. OJT had no significant effects on its own, though job search on its own and classroom training had significant effects.	Corson, Walter, Sharon Long, and Rebecca Maynard. "An Impact Evaluation of the Buffalo Dislocated Worker Demonstration Program." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, 1985.
22	Redcross et al. (2009)	Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), site for Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Yes</b> (for recidivism outcome only)	RCT	RA: 2004-2005, two-year follow-up available	977 (program = 568, control = 409)	New York, NY	Ex-prisoners	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Year 2: Unsubsidized employment -0.7 ns.; Earnings (\$) +445 n.s.; Recidivism (arrested, convicted, or incarcerated) (%) -6.8 sig. No significant differences on employment or earnings by subgroup; recent reentry group had greater impacts on recidivism.	Redcross, Cindy, Dan Bloom, Gilda Azurdia, Janine Zweig, and Nancy Pindus. "Transitional Jobs for Ex-Prisoners Implementation, Two-Year Impacts, and Costs of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) Prisoner Reentry Program." MDRC, August 2009.

**Table B.1 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Evidence Rating	Study Features								Study Citation
				Strong Impact	Study Type	Study Dates	Sample Size	Study Location	Target Population	Fidelity to Model	Selected Author-Reported Impact Estimates/Findings	
22	Redcross et al. (2009)	Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), site for Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Yes</b> (for recidivism outcome only)	RCT	RA: 2004-2005, two-year follow-up available	977 (program = 568, control = 409)	New York, NY	Ex-prisoners	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Year 2: Unsubsidized employment -0.7 ns.; Earnings (\$) +445 n.s.; Recidivism (arrested, convicted, or incarcerated) (%) -6.8 sig. No significant differences on employment or earnings by subgroup; recent reentry group had greater impacts on recidivism.	Redcross, Cindy, Dan Bloom, Gilda Azurdia, Janine Zweig, and Nancy Pindus. "Transitional Jobs for Ex-Prisoners Implementation, Two-Year Impacts, and Costs of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) Prisoner Reentry Program." MDRC, August 2009.
23	Heinrich (1998)	Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) community-based service delivery	<b>Moderate</b> (but Yes OJT not exclusive to program; treatment group more disadvantaged than comparison groups)	QED	1993-1995	1,542 (Treatment site = 42, JTPA participant s from same area = 55, Non-participant s = 62, Program year Title 2A adults = 1,445)	Chicago, IL (1 = 42, JTPA participant s from same area = 55, Non-participant s = 62, Program year Title 2A adults = 1,445)	Highly disadvantaged adults eligible for JTPA	Detail N/A	Versus nonparticipant comparison group: Impact on wages (\$) +\$3,686 over 24 months (sig.); Welfare leavers gained additional +\$6,000 sig. over 24 month period. Versus JTPA comparison group: Mean wage at discharge (\$) +3.38 sig.; Weekly earnings at discharge (\$) +134.54 sig.; Post year 2 - larger employment gains for treatment group. No significant earnings differences in year 2, except for participants who left welfare. Participants who received OJT had significantly higher gains than those receiving other services: +\$9,000 sig. higher than vocational training. Also higher placement, but similar employment retention rates.	Heinrich, Carolyn J. "Returns to Education and Training for the Highly Disadvantaged: What Does It Take to Make an Impact?" <i>Evaluation Review</i> , vol. 22, no. 5, October 1998, pp. 637-667.	
24	Spaulding et al. (2009)	Fathers at Work	<b>Moderate</b> (propensity score matched groups, but groups not highly comparable)	<b>Yes</b>	QED	2001-2004	2,070 (program = 754, comparison 1= 718, comparison 2= 598)	NY, PA, CA, IL, VA	Noncustodial fathers (3 sites), and formerly incarcerated noncustodial fathers (2 sites)	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	Earnings at 12-month follow-up: \$5,654 per year more than group 1, \$4,954 more than group 2 (both sig.). Employed full time: 104% more likely than group 1 (sig.). Employed at all: 67% more likely than group 2 (sig.). Months worked: +5.3 (sig.) compared to group 2. Hours worked: +3.2 (n.s.). Hourly wage: -2.97 (sig.) vs group 1; +0.86 (n.s.) vs. group 2.	Spaulding, Shayne, Jean Baldwin Grossman and Dee Wallace. "Working Dads: Final Report on the Fathers at Work Initiative." P/PV, October 2009.

**Table B.1 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Evidence Rating	Strong Impact	Study Type	Study Dates	Sample Size	Study Features			Selected Author-Reported Impact Estimates/Findings	Study Citation
								Target Population	Fidelity to Model			
25	Corson and Haimson (1996)	New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project	<b>Strong</b>	No	RCT	1986-1987	11,060	NJ (10 sites) UI claimants	Detail N/A	For treatment group 2 versus control group in Year 6: Weeks of UI paid over 6 years -1.47 sig.; Dollars paid over 6 years -293 n.s. (only sig. at 10% level); Change in hourly wage (%) +0.03 sig.; No significant change in earnings. Group 2 versus group 1 in Year 6: Average earnings (\$) +20,682 sig.	Corson, Walter, and Joshua Haimson. "The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project: Six-Year Summary and Follow-up Report Revised." Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, 1996.	
26	Fraker et al. (2004)	Welfare-to-Work Grants Program	Preliminary	No	Outcomes	1999-2003	Approx 6,745	MD, TX, PA, WA, WV, AZ, WI, MA, IL, TN, FL (11 sites)	Welfare recipients	Implementation studied through site visits by study team	O Fraker, Thomas M., Dan M. Levy, Irma Perez-Johnson, Alan M. Hershey, Demetra S. Nightingale, Robert B. Olsen, and Rita A. Stapulonis. "The National Evaluation of the Welfare-to-Work Grants Program: Final Report." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, September 2004.	
27	Joyce (2009)	Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration (TJRD)	No impact study available	N/A	RCT	2006-2010	1,800	Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, St. Paul	Ex-Offenders	Detail N/A	N/A	The Joyce Foundation. "Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration: Testing Strategies to Help Former Prisoners Find and Keep Jobs and Stay Out of Prison." Author, July 2009.

## Abbreviations:

ABE = Adult Basic Education  
 GED = General Educational Development certificate  
 HS = High school  
 N.S. = Not statistically significant  
 N/A = Not available  
 QED = Quasi-experimental design

RA = Random assignment  
 RCT = Randomized controlled trial  
 Sig. = Statistically significant at the 5-percent level  
 TANF = Temporary Assistance for Needy Families  
 UI = Unemployment Insurance  
 WIA = Workforce Investment Act

**Table B.2 Studies Reviewed and Program Models**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Program Model						Eligibility Requirements	Current Operating Costs*
			Type of Work	Work Experience	Hours and Pay	Supplemental Services	Service Delivery	Timing		
<b>Youth Programs</b>										
1	Jastrzab et al. (1996)	American Conservation and Youth Service Corps	Paid work crew experience	Service projects for community-based or nonprofit orgs., government agencies, or educational institutions. E.g., school-based tutoring, assistance at health care facility, post-hurricane clean up, tree planting, park improvement.	Average of 435 hours per participant; program completion requires 1,130 hours. Projects last 2-12 weeks, most 2-4 weeks.	Education and training, support services	During program	Detail N/A	Out-of-school youth, ages 18- 25	\$16.62 per service hour
2	Kemple and Willner (2008)	Career Academies	Work-based learning internships in 11th and 12th grade	Business and finance, high-tech, health, public service, travel and tourism, video technology	Duration varies from 3 to 13+ weeks depending on site, pay also varies from stipends below min. wage to above min. wage.	Career fairs, guest speakers, job search and application workshops, connections between academic and work-place learning, orientation and assessment activities for internships.	During program	School-based	Additional criteria for internships, such as attendance, credit completion, and GPA.	No cost data available; some internships funded through JTPA
3	Schochet et al. (2008)	Job Corps	Over 70% of vocational training education is devoted to hands-on experiences through workplace simulations, group projects, and work experience program placements when possible.	Various, including construction, trades, health, clerical, retail, building maintenance, and food service.	Work Experience Program: 5 hrs/day, 5 days/week for up to 30 days. Unpaid.	Residential living, vocational training, academic education, counseling, social skills training, job placement	During and post-program	Administered by DOL through Job Corps Centers	11 criteria, including age, residency, income, environment. Additional requirements for Work Experience Program vary by center.	\$16,500 per participant
4	Cave et al. (1993)	JOBSTART	7 sites offered paid or unpaid work experience or internships to some participants, but this was not a major aspect of the program.	Detail N/A	Detail N/A	Education and vocational training, support services, job placement assistance	During program	Community-based organizations, schools, and Job Corps Centers	17-21 years old, economically disadvantaged, high school dropout, read below 8th grade level.	\$4,500 per participant

**Table B.2 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Program Model						Eligibility Requirements	Current Operating Costs*
			Type of Work	Industry	Hours and Pay	Services Offered	Timing	Service Delivery		
5	Quint et al. (1997)	New Chance	Paid or unpaid work experience/internships	"Pink-collar" occupations: clerical and medical.	From 2 weeks to 6 months depending on site; not all received a stipend or wage.	Case management, ABE and GED prep, occupational skills training, job search, child care, family planning, counseling and referrals.	During program, 6 hours per day, 5 days per week during phase I; 1 year of follow-up after program.	Community-service organizations, schools and school districts, community college, Private Industry Council.	Mothers 16-22, 19 or younger when first gave birth; receiving welfare, did not have GED or HS diploma, not pregnant when enrolling.	\$9,000 per participant
6	Shapiro et al. (1986)	Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited (LSYOU) program	Paid, on-campus in university departments. Comparison group enrolled in Summer Youth Employment program, not described in report.	Office work, lab assistant work, and some outdoor, warehouse, and maintenance work.	4 hrs/day, 8 weeks during summer, minimum wage	Career counseling, academic instruction and counseling, mentoring; residential living, recreational activities	During program	JTPA provider	14-16 year old, high school student, JTPA eligible in eligible parishes, identified by school counselor as potential dropout risk.	\$300,000 funding level
7	Kisker et al. (1998)	Teenage Parent Demonstration	Youth Corps GED program offered morning GED classes and afternoon paid work experience. Also job skills training and on-the-job training slots, and work experience placements through community organizations.	Detail N/A	Full-time, 30 hours per week for all education, training and employment activities.	Case management, employment-related workshops, family planning, life skills, parenting, child support, nutrition, child care, transportation; employment readiness training, job club and job search assistance.	During program, from 3 days to 3 months of workshops depending on site.	State welfare agencies	Teenage mothers with one child and receiving welfare for the first time, or in their third trimester with no other children (only in IL site).	\$2,200 per year per participant on average
8	Miller et al. (2005)	Center for Employment Training (CET) Replication	Employment and training services that mirror the workplace, including occupational training that emphasizes job-specific skills, and English, reading, or math in the context of job-specific tasks	Various	Full-time, does not appear to be paid (may be receiving JTPA benefits)	Education, job placement, financial assistance with child care, transportation, work-related clothing and equipment	During program; trainees are not exited from program until placement in permanent job	Local CET programs, community-based orgs. and JTPA programs	Youth 16-21 eligible under Title-II of JTPA; most youth under 18 were excluded because of lack of individual consent	Detail N/A

**Table B.2 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Program Model						Eligibility Requirements	Current Operating Costs*
			Type of Work	Industry	Hours and Pay	Services Offered	Timing			
9 Hollenbeck (1996)	Manufacturing Technology Partnership (MTP)	Paid pre-apprenticeship experience, and later on-the-job training for qualified students	Automotive and other manufacturing, health, food service, and others.	Work after-school and during summers, then apprenticeship after graduation depending on test scores	Formal curriculum in manufacturing, academic tutoring for apprenticeship exam	During program; 2-hr 20-min blocks, 12-week classes. 3 classes first year, 2 in second year.	Vocational school	11th and 12 grade students, GPA at least a C, B in 9th grade algebra, grade 9 reading level, good attendance, interest in manufacturing as a career.	Student wages largely financed by JTPA; no cost data available	
10 Gueron (1984)	Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP)	Subsidized employment	Mostly entry-level positions in clerical, building maintenance, and community recreation aides for public, nonprofit, and private organizations.	Part-time during school year (15.2 hours per week on avg.), full-time during summer (29.1 hours per week on avg.); minimum wage; participants worked 56 weeks on avg.	Job development	During program	Welfare agencies prime sponsors, with some school districts	16-19 year olds, low-income or welfare households	\$4,382 per participant per year on average	
11 Martinez et al. (2010)	Youth Transition Demonstration (YTD)	Individualized work-based experiences, including summer- and after-school jobs and paid and unpaid work	Detail N/A	Detail N/A	Career and personal development counseling, recreation, family support, self-advocacy workshops, basic skills training, assessments, benefits counseling	During program	Public universities and state and local agencies, including One-stop Career Centers, school districts, and welfare agencies.	Varies; Social Security Insurance beneficiaries or those at-risk of becoming beneficiary, aged 14-19 on average	Detail N/A	
<b>Adult Programs</b>										
12 Bloom et al. (2007)	Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment (PRIDE)	Unpaid work experience	Positions designed for individuals with work limitations, e.g., no heavy lifting, non-English speaking, or no use of chemicals.	Work-based education track: 7 hours per day, 3 days per week; up to 6 months, with second 6-month period if necessary. Vocational rehabilitation track: 25 hours per week for all services (work experience and education).	Classroom-based education (usually ABE or English as a Second Language) or short-term skills training; job placement assistance; Individualized Education Plan for vocational rehab track; post-placement follow-up	During program: 7 hours per day, 2 days per week; follow-up for 6 months after placement	TANF agency, vocational rehabilitation agency, and nonprofit contractors	Eligible for TANF or childless parent Safety Net program, Human Resources Administration verified work-limiting medical condition	Detail N/A	
13 Nudelman (2000)	Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	See Orr et al. 1997	See Orr et al. 1997	See Orr et al. 1997	See Orr et al. 1997	See Orr et al. 1997	See Orr et al. 1997	Subset of adult women age 22 and older on AFDC when applying to JTPA.	See Orr et al. 1997	

**Table B.2 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Program Model						Eligibility Requirements	Current Operating Costs*
			Type of Work	Industry	Hours and Pay	Services Offered	Timing	Service Delivery		
14	Bell and Orr (1994)	AFDC Homemaker-Home Health Aide Demonstrations	Up to 12 months of subsidized employment, guaranteed for completers of practicum experience	Homemakers and home health aides	Market-level wages	4-8 weeks of formal classroom training with home health care curriculum, and practicum experience in supervised setting	Several weeks of pre-job training, plus 26 hours of practicum experience	Existing social service agencies, training by local vocational-technical schools	AFDC Head of Household and \$4,000-\$9,000 per month, minimum education or reading ability, and sometimes license or car.	
15	Bloom (1990)	Texas Worker Adjustment Demonstration	Tier II (did not find job through job search): On-the-job training (Usage: from 7 to 28% of all participants, and 17 to 87% of Tier II participants depending on site)	Various, such as transportation.	Detail N/A	Tier I: Job search assistance and job clubs, classroom and occupational training; also transportation and child care assistance	During program, 1 week to 6 weeks long	Public agency, private nonprofit, private vocational institution	Unemployed with poor chance of returning to work, recipient of UI, or facing special barriers to reemployment.	\$725 - \$3,381 depending on site.
16	Orr et al. (1997)	Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	On-the-job training (28% of full sample) and work experience	Detail N/A	OJT subsidized for up to 6 months, work experience subsidized if in the public sector	Classroom training in occupational skills, job search assistance, basic education, assessment, job readiness, customized training, vocational exploration.	During program	JTPA service delivery areas	JTPA Title II eligible	(For OJT/JSA group) OJT wage subsidy + incremental training cost: Adult men \$1,495, Adult women \$1,192, Male youth non-arrestees \$3,674, Female
17	Scrivener et al. (2002)	Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project	Community service jobs when full-time work not found through 2 months of job search; only 3% of treatment group worked in a community service job.	Detail N/A	Minimum wage, up to 10 months for each position (subsequent positions possible), part-time (single parents with children under 13) or full time. 35% worked for less than 3 months.	Job search, training, case management, support services, transitional Medicaid coverage and child care assistance for leavers.	During and after program, job search classes once or twice per week for 8 weeks	State welfare office	Received cash assistance for 28 months (single-parent) or 13 months (two-parent)	\$13,792 over 6 years
18	Miller, Tessler, and Van Dok (2009)	Work Advancement and Support Center (WASC)	Program model provides skills development through classroom-based training, on-the-job training and paid work experience. Most participants participated in training, with no mention of how many participated in work experience.	Detail N/A	Detail N/A	Career coaching, skills development, education about available work supports	During program	One-stop Career Centers	Earning \$15 per hour or less, family income 200 percent of poverty line or less, not receiving TANF	Detail N/A

**Table B.2 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Program Model						Eligibility Requirements	Current Operating Costs*
			Type of Work	Industry	Hours and Pay	Services Offered	Timing			
19	Bloom et al. (2009)	Transitional Work Corporation (TWC), site for Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ	Transitional job for up to 6 months (average of 30 days), mostly emphasizing soft skills but sometimes involving more concrete skills	Government or nonprofit agency, mostly entry-level work in service positions.	25 hours/week, average of 4 days a week for 30 days, minimum wage (\$5.15-\$7.15 during study)	2-week job readiness orientation, 10 hours of professional development (job search, job readiness, GED, other classes) every week at TWC, job placement assistance, job retention and bonus payments	During and after for up to six or nine months	Existing nonprofit provider	At least 12 months of assistance since 1997, or no diploma or GED, and not employed or in work activities	Average cost per program member: \$3,500; Operating cost per participant: \$6,345
20	Miller et al. (2008)	New Hope	Community service jobs when full-time work not found in 8 weeks of job search, or were working part-time (1/3 of all participants)	Office and clerical jobs in nonprofit organizations	Minimum wage, part-time or full-time (30 hours per week), could be done twice for up to 12 months in 3-year period. Half of users worked for 6 months or less, one quarter worked for 10 months or more.	Monthly cash earnings supplements, subsidized health insurance, child care assistance, job search assistance	During program	Community-based organization	Lived in target neighborhood, age 18 or older, earned less than 150% of federal poverty level, willing and able to work full time.	\$5,300 (largest component was child care subsidies)
21	Corson et al. (1985)	Buffalo Worker Re-employment Demonstration	On-the-job training for 30% of participants	Detail N/A	Nine weeks in OJT	Testing and assessment, resource center activities, job development and placement services for all participants, classroom training for subsets, relocation assistance	Orientation, assessment, and testing before program; other services during program.	Sponsored by local Private Industry Council	70% of participants were dislocated from 9 large area plants; 30% were dislocated workers from rest of county	\$3,179 per participant for OJT and job search assistance
22	Redcross et al. (2009)	Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO), site for Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ	Paid work crew experiences for average of 8 weeks. When deemed "job ready," work with a job developer to find permanent employment	Maintenance and repair for city and state agencies	4 days/week; average of 8 weeks; minimum wage (\$5.15-\$6.00 during study period)	4-day pre-employment job readiness class; weekly supplementary activities including fatherhood program, job coaching	During and after participation for up to 1 year	Existing nonprofit provider	Individuals referred to CEO by parole officer.	Avg. cost per program group member: \$4,263. Cost per participant for full program: \$7,249

**Table B.2 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Program Model						Eligibility Requirements	Current Operating Costs*
			Type of Work	Industry	Hours and Pay	Services Offered	Timing	Service Delivery		
23 Heinrich (1998)	Job Training Partnership Act	21-24% of treatment and JTPA comparison groups received on-the-job training community-based service delivery	Detail N/A	Detail N/A	Comprehensive services: customized employment and training services, intensive case management, job search assistance, career counseling, supportive services, remedial education	During program	JTPA provider	JTPA eligible, resident of targeted community	\$6,800 per participant	
24 Spaulding et al. (2009)	Fathers at Work	Only CEO and Rubicon offered paid transitional work; CEO also offered some participants subsidized employment with outside employers. TAP briefly operated its own temp agency, and some participants were hired after working successfully for a client. Other sites offered direct job placement and coordinated jobs for several participants at common worksites.	Various, including supermarket retail, residential construction, meatpacking, and biotech.	Detail N/A	Job search, pre-employment skills training, fatherhood curriculum, child care, transportation support, retention services, family outings	During and post-services, minimum 12-month post-program	Existing nonprofit providers	Noncustodial father, 30 years old or younger, earning less than 200 percent of federal poverty level	\$300,000 per year provided for target of 100 participants	
25 Corson and Haimson (1996)	New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project	Classroom or on-the-job training offered to treatment group 2 only; impacts and service description reported here are for treatment group 2 only	OJT: Technical, clerical, and sales occupations.	UI benefits as normal	Treatment group 1 - Job search assistance (JSA) only; group 2 - JSA, classroom training and relocation assistance; group 3 - JSA and reemployment cash bonus.	During program	State UI offices, Employment Services and local JTPA program operators	Received UI payments, at least age 25, worked for last employer for at least 3 years, no specific recall date, not in union hiring arrangement.	\$491 per claimant for JSA plus training	
26 Fraker et al. (2004)	Welfare-to-Work Grants Program	Many sites offered transitional employment opportunities and on-the-job training for between 5% and 85% of their participants, typically for the hard-to-employ	Various, including hospitality, community service, conservation, public agencies, and nonprofits.	Varies by site, up to 12 weeks, both paid and unpaid.	Job readiness training, job search assistance, job placement, retention services	During and after program	WIA, TANF, and other government agencies	Received TANF for at least 30 months, were less than 12 months from time limit, or exhausted benefits. Noncustodial parents also qualified if unemployed or other requirements met.	\$3,607 per participant on average	
27 Joyce (2009)	Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration (TJRD)	Transitional jobs - temporary subsidized work experience	Light manufacturing, merchandise processing and retailing, recycling.	30-40 hours per week, average of 4 months in job	Case management, support services, some occupational training, job placement, employment bonuses.	During program	Community organizations with assistance from government agencies	Male, age 18 or older, released from prison in past 90 days.	Detail N/A	

**Table B.2 (continued)**

#	Study Short Reference	Intervention	Program Model				Service Delivery	Eligibility Requirements	Current Operating Costs*
			Type of Work	Industry	Hours and Pay	Services Offered			

\* Cost estimates are at the time of service provision, not adjusted for inflation.

Abbreviations:

ABE = Adult Basic Education

RA = Random assignment

GED = General Educational Development certificate

RCT = Randomized controlled trial

HS = High school

Sig. = Statistically significant at the 5-percent level

N.S. = Not statistically significant

TANF = Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

N/A = Not available

UI = Unemployment Insurance

QED = Quasi-experimental design

WIA = Workforce Investment Act



**MATHEMATICA**  
Policy Research, Inc.

[www.mathematica-mpr.com](http://www.mathematica-mpr.com)

Improving public well-being by conducting high-quality, objective research and surveys

Princeton, NJ ■ Ann Arbor, MI ■ Cambridge, MA ■ Chicago, IL ■ Oakland, CA ■ Washington, DC

Mathematica® is a registered trademark of Mathematica Policy Research

