

FEDERAL JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS: A SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES

Prepared for Participants

NIEHS Awardee Meeting

SuperJTI Session

Estes Park, Colorado

April 20, 1999

Prepared by Ruth Ruttenberg

National Clearinghouse for Worker Safety and Health Training

5107 Benton Avenue

Bethesda, Maryland 20814

(301) 571-4226

rra@dgsys.com

**FEDERAL JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS:
A SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction..... 2

II. Overview 2

III. Department of Education/Department of Labor 3

A. School-to-Work 3

IV. Department of Housing and Urban Development 5

A. Step-Up Program 5

B. America Works 5

C. Youthbuild Program 6

V. Department of Labor 7

A. Joint Partnership and Training Act (JTPA) 7

1. Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program 8

2. Native American Program 8

3. Summer Youth Employment and Training Program 9

4. Youth Fair Chance 9

5. Job Corps 9

B. The CET Program 14

C. The Senior Community Service Employment Program 15

D. Welfare-to-Work 15

E. Example of a Model Program 18

**F. The Newest Legislation: The Workplace
Investment Act (PL 105-220) 18**

VI. Corporation for National Service: AmeriCorps 21

A. AmeriCorps*NCCC 21

B. AmeriCorps*VISTA 21

VII. Department of Veteran Affairs 22

A. Veterans' Job Training 22

VIII. EPA Brownfields 22

A. Brownfields Workforce Development: Job Training
and Development Demonstration Pilots..... 22

IX. NIEHS Minority Worker Training Program 23

X. The Superfund Job Training Initiative (Super JTI) 25

XI. Evaluation Overall 27

XII. Conclusions Summary and 30

Bibliography

Appendices

FEDERAL JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS:

A SUMMARY OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper briefly describes the range of job training programs in the federal sector -- in an effort to put the NIEHS/EPA Minority Worker Training and Superfund Job Training Initiatives programs in perspective. While all programs have the overriding goals of job readiness, job training, job placement, and career success; each has its own specific eligibility requirements, available services, and targeted purposes. With well over \$5 billion per year being allocated to employment and training programs from the federal sector alone, it is important that each be understood so that program administrators may coordinate and supplement rather than duplicate. It is also important that each be evaluated effectively so that trainees may be successful and so that programs may grow and flourish as well as be accountable.

The pages that follow briefly describe federal job training programs and some of the evaluation results, both positive and negative, that assess program strengths and weaknesses.

II. OVERVIEW

The overriding labor market goal in public policy is to “offer Americans the opportunity to learn the workforce skills and workplace processes that are necessary for the creation of good-paying jobs and a rising standard of living in the emerging international economy.”[\[1\]](#)

There is a proliferation of job training programs throughout the federal government. Dozens of programs teach life skills, job skills, safety and health, and environmental protection. The majority of these programs are administered by the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor, but programs are also carried out in association with other Department of Labor agencies, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). This paper is not a comprehensive review of each program or of the overall array of programs. The focus, instead, is on programs and aspects of programs that are most likely to aid those working with the NIEHS/EPA sponsored Super JTI and Minority Worker Training programs, so they may partner and leverage their own training activities and be a resource to those they train.

III. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION/DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A. School-To-Work

The School-To-Work (STW) initiative, authorized in 1994 by the School-to-Work Opportunity Act, provides seed money to States and local partnerships of business, labor, government, education, and community organizations to develop school-to-work systems. STW addresses the increasingly poor job prospects of high school graduates who do not go on to college by helping states and localities create programs which assist students in completing high school and making a transition to a good first job.

The School-to-Work initiative does not establish a new program, but, rather supports a national system that is based on existing models and efforts, such as career academies, youth apprenticeship, Tech Prep, and cooperative education. A National Employer Leadership Council was founded by 19 CEOs of leading companies to promote work-based learning opportunities for all students in the country's schools in collaboration with other business organizations, school systems, and public sector organizations. Members of this Council include the CEOs of Ford Motor Company, American Express, BellSouth, Eastman Kodak, Manpower Corporation, New England Medical Center, and Siemens Corporation.

Under the School-to-Work Opportunity Act, more than 135,000 employers working through 1800 school districts linked up with more than 500,000 students in school-to-work programs nationwide the first two years. Federal grants have been approximately \$400 million per year.^[2] The major federal grants associated with the program are: Development Grants for States and Territories, State Implementation Grants, Local Partnership Grants, Urban/Rural Opportunities Grants, Indian Program Grants, and Out-of-School Youth Grants. In addition there are many other grants, some from foundations. These foundations include: ^[3] Aetna Foundation, American Honda Foundation, BankAmerica Foundation, Barbara Bush Foundation, Bell South Foundation, Ford Foundation, Kellogg Foundation, Shell Oil Company Foundation, and Toyota USA Foundation. ^[4] See Appendix I for list of School-to-Work contacts in each state and Appendix II for list of School-to-Work assistance Resource Bank features.

One example of partnership between unions and schools is a school-to-work project run by the Cincinnati Central Labor Council. Building trades unions in cooperation with the Great Oaks Institute of Technical and Career Development ran a week-long "construction camp" for 12 students, two teachers, and two counselors. It introduced them to the world of construction work by building a storage shed for sports equipment at their school. In addition rank-and-file members mentor students, which has led to a better fit of school requirements to possible jobs. For example, electricians working with kids and receiving applications for training, lobbied local and state school board members to strengthen math requirements (at a time when they were considering dropping the algebra requirement) because many of the kids had not taken enough algebra to master the formulas they would need on the job.^[5]

Another example is the Central Iowa School-to-Work Project, which helps at risk young people make the transition from school into productive adulthood. The project, facilitated by the South Central Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, utilizes placement sites, and resources for applied learning in basic and job-specific skills. Working people, recruited through local unions and trained by the United Way of Central Iowa, serve as local mentors for at risk youth. The State Employment Service and local job training organizations help students assess their career interests and abilities, develop job shadowing opportunities matching those interests, and analyze those jobs in terms of the basic and applied skills needed to perform them. Faculty of area alternative high schools work with the job analysts to integrate those basic and applied skills into the curriculum for individual students. Students then spend time shadowing or working in the job. The result is an integrated approach to career assessment, classroom education, and job placement for at risk youth.^[6]

Evaluation of School-to-Work. Contextual learning, which emphasizes learning academic skills in a "real-world" context, more directly prepares students for work.^[7] This approach is not unlike Job Corps and CET. (See sections which follow.) A 1996 telephone survey by the U.S. Census Bureau, which contacted nearly 7000 private establishments with more than 20 employees, found that one in four participated in school-to-work partnerships. Over 90 percent of these businesses offered work-based learning opportunities.^[8]

There are some opponents of School-to-Work and School-to-Careers programs. Some conservative groups, such as the Texas Eagle Forum, see STW as the Clinton Administration's attempt to supersede local control of education, despite the fact that the program is voluntary and all school districts and students in any district can opt out.^[9]

IV. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

A. Step-Up Program

The Step-Up program is an apprenticeship-based employment program in which participants earn wages while they learn skills both on the job and in the classroom. Step-Up seeks the development of constructive relationships with organized labor and the building industry general through collaborations and creative partnerships. The Step-Up program model mobilizes existing public and private resources, with the federal government providing technical assistance, supportive seed money, and existing funding streams. The program is a collaboration of HUD, and the Departments of Labor, Justice, Health and Human Services, and the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

Step-Up is first and foremost an apprenticeship-based employment program where participants earn wages while they learn skills on the job and in the classroom. Billions of dollars of public funds annually go to hundreds of local housing authorities and generate tens of thousands of direct and indirect jobs mostly in construction and maintenance. The idea of Step-Up is to convert these funding streams into income streams.

Counseling, including substance abuse prevention, money management job readiness, and remedial class work, safety, child care, transportation assistance, and mentoring are an integral part of the Step-Up concept. In addition participants must sign an apprentice agreement emphasizing the commitment or contract and work ethic necessary to achieve a successful outcome from apprenticeship

There are efforts underway to use the Step-Up paradigm in conjunction with EPA's Superfund and Brownfields programs, in Indian country housing and community development, in Enterprise Zones/Enterprise Communities, and in conjunction with other job training programs such as Youthbuild, Youth Corps, and Job Corps.

B. America Works

Founded in 1995, the America Works Partnership, in collaboration with local housing authorities and HUD, created the Resident Apprenticeship Demonstration Program in 21 cities. These programs offer welfare recipients the opportunity to learn life skills and a craft upon entry into a bona fide union apprenticeship program.

The America Works Partnership (AWP) exists to identify, mobilize, and coordinate the complementary strengths and resources of national, city, and regional public and private partners across the country. AWP focuses on producing a trained workforce that reflects the diversity of the community it serves. AWP is a 501(c)(3) organization that produces:[\[10\]](#)

Pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship training opportunities for low-income persons,

Real construction career opportunities in the public and private sectors,

The coordination of community and private development projects at the front-end of the work production cycle,

Investment standards for community development projects embracing AWP's training-to-jobs continuum,

Technical assistance in the development of community-based programs,

Community-based non-profit affiliates through which these activities can be conducted.

One example of partnership involves the International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades, which is working with other building trades unions such as the Brother of Carpenters and Sheet Metal Workers to join in with commitments for apprenticeship and training slots in the Partnership's 22-city Resident Apprenticeship Training Program. Cities that have completed AWP classes include: New Haven, Detroit, Jacksonville, Miami, San Diego, and St. Paul.

Evaluation of America Works. More than three of every four graduates have found jobs with private- and public-sector employers, a higher retention rate than traditional industry averages.[\[11\]](#) Women and persons of color have been linked with building trades unions. The program has also been successful in encouraging union and public employee pension funds to invest in the revitalization of communities, in negotiating participating agreements with employers and public works agencies to provide a continuum of jobs for low-income persons, providing technical assistance for community development projects, and assisting cities and affiliates to submit grant proposals.

C. Youthbuild Program

The Youthbuild Program provides disadvantaged young adults with education, employment, and leadership skills. The program is authorized under Subtitle D of Title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended by Section 164 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992. The Youthbuild Program regulations are in 24 CFR part 585.

The stated purposes of Youthbuild are:[\[12\]](#)

To provide economically-disadvantaged young adults with opportunities to obtain education, employment opportunities to obtain education, employment skills, and meaningful on-site construction work experience as a service to their communities and a means to achieve self-sufficiency;

To foster the development of leadership skills and commitment to community;

To expand the supply of permanent affordable housing for homeless and low-and very low-income persons by providing implementation grants for carrying out a Youthbuild program;

To provide disadvantaged young adults with meaningful on-site training experiences in housing construction and rehabilitation to enable them to provide a service to their communities by helping to meet the housing needs of homeless and low-income families;

To give, to the greatest extent feasible -- and consistent with existing Federal, State and local laws and regulation -- job training, employment, contracting, and other economic opportunities to low-income persons and business concerns.

V. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A. Joint Partnership and Training Act (JTPA)

The Job Training Partnership Act of 1982, initiated in October 1983, is the largest civilian federally-funded training program. Its objective is to bring the jobless into permanent, unsubsidized, and self-sustaining employment by providing training, basic education, job counseling, and placement. The target populations of its various programs include economically disadvantaged adults and youths, dislocated workers, and other groups who face serious employment barriers. The composition of JTPA participants is thus quite varied and includes experienced workers, new entrants and reentrants to the work force, young and older workers, and workers associated with regular and permanent employment as well as those whose employment tends to be seasonal or irregular.[\[13\]](#)

JTPA provides job-training services for economically disadvantaged adults and youth, dislocated workers, and others who face significant employment barriers. State and local governments, together with the private sector, have primary responsibility for development management, and administration of training programs under JTPA. Governors have approval authority over locally developed plans and are responsible for monitoring program compliance.

To be eligible for JTPA, an individual must be a U.S. citizen or eligible non-citizen; be in compliance with the Military Selective Service Act; and either be economically disadvantaged, face specific barriers to employment (displaced homemakers, handicapped, criminal record, substance abuse), be 55 years of age or older and meet income guidelines, or be a displaced worker.

One of the guiding principles behind JTPA is the establishment of Private Industry Councils (PICs). The administration of the federal JTPA funds at the local level is through a joint partnership agreement between local elected officials and the PICs.

Title I of JTPA describes coordination efforts, primarily through State Job Training Coordinating Councils and Private Industry Councils. The State Councils are appointed by governors with representatives of business, state agencies, local government, and the unemployed. They recommend training components and plan employment services. PICs are appointed by local elected officials to guide and oversee job and training programs at the Service Delivery Area. PICS have members from business, education, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, community-based organizations, economic development agencies, and public employment services. They are chaired by a business representative and are the key mechanisms for bringing the private sector into the active management of job training programs.

Title II authorizes training services A) for the economically disadvantaged, B) for young people during the summer, and C) for year round youth employment. Services include, beyond job training, academic enrichment, school-to-work transition, transportation, remedial transportation, counseling, and other support services.

To be eligible under Title II-A an individual must be 22 years of age or older, economically disadvantaged, or be a welfare recipient, have a deficiency in basic skills, be a high school drop out, be disabled, or be homeless. To be eligible for Title II-C an individual must be 14 through 21, be economically disadvantaged, and have a listed major barrier to employment.

Title III provides employment and training for dislocated workers, mostly those who lose their jobs in mass layoffs or plant closings.

Title IV authorizes federal programs for native Americans, migrant and seasonal farm workers, and veterans. It also authorizes the Job Corps.

1. Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program[\[14\]](#)

The Employment and Training Administration (ETA) administers a national program to help combat chronic unemployment,

underemployment, and substandard living conditions among migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families. The program is designed to provide training and support services to farmworkers who seek alternative job opportunities that will enable them to secure stable employment at an income above the poverty level. Services include classroom training, on-the-job training, work experience, day care, health care, legal aid, transportation assistance, and food and housing in emergency situations. A national network exists of 34 private nonprofit and state and local government agencies in 48 states and Puerto Rico.

2. Native American Program[\[15\]](#)

The Department of Labor sponsors special employment and training programs to help jobless Native Americans. Eligible persons include American Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts, Hawaiians, and others of Native American descent who are economically disadvantaged, unemployed, or underemployed. Services include job referrals, job training, counseling, child care, transportation, and training allowances. The program is administered through JTPA.

3. Summer Youth Employment and Training Program

Summer Youth Employment and Training Program is funded by JTPA and provides disadvantaged youth with a summer employment experience along with academic enrichment. Approximately half a million participants are reached in a year.

4. Youth Fair Chance

The Youth Fair Chance program is a comprehensive, community-based initiative that transforms high schools to help students make the transition from school to work. Authorized by the 1992 amendments to the JTPA, eligible communities are those with populations of 25,000 or less with the highest concentration of poverty based on the latest Bureau of the Census estimates; migrant or seasonal farmworker communities; native Alaskan villages or Indian reservations. The in-school component transforms high schools to help students make the transition from school to work. It also provides counseling, mentoring, job search assistance, recreation and sports, etc. The out-of-school component helps improve the education, training, and employment opportunities for youth so they can get and keep a job.

To be eligible, students must be between 16 and 19 years of age and must make a commitment to continue and complete high school. Wage subsidies of up to 50 percent are provided by some projects. Duration of employment is limited to one year and students are restricted to 15 hours of work per week during the school year. [\[16\]](#)

5. Job Corps

Job Corps is the nation's largest and most comprehensive residential education and job training program for at-risk youth, ages 16 through 24. There are more than 110 centers in 46 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. It touches the lives of 100,000 young people every year. See Appendix III for list of contacts at each Job Corps site and Appendix IV for a list of related web sites.

Job Corps was established in 1964 as a residential education and training program for economically disadvantaged, at-risk students ages 16 to 24. The program is a full-time, year-round residential program that offers a comprehensive array of training, education and supportive services, including supervised dormitory housing, meals, medical care, and counseling. The typical Job Corps student is an 18-year-old high-school dropout who reads at the seventh grade level, belongs to a minority group, and has never held a full-time job. [\[17\]](#)

Job Corps youth are more disadvantaged than most of the out-of-school youth in JTPA Title II. Over 80 percent of Job Corps enrollees are high school dropouts, and about 75 percent have never worked before coming to the Corps. The program is a highly intensive residential ("boarding school" type) program that provides basic education, vocational skills, and a wide range of supportive services, including job placement services. [\[18\]](#) The Job Corps receives approximately \$1 billion a year and per participant costs are approximately \$15,000.

There are eight eligibility criteria for Job Corps:

Be at least 16 and not yet 25.

Be a U.S. citizen, U.S. national, permanent resident alien, or other alien authorized to accept permanent employment

Be economically disadvantaged.

Have signed consent from a parent or guardian if the applicant is a minor.

Be free of behavior problems and free of face-to-face court or institutional supervision or court-imposed fines.

Be drug-free and free of any health condition that could be a serious hazard to self or others or require costly treatment.

Live in an environment that is not conducive to getting a job or an education.

Be a high school dropout or in need of further vocational training, education or other support services in order to participate successfully in the work world.

The Job Corps program operates through a partnership of government, labor, and the private sector. Major corporations – such as Teledyne, ITT, Vinnell, Management and Training Corporation, Career Systems Development Corporation, Res-Care and MINACT – operate 81 Job Corps centers under contracts with the Department of Labor. Thirty centers, known as civilian conservation centers are located on federal lands and are operated by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. Labor unions and trade associations conduct vocational training at many Job Corps centers.

Job Corps is currently involved with School-to-Work initiatives. Job Corps has a Zero Tolerance Policy for drugs and violence. Job Corps centers provide classrooms, dormitories, recreational programs, a cafeteria, and medical facilities. Other support services

include living allowance, clothing allowance, cash bonuses and readjustment allowance, dental and vision care, transportation, and books and work clothing.

Among the trades taught at Job Corps centers are auto repair, bricklaying, building and apartment maintenance, carpentry, computer operator, data entry specialist, electrician, heavy equipment operator, medical records technician, nurse's aide, office clerk, painter, retail sales clerk, and welder.

Evaluation of Job Corps. More than 75 percent of those who enroll in Job Corps become employed, obtain further training, or join the military. [19] A 1995 Labor Department study [20] found that Job Corps participation significantly increased earnings and educational attainment, while reducing welfare dependency and the incidence of serious crime among graduates. The exception was disadvantaged single mothers, for whom significant earnings gains were not found. When benefits are summed, the study cited conclusions that lifetime benefits to society from Job Corps training are about 45 percent greater than program costs. [21]

A chronic problem of Job Corps has been that about 30 percent of youths entering the program drop out within 90 days.

One program within Job Corps -- Navy Junior ROTC program operating within a Job Corps program at Excelsior Springs center near Kansas City [22] -- boasts that its participants are 23 percent more likely to complete a training program and 26 percent more likely to obtain a GED or high school diploma.

One criticism of Job Corps has been that it overstates its job training success. The National Center for Policy Analysis, in 1998, cited Congressional investigators whose review found hundreds of dubious "job matches." [23] The National Center for Policy Analysis cited a GAO study which found about 40 percent of reported job matches were questionable.

Evaluation of JTPA. Many studies have evaluated the impacts of JTPA. A few are summarized below:

The National JTPA Study. The National JTPA study, published in January 1994, was commissioned by the Employment and Training Administration at DOL in 1986 to measure the impacts and costs of selected employment and training programs for economically disadvantaged Americans funded under Title II-A of JTPA. Sixteen sites around the country were the focus of the study. Key findings were: [24]

• JTPA produced a modest increase in the earnings of adults that was statistically significant and was sustained throughout a 2 ½ year follow-up period. The average total 30-month earnings gain for women was \$1,837 (15 percent) per JTPA enrollee; for men it was \$1,599 (8 percent) per enrollee.

• Earnings gains produced by JTPA during those 2 ½ years exceeded the cost of the added services received by the program group for both adult women and adult men.

• The adult service strategy subgroups experienced significant and sustained earnings gains; these gains more than offset the costs of the additional services provided due to JTPA. Adult women and adult men who were recommended for on-the-job training experienced program-induced earnings gains that were statistically significant at or near conventional levels and were sustained throughout the 30-month follow-up period. The program had no statistically significant effects on the earnings of adults recommended for classroom training in occupational skills. Adult women (but not adult men) who were recommended for other services (e.g., job search assistance or basic education) enjoyed a significant earnings gain.

• There were no statistically significant positive effects on the earnings of out-of-school youths, regardless of the service strategy for which they were recommended.

• JTPA increased the percentage of school dropouts who attained a high school diploma or GED among adult women, adult men, and female youths, but had no discernible effect on male youth dropouts. Because school dropouts were a minority of sample members, the effect on the overall educational attainment level of each target group as a whole was small.

• JTPA led to almost no statistically significant reduction in the receipt of AFDC benefits or food stamps benefits, for either adults or out-of-school youths.

The Study authors suggest rigorous evaluation in the future, using random assignment and control groups.

1995 Study, Office of the Chief Economist, U.S. Department of Labor

Findings for the out-of-school youth component of the program were discouraging. JTPA produced no statistically significant positive effects for out-of-school youths, either male or female. This finding held true over a two and a half year follow-up period and for all the different service strategies that were used -- classroom training, OJT job search assistance, or a mix of less intensive services. In addition, no reduction in youth crime rates or welfare receipt was found. [25]

GAO Report on Long-Term Earnings and Employment Outcomes[\[26\]](#)

GAO statistical analysis showed some positive effects of JTPA in the years immediately following training, but the study found no significant effect of JTPA on earnings or employment rates after 5 years. In some earlier years, adult men and women who received training – but not male or female youths – had earnings or employment rates significantly higher than those of the control group. By the fifth year, each of the four treatment groups had earnings and employment rates that were nominally higher than those of the control group. Because none of the fifth-year differences were statistically significant, however, GAO could not attribute the higher earnings to JTPA training rather than to chance alone.

A study of literacy of DOL job training participants in 1992[\[27\]](#) concluded that unless an attempt is made to upgrade the level of literacy skills of JTPA participants, their success in job-training programs may be limited, thus hampering their access to the job market.

Criticisms by James Bovard of the Cato Institute include: [\[28\]](#)

In 1988 the Labor Department's inspector general found that young JTPA trainees are more than twice as likely to receive food stamps after training.

According to the Inspector General, although JTPA's OJT subsidies were intended to aid people who would not otherwise be hired, 60 percent of the businesses surveyed would have hired the JTPA clients that they had trained even without such subsidies.

According to Bovard, job placement is not what JTPA says it is. In a 1990 paper, he wrote that the method used to calculate the number of placements varies from PIC to PIC, which makes the national statistics meaningless. Some PICs claim a placement if a participant holds a job for a single day.

According to Bovard, "JTPA primarily serves to transfer the cost of job training from private firms to the federal government. The program will pay an employer 50 percent of a worker's wages for up to six months if it claims to be training him."

The National Conference of State Legislatures during 1996 and 1997 made several suggestions for strengthening of job training programs. These suggestions included:[\[29\]](#)

Reverse the pattern of functional illiteracy and reduce drop-out rates. Focus on middle schools.

Strengthen school-to-work transition services.

Provide after-school job opportunities and full-time summer jobs. School attendance and scholastic performance should be a prerequisite.

Create public service opportunities for young people.

Provide long-term follow-up services.

JTPA should define adults as persons age 21 years and older.

A 1997 evaluation of the District of Columbia Job Training Programs identified a series of weaknesses:[\[30\]](#)

The DC JTPA System is weak and fragmented, not focused on quality outcomes, and not connected to the private sector.

There is effectively no planning system.

The program lacks customer focus.

Customer services serve vendors and administrative requirements, not the customers.

Focus in on managing the individual components with little regard for program outcomes.

There is no effective management information system for JTPA.

B. The CET Project

Founded in 1968, CET provides three to six months of vocational training to disadvantaged youth and adults. As of 1995 the program operated training centers in 25 sites in three western states, with the majority in California. Headquarters are in San Jose. CET clients

are mostly Hispanic.[\[31\]](#)

CET integrates basic education and vocational skills training. It has an individualized and open-entry open-exit program and its staff is highly experienced with extensive local knowledge.[\[32\]](#)

Evaluation of CET. Earnings increases for participants are among the highest of any youth training program.[\[33\]](#)

C. The Senior Community Service Employment Program

The Senior Community Service Employment Program is funded under Title V of the Older Americans Act and is administered through ETA. It serves individuals with low incomes who are 55 years old or over and have poor employment prospects. The services include:

1. Up to 1300 hours per year of part-time employment in community service assignments
2. Job training and related educational opportunities
3. Opportunities for placement into unsubsidized jobs.

D. Welfare-to-Work

In August 1996, Congress overhauled the nation's welfare system, by enacting P.L.104-193, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act. The Act abolished the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children program and established TANF block grants. To foster the goal of moving welfare recipients to work and economic self-sufficiency, Congress authorized Welfare-to-Work grants in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (P.L.105-33). These grants help hard-to-employ persons receiving aid under the block grant program of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), to obtain employment. Welfare-to-Work grants totaled \$1.5 billion in 1998 and another \$1.5 billion in 1999. About 75 percent of the funds are for formula grants to states, and nearly 25 percent are for competitive grants to local organizations for innovative approaches in moving welfare recipients into permanent work. To receive a formula grant, states must pledge one dollar of state matching funds for every two dollars of federal Welfare-to-Work funds. States must also submit a plan describing how the formula funds will be used and ensure that the plan was developed in consultation with appropriate state and local agencies. States must pass most of the formula funds to substate areas that plan for and administer the funds. Governors may retain a small portion, 15 percent, of the states' formula for special Welfare-to-Work projects.[\[34\]](#)

The purpose of Welfare-to-Work is to provide transitional assistance which moves hard-to-employ welfare recipients living in high poverty areas into unsubsidized employment and economic self-sufficiency. Other goals are to prepare participants for non-subsidized employment, for secure and lasting employment, to provide targeted funds to high poverty areas. Welfare-to-Work activities should be coordinated with those undertaken through TANF, as hard-to-employ welfare recipients constitute a significant portion of the TANF eligible population. Activities conducted with Welfare-to-Work grant funds must be grounded in the "work first" philosophy which is fundamental to the Act.[\[35\]](#) See Appendices V through IX for:

Appendix V The Welfare-to-Work contacts within the Department of Labor Regional Offices.

Appendix VI The Welfare-to-Work SBA District contacts, by Region.

Appendix VII List of "Welfare-to-Work" federal partners – from Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration to the Social Security Administration.

Appendix VIII List of Related Information Sources; for example, American Public Welfare Association or National Clearinghouse on Welfare Reform.

Appendix IX List of "Top Ten Hot Links" to Welfare-to-Work, including the Urban Institute and the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Employers are encouraged to hire long-term welfare recipients by using the Welfare-to-Work tax credit. The credit is administered under the Work Opportunity Tax Credit certification procedures established by the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, as amended. This tax credit can reduce employer federal tax liability by as much as \$8500 per new hire.

The Small Business Administration works to connect small businesses with service providers that can provide training to, and support for, individuals leaving public assistance. SBA provides a national network of SBA resource partners to assist employers. Also SBA works to improve access to credit for former welfare individuals through SBA's MicroLoan Program and other capital-access programs.

The Federal Transit Administration is also involved in Welfare-to-Work through an "Access to Jobs" program. Efforts are being

made to get transportation into state welfare reform planning. Projects are underway in many cities,[\[36\]](#) including new transportation links and using unemployed individuals to provide transportation.

There is a special set-aside for the Indian and Native American Welfare-to-Work Program, operated through the Division of Indian and Native American Programs of the Employment and Training Administration in the Department of Labor.

Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work. The 1996 welfare legislation had nine activities for helping to move people from welfare to work. Any evaluation of the program would need to also evaluate the effectiveness of these activities. The activities are:[\[37\]](#)

Mobilizing the Business Community. Over 10,000 participating businesses have now hired people from the welfare roles.

Connecting Small Businesses with New Workers. SBA provides assistance to businesses through its 1-800-U-ASK-SBA.

Mobilizing Civic, Religious, and Non-Profit Groups.

"Doing Our Fair Share" with the Federal Government's Hiring Initiative. The Federal agencies have committed to directly hire at least 10,000 welfare recipients over four years, and has already hired over 9700 welfare recipients.

Funds to Help Move More People from Welfare-to-Work, with a Focus on Fathers.

Tax Credits for Employers.

Welfare-to-Work Housing Vouchers.

Welfare-to-Work Transportation.

Eliminating Anti-Work and Anti-Family Rules that Denied Families Health Coverage.

What makes a job training program effective? The Cooperative Health Care Network, a federation of three employee-owned home care cooperatives in the South Bronx, New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, which has participated in the Welfare-to-Work program, identified ten factors necessary to succeed:[\[38\]](#)

Create a Decent Job - full-time with benefits at 150% minimum wage after a year.

Invest in Workers for the Long Term - including career and educational advancement.

Prepare for the Shocks of Transition from welfare.

Be Flexible, but Tough.

Create and Support Systematic Responses,

Value the Individual.

Create a Community within Work.

Emphasize the Front-Line Supervisor.

Invest in Employer-based Training.

Recognize that Context is Everything.

A 1997 study suggested that the Welfare-to-Work programs should adopt School-to-work strategies – including mentoring, contextual learning and instruction and credentialing.[\[39\]](#) The author suggested that for success, private sector businesses should no longer assume that new hires be job ready. Employers tend to make very limited investments in training their low-skilled workers.

Welfare-to-Work programs are often cost-effective, but overall levels of poverty, welfare receipt, and unemployment remain high even after participation in welfare to work programs.[\[40\]](#)

A research study of welfare and unemployment clients in California found that training programs didn't target the right jobs.[\[41\]](#) There were, for example, too many with experience for cashier positions and janitor and cleaning jobs, and too few for computer systems, mining, manufacturing, and wholesale sales representatives.

A 1995 GAO report[\[42\]](#) evaluated five programs aimed at helping unwed teenage mothers to obtain a high school diploma or GED

certificate. In three of the five programs there were increased high school or GED completions. All three of these programs actively monitored school attendance and follow up on attendance with either financial incentives or sanctions and/or aided in resolving barriers to school attendance. The other two programs did not. The three more successful programs also provided access to child care and transportation.

The National Partnership for Women and Families is working to overcome discrimination against welfare recipients.[\[43\]](#) A survey done by the Partnership found evidence of discrimination against women, racial minorities, ethnic minorities, and the disabled. The report lists more than a dozen pieces of federal legislation that need to be used to protect worker rights.

E. Example of a Model Program

The Asbestos Removal Job Training and Placement Project for Offenders[\[44\]](#) places ex-offenders into good paying asbestos removal jobs. The project involves the close collaboration of community corrections (5th Judicial District), a community based organization (Iowa Comprehensive Human Services), the Iowa Laborers Training Fund, and asbestos removal contractors through Laborers Local #177 and other Laborers Local Unions in Iowa. Corrections staff identify and screen potential trainees, then a joint selection committee of project collaborators selects the project participants. ICHS provides project coordination and work readiness training to the participants, and the Laborers provide the skill training and job placement. The Corrections staff offers on-going support and follow-up services for offenders upon placement. The Central Iowa Employment and Training Consortium provides additional referrals to the project, basic and remedial skill training, and additional job skill training opportunities. Participants are placed in jobs and receive union wages and benefits.

F. The Newest Legislation

The Workplace Investment Act (PL 105-220) was signed into law August 7, 1998, and replaces or enhances aspects of the JTPA legislation. The Workforce Investment Act works with JTPA and other training programs to move from a complex, cumbersome, fragmented "one size fits all" system to a more integrated, performance-driven system that offers more customer choice. A major goal of the Workforce Investment Act is to provide access to state-of-the-art training programs geared to real job opportunities in local communities. A customer-friendly system of "one stop career centers" will identify career options, encourage participation, and facilitate training. Sixty federal job training, vocational rehabilitation, and adult education programs are to be coordinated. Five expectations of the "one-stop" approach are:

ceive a preliminary assessment of ones skill levels, aptitudes, abilities, and support service needs.

tain information on a fully array of employment-related services.

ceive help filing claims for unemployment insurance and evaluating eligibility for job training and education programs or student financial aid.

tain job search and placement assistance and receive career counseling.

ve access to up-to-date labormarket information.

Required partners in the "One-Stop" approach include:[\[45\]](#)

ult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth Activities,

ployment Service,

ult Education,

secondary Vocational Education,

ational Rehabilitation,

lfare-to-Work,

le V of the Older Americans Act,

de Adjustment Assistance,

FTA Transitional Adjustment Assistance,

erans Employment and Training Programs,

Community Services Block Grant,

employment and training activities carried out by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development,

employment Insurance.

One billion dollars is used to help out-of-school youth, to provide teenage boys with the training they need to get a job and support their families, and to help teenage girls avoid the downward cycle of getting pregnant, dropping out of school and landing on welfare. The overall budget is approximately \$5 billion, with the use of another \$6 billion from other federal programs that will work out of the one-stop centers. Job-training programs financed by corporations, foundations, and labor unions will draw even more money into the effort.[\[46\]](#)

The Act establishes “individual training accounts” for eligible participants, who will use vouchers to enroll in specific career education and skill training programs. Those seeking assistance will no longer be limited to a few predetermined options. As long as there are real job opportunities in the field selected and the training program meets performance standards, individuals will be free to choose the option that best suits their needs.[\[47\]](#) The legislation has seven major principles:[\[48\]](#)

Streamlined Services

Empowering Individuals

Universal Access

Increased Accountability

New Roles for Local Boards

State and Local Flexibility

Improved Youth Services

Some have commented that one of the best parts of the federal Workforce Investment Act is the creation of a simplified system to connect job seekers with employers who have vacancies to fill.[\[49\]](#) Another strong point of the legislation is called the “G.I. Bill for workers” because it confers more independence and opportunity on workers to find training that matches their skills and interests.[\[50\]](#)

Examples of Greater Choice and Opportunities for Job Seekers:[\[51\]](#)

Working with Welfare-to-Work agencies, job training agencies now have an increased capacity to pay child care costs for welfare-to-work trainees.

Job seekers who want a job will have the option of being referred directly to a job without first being required to apply for job training and job readiness services.

Individuals can participate in training after they become employed to help them stay on the job – fostering the “work first” approach under welfare reform.

The waiving of past restrictions means laid-off workers can gain work experience essential for new careers; prior to this, they could only access reemployment assistance and related training.

VI. CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL SERVICE: AMERICORPS

The Corporation for National and Community Service was created by the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. Programs of the Corporation include AmeriCorps, VISTA, the National Civilian Community Corps, Learn and Serve America, and the Senior Volunteer Program. The Corporation also oversees the Commission for National and Community Service and ACTION.

Volunteers are eligible for education awards of \$4725 upon completion of service. All full-time members receive a modest living allowance, health insurance, and sometimes child care assistance and relocation expenses.

A. AmeriCorps*NCCC

AmeriCorps*NCCC is a program for individuals 18 to 24 years old, doing service projects from trail building and disaster relief to tutoring and construction.

B. AmeriCorps*VISTA

AmeriCorps*VISTA is a program for individuals 18 or older, to organize and develop a community service program, mobilize volunteers and dig up resources to get things done in a needy community.

There have been instances of liaison between AmeriCorps and Welfare-to-Work programs. For example, in collaboration with the Rhode Island Department of Human Services and the Providence School Department, AmeriCorps developed an education award in which participants continued to receive their public assistance benefits. The program, called "Parents Making a Difference" serves as training for jobs as educational aides and assistants in the schools. [52]

Evaluation of AmeriCorps. The Corporation for National Service contracted with AmeriCorps Alum, Inc. to develop a system of tracking graduates of national service. Research was conducted to assess civic involvement and leadership of the AmeriCorps Leader Program alumni, but the survey instrument will be transferable to the larger AmeriCorps national service network and provide comparable data to existing surveys. A telephone survey in 1998 reached 90 percent of alumni. Forty percent of those respondents then returned written surveys. One problem in efficient tracking was the fact that 81 percent of the alumni had changed residences since graduating. [53]

VII. DEPARTMENT OF VETERAN AFFAIRS

A. Veterans' Job Training

The Veteran's Job Training Act provides funds for a designated period to employers who hire and train veterans.

VIII. EPA BROWNFIELDS

A. Brownfields Workforce Development: Job Training and Development Demonstration Pilots

EPA, other federal agencies, local job training organizations, community colleges, labor groups, and others have established partnerships to develop long-term plans for fostering workforce development through environmental training, ensure the recruitment of trainees from socio-economically disadvantaged communities, provide quality worker-training, and allow local residents an opportunity to qualify for jobs developed as a result of Brownfields efforts. [54]

The Brownfields Job Training and Development Demonstration Pilots will each be funded up to \$200,000 over two years. These Pilots will bring together community groups, job training organizations, educators, labor groups, investors, lenders, developers, and other affected parties to address the issue of providing environmental employment and training for residents in communities impacted by brownfields.

EPA and the Department of Labor signed a Memorandum of Understanding to establish policies and procedures in support of the Brownfields Initiative and the Employment and Training Administration at the Department of Labor is providing information and technical assistance to each state JTPA Liaison. EPA is also working with NIEHS and the Minority Worker Training Program to develop minority youth training programs in brownfields pilot cities. EPA and the Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education and School-to-Work programs are working to identify outreach mechanisms for local public schools. And EPA is also working with the Department of Veterans Affairs on a Memorandum of Understanding. In cooperation with the Hazardous Materials Training and Research Institute (HMTRI), EPA is working to expand environmental training and curriculum development at community colleges located near brownfields pilots. Over 60 community colleges have benefited from HMTRI training. [55]

The location and sponsor of Brownfields demonstration pilots include the following:

Camden and Newark, New Jersey: New Jersey Youth Corps

Clearwater, Florida: Career Options of Pinellas, Inc.

Dallas, Texas: Texas A&M University, Texas Engineering Extension Service, Dallas

Kansas City, Missouri: Metropolitan Community Colleges, Kansas City

Lynn and Somerville, Massachusetts: Jobs for Youth-Boston

Miami-Dade, Florida: Miami-Dade Community College

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Milwaukee Community Service Corps

New Bedford, Massachusetts: New Bedford, MA

Oakland, California: Oakland Private Industry Council

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Impact Services Corporation

Richmond, California: Richmond Employment and Training Department.

IX. NIEHS/EPA MINORITY WORKER TRAINING PROGRAM

The Minority Worker Training Program (MWTP) was established to provide a series of national pilot programs to test a range of strategies for the recruitment and training of young persons, who live near hazardous waste sites or in the community at risk of exposure to contaminated properties, for work in the environmental field. These environmental career-oriented projects are developed within the context of other social and health needs of the community. The programs provide pre-employment job training, including literacy, life skills, environmental preparation, and other related courses, construction skills training, environmental worker training including hazardous waste, asbestos and lead abatement training, and safety and health training. Some training also includes enrollment in apprenticeship programs for construction and environmental remediation worker training. Particular focus is placed on mentoring.

The programs target twelve cities: Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles, Memphis, Minneapolis/St. Paul, New Orleans, New York, Oakland, San Francisco, and Washington, DC.

In Fiscal year 1998 alone, 240 minority students received over 146,000 contact hours of training in 20 subjects. One hundred fifty-six of these students are now employed, a placement rate of 65 percent; and some of the remaining 35 percent have gone on to higher education. The jobs they hold are in the environmental field, in general construction, and in lead, asbestos, and hazardous waste management. Eighty-four percent are African American, 14 percent Hispanic, one percent Pacific Islanders, and one percent Asian, including Cambodians and Laotians.

According to data compiled by one awardee, the New York/New Jersey Consortium, wages earned by its trainees equal or exceed the total costs of training. Graduates in the 1995-96 and 1996-97 programs have earned significant incomes. The earliest graduates earned a median income of \$17,215, before benefits, with a maximum of \$44,315. Over the course of both program cycles, the students earned a combined pre-benefit total of \$385,606 roughly equal to the total award to the consortium for a single year of training.

The MWTP program promotes partnerships or subagreements with academic and other institutions, with a focus on historically black colleges and universities, public schools, and community-based organization. The awardees of the MWTP program are:

Clark Atlanta University: In cooperation with the Laborers-AGC Training Fund and Xavier University, Clark Atlanta is working with youth, 18-25 years old, in environmentally impacted neighborhoods in Atlanta and New Orleans.

Jackson State University: Jackson State is working in cooperation with the Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA-Local #145) to train minority youth in disadvantaged communities in Mississippi.

Laborers-AGC Education and Training Fund: The Fund is working in cooperation with the Laborers Health & Safety Fund, the Building & Construction Trades Department (AFL-CIO), Cuyahoga Community College, Clean Sites Inc., the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and San Francisco State University. Focus is on trainees in Cleveland and San Francisco. Built into the program are such incentives as stipends, child care, and transportation.

Carpenters Health and Safety Fund (Center to Protect Workers Rights): The consortium includes the Ironworkers National Training Fund, the Painters and Allied Trades Labor-Management Fund, the Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons Union, the Sheet Metal Workers Training Fund, Delgado Community College, the Community College of Southern Nevada, the National Association of Minority Contractors, and the International Union of Operating Engineers. In addition there are members of the Environmental Justice Construction Consortium – including the Roofers Union, Cypress Mandela Training Center, DePaul University, and Louisiana Technical College-Sydney Collier Campus as well as others named above. Target areas are New Orleans, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, and Minneapolis.

DePaul University: The consortium includes People for Community Recovery, Inc. and the Lauback Center for Workforce Education. The DePaul program targets minority youth in Southeast Chicago.

New York/New Jersey Consortium: The consortium includes Hunter College, the New York City Environmental Justice Alliance, Magnolia Tree Earth Center, the West Harlem Environmental Action, the New York Carpenters Labor Technical College, El Puente de Williamsburg, and the South Bronx Clean Air Coalition. Part of the New York/New Jersey Hazardous Materials Worker Training Center, the goal of the Alliance is to employ young people of color in the environmental clean up field. The training and counseling program focuses on literacy, math, job and personal skills, as well as environmental and safety awareness. The Alliance also sees opportunities to encourage trainees who complete this program to continue their education to a college degree. At completion, graduates will be qualified to perform a range of environmental work and the graduates of the program are linked to local employers, contractors, and schools. The training program recruits individuals from disadvantaged communities into a Pre-Apprentice Training Program conducted by the New York Carpenters Labor Technical College. Trainees are trained for four kinds of environmental work: hazardous material handling and remediation, asbestos abatement, lead paint abatement, and confined space entry.

X. THE SUPERFUND JOB TRAINING INITIATIVE (SUPERJTI)

EPA's Super JTI program provides training to community residents and promotes employment with Superfund site contractors. The program focuses on job training for residents living near Superfund sites, particularly in disadvantaged communities. Residents who take part in the program gain career skills and participate in environmental remediation activities in their neighborhood. Superfund JTI provides classroom and hands-on work experience. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Community Involvement has partnered with the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) to provide the training. The program has two tiers: Tier 1 is a basic jobs training program and Tier 2 is more extensive and includes the Department of Labor's registered apprenticeship program. Some of the Tier 1 tasks at EPA facilities include: providing site security, stocking and tracing materials inventory, acquiring materials from local resources, tracking trucks entering or leaving site, participating in site cleanup, supporting decontamination activities, and assisting in sample collection and laboratory activities. Some of the Tier 2 activities include: environmental analyst, well drill operator, construction worker, laboratory technician, plant operator, welding technician, hazardous waste materials technician, and industrial engineering technician.

EPA is working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to model SuperJTI Tier 2 after HUD's Step-Up Program, which incorporates an apprenticeship program and provides employment opportunities for housing residents.

Super JTI recruits young people between the ages of 18 and 25 in communities where there are Superfund sites and then provides them with environmental technician training predominantly through the NIEHS Worker Education and Training Program. Upon completion of training, participants are helped to find jobs in the remediation industry. Through the interagency agreement with EPA, NIEHS has awarded a further \$3 million for the development of Brownfields environmental job training programs targeting people of color at 11 of the 16 Brownfields Showcase Communities. Thirteen MWTP programs are now operating in brownfields pilot sites. In one alliance, NIEHS MWTP awardees Laborers-AGC Education and Training Fund and the University of Massachusetts-Lowell have joined forces with the Coalition for a Better Acre, the Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association, and Lowell Public Schools Adult Education-Program. The city of Lowell, a Brownfield Showcase community, contains one of the most contaminated Superfund sites in New England as well as 97 other hazardous waste sites. Trainees belonging to several low-income minority groups, including Cambodians, Laotians, Columbians, Puerto Ricans, Chileans, and West Indians, have been trained to fill jobs as environmental technicians and construction laborers.

Pilot sites for Super JTI, include the following:

- Clark Atlanta University

Agricultural Street Landfill Community, New Orleans, LA. Five men selected from the community joined with the 1997 class of MWTP trainees at Xavier University. All five students completed every facet of basic skills and technical training. At the end of 1997 two were employed and three had employment pending.

RSR Smelter Site, West Dallas, TX. Under development is a partnership among the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice at Xavier University, the New Start Community Organization, and the Laborer's-AGC Education and Training Fund. The project is designed to recruit 15 community residents for training and conduct a six week job training cycle.

- Center to Protect Workers Rights (United Brotherhood of Carpenters Health and Safety Fund)

East Palo Alto, CA. A partnership of the Carpenters' District Council, OIC-West, DePaul University, Private Industry Council, the City of East Palo Alto Economic Development Office, Mission Community College, and the Regional EOA office is to train 22 residents. Union contractors have been awarded construction work for the new airport construction project and 20 jobs have been lined up for the East Palo Alto program graduates. Students will receive basic remedial skills, general construction training, lead abatement training, asbestos abatement training, confined space training, underground storage tank training, and hazardous waste worker training.

- DePaul University

NL Taracorp Site, Granite City, IL. In 1997, sixteen ethnic minority residents, ages 18-25, from the community surrounding the Superfund site in Granite City participated in education and environmental technician training. Involved in the partnership, were DePaul, NIEHS, EPA, the US Army Corps of Engineers, Belleville Area Community College, Venice Lincoln Technical Center, and OHM Remediation Services Corporation.

Dutchboy Site, Chicago, IL. During 1998, DePaul provided training in cooperation with the Abraham Lincoln Center, the One Stop program, and EPA region 5 for residents surrounding the site.

Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC. DePaul subcontracted with the Alice Hamilton Occupational Health Center to provide training for residents surrounding the Washington Navy Yard Site. Partnership includes the Bridges to Friendship which is dedicated to supporting the cleanup and redevelopment of the Washington Navy Yard and the greater Southeast Washington Community. In addition to the \$100,000 from the regular Minority Worker Training Program, an additional \$15,000 was awarded to support Super JTI efforts at the Navy Yard.

- PACE (OCAW)

North Denver Super JTI Site. PACE is partnering with EPA Region 8 and other local community based organizations to train minority Latino residents of North Denver, Colorado to be prepared for employment on Superfund cleanup. Partners include EOA Region 8, Colorado People's Environmental and Economic Network (COPEEN), and the Denver Mayor's office. Forty-eight trainees will be recruited from residents of the Swansea, Elyria, and Globeville communities.

XI. OVERALL EVALUATION

Evaluating the impact of federal job training programs is no easy matter. There have been many evaluations, using many different methodologies. A summary of research on the economic impacts of employment and training programs was released by the Office of the Chief Economist at the Department of Labor in January 1995.^[56] The study reviews four basic types of employment services: job

search assistance, short-term classroom training, long-term classroom training, and subsidized employment usually in the form of on-the-job training. The study came to eight overall conclusions:^[57]

At least some services have been successful for every population examined.

Interventions have larger net impacts on some populations than on others. With some exceptions, such as the Job Corps and the CET program, most interventions for disadvantaged out-of-school youth have not shown measurable long-term success. In contrast, programs for disadvantaged adult women have often produced positive impacts.

Results from successful programs are significant but moderate on average.

Many employment services for displaced workers and the disadvantaged appear to be cost-effective investments. Returns to society of \$1.40 or more per dollar invested have been found in reliable evaluations of JTPA training for disadvantaged adults, the Job Corps, the San Jose CET, many welfare-to-work programs, and job search assistance for displaced workers.

It is important to make a wide variety of training and employment programs accessible to workers.

It appears to take time for programs to begin to work.

Only a limited range of interventions have been tried, and even fewer have been evaluated. For example, most training programs for the disadvantaged have been short-term and not particularly intensive. Also important is the fact that employment and training programs have rarely been able to saturate a single neighborhood or community, and have rarely been combined with a range of other interventions directed at the same areas. There is evidence that such a comprehensive approach may be more successful than isolated interventions.

Continued progress requires additional evidence.

There are many ways to look at the effectiveness of employment and training programs: how they are implemented, qualitative descriptions of their effect on participants, their effect on some measure of participant skills (such as test scores), client satisfaction with the program, the measurable impact of the program on the future success of its participants.^[58] Perhaps key to the methodological problems of evaluation is how to determine what the labor market experience of participants would have been without access to a given program.^[59]

So far, programs oriented toward rapid job placement have shown better employment results than programs that focus on classroom education alone.^[60]

Job Search Assistance (JSA). JSA had positive effects for every population for whom it has been tried. It seems to accelerate the process of getting a job, but not make a permanent difference in the quality of job obtained.^[61]

Short-Term Classroom Training. The record of short term – three to six months – classroom training has been very mixed. A few programs have shown some success, but in most cases short-term classroom training has not been found to be particularly successful.^[62]

Long-Term Classroom Training. A 1995 Labor Department study concluded that long-term education and training is likely to be an effective strategy for some disadvantaged persons and displaced workers.^[63] These programs are primarily college and community college programs and Job Corps.

Subsidized Employment Approaches. Subsidized employment has proven remarkably successful for single mothers who are on AFDC. In some cases it has been successful in helping other adult populations, although the evidence is more mixed than for single mothers.^[64]

In a recent study, Canada's Fraser Institute looked at U.S. programs to train workers – such as those targeted at welfare recipients, youths from low-income families, and school dropouts. The study concluded these programs just are not working.^[65] The Fraser study suggests that improved education at the elementary and secondary level, rather than intervention later in life, is the key to progress.

More Involvement By Small Business is Needed. A 1996 GAO report found that large employers are about twice as likely to take advantage of several types of training programs as are small employers. Small employers may perceive barriers that make participation in training programs more difficult.^[66]

What makes a program successful? In Congressional testimony^[67] in 1996, Carlotta Joyner from GAO summarized the elements necessary for a successful job training program, successful in terms of project completion rates, job placement and retention rates, and wages at first job. The four key features are:

Ensuring that clients are committed to training and getting a job;

Removing barriers, such as a lack of child care, that might limit the client's ability to finish training and get and keep a job;

Improving clients' employability skills, such as getting to a job regularly and on time, working well with others while there, and dressing and behaving appropriately; and

Linking occupational skills training with the local labor market.

The General Accounting Office in a 1994 series of evaluations on job training programs (see bibliography), identified some of the following problems:

Not tailoring assistance to job seeker needs

- > Little effort to monitor performance or measure impact
- > Basic data often missing
- > Many programs not collecting data on whether participants obtained jobs.

GAO recommended that improvements be made in tracking and in progress across program lines.

XII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Minority Worker Training Program and the Superfund Jobs Training Initiative are active job training programs, under the authorities of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and the Environmental Protection Agency. They are both relatively new programs in the arena of federal job training and, as such, have much to learn from the strengths and weaknesses of the many other job training programs within the federal system.. Many individual initiatives are already in partnership with School-to-Work and JTPA activities. This short paper is intended to aid not only in understanding, but in facilitating additional partnership opportunities. As appendices to this paper are several lists of contact persons and offices around the United States which may be starting points for partnership development.

[1] U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "ETA Mission, Strategy, Values, and Goals," undated.

[2] "Blue-collar training gets better reputation," Boston Herald, July 14, 1998.

[3] <http://www.stw.ed.gov/grants/typegran.htm>, downloaded February 19, 1999.

[4] <http://www.flstw.fsu.edu/grants.html>, downloaded February 19, 1999.

[5] "Cincinnati School-to-Work," America@Work, AFL-CIO, January 1999.

[6] U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Leaders of Change! Successful Workforce Development Projects, Workforce Development Forums, November 1993, p. 9.

[7] U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Chief Economist, p. 21.

[8] Reported in "One in Four Businesses Participate in School-To-Work Partnerships," Employment and Training Reporter, November 26, 1997, p. 245.

[9] Jennifer Autrey, "Official says job program helps pupils build future," Fort Worth Texas Star Telegram, November 2, 1998.

[10] "The America Works Partnership," <http://www.awp.org>, downloaded February 20, 1999.

[11] <http://www.awp.org/success.htm>, downloaded February 20, 1999.

[12] "Funding Availability for Youthbuild Program," <http://www.hud.gov/nofa/suprnofa/supnofa2/4363se>, downloaded February 12, 1999.

[13] Irwin Kirsch, Ann Jungeblut, and Anne Campbell, Beyond the School Doors: The Literacy Needs of Job Seekers Served by the U.S. Department of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor and Educational Testing Service, September 1992, p. 5.

- [14] U.S. Department of Labor, ETA, "Fact Sheet: Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program," undated.
- [15] U.S. Department of Labor, ETA, "Fact Sheet: Native American Program," undated.
- [16] U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Youth Fair Chance Program," <http://www.doleta.gov/programs/factsht/yfc.htm>, downloaded February 12, 1999.
- [17] U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Fact Sheet: Job Corps," undated.
- [18] U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Chief Economist, "What's Working (and what's not), January 1995, p.14.
- [19] "Job Placement," <http://www.jobcorps.org/place.htm>, downloaded February 9, 1999.
- [20] U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Chief Economist, "What's Working (and what's not), January 1995.
- [21] Ibid., p.15.
- [22] Ruth Igoe, "Navy Reinforces Job Corps Efforts," Kansas City Star, September 1, 1998, p. B1.
- [23] National Center for Policy Analysis, "Job Training Success Overstated," 1998, <http://www.ncpa.org/pd/budget/pd1998b.html>, downloaded March 15, 1999.
- [24] Abt Associates, "The National JTPA Study: Overview," A Report to the U.S. Department of Labor, January 1994, pp. 5-6.
- [25] U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Chief Economist, "What's Working (and what's not), January 1995, p.13.
- [26] U.S. General Accounting Office, Job Training Partnership Act: Long-Term Earnings and Employment Outcomes, GAO/HEHS-96-40, March 1996.
- [27] Kirsch et al., p. 117.
- [28] Cited in James Bovard, Cato Institute, "JTPA: Another Federal Training Fraud," Policy Analysis, No. 131, March 27, 1990, <http://www.dato.org/pubs/pas/pa131es.html>, downloaded March 15, 1999.
- [29] National Conference of State Legislatures, "Education, Labor and Job Training," <http://www.ncsl.org/statefed/policies/96-97/EDUCATE.htm>, downloaded March 15, 1999, p. 5.
- [30] "Report: District of Columbia: Job Training Review," August 7, 1997.
- [31] U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Chief Economist, "What's Working (and what's not), January 1995, p.18.
- [32] Ibid.
- [33] Ibid.
- [34] U.S. General Accounting Office, Welfare Reform: Status of Awards and Selected States' Use of Welfare-to-Work Grants, GAO/HEHS-99-40, February 1999, p.1.
- [35] "Welfare-to-Work Grants," 20 CFR Part 645, Federal Register, Volume 62, Number 222, November 18, 1997, p. 61594.
- [36] <http://www.fta.dot.gov/wtw/access-to-jobs-bochure.html>, downloaded March 24, 1999.
- [37] "Clinton-Gore Accomplishments Reforming Welfare," <http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/Welfare/Accomp.html>, downloaded, March 24, 1999.
- [38] As cited in "Health Network's Higher Wages Help Low-Income Employees Leave Rolls," Employment and Training Reporter, July 30, 1997, p. 928.
- [39] Judith Combes-Taylor, "Learning at Work in a Work-Based Welfare System: Opportunities and Obstacles, Lessons from the School-to-Work Experience," Jobs for the Future, Boston, MA, cited in "Providers Can Learn Lessons From School-Based Job Training Programs," Employment and Training Reporter, July 2, 1997, p. 868.
- [40] U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Chief Economist, "What's Working (and what's not), January 1995, p. 36.
- [41] Reported in Lisa Toloken, "Training Programs Don't Target Right Jobs, Report Says," Employment and Training Reporter, Washington, DC, November 19, 1997, p.234.
- [42] U.S. General Accounting Office, Welfare to Work: Approaches That Help Teenage Mothers Complete High School, GAO/HEHS/PEMD-95-202,

September 1995.

[43] National Partnership for Women & Families, "Preventing Discrimination: A Guide for Caseworkers and Others Helping Welfare Recipients Enter the Workforce," Washington, DC, January 1999.

[44] U.S. Department of Labor, Leaders of Change!, p. 10. Contact: Iowa Comprehensive Human Services, Tel. 515-245-7800.

[45] U.S. Department of Labor, ETA, "Implementing the Workforce Investment Act of 1998," Draft, October 8, 1998, p. 6.

[46] "A 'Third Way' of Job Training," National Journal, September 19, 1998, p. 2164.

[47] Senator Edward Kennedy, op-ed, "Bay State Must Organize its Job Efforts," The Standard-Times, New Bedford, Massachusetts, August 17, 1998.

[48] "Workforce Investment Act of 1998," <http://usworkforce.org/wia/wia7shw/slide1.html>, downloaded March 18, 1999.

[49] Editorial, Seattle Times, August 12, 1998, http://seattletimes.com/news/editorial/html98/altjobbed_081298.html, downloaded March 15, 1999.

[50] Editorial, Seattle Times, August 12, 1998, http://seattletimes.com/news/editorial/html98/altjobbed_081298.html, downloaded March 15, 1999.

[51] U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) Waivers," Press Release, July 1977, <http://www.dol.gov/dol/opa/public/>.

[52] Corporation for National Service, "Career Ladders, Community Service, and Welfare-to-Work," Research: Fellows Reports, http://www.cns.gov/research/fellows_reports/barnes_heleen.html, downloaded March 5, 1999.

[53] Corporation for National Service, "Examining Life After AmeriCorps," Research: Fellows Reports, http://www.cns.gov/research/fellows_report/nakatani.html, downloaded March 5, 1999.

[54] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, "Brownfields Workforce Development," <http://www.epa.gov/swerosps/bf/job.htm>, downloaded April 12, 1999.

[55] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Brownfields - Workforce Development," EPA 500-F-97-158, September 1997, <http://www.epa.gov/swerosps/bf/html-doc/wkforc2.htm>, downloaded, April 12., 1999.

[56] U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Chief Economist, "What's Working (and what's not)," January 1995.

[57] *Ibid.*, pp. x-xi.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[59] Abt Associates Inc., "The National JTPA Study: Impacts, Benefits, and Costs of Title II-A," A Report to the U.S. Department of Labor, March 1994, p. 7.

[60] U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Chief Economist, "What's Working (and what's not), January 1995, p. 37.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[65] National Center for Policy Analysis, "Fraser Institute: Do Government Training Programs Work?" 1997, <http://www.ncpa.org/pd/budget/feb98.html>, downloaded March 15, 1999.

[66] U.S. General Accounting Office, Job Training: Small Business Participation in Selected Training Programs, GAO/HEHS-96-106, April 1996, p.2.

[67] Carlotta Joyner, Director, Education and Employment Issues, Division of Health, Education, and Human Services, U.S. General Accounting Office, "Successful Projects Share Common Strategy, Testimony Before Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, U.S. House of Representatives, GAO/T-HEHS-96-127, April 18, 1996, pp. 1-2.