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Job Training Success Project: A Comprehensive Research Initiative

Research Questions

-- Which supportive services are most critical to success in job training programs?
-- How widely available are these supports?
-- Is there evidence that supportive services improve outcomes?
-- What are some strategies for increasing the impact and leveraging resources to access support services?

Methods

– Research review
– Expert interviews
– Program scan
– Promising practices study
– Online surveys of trainees and program administrators
Program Administrator Survey

- Disseminated over three months
- 268 completed survey responses
- 300 partially completed survey responses
Characteristics of Responding Organizations

- Most organizations described themselves as a nonprofit (72%) or government agency (22%)
- Community colleges (31%) and direct social service providers (27%) make up the largest share of organizations
- 71% have a location in an urban area
- 41% have a location in a suburban area
- 36% have a location in a rural area

Note: Respondents were allowed to choose more than one category for organization type. Some organizations have more than one location.
Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
The Majority of Survey Respondents Provide Job Training

Work Done by Organizations

- Provide job training: 83%
- Work with a partner org that provides support services: 57%
- Work with partner org that provides job training: 53%
- Refer individuals to job training providers: 48%
- Screen JT individuals to determine support needs: 46%
- Refer clients to job training: 42%
- Provide support services to JT individuals: 38%
- Other: 8%

Note: N=441. Respondents were allowed to choose multiple answers. Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Supportive Services
Non-Completion is Most Often Due to Financial Hardship or Insufficient Child Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial considerations</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient child care</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not have/afford transportation</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training too difficult/inadequate preparation</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours/scheduling got in the way</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health issues (theirs or a family member's)</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed to care for a family member</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure of their career goals</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training was not what was expected/wanted</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not have/afford housing</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked to leave by the program</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate partner or family violence</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=239. Data include only organizations that offer job training. Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Administrators Agree That Support Services Are Vital to Job Training Completion

Importance of Support Services on Retention and Completion

- Very important: 85.7%
- Important: 11.0%
- Somewhat important: 2.8%
- Not important: 0.0%
- Don't know: 0.6%

Note: N=182. Data include only organizations that offer job training.
Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Job Training Participants Much More Likely to Receive Case Management than Any Other Support Service

Percent of Organizations That Reported At Least Half of Participants Receive Support from any Source

- **Case Management**: 60.3%
- **Financial Education & Counseling**: 49.1%
- **Transportation Assistance**: 41.0%
- **Help Accessing Public Benefits**: 39.4%
- **Assistance Obtaining Clothing/Shoes**: 29.5%
- **Other Support Services**: 29.3%
- **Health Care**: 26.1%
- **Peer Support Groups**: 24.3%
- **Child Care Assistance**: 18.9%
- **Housing Assistance**: 17.8%
- **Mental Health Counseling**: 13.2%
- **Substance Abuse Counseling**: 9.8%
- **Emergency Cash Assistance**: 8.5%
- **Services for DV Survivors**: 6.6%
- **Pregnancy Prevention Services**: 6.1%
- **Legal Services**: 6.1%

Note: The N for each service ranges from a low of 205 (other support services) to a high of 214 (financial education and counseling). Data include only organizations that offer job training. Denominator includes those who responded “don’t know” as part of those NOT receiving services.

Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Participants’ Support Service Needs Are Only Partially Met

Perception of Extent to Which Participants' Needs Are Met

- **2%** of the participants' needs are being met extremely well.
- **20%** of the participants' needs are being met well.
- **70%** of the participants' needs are being met to some extent.
- **8%** of the participants' needs are not being met well.
- **1%** of the participants' needs are not being met at all.

Note: N=174. Data include only organizations that offer job training.
Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Greatest Unmet Needs Differ Between Women & Men in Training

Top 3 Greatest Unmet Needs Among Women & Men in Job Training Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Emergency</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Mental Health</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=220 (women), N=206 (men). Percent of respondents who identified the need as among the top five greatest. Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Organizations Would Like to Provide More Services to Job Training Participants

Top 5 Supports Administrators Would Like to Provide/Provide More Of

- Transportation assistance: 57.2%
- Child care assistance: 56.7%
- Emergency cash assistance: 54.9%
- Housing assistance: 47.0%
- Mental health counseling: 44.2%

Note: N=215.
Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Funding Difficulties are the Main Reason for Not Providing More Services

Reason Support Service is not Provided/Provided More Often

- Child care assistance: 48.8%, Lack of Funding 29.3%, Lack of staff 14.0%
- Housing assistance: 42.8%, Lack of Funding 26.0%, Lack of staff 13.0%
- Transportation assistance: 51.2%, Lack of Funding 27.0%, Lack of staff 15.8%
- Emergency cash assistance: 50.7%, Lack of Funding 32.1%, Lack of staff 14.0%
- Mental health counseling: 40.0%, Lack of Funding 26.0%, Lack of staff 14.0%

Note: N=215.
Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Few Respondents Believe Support Services are Adequately Funded

Perceived Adequacy of Funding Levels for Supportive Services

- Don't know 10%
- Adequately Funded 11%
- Not Adequately Funded 37%
- Some are, but others are not 42%

Note: N=109.
Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Funding for Support Services Comes from a Variety of Sources

Sources of Funding for Support Services

- Private foundations: 68.7%
- Public funding: 64.8%
- General operating funds: 58.1%
- Individual donations: 36.3%
- Corporate donations: 28.5%
- Fee-for-service: 15.6%
- Other: 13.4%
- Don't know: 18.4%

Note: N=179. Respondents were allowed to choose more than one answer.
Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Most Have Favorable Views of WIOA

Effects of WIOA on Programs

- Improve program success: 41%
- Worsen program success: 2%
- Some positive and some negative effects: 28%
- Don't know: 29%

Note: N=294.
Source: IWPR survey of Job Training Administrators.
Cost Effective Strategies for Support Service Provision

- Referral Models
- Organizational Partnerships
- Braided Funding
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Key Federal Workforce Policies

• Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)
• SNAP E&T
• Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)

- Signed into law July 2014, replaces the Workforce Investment Act (WIA)
- Implementation began July 1, 2015
- Focus on alignment across federal workforce, education programs

Photo credit: Flickr user Katie Harbath. Used by permission under a Creative Commons license.

www.nationalskillscoalition.org
WIOA – Four Titles, Six “Core” Programs

- Title I – Workforce Development Activities (Adult, Dislocated Worker, Youth)
- Title II – Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA)
- Title III – Wagner-Peyser Act (Employment Services)
- Title IV – Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (vocational rehabilitation)
Career and Training Services under Title I

• Career Services – can include:
  – Skills assessments
  – Job search and placement assistance
  – Assistance with UI, other benefits
  – Career counseling
  – Pre-vocational training
  – Supportive services (incl. child care)

• Adult Training Services
  – Must be on Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL)
  – Exceptions include contracts with CBOs to serve individuals with barriers to employment

• Youth Services
  – Increased focus on out-of-school, older youth (up to 24)
  – Supportive services a required program element
Industry or Sector Partnerships

- Partnerships between multiple employers, local boards, labor, and training providers
- Required at local/regional level, states must provide support
- Specific activities not defined, but can and should include full range of services necessary to engage target populations
WIOA and Career Pathways

• State board must develop strategies to support the use of career pathways

• Local board must lead efforts to develop and implement career pathways with secondary and postsecondary providers

• Youth service strategies must include career pathways

• DOL “toolkit” released in early December
SNAP E&T “50-50” Funds

• States can use “50-50” funds to leverage expertise and resources of partner organizations and expand training/support services for SNAP E&T participants

• Federal government reimburses states for 50% of expenditures on:
  – SNAP E&T program costs
  – Support services, such as transportation, child care, and books & supplies

• Costs eligible for 50% reimbursement must be paid for from certain non-federal funding sources (e.g. state, local, or philanthropic funds)
TANF and Training

• $32 billion in combined FY’14 funds
  – 27 percent cash assistance
  – 16 percent child care
  – 7 percent work related activities

• Restrictions on training, education create coordination challenges

• Increased emphasis on “two-generation” approaches
Strengthening Working Families Initiative

- $54 million in US DOL grants awarded June 14
- Up to 25 percent of budget may be used to support child care
- Focus on innovative strategies (service co-location, non-traditional scheduling)
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CCAMPIS: Childcare Access Means Parents In School

- CCAMPIS is a federally funded grant program that provides financial assistance to income eligible, Lansing Community College student parents who are in need of child care as they enroll, persist and graduate from their academic programs.

- The grant is a four year grant with a 337,850 per year budget allocation

- CCAMPIS serves over 50 families per year in accessing high quality childcare and receiving success coaching reflective of proactive advising.
CCAMPIS @ Lansing Community College: What We Do?
CCAMPIS Administration & Supports

- 1.3 million dollar budget allocation over four years
  71% of grant support directly applies to student child care cost
- Childcare funding support: On average CCAMPIS funds $500 per student per month in high quality childcare both on and off campus
- Advocacy for student parent population to thrive academically
- Campus & community partnerships to create a resource network for student parents to access
- Bridge semester funding for childcare provided to help with enrollment support
- Data collection of student parent indicators, needs, and outcomes
- Continual program improvement and oversight
- Department of Ed reporting of data and outcomes
- Enrollment Action Steps
- Testing & Assessment Guidelines
- Financial Aid Completion Support
- Childcare Access both on and off campus
- Elimination of enrollment barriers i.e. financial responsibility
- Personal support resources
- Social Capital Network
- Campus Engagement Support
- Lunch & Learn Month Seminars
- Academic intervention support
- On going proactive student success coaching
Tuition Worksheet
Funding Model Review

Student Parents must have a clear understanding of cost and value of subsidies received from the various funding sources.

### Early LCC Childcare Cost Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCC Student Parent(s) Name(s):</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant/Toddler</td>
<td>$120/4h*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool (including 4s and 5s)</td>
<td>$140/4h*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Age Summer Camp</td>
<td>$205/4h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>$20/week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 Day Care Fee [per] Day: [ ] $20/4h/week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available Subsidies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC - Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income [less than]: [ ] [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Subsidy/Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee/LC</strong> [Income]</td>
<td>[ ] Eligibility Confirmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Under Subsidies: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPS Income-Based Bidding Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Up to $16,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Up to $15,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Up to $14,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Up to $13,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Up to $12,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Up to $11,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Up to $10,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) Up to $9,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Up to $8,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) Up to $7,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K) Up to $6,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L) Up to $5,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) Up to $4,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) Up to $3,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O) Up to $2,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) Up to $1,000 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q) Up to $0 per child: [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Subsidy/Scholarship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED CO-OP FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:**
- A subsidy is available to families with an annual income up to $16,000.
- A subsidy is not available to families with an annual income over $16,000.
- Families with an income between $16,000 and $20,000 may be eligible for a partial subsidy.
- Additional programs and support may be available for families in need.
Ascend of the Aspen Institute Partnership

Ascend is a policy program of the Aspen Institute and the national hub for breakthrough ideas and collaborations that move vulnerable children and their parents toward educational success and economic security. We take a two-generation approach to our work — focusing on both children and their parents together — and bring a gender and racial equity lens to our analysis.

http://b.3cdn.net/ascend/5d226329f1fe95c6a6_5gm6i2zji.pdf