

Program: JOB CORPS

Population Served:

Size: Currently delivered at 119 Job Corps centers nationwide. Job Corps serves more than 60,000 new enrollees annually.

Age: 16-24

Other Characteristics: Job Corps has been a central part of federal efforts to provide employment assistance to disadvantaged youths between the ages of 16 and 24 since 1964.

Studies: 2 experimental

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Academic education	Center *	Open entry, open exit	Individual and self-paced. Includes remedial education, world of work (consumer education), driver education, home and family living, health education, programs for participants whose primary language is not English, and GED courses.
Vocational training	Center or national labor organizations through contracts with Job Corps	Open entry, open exit	Individual and self-paced. Includes business and clerical, health, construction, culinary arts, and building and apartment maintenance.
Residential living	Center	Open entry, open exit	Nonresidential students limited to 20 percent. Includes meals, dormitory life, entertainment, sports and recreation, center government, center maintenance, and other related activities. Required social skills training.
Health care, health education	Center	Open entry, open exit	Residential and nonresidential. Includes medical examinations and treatment; biochemical tests for drug use, sexually transmitted diseases, and pregnancy; immunizations; dental examinations and treatment; counseling; instruction on basic hygiene, preventive medicine, and self-care.

Program: JOB CORPS

Counseling	Counselors and residential advisors	During involvement in program, recruitment, placement, and transition into regular life and jobs	Help students plan their educational and vocational curricula, offer motivation, and create a supportive environment.
Job placement assistance	Placement contractors (state employment offices, private contractors, or Job Corps centers)	Open entry, open exit	Provide assistance with interviewing and resume writing and services for job development and referral. Distribute the readjustment allowance, a stipend students receive after leaving the program.

* Centers are either contracted out or at U.S. Department of Agriculture Civilian Conservation centers.

Program Objectives/Goals:

To help disadvantaged youths become “more responsible, employable, and productive citizens” through an intensive and comprehensive program that offers academic education, vocational training, residential living, health care services, counseling, and job placement assistance.

Costs:

Job Corps costs approximately \$14,100 per participant. This includes program costs, nonreported costs, and costs of land, buildings, and other capital used by the program.

Study 1:

Schochet, P., Brughardt, J., & Glazerman, S. (2000). *National Job Corps Study: The short-term impacts of Job Corps on participants’ employment and related outcomes*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

Answer the questions: How effective is Job Corps at improving the employability of disadvantaged participants in the short term? Do Job Corps short-term impacts differ for youths with different characteristics? How effective are the residential and nonresidential components of Job Corps in the short term?

Measurement instrument:

Data at baseline, 12-month, and 30-month follow-up surveys; forms filled out by counselors.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental design based on a comparison of eligible program applicants who were randomly assigned to a program group (offered the chance to enroll in Job Corps) or to a control group (not given this option); control group members could apply for other job programs.

Statistical techniques: Difference in means, with significance testing; weighted analysis; analysis control group members for background characteristics that may affect outcomes.

Significance level: $p \leq .05$

Population evaluated: 11,787 youths who completed 30-month interviews.

Program: JOB CORPS

Key Findings:

Findings are presented per eligible applicant, and per participant, each is compared to the control group. When presenting findings per applicant, the term “program group member” is used. When presenting the findings per participant the term “program participant” is used. These are comparable to the “Intent to Treat” (ITT) and “Treatment on the Treated” (TOT) distinction, respectively.

Education and training:

Compared to the control group, program group members were more likely to receive a GED (35 percent compared to about 17 percent) or vocational certificate (28 percent vs. about 8 percent) and to spend more hours in vocational training (4.5 hours per week vs. 1 hour). Participation did not improve college attendance and had negative impacts on receiving a high school diploma for those enrolled in school at the time they were assigned to participate in Job Corps. Only youths over age 17 spent more hours in academic classes than the control group members, the same did not hold true for younger participants (probably because nearly half of the control group was age 16 and 17 and attended high school).

Employment and earnings:

The program increased average weekly earnings after about 2 years from random assignment: In the last quarter of the 30-month follow-up period, the gain in average weekly earnings per participant was \$18, or 11 percent, compared to the control group; average earnings for all participants were \$13 higher per week. The program provided greater gains for very young students, female participants with children, and older youths who did not possess a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment. Program group members secured higher-paying jobs with slightly more benefits in the most recent job in quarter 10 (7.07 vs. 6.82, on average).

According to several nonexperimental analyses, less than half of those who actually enrolled (39 percent) said they received job placement services, and 75 percent took “world of work” classes that taught general skills for getting and keeping a job—preparation of a resume and application, job sources and interviewing, transition issues.

Non-labor market outcomes:

Arrest rates were reduced by 22 percent. For those ages 16 and 17, reductions were largest in the early follow-up period (about 40 percent), before they started leaving the program. Impacts were more sustained for older applicants—the arrest rate for this group did not increase as much after they left the program.

Compared to the control group, program group members reported receiving about \$300 less in public benefits and were less likely to report their health as poor or fair. The program did not significantly affect use of alcohol and illegal drugs or drug treatment services, living with a partner, having a child, or the likelihood of living with or providing support for a child.

Positive impacts for 16- and 17-year-olds are striking:

Earnings gains per participant were nearly 20 percent by the end of the follow-up period. The percentage earning a high school diploma or GED was up by 80 percent. Arrest rates were reduced by 14 percent, and rates of incarceration for a conviction were reduced by 26 percent.

Participation:

73 percent of youths given the opportunity to enroll in Job Corps did so. Program group members reported staying an average of 8 months, with over 25 percent staying more than 1 year.

Other Information:

Program funded through Job Training Partnership Act. Evaluation took place 30 months after assignment to the program group. Time in program varies for each individual; for many, the 30-month point represents short-term (about 0- to 15-month) impacts. Residential and nonresidential components not randomly assigned; therefore, results for this difference are not causal.

Program: JOB CORPS

Study 2:

Schochet, P., Brughardt, J., & Glazerman, S. (2001). *National Job Corps Study: The impacts of Job Corps on participants' employment and related outcomes*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

Answer the questions: How effective is Job Corps at improving the employability of disadvantaged participants in the short term? Do Job Corps impacts differ for youths with different baseline characteristics? How effective are the residential and nonresidential components of Job Corps?

Measurement instrument:

Baseline data and follow-up data at 12-, 30-, and 48-month periods after random assignment.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental design based on a comparison of eligible program applicants who were randomly assigned to a program group (offered the chance to enroll in Job Corps) or to a control group (not given this option); control group members could apply for other job programs.

Statistical techniques: Difference in means, with significance testing; weighted analysis; analysis control group members for background characteristics that may affect outcomes.

Significance level: $p \leq .05$

Population evaluated: 11,313 youths who completed the 48-month interviews (6,828 program group members and 4,485 control group members).

Key Findings:

Findings are presented per eligible applicant and per participant. When presenting findings per applicant the term "program group member" is used. When presenting the findings per participant the term "program participant" is used.

Education and training:

Compared to the control group, program group members were more likely to receive a GED (42 percent vs. 27 percent) or vocational certificate (37 percent vs. 15 percent) and to spend more hours in vocational training (3.1 hours per week vs. to 0.9 hour). Participation had negative impacts on receiving a high school diploma for those without credentials at the time they were assigned to the program: 7.5 percent of control group members received diplomas vs. to 5.3 percent of program group members. Job Corps provided participants with the instructional equivalent of 1 additional year in school.

Participation did not improve college attendance. About 12 percent of each group (program and control) attended 2-year colleges, and about 3 percent attended 4-year colleges. Less than 2 percent obtained college degrees.

Impacts on education and training were large across all subgroups. Older youths spent more hours in academic classes, and program participants in all age groups spent more hours in vocational training. There were no differences in hours spent in academic classes for 16- and 17-year-olds because nearly half of all control group members in that age range attended academic classes in high school.

Program: JOB CORPS

Employment and earnings:

The program increased average weekly earnings after about 2 years from random assignment: In year 4, the gain in average weekly earnings per program participant was \$22, or 12 percent, compared to the control group (average earnings for all program group members were \$16 higher).

Beginning in year 3, program group members were more likely than control group members to be employed, and they spent more time employed. In year 4, 69 percent of the program group was employed, compared to 66 percent of the control group. In year 4, program group members worked 27.4 hours per week, compared to 26 hours per week for control group members.

Program group members secured higher paying jobs (\$7.55 per hour compared to \$7.33, on average) and employed program group members were more likely to receive benefits. In quarter 16, 57 percent of employed program group members received health insurance, compared to 54 percent of employed control group members.

The program provided gains across most key subgroups including those at special risk of poor outcomes (very young students, mothers, youths who had been arrested for nonserious offenses, and older youths who did not possess a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment) as well as those at lower risk (that is, those with a high school credential at the time of assignment to the program).** Earnings gains were similar for male and female participants.

The program had negative impacts on employment and earnings for Hispanic youths and for 18- and 19-year olds. Researchers have not been able to explain these findings, although the following factors have been ruled out through analysis: differences in enrollment rates or length of time in the program, personal or family characteristics associated with low impacts, and a language barrier.**

** The magnitude of the impacts for each subgroup can be found in the complete report.

Receipt of public assistance:

Over all 4 years, program participants reported receiving \$640 less, on average, than control group members; program group members reported receiving \$460 less. Each subgroup analyzed—young men, young women with children, and young women without children—experienced this impact at a different time. For young men, reductions were uniform throughout the follow-up period. For mothers (most of whom were nonresidential), reductions were small while the youths were in the program but larger during the follow-up periods, as earnings rose. For young women without children, reductions were greatest just after the program ended, but they declined to nearly zero later.

Involvement in the criminal justice system:

Overall, participation reduced arrest rates, conviction rates, and time spent in jail. Over the 48-month follow-up, arrest rates dropped by 16 percent. Reductions were statistically significant during the first year after random assignment, when youths were still in the program. Smaller reductions were realized in subsequent years, but those reductions are not statistically significant. Program group members and participants had lower conviction rates and were less likely to have served time in jail after being convicted of a crime than control group members: 22 percent of program group members were convicted compared with 25 percent of control group members, and 16 percent of program group members served time in jail for convictions, compared with 18 percent of control group members. However, there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in the average number of weeks in jail for convictions.

Substance use:

The program had no impact on tobacco, alcohol, or illegal drug use and had no statistically significant impact on time spent in drug treatment.

Program: JOB CORPS

Health status:

Participants were less likely than control group members to report their health status as “poor” or “fair”: about 15.5 percent vs. 17.5 percent.

Family formation and child care:

The program had no impact on fertility or custodial responsibility. Thirty-nine percent of program group members and 37.8 percent of the control group had children 48 months after random assignment, a difference that is not statistically significant. Custodial responsibility (measured only for young men) did not differ between the program and control groups. Custodial responsibility measures include living with the child, spending time with the child, providing any type of nonmonetary support, and providing monetary support.

Program group members were slightly less likely than control group members to live with their parents 48 months after random assignment (34.7 percent vs. 31.8 percent). Program group members were also more likely to be married or living with a partner than control group members (31 percent vs. 29.4 percent), a difference that is statistically significant.

Participants used an average of about 146 more hours of child care during the 48-month follow-up period than they would have if they had not enrolled in the program. Participants were more likely than their control group counterparts to use child care during the first year after random assignment (while still enrolled in the program) and during the fourth year (when employment gains were largest). In the first year, 17.3 percent of the program group and 15.1 percent of the control group reported using child care; in the fourth year, 35.2 percent of the program group and 33.3 percent of the control group reported using child care. Subgroup analyses found impacts for females but not for males (only a small percentage of fathers were living with their children).

Mobility:

There were no statistically significant differences on measures of mobility (i.e., difference in miles between zip code at application and at 48-month interview) between program group members and the control group. Also, there were no significant differences in the characteristics of the counties that control group and program group members lived in at the 48-month follow-up.

Positive impacts for 16- and 17-year-olds are striking:

In year 4, average earnings gains per participant were nearly \$900. Program participants were significantly more likely to receive a GED or diploma than control group members (46.7 percent vs. 36.2 percent). Over all four years program group members were less likely to have been arrested or charged with a delinquency or criminal complaint than control group members (38.1 percent vs. 41.4 percent) and were less likely to have spent time in jail (20.7 percent vs. 24.2 percent).

Positive impacts for females with children at the time of enrollment:

Women in this subgroup saw positive earnings growth (more than 20 percent) at year 4. Many of them were nonresidential students.

Residential and nonresidential subgroups:

The programs serve different types of students, but each is effective for its target group. Earnings and employment impacts during the last 2 years were generally positive for those assigned to both the residential and non-residential groups (except for young women without children in the nonresidential group). Note: analyses do not allow residential and nonresidential programs to be compared, since they serve different types of students.

Other Information:

None

Program: JOBSTART

Population Served:

Size: 13 local programs nationwide from 1985 to 1988 (2,312 eligible applicants for demonstration)

Age: 17-21

Other Characteristics: Economically disadvantaged school dropouts with poor reading skills; funded through the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982.

Studies: 2 experimental

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Basic education	Site staff	Minimum of 200 hours offered; actual participation varied by site and individual	Self-paced and competency-based; computer-managed or -assisted; focused on reading, communication, and basic computation skills
Occupational skills training	Site staff	Minimum of 500 hours offered; actual participation varied by site and individual	Classroom setting, combined theory and hands-on experience; prepares enrollees for jobs in high-demand occupations; developed with assistance from private sector to ensure that graduates meet the entry-level requirements of local employers
Training-related support services		Varied by site	Tailored to individual needs; include transportation and child care and some combination of work-readiness and life skills training, personal and vocational counseling, mentoring, tutorial assistance, and referral to external support systems; need-based payments or incentive payments tied to length of stay, program attendance, or performance
Job development and placement assistance	Site staff and subcontractors	Varied by site	Assist participants in finding training-related jobs

Program Objectives/Goals:

- In general, to improve the lives of young, low-skilled dropouts. The five specific goals were to:
1. Have local agencies attract young, economically disadvantaged, low-skilled dropouts into an alternative education and training program.
 2. Put in place a package of services designed to address the needs of these youths while working within the constraints of JTPA funding, performance standards, and administrative practices.
 3. Have the young people respond favorably to this opportunity and make an investment of their time and effort by participating in the services.
 4. Increase educational attainment, as measured by receipt of high school diploma or GED.
 5. Over time, increase employment and earnings and reduce reliance on public assistance.

Program: JOBSTART

Costs:

In 1986, the program cost \$4,548 per participant.

Study 1:

Cave, G., & Doolittle, F. (1991). *Assessing JOBSTART: Interim impacts of a program for school dropouts*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

Specifically, to answer the first 3 questions and part of the 4th question listed in program goals above.

Measurement instrument:

JOBSTART enrollment form filled out by program staff; monthly report of participation in JOBSTART activities; tests of Adult Basic Education; 12- and 24-month follow-up surveys of sample designed to measure impacts of amount of education and training received, employment and earnings, and other outcomes; qualitative descriptions of the program and participants' experiences.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental; random assignment of JOBSTART applicants to experimental or control group (who did not receive JOBSTART services).

Statistical techniques: significance testing, regression analysis.

Significance level: $p \leq .05$

Population evaluated: 1,839 out of 2,312 youths who applied for JOBSTART and who provided information at the 24-month follow-up constitute the "impact" sample; 949 were in the experimental group and 890 were in the control group.

Key Findings:

Overall, sites reported that about 89 percent of the youths assigned to the experimental group actually participated in JOBSTART. Four factors influenced the percentage who participated: length of intake (youths dropped out when the intake period was long); open entry, open exit vs. fixed-cycle scheduling (youths assigned to fixed-cycle sites might face delays in program startup, resulting in lower participation rates); start-up or scheduling problems (such difficulties result in lower participation rates); and differences in sites' attendance reporting.

Education:

33.1 percent of participants vs. 16.5 percent of the control group received a GED or high school diploma, a significant difference.

Employment:

As expected, more youths in the control group than in the experimental group worked during the first year of follow-up; the difference is not significant in the second year of follow-up.

Participants' earnings were significantly below those of the control group in years 1 and 2. Among women living with their own children at the time of random assignment, a higher percentage of participants than control group members worked in each of the two years, with the second year showing a somewhat larger impact on employment rate.

Other:

During the first 24 months of follow-up, JOBSTART had no statistically significant impacts on receipt of most public benefits, childbearing, fathering of children, provision of child support, or criminal arrests.

Program: JOBSTART

Other Information:

None

Study 2:

Cave, G., Bos, H., Doolittle, F., & Toussaint, C. (1993). *JOBSTART: Final report on a program for school dropouts*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

To assess the difference the program made in the lives of the young people who participated in JOBSTART. Specifically, to answer all 5 questions listed in program goals above.

Measurement instrument:

JOBSTART enrollment form filled out by program staff; monthly report of participation in JOBSTART activities; tests of Adult Basic Education; 12-, 24-, and 48-month follow-up surveys designed to measure impacts of amount of education and training received, employment and earnings, and other outcomes; qualitative descriptions of the program and participants' experiences.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental; random assignment of JOBSTART applicants to experimental or control group (who did not receive JOBSTART services).

Statistical techniques: Significance testing; $p \leq .10$

Population evaluated: 1,941 out of 2,312 randomly assigned youths who had 48-month follow-up data (988 in the experimental group and 953 in the control group).

Key Findings:

Education:

JOBSTART led to a significant increase in the rate at which participants passed the GED (42 percent vs. 28.6 percent of control group members).

Male participants were more likely than males in the control group to receive any education or training in the follow-up period. They also received more hours of education or training than control counterparts. Results are similar for young women. Participants who were white, non-Hispanic, black, non-Hispanic, Hispanic, or of other races/ethnic backgrounds were more likely to receive any education or training in the follow-up period than their counterparts in control groups. In addition, participants age 16-19 and 20-21 were more likely than their control counterparts to receive any education or training in the follow-up period.

Male participants were more likely than males in the control group to earn a GED during the follow-up period. Results are similar for participants who are female, non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, age 16-19, and age 20-21.

Employment:

In the final 2 years of the follow-up, average earnings of participants were higher by approximately \$400 per year, but this difference is not statistically significant.

Impacts on earnings were encouraging for young men with an arrest record when they entered the program (impacts were positive and statistically significant in year 4) and for young men who had dropped out of school because of educational difficulties before entering the program (in year 3)

More youths in the control group than in the experimental group worked during the first year of follow-up; in the second year, slightly more participants than control group members worked; in the third and fourth

Program: JOBSTART

years there was no significant difference.

Other outcomes:

No significant impacts on youths' receipt of public assistance except that female participants who were not mothers when they entered the program were significantly less likely than their counterparts in the control group to receive AFDC during the later years of follow-up. Female participants living with their own children received more in total general assistance income than their counterparts in the control group.

Arrest rates were reduced during the first year of follow-up for all participants and for some subgroups. A larger impact was observed on young men without a prior arrest. However, there was only a small difference in arrests during the entire 4-year period, implying that involvement in the program made a difference that did not continue once participation ended.

Participants reported significantly less use of drugs other than marijuana, compared to the control group (4.1 percent of participants vs. 5.8 percent of youth in the control group reported drug use).

Male participants were more likely to experience positive activity (work or further education or training) during the follow-up than their control counterparts. Similar results are seen for women living their own children and women not living with their own children (including those who do not have children).

Subgroups:

Custodial mothers who entered JOBSTART experienced significantly increased childbearing and no impact on receipt of AFDC. These participants saw a \$1,004 increase in net income, resulting from increases in both earnings and welfare payments received for additional children. For other participants, the effect of JOBSTART on income remained negative after 4 years of follow-up.

Participants received substantially more services than the control group. More than 90 percent of the experimental group participated in JOBSTART and averaged 400 hours of activities.

There is no discernable pattern of effective program practices in the 13 sites. It does not seem to matter whether programs offer education followed by occupational training or offer education and training simultaneously.

Other Information:

JOBSTART is funded primarily through the Job Training Partnership Act.

Program: OHIO LEARNING, EARNING, AND PARENTING PROGRAM (LEAP)

Population Served:

Size: 10,000 teens participated in LEAP

Age: Teen mothers under age 20 who are on welfare and do not have a GED or high school diploma.

Other Characteristics: The program targeted teenage mothers on welfare in 12 Ohio counties. The program is mandatory for all women under 20 who are receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and who do not have a GED or high school diploma. The program includes teens who head welfare cases and those who are on someone else's welfare case.

Studies: 3 experimental

Program Components*

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Financial incentive		Throughout the program	Teens are given \$62 more in welfare payments for enrolling in school or a GED program and an additional \$62 in welfare payments for every month they stay in school. If teens do not meet attendance requirements, they do not receive this financial incentive. Teens who fail to verify that they are enrolled in school have \$62 deducted from their welfare check every month until they comply.
Case management	Case manager	Throughout the program	Teens are assigned a case manager who monitors program compliance and assists with barriers to school attendance. Transportation and child care are available to help teens attend school.
Child care and transportation assistance	Program	Throughout the program	These services were provided only upon case manager approval.

* Other services may have been provided by schools, educational programs, or other agencies. These services would also have been available to youth in the control group.

Program Objectives/Goals:

To promote school attendance by pregnant teenagers and custodial teen parents on welfare. By requiring school attendance, the program tries to trigger a chain of effects on the teens' behavior—promoting academic progress, increasing the proportion of teens who earn a high school diploma or GED, and eventually producing gains in employment and reductions in welfare dependence.

Costs:

The net cost of the program is \$1,388 per teen over the course of 22.3 months or \$747 per year. Net cost is the amount spent per treatment group member over and above the amount spent per control group member.

Program: OHIO LEARNING, EARNING, AND PARENTING PROGRAM (LEAP)

Study 1:

Bloom, D., Fellerath, V., Long, D., & Wood, R.G. (1993). *LEAP: Interim findings on a welfare initiative to improve school attendance among teenage parents*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

To determine the impacts of the financial incentives and sanctions on school enrollment and attendance. Also to determine whether the program has effects on school completion.

Measurement instrument:

In-person and phone surveys, GED testing data, focus groups, high school and adult education data, LEAP and AFDC case file data, and staff interviews/field research.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental

Statistical techniques: Chi-square, F-test, t-test.

Significance level: $p \leq .10$

Population evaluated: 7,017 teens were randomly assigned to a program group or a control group: 5,611 teens (80 percent) to a program group and 1,406 teens (20 percent) to a control group. This ratio was used to minimize the number of teens not receiving LEAP services yet still provide enough participants for statistical analyses.

Key Findings:

Incentives and sanctions:

Ninety-three percent of teens in the program received at least one financial incentive or sanction while in LEAP; most earned incentives as opposed to sanctions. Seventy-five percent of teens earned at least one bonus and 56 percent of teens received any sanctions. In addition, 37 percent of teens received only incentives, while 18 percent received only sanctions.

The program found discrepancies between having earned an incentive or received a sanction and actual changes in teens' monthly payments. This situation arose because case managers monitor program compliance but do not directly process incentives or sanctions. As a result, some participants never received their incentives or sanctions. The problem varied by county; in Cuyahoga County, for instance, approximately 50 percent of incentives and sanctions were actually processed.

Some teens continued receiving sanctions but never complied with LEAP requirements. This group comprised mainly students who had dropped out of high school for over a year. The researchers concluded that LEAP was unable to reach approximately 13 percent of teens.

In a survey, approximately 50 percent of teens viewed LEAP as fair and 33 percent labeled it unfair. The data indicate that teens who had received sanctions had more negative views of LEAP.

Less than 20 percent of teens took advantage of the child care assistance offered by LEAP.

Program: OHIO LEARNING, EARNING, AND PARENTING PROGRAM (LEAP)

School attendance, enrollment:

LEAP increased both retention in school and the number of students returning to school. Among teens who were already in school, program participants were 10.3 percent more likely than control group members to remain enrolled for at least 10 of the 12 months. Among teens who had dropped out of school, program participants were 13.4 percent more likely than control group members to return to school. These differences are statistically significant.

Participants who had dropped out of school for over a year were significantly more likely to start an adult education program than control group members: 32.7 percent vs. 18.4 percent.

LEAP also increased attendance: On average, LEAP participants attended 1.5 days more of school or adult education than control group members, a significant difference.

High school completion and GED attainment:

The data on performance in school indicate that participants had significantly higher rates of graduation than control students, as well as significantly higher rates of GED attainment. For the 1989-1990 and 1990-1991 school years, 26.3 percent of participants graduated from high school vs. 19.3 percent of control group members. Similarly, 3.9 percent of participants achieved a GED, while only 2.4 percent of control teens did.

Other Information:

None

Study 2:

Long, D., Gueron, J.M., Wood, R.G., Fisher, R., & Fellerath, V. (1996). *LEAP: Three-year impacts of Ohio's welfare initiative to improve school attendance among teenage parents*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

To determine the experiences of LEAP teens and control teens 3 years into program implementation. This study examines the effects of LEAP on the attainment of a GED, college enrollment, training, employment and earnings, welfare receipt, family composition, and income.

Measurement instrument:

Telephone and in-person surveys, school records

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental

Statistical techniques: T-test, F-test

Significance level: $p \leq .10$

Population evaluated: 5,575 teens were evaluated in this study. The remaining 1,442 teens from the original random sample were not evaluated because they had only participated in LEAP during its start-up phase, when the rules were different. In the original evaluation, 80 percent of teens were assigned to a program group and 20 percent were assigned to a control group.

Program: OHIO LEARNING, EARNING, AND PARENTING PROGRAM (LEAP)

Key Findings:Incentives and sanctions:

Most participants received incentives (75 percent) or sanctions (56 percent). Overall, 93 percent of teens received at least one sanction or incentive. Teens who were in school at the time of enrollment in LEAP were less likely to receive a sanction than teens who had dropped out of school. In Cleveland, approximately 56 percent of teens in school at the time of enrollment in LEAP received only incentives or more incentives than sanctions, compared to 29 percent of teens who were not enrolled in school.

The sanctions imposed on teens led to less spending on essentials such as clothing and food, whereas incentives led to increased spending on children. Among teens with four or more sanctions, 54 percent reported having fewer essentials such as clothing and food. Among teens with four or more incentives, 46.5 percent reported having spent the incentive on essentials such as clothing and food, which affects children.

High school completion and GED attainment:

Participants were significantly more likely than control teens to have enrolled in school and to have attended through 11th grade (50 percent vs. 45.4 percent), but LEAP did not have any significant effect on high school graduation. Participants attained a significantly higher grade level (10.34) than control teens (10.22).

There were no significant differences in GED attainment or high school graduation. The data indicate that 66 percent of participants and 68.1 percent of control teens had not received a high school diploma or GED at the 3-year survey. Approximately 23 percent of participants and 24 percent of control teens completed high school; 11 percent of participants and 8 percent of control teens received a GED.

Participants who were in school at the time of enrollment in LEAP were significantly more likely to complete high school or attain a GED (45.6 percent vs. 38.6 percent). Furthermore, participants who had dropped out of school at the time of enrollment in LEAP were significantly more likely than their counterparts in the control group to complete grade 11 (35.8 percent vs. 28.0 percent).

Impacts on high school completion varied from site to site.

Employment, welfare receipt, and college enrollment:

Participants were significantly more likely than control teens to be working and significantly less likely to be receiving AFDC at the 3-year survey: 33.2 percent of participants vs. 27.6 percent of control teens had been employed within the past 3 months, and 83.8 percent of participants vs. 87.6 percent of control teens were receiving AFDC.

The employment findings can be attributed largely to the teens who were in school at the time of enrollment in the program. For this group, LEAP increased employment rates significantly (by 38.9 percent vs. 27.4 percent for control teens). LEAP had no significant impacts on the employment rate of participants who had dropped out of school at the time of enrollment in the program.

LEAP had significant impacts on college enrollment at only one site, Cleveland. At this site, 20.6 percent of participants and 11.8 percent of control teens enrolled in college.

The impacts of this study suggest that LEAP has the greatest benefits for teens who have not yet left school.

Other Information:

None

Program: OHIO LEARNING, EARNING, AND PARENTING PROGRAM (LEAP)

Study 3:

Bos, J.M., & Fellerath, V. (1997). *LEAP: Final report on Ohio's welfare initiative to improve school attendance among teenage parents*. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:Objective:

To examine the long-term effects of LEAP on employment, earnings, and welfare receipt and to provide a cost-benefit analysis of the program.

Measurement instrument:

Administrative records (e.g., unemployment insurance earnings records, AFDC payment records), telephone and in-person interviews, self-report surveys

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental

Statistical techniques: t-test, regression analysis, chi-square

Significance level: $p \leq .10$

Population evaluated: 4,151 teens who were randomly assigned to a program group or a control group during the second year of LEAP; 3,479 teens were assigned to the program group and 672 teens were assigned to the control group. This study reports the results of a 3-year follow up after the program's end.

Key Findings:LEAP had positive effects on school attendance and enrollment:

At the 3-year follow-up, participants were significantly more likely (4.6 percentage points) to have completed 9th, 10th, and 11th grade than those in the control group. Fifty percent of LEAP teens and 45.4 percent of control teens completed 11th grade.

The program had mixed effects on high school graduation or GED attainment:

Participants who were in school when they entered LEAP were significantly more likely to have received their GED at the 3-year survey than their counterparts in the control group (10.0 percent vs. 4.4 percent), but LEAP had no significant effects on the high school graduation rate of this subgroup. For teens who were not in school at the beginning of LEAP, the program had no significant effects on high school graduation or GED attainment. Overall, 34 percent of participants received a GED or high school diploma; however, there was no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group.

The program had mixed effects on employment and earnings:

Participants initially enrolled in school fared better than participants not initially in school. Participants initially in school were significantly more likely to be employed over the 3-year follow up than control teens (4.41 percent vs. 4.03 percent), although participants' overall earnings were not significantly higher. There were no significant differences between participants who were not in school at the time of enrollment and the control teens. LEAP's impacts seem to have been greatest for those under age 18 at the time of assignment to the program, although the impacts on earnings were greatest for those who were age 17 and in school at the time of assignment. It is possible that employment impacts for those under 17 did not translate into comparable earnings gains because many of them might still have been in school at the end of the follow-up period. There was a marginally significant positive effect for black participants who were not initially enrolled in school, compared to non-black participants who were not initially enrolled in school, especially in the area of earnings.

Program: OHIO LEARNING, EARNING, AND PARENTING PROGRAM (LEAP)

AFDC receipt:

Participants were less likely to be on welfare than teens in the control group. During years 3 and 4, participants were on welfare significantly less time than control group members: an average of 15.27 months vs. 16.03 months, which amounts to a 4.7 percent reduction relative to the control group. Furthermore, participants received less welfare than control group members: an average of \$5,185 vs. \$5,459 in years 3 and 4. AFDC receipt varied significantly by age; it was highest for participants age 15 or 16 when assigned to the program because of a \$596 reduction in benefits received during years 3 and 4.

Cost-benefit analysis:

The program recovered its costs in savings on AFDC, food stamps, and Medicaid. Data indicated that the average net cost per participant was -\$1,110 over the 4 years from program start to 3-year follow-up. This combines the costs of the program and the money saved from sanctions and participants' not being on welfare.

Other Information:

LEAP appears to be most beneficial for the subgroup of teens who are in school at the time of enrollment in the program.
