

Usage, Achievements and ROIs of Vulnerable Populations in Virginia Workforce Programs



Elsie Harper-Anderson, PhD
May 14, 2014

Project Purpose

- Follow-up to ROI workforce study 4/2014, Harper-Anderson & Jin (2014)
- Examine experiences of vulnerable populations in three workforce programs (WIA, WP, TAA) and compare to their non-vulnerable counterparts

Background

Literature

- Individuals facing labor market challenges are less likely to be employed (Loprest and Zedlewski 2006).
- The vulnerabilities of several groups have been examined in the literature including some with labor market barriers and some who are members of demographic groups which have historically been systematically disadvantaged in the labor market.
- Groups facing labor market vulnerabilities often experience outcomes from workforce programs that are different than those experienced by the general population.

Who are the Vulnerable Populations in Workforce Programs?

Two groups of vulnerable populations in this study

Groups with obvious LM Barriers

- Disability
- Offenders
- Homeless
- Low income
- Low education
- English not native language

Demographic Groups Traditionally Disadvantaged in the LM

- Women
- Elderly
- Blacks
- Latinos

Literature on Labor Market Vulnerability

- **Women** have historically faced occupational crowding and discrimination in hiring, promotion and compensation (Crandall and Jain, 2007)
- **Individuals with disabilities** are sometimes disadvantaged by a lack of adequate accommodations for their disability (Freeburg, 1994). They may also suffer from a lack of postsecondary education (Flannery et. al 2007)
- **Immigrants** (including Hispanic) are often plagued by language barriers (Zeidner, 2009;) but sometimes also face discrimination (Carten and Finch , 2010)
- **Criminal offenders** are often lacking in educational credentials and work history, but can also be limited by laws prohibiting them from working in certain fields (Carter, 2007)
- **Elderly** job seekers may have limitations to their physical capabilities (Tishman et. al, 2012) but also sometimes suffer from negative stereotypes or age related hiring policies (Githens, 2007).

Literature on Labor Market Vulnerability (continued)

- ***Homeless*** job seekers are often plagued by low education levels combined with limited work histories. Unemployment among homeless has also been associated with increased substance use and criminal activity (Ferguson et. al 2011)
- ***Low Income*** job seekers consistently identify transportation as a serious problem. Sandoval et. al (2011) find that car ownership is particularly influential on employment outcomes.
- ***African American*** jobseekers often suffer from disproportionately low education levels and residential segregation into areas with limited job opportunities. Further, studies show that African Americans still encounter racism and disparate treatment, which impedes their career development (Cornileus, 2013)

Methodology

- Used administrative records for three programs (WIA, TAA and WP). Included individuals who were over 18, exited each program between 2008 and 2012, and had accurate wage data available. All figures represent aggregated (pooled) data across all years
- Selected select group of vulnerable population groups to study based on previous literature and available variables in each dataset
- Performed descriptive analysis of the average number of barriers, service usage, achievements and ROI patterns for group members of each vulnerable population group compared to non-group members

Each Vulnerable Population's Proportion of Total¹

<i>Population</i>	WIA		TAA		WP	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent of Ttl.</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent of Ttl.</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent of Ttl.</i>
Barriers to Labor Market						
Disability	1,670	4.4	11	0.1	45,321	3.4
Limited English	444	1.2	82	0.9	-	-
Basic skills deficient	2,533	6.7	-	-	-	-
Less than high school	5,478	14.5	1,169	12.9	149,892	11.4
Homeless	380	1.0	-	-	-	-
Offender	2,155	5.7	-	-	-	-
Low income ²	15,739	41.5	22	0.2	-	-
Traditionally Disadvantaged						
Female	21,849	57.6	3,701	40.7	624,549	47.3
Hispanic	1,198	3.2	145	1.6	61,764	4.7
Black	17,050	45.0	2,472	27.2	486,303	36.9
Elderly	285	.8	187	2.1	21,852	1.7

¹ Vulnerable population categories are not mutually exclusive

² Low income WIA based on variable; Low income for TAA based on assumption that clients who receive SSI or TANF or General Assistance are low income

- Indicates that data was not available for a particular program

Average Number of Barriers per Participant by Program

# of Barriers ¹	WIA		TAA		WP	
	<i>All Barriers</i>	<i>Trad. Only</i> ²	<i>All Barriers</i>	<i>Trad. Only</i>	<i>All Barriers</i>	<i>Trad. Only</i>
0	16.0	51.5	36.7	86.2	25.1	85.5
1	28.7	30.3	39.0	13.4	43.0	14.1
2	26.8	11.9	17.3	0.4	23.9	0.4
3	18.2	4.6	2.5		3.4	
4	7.5	1.6	0.2		0.2	
5	2.4	0.1	0.0		0.0	
6	0.4					
7	0.0					

¹ Each dataset contained a different number of barriers due to variables available. Where as a value of "0.0" indicates that the variable was present in the data set but very 0% experienced it, blank means the variable was not captured in a particular data set

² "Trad. Only" does not include demographic factors (race, gender, age or ethnicity) as barriers whereas "All Barriers" includes these demographic factors as barriers

WIA

WIA Average Service Usage by Vulnerable Populations								
Vulnerable Group	Training		Supportive Services		Follow-up Services		Months in Program	
Barriers to Labor Market	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members
Individual with Disability	48.3	49.6	26.2	29.1	1.0	6.0	13.77	12.00
Limited English	48.5	34.2	26.4	18.2	1.2	1.1	13.70	13.69
Basic skills deficient	47.9	54.6	25.1	43.8	.4	13.4	13.86	11.39
Less than High School	49.8	39.9	24.6	36.6	.8	4.0	13.88	12.64
Homeless	48.3	53.7	26.3	29.7	1.2	5.3	13.73	10.29
Offender	48.1	53.2	26.5	22.4	1.2	2.1	13.88	10.61
Low income	43.8	54.7	24.6	28.6	.0	3.0	15.03	11.82
Average	47.8	48.6	25.7	29.8	0.8	5.0	14.0	11.8
Traditionally Disadvantaged								
Female	44.5	51.2	23.3	28.5	1.2	1.3	12.18	14.31
Hispanic	48.3	49.5	26.7	14.6	1.2	2.1	13.76	11.66
Black	49.4	47.1	29.2	22.7	.8	1.8	13.95	13.40
Elderly	48.5	31.2	26.3	21.4	1.3	-	13.71	12.40

WIA Achievements by Vulnerable Group

Vulnerable Group	Earned Credential ¹		Employed		Quarterly earnings	
Barriers to LM	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members
Individual with Disability	63.5	69.1	52.5	32.5	\$4,079	\$1,554
Limited English	63.6	75.0	67.6	68.9	\$3,925	\$3,219
Basic skills deficient	62.5	78.3	72.2	54.0	\$4,192	\$1,391
Less than High School	61.8	78.1	70.1	53.5	\$4,079	\$1,860
Homeless	63.7	71.1	67.8	45.1	\$3,925	\$1,434
Offender	63.7	64.1	68.5	51.5	\$4,039	\$1,766
Low income	60.1	67.8	71.7	61.5	\$4,919	\$2,444
Average	62.7	71.9	67.2	52.4	\$4,197	\$1,953
Traditionally Disadvantaged						
Female	61.4	65.3	65.5	69.1	\$4,592	\$3,433
Hispanic	63.6	66.4	67.7	66.2	\$3,921	\$3,797
Black	64.1	63.2	68.8	66.2	\$4,505	\$3,206
Elderly	63.8	51.7	67.9	32.3	\$3,937	\$1,440
Average	63.2	61.7	67.5	58.4	\$4,239	\$2,969

¹ Percent of those who trained who earned a credential

WIA 5-year ROI by Vulnerable Group compared to Non-Group Members

Barriers to LM	Non- Group Members	Group Members
Individual with Disability	\$0.47	\$6.53
Limited English	\$0.73	\$0.28
Basic skills deficient	\$0.27	\$8.81
Less than High School	\$0.31	\$3.04
Homeless	\$0.66	\$7.55
Offender	\$0.27	\$8.81
Low income	-\$7.77	\$13.23
Traditionally Disadvantaged		
Female	-\$4.09	\$4.19
Hispanic	\$0.71	\$1.12
Black	-\$1.87	\$3.87
Elderly	\$0.87	-\$18.52

WIA Conclusions

1. 30% of WIA participants faced at least one barrier in the labor market; 18% faced multiple barriers
2. On average, vulnerable populations received more training and used more supportive and follow-up services but stayed in programs for a shorter period of time
3. Vulnerable populations earned credentials at consistently higher rates than the rest of the population but their employment rates and earnings outcomes were consistently lower than others.
 - a. On average employment was nearly 5 percentage points lower and earnings were 53% lower)
 - b. For demographic groups employment was 9 percentage points lower and earnings were 30% lower
4. ROIs for vulnerable population group members are generally higher (compared to non-group members) with a few notable exceptions (elderly and limited English speakers)

TAA

TAA Service Usage by Vulnerable Populations						
Vulnerable Group	Training		Supportive Services		Months in Program	
Barriers to LM	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members
Individual with Disability	31.1	36.4	19.1	9.1	18.5	23.4
Limited English	31.3	12.2	19.1	17.1	18.5	16.9
Less than High School	32.2	21.8	18.2	23.5	18.4	18.8
Low income	31.1	22.7	19	40.9	18.5	21.6
Average	31.4	23.3	18.9	22.7	18.5	20.1
Traditionally Disadvantaged						
Female	25.5	39.3	13.6	27	11.0	11.9
Hispanic	31.2	24.1	19.2	10.3	18.6	14.9
Black	30.5	34	18.5	22	16.5	19.7
Elderly	31.6	7.5	19.3	6.4	18.6	14.7
Average	29.7	26.2	17.7	16.4	16.2	15.3

TAA Achievements by Vulnerable Group

Vulnerable Group	Earned Credential ¹		Employed		Quarterly earnings	
	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members
Barriers to LM						
Individual with Disability	26.4	0	62.0	54.5	\$4,626	\$3,591
Limited English	26.4	21.2	62.0	61.8	\$4,633	\$3,562
Less than High School	26.6	25.0	64.1	47.6	\$4,975	\$2,284
Low income	26.4	25.0	62.0	70.0	\$4,632	\$1,396
Average	26.45	17.8	62.5	58.5	\$4,717	\$2,708
Traditionally Disadvantaged						
Female	22.7	31.4	60.4	64.5	\$5,232	\$3,721
Hispanic	26.3	30.8	62.0	57.6	\$4,615	\$5,167
Black	28.3	22.0	56.0	65.3	\$4,787	\$4,152
Elderly	26.9	2.0	63.0	12.3	\$4,706	\$617
Average	26.05	21.55	60.4	49.9	\$4,835	\$3,414

¹ Percent of those who trained who earned a credential

TAA ROI by Vulnerable Group

Barriers to LM	Non- Group Members	Group Members
Individual with Disability	-\$35.92	-\$26.01
Limited English	-\$35.87	-\$40.77
Less than High School	-\$36.95	-\$30.26
Low income	-\$35.93	-\$24.13
Traditionally Disadvantaged		
Female	-\$45.09	-\$22.22
Hispanic	-\$35.86	-\$39.06
Black	-\$37.76	-\$29.34
Elderly	-\$35.53	-\$54.26

TAA Conclusions

- TAA vulnerable populations on average are less likely to receive training than non-vulnerable counterparts
- A larger proportion of TAA vulnerable populations use supportive services than their counterparts and they stay in the program longer
- TAA vulnerable populations tend to have much lower earnings than their non-vulnerable populations

Wagner Peyser

WP Achievements by Vulnerable Group

Vulnerable Group	Employed		Quarterly earnings	
	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members	% Non-Group Members	% Group Members
Barriers to LM				
Individual with Disability	51	36	\$2,841	\$1,954
Less than High School	52	42	\$2,939	\$1,746
Traditionally Disadvantaged				
Female	49	52	\$3,048	\$2,525
Hispanic	51	50	\$2,801	\$2,725
Black	51	48	\$3,100	\$2,287
Elderly	51	25	\$2,828	\$1,210

WP ROI by Vulnerable Group

Barriers to LM	Non- Group Members	Group Members
Individual with Disability	\$62.23	\$65.67
Less than High School	\$65.40	\$40.24
Traditionally Disadvantaged		
Female	\$69.32	\$55.31
Hispanic	\$62.51	\$55.08
Black	\$72.89	\$45.24
Elderly	\$61.80	\$116.18

WP Conclusions

- WP does not offer training and does not contain many of the data variables to determine which clients belong to vulnerable groups
- Of the groups that were discernable, lower percentages of vulnerable populations were employed and they generally earned less than their counterparts who were not part of the vulnerable group.

Sources

- Carten, A.J. & Finch, J.B. (2010). An empirically based field-education model: Preparing students for culturally competent practice with new immigrants. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 4(3), 365-385.
- Carter, F.C. (2007). Meeting the needs of returning offenders through employment. *Corrections Today*, 69(6), 98-99.
- Cornileus, T. H. (2013). "I'm a Black Man and I'm Doing this Job Very Well": How African American Professional Men Negotiate the Impact of Racism on Their Career Development. *Journal of African American Studies*, 17(4), 444-460.
- Crandall, S.R. & Jain, S. (2007). New directions in workforce development? Do they lead to gains for women? *New England Journal for Public Policy*, 22(1-2), 81-98.
- Freeburg, E.W. (1994). Employment provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act: Implications for HRD practice. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 5(1), 93-98.
- Flannery, K. B., Slovic, R., Benz, M.R. & Levine, E. (2007). *Priorities and changing practices: Vocational rehabilitation and community colleges improving workforce development programs for people with disabilities*. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 27, 141-151.
- Ferguson, K. M., Bender, K., Thompson, S., Xie, B., & Pollio, D. (2011). Correlates of Street-Survival Behaviors in Homeless Young Adults in Four U.S. Cities. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 81(3), 401-409. doi: 10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01108.x
- Githens, R.P. (2007). Older adults and e-learning: Opportunities and barriers. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 8(4), 329-338.
- Harper-Anderson, Elsie, & Myung Jin. "Return on Investment for Virginia's Workforce Programs." Policy Report prepared for the Virginia Community College System, April 2014.
- Loprest, Pamela, and Sheila Zedlewski. 2006. "The Changing Role of Welfare in the Lives of Low-Income Families with Children." Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Assessing the New Federalism Occasional Paper 73.
- Sandoval, J. S., Cervero, R., & Landis, J. (2011). The transition from welfare-to-work: How cars and human capital facilitate employment for welfare recipients. *Applied Geography*, 31(1), 352-362.
- Tishman, F.M., Van Looy, S. & Bruyere, S.M. (2012, March). Employer strategies for responding to an aging workforce. *The National Technical Assistance and Leadership Center*. Retrieved from http://www.dol.gov/odep/pdf/NTAR_Employer_Strategies_Report.pdf.