

October 2009

Findings for the Eugene and Medford, Oregon, Models: Implementation and Early Impacts for Two Programs That Sought to Encourage Advancement Among Low-Income Workers

Frieda Molina, Mark van Dok, Richard Hendra, Gayle Hamilton,
and Wan-Lae Cheng

This report presents interim results for two programs, based in Eugene and Medford, Oregon, that were designed to help low-wage workers stay employed and advance in their jobs. Both programs were part of the national Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA) project, which was conceived and funded by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and also supported by the U.S. Department of Labor. The project is testing the effectiveness of 16 different innovative models across the country that aim to promote steady work and career advancement for current and former welfare recipients and other low-wage workers. A great deal is known about how to help these groups find jobs, but there are few proven strategies for promoting their job retention and career advancement. The ERA evaluation is seeking to identify promising approaches to furthering these goals. MDRC — a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization — is conducting the ERA evaluation under contract to ACF and is producing an interim report that is similar to this one for each site in the project.

Structure and Goals of the Eugene and Medford ERA Programs

The ERA programs in Eugene and Medford began in early 2002 and operated through mid-2005. They were designed to improve employment retention and career advancement outcomes among recently employed leavers of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program; for employed food stamp recipients; or for working people who were receiving government-provided, employment-related daycare benefits. Both ERA programs offered participants employment retention and career advancement services and involved significant levels of collaboration between different institutions to manage operations. In both sites, most members of the research sample were single parents, and the two programs operated under the same state welfare rules and under similar labor market conditions.

The programs offered participants individualized career coaching and case management assistance. Site staff worked with participants to write personal career development plans and then provided them with various services to help them stay employed and advance. Services that were focused on employment retention included job coaching, referrals to supportive services, budgeting and financial planning, and advice on conflict resolution in the workplace. Career advancement services included job search activities, career coaching, help with résumé development, help with enrolling in education and training opportunities, and assistance in applying for financial aid.

The ERA program in Eugene was managed jointly by the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS) and Lane Community College (LCC), and it leveraged resources from the welfare and workforce agencies. Career development specialists at LCC delivered counseling services focused on career advancement, while DHS case managers helped participants obtain supportive services and extended benefits available through the welfare system — supports such as extending the child care assistance available for periods of time after someone leaves welfare for work.

Initially, the ERA program in Medford was operated by a team comprising staff from four partner agencies: the Oregon Department of Human Services (DHS), The Job Council, Rogue Community College (RCC), and the Employment Department (ED). To underscore the program's focus on career advancement, the service team was housed at offices of The Job Council. Midway through the period of program operations, the ED and RCC staff withdrew from the team due to funding cuts that affected their agencies, and, as a result, these partner agencies ceased participating in the Medford ERA program.

The ERA Evaluation

A random assignment research design is being used to assess the effectiveness of the ERA programs in Eugene and Medford. From 2002 to 2004, individuals in each site were assigned to either the ERA group (which was offered ERA services) or to a control group (whose members were not eligible for the ERA program but who could seek services from other providers in their communities).

MDRC is tracking both groups using automated TANF and food stamp benefits data from DHS and quarterly earnings data reported to Oregon's unemployment insurance (UI) program. One and a half years of follow-up data on UI earnings and welfare and food stamp benefits are available for each person covered by the report's analysis. For a smaller sample, data are also available from the ERA 12-Month Survey of clients.¹

¹While the Eugene survey results are reliable, some indication of survey response bias was found in the Medford survey. An assessment of the Medford survey results indicates that ERA group members who were
(continued)

There are some important differences in how the samples in the Eugene and Medford tests were defined and identified. Moreover, the roles and responsibilities of DHS staff on the ERA team across the two programs differed, likely contributing to differences in participation among ERA program group members. In Eugene, employed TANF leavers were randomly assigned into the study when they found employment and submitted a form to DHS to report their new status and wages. They were subsequently informed of their research status, and, if assigned to the ERA program group, they were invited to receive services through Eugene's ERA program. DHS case managers in Eugene provided supportive services and extended benefits to ERA program participants. In Medford, study-eligible individuals were first contacted to assess their interest in ERA-type services. These individuals included recently employed TANF leavers, employed food stamp recipients, and recipients of extended child care benefits. Individuals who expressed interest in the types of services that ERA could provide were randomly assigned as part of the study; if assigned to the ERA program group, however, they still needed to volunteer in order to access program services. In contrast to the program model in Eugene, in Medford the DHS case manager on the ERA team did not help ERA program participants obtain or maintain benefits available through the welfare system.

These eligibility criteria and the role of the DHA case managers had the following results. First, Medford sample members entered the study with somewhat more stable employment than Eugene sample members. Second, inasmuch as participation in ERA services by ERA program group members in both sites was voluntary, staff in the Eugene program needed to do more marketing of ERA services following random assignment than staff in the Medford program. Third, because Eugene program participants entered the study immediately after they left TANF due to employment, and because the Eugene ERA case manager was tasked to help these participants access supportive services and extended benefits, these recent TANF leavers had more occasion to seek the services of the ERA team. In contrast, ERA program participants in Medford who needed help with accessing welfare-related services and supports were required to go to the welfare office and talk with different staff to obtain benefits.

Two aspects of the economic context within which the programs operated are also worth highlighting: First, during the period of program operations, Oregon had one of the nation's highest unemployment rates, which may have made higher-paying jobs more difficult to find than in states with less unemployment. Second, Oregon's relatively high state minimum wage (\$7.50 per hour in 2005) may have made it more difficult for case managers to increase the wages of program group members above the wages of control group members.

interviewed for the survey entered the study more job-ready than their counterparts interviewed in the control group. Thus, the Medford survey results should be viewed with caution, and, in cases where the survey results differ from the results of analyses of administrative records, more weight is given in this report to results from the larger and unbiased administrative records sample. For a more detailed explanation and analysis of the reliability of the surveys in Eugene and Medford, see Appendix F and Appendix G.

Key Findings on Program Implementation

- **In Eugene, services were delivered as envisioned by the program designers and were focused on employment and job retention goals.**

Field research indicates that when viewed through the lens of the level and quality of services offered to people who requested them, the Eugene program was a strong one. The colocation of staff facilitated information sharing and problem solving about participants and made it easier for participants to access services more immediately and more often than would have been the case if staff had been based in separate offices. Job retention and career advancement services were offered concurrently, and staff worked hard to address clients' personal and family challenges, but, instead of focusing on personal barriers to job retention and career advancement as stand-alone issues, staff consistently tried to relate these problems to individuals' larger employment goals. A key component of Eugene's job retention and case management services involved referring clients to and following up with partner agencies — for example, to a women's shelter where the ERA staff had relationships with staff and where participants could be helped to address domestic violence problems. Staff focused on career advancement during most of their interactions with clients. Focus groups that were conducted with clients revealed high levels of satisfaction with the program.

- **In the Medford program, staff initially focused on crisis management but, over time, focused more on career advancement.**

In the early phase of the Medford program operations, staff were much more focused on helping clients resolve personal crises and overcome barriers to employment, as ways to stabilize individuals' employment situations; career advancement was given limited emphasis, if at all. Once this problem was recognized, changes were made to the content of services and to the sequencing of job retention and career advancement services. The Medford ERA team began to offer advancement services — to help clients advance within their current job or to find a better job — concurrently with assistance to help them retain employment.

The Medford team also began to move away from intervening in personal crises and instead started to focus its job retention assistance on on-the-job problems or on problems that could put clients at risk of losing their jobs or quitting. Overall, while staff were successful in reorienting their services away from crisis intervention and toward advancement, delivering advancement services was a new endeavor for staff, and they initially struggled to define advancement and determine how to help clients progress.

- **In both programs, the staff faced challenges in keeping clients engaged as caseloads grew and reemployment emerged as a more pressing issue than expected.**

In both the Eugene and the Medford ERA program, staff took a proactive approach to client engagement, and levels of engagement were initially high. But by the end of the random assignment period, in mid-2004, engagement levels had dropped off considerably in the two programs, particularly in Medford.

A number of factors contributed to the difficulty of maintaining high levels of client engagement in the sites. One factor was that clients' rates of job loss were very high, with the result that responsibilities for helping clients find new jobs consumed more staff time than originally anticipated. Consequently, staff in both programs struggled to provide services at the level of intensity and comprehensiveness that had been intended, and advancement activities to some extent were crowded out by reemployment concerns. As caseloads grew in both programs — reaching over 100 per staff member at the peak of operations — staff found it increasingly difficult to provide services to each client, especially because there was insufficient funding to hire more staff to reduce caseloads. This resulted in two kinds of clients attracting the most staff attention: clients who were in crisis and needed immediate assistance and clients who put in effort to initiate contact (and may have been likely to seek out services on their own without ERA). As a result, an important segment of the ERA sample — clients who were not in crisis (and could perhaps have had more to gain from retention and advancement services) — did not receive as much attention from the program as the groups that were given priority.

Staff also reported that many of those who were eligible for ERA but who were not already pursuing job retention and career advancement activities on their own may simply not have been stable enough in either their personal or professional life to participate in a career advancement program. In addition, focus groups that were held with ERA-eligible individuals revealed that some of them were concerned that if they advanced, they would lose access to such key benefits as Medicaid — a concern that may have undercut their motivation to participate in ERA.

- **The Medford program experienced funding difficulties and staff turnover problems.**

Partway through the period of the Medford program's operations, its partner agencies were confronted by funding cuts that had adverse effects on staff morale and on the level of human resources available for the program. As a result of these cuts, the staff member from the community college was no longer able to provide services on-site to participants, and a staff member from the employment department was unable to give priority to ERA clients. Also because of the funding problems, some staff left their jobs or had their hours reduced. Changes in the program's management structure in the wake of the cutbacks left program staff with diminished levels of day-to-day supervision and guidance and affected staff cohesion.

Key Findings on Program Participation

- **In both Eugene and Medford, control group members were more actively engaged than originally anticipated in some types of retention- and advancement-related activities. The result was smaller-than-expected differentials in levels of service receipt between the program and control groups.**

Outside ERA, there were more services than MDRC and the State of Oregon had originally expected that resembled the ERA services (such as help accessing education and training and supportive services) — services that were available to and being used by the Eugene and Medford target populations. The control group columns in Table ES.1 indicate the substantial proportions of control group members who received help or participated in services on their own initiative — that is, without any exposure to ERA. Moreover, as it turned out, the same service providers outside the program to which ERA staff referred program participants also could be accessed fairly easily by motivated individuals in the control group. In Eugene, for example, all TANF recipients who participated in Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS), Oregon’s welfare-to-work program, were informed about and encouraged to use the services available to them at the local One-Stop service center (funded by the federal Workforce Investment Act). After these former TANF recipients found jobs, some of them became control group members and accessed One-Stop services on their own. Likewise, in Medford, the local One-Stop’s services were similar to those offered by ERA, and, toward the end of the program period, the Medford ERA program outstationed a staff member at the One-Stop to provide services not only to ERA clients but to the public at large.

- **The Eugene ERA program did not increase rates of overall contact with employment or welfare agency staff for any purpose relative to those of control group members. The Medford ERA program did increase such contact.**

Table ES.1 summarizes the impacts of the two programs on clients’ levels of contacts with staff, their receipt of services, and their rates of participation in activities. Differences between the ERA and control groups that are marked with asterisks are statistically significant, which means that it is very unlikely that these difference arose by chance and were not due to the programs.

As shown in the top row of Table ES.1, during the year after they entered the study, about 85 percent of both the program and the control group members in Eugene reported contact with programs or organizations that help people find and/or keep jobs or with a case manager or staff person from an employment, welfare, or similar type of agency. The high percentage of sample members reporting contact with program or agency staff members is likely due to the fact that when most sample members entered the study, they were recent welfare leavers, and leavers often contact welfare agencies to maintain subsidized medical coverage and/or child care benefits.

The Employment Retention and Advancement Project

Table ES.1

Impacts on Contact, Services, and Participation

Eugene and Medford

Outcome	Eugene				Medford			
	ERA Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	ERA Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Any contacts with case manager/employment program since random assignment ^a (%)	83.4	85.7	-2.3	0.518	73.0	62.4	10.6 **	0.045
Average number of contacts with staff/case manager	21.4	17.5	4.0	0.114	9.9	6.5	3.4 **	0.038
Ever met with staff/case manager (%)	76.9	75.4	1.4	0.735	58.1	47.2	11.0 **	0.050
Received help with support services (%)	65.9	58.6	7.3	0.110	38.6	39.0	-0.4	0.942
Received help with basic needs (%)	57.7	50.0	7.8	0.110	40.2	37.5	2.7	0.623
Received help with public benefits (%)	79.8	73.8	6.0	0.148	55.3	66.1	-10.7 **	0.046
Received help with job preparation (%)	50.3	40.1	10.2 **	0.036	25.9	19.6	6.3	0.164
Received help with retention/advancement (%)	38.2	21.8	16.4 ***	0.000	24.6	16.3	8.3 *	0.063
Ever participated in any activity ^b (%)	81.0	74.0	7.0 *	0.087	63.3	55.8	7.4	0.178
Participated in a job search activity (%)	74.8	67.0	7.9 *	0.072	46.2	43.1	3.1	0.569
Participated in an education/training activity (%)	22.0	24.9	-2.9	0.487	30.2	21.7	8.4 *	0.086
Ever participated in an employment or education activity while working (%)	38.0	31.6	6.4	0.166	41.4	26.9	14.5 ***	0.006
Sample size (total = 785)	220	220			167	178		

(continued)

ES-7

Table ES.1 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations from responses to the ERA 12-Month Survey.

NOTES: Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Two-tailed t-tests were applied to differences between outcomes for the ERA group and the control group. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: * = 10 percent; ** = 5 percent; and *** = 1 percent.

Unless otherwise stated, results in Eugene are for sample members who were randomly assigned from June 24, 2002, through June 29, 2004. Results in Medford are for sample members who were randomly assigned from February 21, 2002, through April 29, 2004.

^aThis measure includes respondents who said "yes" on the client survey to either of the following questions: "Have you had any experiences with programs or organizations that help people find or keep jobs since your random assignment date?" "Since your random assignment date, have you had any contact, in-person or by phone, with a case manager or a staff person from an employment, welfare or other agency?" However, subsequent survey questions regarding the number and location of contacts were asked only of respondents who said "yes" to the latter question. Therefore, there are some respondents who reported contact but were not asked about the number and location of contacts.

^b"Any activity" includes employment-related activities, education/training activities, life skills, and other types of activities.

In Medford, about 73 percent of the program group, compared with about 62 percent of the control group, reported contact with staff from an employment or similar type of program during the year after they entered the study.

- **ERA program group members in both sites were more likely than their control group counterparts to have reported that they had received help specifically with employment retention, advancement, and preparing for work. Still, overall levels of receipt of help among program group members were lower than expected.**

As shown in Table ES.1 (“received help with retention/advancement”), about 38 percent of the Eugene program group, compared with 22 percent of the Eugene control group, reported having received assistance directly related to keeping a job or advancing to a better one. Specifically, the Eugene program led to increases in receiving help focused on career assessment, on switching to a better job, and on other types of retention- or advancement-related activities. (These findings are not shown in the table.)

Only about 25 percent of the Medford program group reported having received help with employment retention and advancement, compared with 16 percent of the Medford control group, representing a more modest increase than that achieved in Eugene. In addition, the Medford program increased the percentage of program group members receiving help enrolling in job readiness or training activities (findings not shown in table).

While both programs increased the likelihood that individuals would receive support for job retention and advancement, the overall level of receipt of help was low, reflecting the difficulty that staff in both programs had in engaging employed single parents in activities focused on job retention and advancement at rates higher than what they could achieve on their own initiative.

- **ERA group members in Eugene were somewhat more likely than their control group counterparts to participate in job search activities. In Medford, ERA group members were more likely than their control group counterparts to participate in education and training.**

For both research groups and in both sites, the overall rates of participation in job search activities (third row from the bottom in Table ES.1) were much higher than expected for programs that targeted employed individuals. This was probably due to two factors: the high rate of job loss experienced by sample members following random assignment and, possibly, staff’s efforts to help sample members seek and advance to better jobs.

In the Eugene program, participation rates in job search activities were higher for the program group (about 75 percent of respondents to a survey administered approximately 12 months after their random assignment date) than for the control group (about 67 percent of respondents) (Table ES.1).

The Eugene program did not increase participation in education and training activities over the control group average.

The Medford program did not increase the proportion of individuals who participated in a job search activity, but it did increase the proportion who participated in education and training activities by 8 percentage points above the control group average of 22 percent. Most of the difference in Medford was driven by an increase in the proportion of sample members who took college courses. (Short-term vocational training offered at the local community college was part of the program’s advancement strategy.)

Key Findings on Economic Impacts

- **Neither the Eugene nor the Medford ERA program led to increases in employment retention or economic advancement.**

Table ES.2 summarizes the impacts of the Eugene and Medford programs on measures of employment retention and economic advancement over the first year and a half following random assignment, or during Quarters 2 through 7. (This follow-up period does not include the quarter of random assignment, a period when all sample members were employed.) These results are based only on unemployment insurance (UI) earnings data, not on results from the 12-month survey. Retention outcomes reflect the stability of employment over time, while advancement is measured mainly by earnings increases.² As shown in the table, neither ERA program generated a systematic increase in measures of employment retention or economic advancement.

While a high proportion of sample members in both sites worked in UI-covered jobs during the follow-up period, keeping jobs was a challenge, as indicated by the average number of quarters that sample members were employed (“average quarterly employment” in Table ES.2). Eugene program group members worked for about two-thirds of the follow-up period, and Medford program group members were employed for around three-quarters of that time.

The Eugene ERA program did increase the percentage of program group members who were ever employed during the follow-up period, representing an increase in the proportion of individuals who were still employed, but by less than 3 percentage points above the control group average of 91 percent (Table ES.2). The program generated no other impacts on measures of employment retention or advancement. Members of the program and control groups were about equally likely to be

²Staff in the Medford program defined “advancement” more broadly than earnings increases, to include, for example, reducing commuting time to work and spending more time with family. These aspects of advancement were not measured in the Medford test.

The Employment Retention and Advancement Project
Table ES.2
Impacts on UI-Covered Employment and Earnings
Eugene and Medford

Outcomes	Eugene				Medford			
	ERA Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value	ERA Group	Control Group	Difference (Impact)	P-Value
Quarters 2-7								
Ever employed (%)	93.9	91.3	2.6 *	0.092	91.5	95.5	-4.0 ***	0.005
Average quarterly employment (%)	68.9	66.5	2.3	0.237	74.7	76.7	-2.0	0.275
Number of quarters employed	4.1	4.0	0.1	0.237	4.5	4.6	-0.1	0.275
Employed 4 consecutive quarters (%)	56.1	53.9	2.1	0.457	64.8	66.5	-1.8	0.506
Total earnings (\$)	12,800	12,471	329	0.586	14,800	15,325	-525	0.350
Earned over \$15,000 (%)	39.3	35.9	3.4	0.221	44.6	46.0	-1.4	0.589
Average quarterly full-time employment (%)	19.2	17.8	1.4	0.365	22.4	25.8	-3.4 **	0.049
Ever received TANF (%)	38.7	41.9	-3.2	0.251	11.7	10.8	0.8	0.651
Amount of TANF received (\$)	1,068	1,292	-224 *	0.065	298	301	-3	0.961
Ever received food stamps (%)	95.8	96.5	-0.7	0.542	89.7	92.6	-2.9 *	0.069
Amount of food stamps received (\$)	3,591	3,603	-12	0.916	3,050	3,100	-50	0.633
Total measured income ^a (\$)	17,459	17,366	93	0.868	18,148	18,726	-578	0.279
Sample size (total = 2,301)	563	574			590	574		

(continued)

Table ES.2 (continued)

SOURCE: MDRC calculations from UI administrative records from the State of Oregon.

NOTES: This table includes only employment and earnings in jobs covered by the Oregon unemployment insurance (UI) program. It does not include employment outside Oregon or in jobs not covered by UI (for example, "off-the-books" jobs, some agricultural jobs, and federal government jobs).

Estimates were regression-adjusted using ordinary least squares, controlling for pre-random assignment characteristics of sample members.

Rounding may cause slight discrepancies in calculating sums and differences.

Two-tailed t-tests were applied to differences between outcomes for the ERA group and the control group. Statistical significance levels are indicated as follows: * = 10 percent; ** = 5 percent; and *** = 1 percent.

Dollar averages include zero values for sample members who were not employed or were not receiving TANF or food stamps.

Hourly wages have been top-coded at \$25. ERA study members with UI-wage-reported earnings and no hours worked were excluded from this analysis.

Working full time is defined as working 455 hours per quarter (35 hours per week times 13 weeks).

Unless otherwise stated, results in Eugene are for sample members who were randomly assigned from June 24, 2002, through June 29, 2004. Results in Medford are for sample members who were randomly assigned from February 21, 2002, through April 29, 2004.

^aThose who did not work are not included in this category.

employed for four consecutive quarters (56 percent and 54 percent, respectively) and to have earnings of \$15,000 or more (39 percent and 36 percent, respectively).

The Medford program did not generate statistically significant increases for any of the measures of employment retention and advancement. Instead, the program led to a reduction in employment. As shown in Table ES.2, the Medford ERA program decreased the percentage of program group members who were employed at some point during the follow-up period by about 4 percentage points below the control group average of 96 percent. This negative impact represents a reduction in the percentage who were *still employed*.

- **The ERA programs reduced the amount of TANF benefits received in Eugene below the control group average and reduced the percentage who received food stamps in Medford. There was no impact on overall income in either site.**

As shown in the lower rows of Table ES.2, the Eugene program did not affect the percentage of sample members who ever received TANF. But it did reduce the amount of TANF received among ERA group members by \$224 below the approximately \$1,300 average that control group members received during the follow-up period — a 17 percent difference. (The program did not affect levels of food stamp receipt or total income.) The reduction in the amount of TANF received was surprising because the program did not increase earnings. Especially because most of the decrease occurred early in the follow-up period, the drop may be attributable to a program practice: case managers for Eugene ERA clients would not accept an application for TANF from program participants who lost their jobs until they had completed a 45-day period in which they participated in rapid-reemployment services. Once that period had ended, they were subject to the same TANF 45-day assessment period (during which time they were required to participate in the JOBS program) as were their control group counterparts. The “extra” delay in processing an application may account for the decrease in the amount of TANF benefits received by the program group.

The Medford program produced a small reduction in the number of program group members who received food stamps at some point during the follow-up period, but it had no effect on levels of TANF receipt, amounts of benefits, or total income.

Conclusions and Policy Implications

Despite some staffing and funding problems, the Eugene and Medford ERA programs are good examples of models that try to use intensive case management, individualized career counseling, and collaboration between managing agencies to promote employment retention and advancement among low-wage workers. Neither of these two voluntary programs, however, produced sustained

or substantial effects on employment retention and advancement outcomes over one and a half years. Possible reasons for this lack of impacts include the following:

- **The programs operated in an environment where control group members were receiving high levels of employment-related assistance from existing service providers.**

The two ERA programs were designed to provide services that were different from what otherwise existed in their communities or that were not regularly used by their target populations. A main finding from these two and other ERA tests is that the working poor are already expending considerable effort on their own to get ahead in the labor market. The programs did produce some increases in the levels at which individuals received services that were focused on employment retention and advancement — specifically, job search services (Eugene) and education (Medford). But these increases were not large and so far have not translated into improved retention or advancement outcomes relative to those achieved by the control group.

The results suggest that it is critical for program operators to assess what services are actually being accessed by members of a target population and what levels of employment retention and advancement they are achieving with current levels of service. This will enable new interventions to fill service gaps and not inadvertently duplicate existing services. It remains possible, however, that, with more sustained funding or fewer implementation problems, the Eugene and Medford programs might have increased take-up rates of employment retention and advancement services more than they did and that these increases could have improved the economic impacts.

- **Future postemployment programs that are focused on advancement will need to emphasize reemployment along with advancement.**

Sample members in both the Eugene and the Medford ERA program had high levels of job loss, which made it difficult for staff to focus on advancement. This suggests that advancement programs for groups similar to the ones served in these two sites should expect high levels of rapid job loss. In fact, working with clients at the point when they are seeking reemployment may represent the best opportunity to alter their labor market trajectories. Evidence from the ERA tests in Chicago and in Riverside, California (the Post-Assistance Self-Sufficiency [PASS] program) indicate that the reemployment efforts of these programs may have led to improvements in employment and earnings.³ Other literature also points to job change as a driving force behind advancement.⁴ Viewed in that light, reemployment services represent an opportunity for promoting advancement.

³See Bloom, Hendra, and Page, *The Employment Retention and Advancement Project: Results from the Chicago ERA Site* (New York: MDRC, 2006); and Navarro, van Dok, and Hendra, *The Employment Retention and Advancement Project: Results from the Post-Assistance Self-Sufficiency (PASS) Program in Riverside, California* (New York: MDRC, 2007).

The early results presented in this report are not the final word on the Eugene and Medford program models; MDRC will continue to track sample members in these two sites using administrative records. Longer-term results will be made public when they are available.

⁴Andersson, Holzer, and Lane (2005).