

# HUMANITARIAN CENTER PROGRAM

## YEAR TWO EVALUATION



**April 2012**

**Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson, Ph.D. - Principal Investigator**  
**Sarah Tellesbo – Research Assistant**  
**Social Research Institute**  
**College of Social Work – University of Utah**

# **HUMANITARIAN CENTER PROGRAM YEAR TWO EVALUATION**

Principal Investigator:  
Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson, Ph.D.  
mvogel@socwk.utah.edu

Research Assistant:  
Sarah Tellesbo

Prepared for:  
Utah's Department of Workforce Services  
And  
Presented to The Humanitarian Center

April 2012

# HUMANITARIAN CENTER PROGRAM: YEAR TWO EVALUATION

## Executive Summary

Since October 2009, the Humanitarian Center Program has provided daily jobs skills training (4 hours) and English language classes (4 hours) to refugees seeking to gain employment to help support themselves and their families. This partnership program between Utah's Department of Workforce Services (DWS) and the LDS church seeks to "help participants improve their employable skills so that they will be job ready and able to move into family supporting paid employment at some time within approximately 12 months of program entry."

The primary outcome measures for this program are English language level gains and employment rates. Year one results indicated a great deal of success in both areas as 64 (63.4%) associates attained employment and 86 (87.8%) associates achieved at least one level gain in their English proficiency. There were also many important lessons learned throughout the course of the first year. These findings were used to make adjustments to the program during year two including increased case manager involvement, refining of the referral and placement process for DWS associates, earlier discussions regarding program exit and employment, enhanced job development efforts, and the development of additional English language programs to meet the needs of targeted populations. The introduction of these components significantly enhanced the overall functioning of the program.

These outcomes at the two year mark (all associates who entered the program between November 2009 and December 2010) are reflective of differences in associate demographics and personal histories in addition to administrative/functional changes made within the program itself.

### Year 2: Employment Outcomes

- 56 (58.9%) associates obtained employment (LDS referred = 50.9%) (DWS referred = 69.0%)
  - 60.7% of secured positions offered benefits
  - The average wage, \$9.24, is almost \$2 per hour above minimum wage
  - Of those who had been in their position 3 months or more, the retention rate was 92.1%
  - A majority of those exiting into employment came from the higher English level groups
  - DWS associates exiting into employment averaged 10.3 months in the program
- 13 associates benefited from participating in a business partnership (subsidized employment) to expand their training opportunities

### Year 2: English Language Outcomes

- 57 (62.6%) associates made 2 or more level gains (one level gain/year is typically considered successful in ESL)
- 75 (82.4%) associates made at least one level gain in their English achievement
- 3 lower level participants who did not show actual level gains made a degree of progress equivalent to at least one level gain

- 12 of the 16 associates who made no official level gains successfully exited the program with employment

## Discussion

A review of the evaluation data shows a slight decrease in employment outcomes for year two. Changes in the demographic characteristics between the two years explain these differences. The primary factor for the LDS referred associates was that significantly more females were referred in year two and 8 of these female associates had to exit due to health reasons (5 due to pregnancy).

In addition to analyzing outcome measures, feedback was elicited from stakeholders and Humanitarian Center associates. Feedback from both the first and second years, in conjunction with the findings relative to outcome measures, resulted in several recommendations and future program considerations.

## Future Considerations

- **Increase Job Rotation:** In feedback received from both job coaches and associates, it was expressed that associates would benefit from having more opportunity to rotate tasks within the Humanitarian Center (i.e. sorting, mattresses, etc.) Increased capacity for rotation would allow for associate training in a variety of areas.
- **Enhance Communication:** In response to year one findings, much effort was placed into increasing communication between the many service providers connected to the associates and significant progress was made with this focus of energy. In light of feedback and analysis, it is imperative that clear and honest communication continue to be prioritized to provide the most appropriate, effective assistance to associates in the program.
- **Continued Refinement of the Screening Process:** Many positive modifications have been made to the screening/referral process thus far, however, continued evaluation and fine tuning of this process will benefit the program and associates by ensuring that the most appropriate individuals are selected for participation. As the continuum of service expands and new programs are developed for individuals in need of other types of assistance and/or more intensive ESL services, this process will become increasingly refined.
- **Enhance Job Development:** As is apparent over time, the job development component of the Humanitarian Center Program is crucial to successful placements into employment. The job developer is crucial for two reasons, the first of which is simply increasing the opportunities for associate placements. The second reason, however, has become more apparent in the last year and manifests itself in retention rates. With a 5.4% increase in employment retention over year one, it seems as though focusing on individualized job development can also impact the ability/desire for associates to keep their jobs on a long-term basis.
- **Ongoing Informal Evaluation:** The population at the Humanitarian Center is not static; nor are the external agencies responding to this community. It is important, therefore, to continue to evaluate the program and its effectiveness on an ongoing basis and make adjustments as necessary. Informal means of analysis and evaluation can help guide program efforts into avenues that will be most beneficial to everyone involved.

# HUMANITARIAN CENTER PROGRAM: YEAR TWO EVALUATION

## Introduction

The Humanitarian Center, sponsored by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS), has provided training and placement services for program “associates” since 1991. Traditionally, the program consisted of intensive employment skills training for those in need of such training and a few hours of English as a Second Language (ESL) classes for those in need of English skill development. The philosophy of the program includes the belief that moving participants toward self-reliance through employment “transforms lives” for participants and their families.

In October 2009 a partnership effort between Utah’s Department of Workforce Services and the LDS Church launched an innovative program to serve refugees living in the Salt Lake valley who were in need of both English language skills and job training. The mission of this program is to:

“provide job skills training and English language classes to refugees seeking to gain employment to help support themselves and their families. The goal of the program is to help participants improve their employable skills so that they will be job ready and able to move into family supporting paid employment at some time within approximately 12 months of program entry.”

In this program, all associates receive 4 hours of work skills training and 4 hours of English skills instruction (3 hours of classroom instruction, 1 hour of activities with volunteers) five days a week. This model of combining intensive work skill and language acquisition is innovative and unique. A team of workers (job coach, English teacher, development specialist, job developer and volunteers) work closely with each associate to help them gain the work and English skills needed for future employment. Funding for the program is provided through the Refugee Services Office (RSO), DWSs’ TANF grant and the LDS Church.

Now in its third year of functioning, the Humanitarian Center Program has successfully assisted hundreds of refugee and immigrant associates transition into employment and increase their English language skills. Over time, components of the program have been modified and improved based on both feedback from stakeholders and associates, as well as the ongoing analyses of outcomes.

## Year One Outcomes and Lessons

The evaluation of the first year of the Humanitarian Center Program produced findings for 101 associates, that is, all associates entering the program between October 2009 and September 2010. In summary, significant findings from year one include: (See Appendix A for complete year one data)

### Year 1: Employment Outcomes

- 64 (63.4%) associates obtained employment (LDS referred = 54.7%) (DWS referred = 72.9%)
  - Nearly all (82.8%) positions offered benefits
  - The average wage, \$9.34, is more than \$2 per hour above minimum wage
  - Of those who had been in their position 3 months or more the retention rate was 90.5%

- A majority of those exiting into employment came from the higher English level groups
- DWS associates exiting into employment averaged 11.2 months in the program
- 12 associates benefited from participating in a business partnership (subsidized employment) to expand their training opportunities

#### **Year 1: English Language Outcomes**

- 58.1% made 2 or more level gains (1 level gain/year is typically considered successful in ESL)
- 86 (87.8%) associates made at least one level gain in their English achievement
- 4 lower level participants who did not show actual level gains made a degree of progress equivalent to at least one level gain
- All 6 associates who made no level gains also exited with no employment;
  - No previous education, no parental education, and no previous ESL were factors associated with 0 level gains; older age and less time in the U.S. were also predictive

From stakeholder and first-year associate feedback, in addition to more extensive data analysis, recommendations were developed for consideration as the program moved into its second year.

#### **Year 1: Recommendations**

Strengthen communication and partnerships between the many service providers working with each associate.

- Re-evaluate the screening process for admitting associates into the program.
- Develop a process to begin formally discussing employment approximately three months prior to Humanitarian Center exit.
- Call together community service providers to evaluate the continuum of care in areas of ESL programs and employment development
- Reactivate the Employment Subcommittee of the Governor's Refugee Advisory Committee
- Provide a skilled, trained job developer to work with all associates exiting the program

Data from the year one study was presented in February 2011 and was used to make adjustments in the program moving forward.

#### **Year Two Additions**

Efforts to continue the program mission and incorporate the experience gained from year one led to much learning and growth, including some practical shifts in the implementation of specific components of the program. While the basic design of the program remained the same, significant changes were introduced into the program based on year one findings.

**Case Manager Involvement:** While job coaches and ESL instructors work with associates on a daily basis during their time in the program, case managers from the referring agencies have often worked with the entire family for much longer. Case manager insights regarding the broader strengths and challenges for the associate and their family provide important information when designing a plan for moving from the program into employment. Case managers have been

encouraged to increase their involvement with clients in the Humanitarian Center program. It was also hoped that the additional focus on external case management would facilitate better communication between the many service providers connected to each associate and their family. In addition, this information from the case manager could be used by onsite job coaches and job developers to more effectively advocate for the associates and identify the appropriate next steps.

**Screening Process:** Toward the end of year one the number of appropriate referrals of potential DWS associates declined dramatically. This was most surprising as the original criteria for program entry had been established by the referring agencies and DWS based on their knowledge of the needs of the refugee community. Outreach to the referring agencies and re-education on program entry criteria and benefits was initiated to boost referrals. The goal was to ensure that the most appropriate DWS associates were accepted into the program and others were referred to community programs and agencies that could better meet their needs.

**Addition of an LDS Associate Job Developer:** During the first year of the program, DWS was able to fund a full time job developer to provide individualized development services to associates at the Humanitarian Center. As the position was funded by DWS, job development focused on DWS associates, although job leads were often provided to Humanitarian Center personnel assisting LDS associates with job development. The DWS job developer was a critical component of the job placement success for DWS associates in the first year. In light of these successes, those responsible for assisting the LDS associates also recruited a part-time job developer to assist in program exits into employment during the second year.

**Earlier Employment Discussions:** Toward the end of year one it was very common for associates to report surprise and even fear as they learned that in perhaps a month or six weeks their time in the program was going to end. Designing a process to better assist the associate in navigating program exit became a priority. A process was designed to engage each associate in discussion for planning their next steps. These discussions began occurring at 3 months prior to exit during the second year and incorporated job coaches, job developers, case managers, and the associates themselves. In addition to preparing the associate for ending their training period in the program, it was hoped that this early initiation of next step planning would assist the job developer in finding positions well suited to the needs and interests of each associate.

**Alternative Program Development:** In evaluating first year findings, it became increasingly clear that the Humanitarian Center program was most beneficial for associates with some level of literacy in their native language. It was noted that pre-literate individuals had more difficulty obtaining and retaining employment in addition to struggling to keep up with the pace of ESL classes. While referrals for pre-literate associates were frequent, it was recognized that these individuals required more intensive services prior to entering the Humanitarian Center program.

As a direct result of this realization, a program called Pre-Literate Refugee Employment Skills Training (PREST) was developed using grant money obtained through the Office of Refugee Resettlement. This new program was made available to pre-literate individuals (especially targeting those receiving cash assistance through the Family Employment Program (FEP)) and offered 6 hours of ESL per day for nine months, followed by a less intensive work/ESL portion in months 10-12, in an effort to help secure employment. This would take the place of other FEP requirements and could be

used as a spring board into other ESL programs such as the Humanitarian Center program where individuals still not ready to work could obtain an additional 12 months of ESL and work support.

### Year Two Findings – Demographics and Primary Outcome Measures

There were 95 associates who entered the Humanitarian Center Program between November 2009 and December 2010. The findings presented below provide descriptions and details regarding the primary outcome measures for this program, employment and English language level gains. All 95 associates have completed their time in the program; the final participant in this cohort exited in mid February 2012.

#### Demographics

As shown in Table 1, the ratio of male to female associates was approximately equal in the year two group of associates. However, there were significant differences between the two groups as females comprised the majority of LDS associates and males were more prevalent in the DWS group. Overall, female participation increased nearly 10% between years one and two. This reduction in the number of single male associates in the LDS cohort clearly influenced the average family size and the overall population being served.

**Table 1: Demographics of Associates (November 2009 – December 2010)**

	<b>LDS Associates N = 53</b>	<b>DWS Associates N = 42</b>	<b>Total N = 95</b>
Gender			
Male	20 (37.7%)	28 (66.7%)	48 (50.5%)
Female	33 (62.3%)	14 (33.3%)	47 (49.5%)
Average age at program start (range: 18 – 60)	36.5 yrs	40.0 yrs	38.0 yrs
Primary Languages (top 7 of 22)			
Nepali	6	12	18 (18.9%)
Kirundi	9	3	12 (12.6%)
Arabic	2	8	10 (10.5%)
Karen	5	5	10 (10.5%)
French	7	2	9 (9.5%)
Spanish	7	0	7 (7.4%)
Farsi	0	4	4 (4.2%)
Time In US prior to program: (Range 2 – 59 months)			
8 months or less	10 (18.9%)	7 (16.7%)	17 (19.5%)
9 months - 2 years	15 (28.3%)	25 (59.5%)	40 (46.0%)
More than 2 years	28 (52.8%)	10 (23.8%)	30 (34.5%)
Average Family size	4.0 people	5.2 people	4.6 people
Total household members impacted by program	182 people	215 people	397 people



The primary languages spoken by program participants did not change significantly between years one and two. However, associates in the year two group generally spent more time in the U.S. prior to their participation in the Humanitarian Center program as compared to the first group of associates. The fact that residency in the U.S. for more than 8 months was a qualification for DWS associates likely influenced results for this group. In addition, many LDS referred associates are assisted by their local Bishop for a period of time prior to referral to this program. This, in addition to the fact that some LDS associates in the program were not members of the refugee community (N = 8) could also have influenced these findings.

### Work History

As in year one, associates were interviewed shortly after program arrival to better understand the work and education experiences each person brought into the program. As shown in Table 2, nearly three quarters of program participants had worked in their own country prior to coming to the U.S., while only about 39% have worked since coming to this country. These findings represent a significant shift from the work histories of year one participants. Overall, fewer associates in the second year group had worked in their native country (Year 1 = 96.4%; Year 2 = 71.0%), but more had worked in the U.S. at some point prior to being accepted into the Humanitarian Center Program (Year 1 = 21.7%; Year 2 = 38.7%).

**Table 2: Previous Work History**

	LDS Associates N = 51	DWS Associates N = 42	Total N = 93	
Ever work in native country: (Range: 1 month to 45 years)	Yes	37 (72.5%)	29 (69.0%)	66 (71.0%)
	No	14 (27.5%)	13 (31.0%)	27 (29.0%)
Ever work in United States: (Range: 1 month to 5 years)	Yes	19 (37.3%)	17 (40.5%)	36 (38.7%)
	No	32 (62.7%)	25 (59.5%)	57 (61.3%)

### Education History

Findings regarding the educational backgrounds of year two associates are found in Table 3. Analysis of educational levels for the year two cohort found that while the average years of formal education decreased between years one and two (from 8.5 years to 5.5 years), there was an 11.8% increase in associates with *any* educational background. (The introduction of the PREST program as an alternative for refugees with no former education certainly could have played a role in this outcome.) As a group the LDS cohort entered the program with more educational background than the DWS associates. However the distribution of DWS cohort is more even and the LDS cohort is more weighted toward the top. Gender also plays a role in education levels in many of the countries from which the refugee originate. The LDS cohort had a higher proportion of females in year two.

Analysis of education by gender found that a higher proportion of those with no education history were also female.

**Table 3: Education History**

	<b>LDS Associates N = 53</b>	<b>DWS Associates N = 42</b>	<b>Total N = 95</b>
Attended any school prior to U.S. arrival	34 (64.2%)	25 (59.5%)	59 (62.1%)
Average years of formal education (Range 1 – 16)	6.1 years	4.7 years	5.5 years
Years of formal education			
None	19 (37.2%)	17 (40.5%)	36 (38.7%)
1 year	1 (1.9%)	3 (7.1%)	4 (4.3%)
2 – 5 years	6 (11.8%)	6 (14.3%)	12 (12.9%)
6 – 9 years	7 (13.7%)	6 (14.3%)	13 (14%)
10 – 12 years	12 (22.6%)	5 (11.9%)	17 (18.3%)
13 or more years	6 (11.8%)	5 (11.9%)	11 (11.8%)
	<b>N = 51*</b>	<b>N = 42</b>	<b>N = 93</b>
Attended school in refugee camp	14 (27.5%)	9 (21.4%)	23 (24.7%)
Average years of school in refugee camp (Range .5 – 20 years)	6.7 years	3.2 years	5.3 years
Taught by family at home	4 (7.8%)	1 (2.4%)	5 (5.4%)
Highest level of schooling completed:			
None	25 (49.0%)	27 (64.3%)	52 (56%)
Primary	4 (7.8%)	5 (11.9%)	9 (9.7%)
Secondary	17 (33%)	6 (14.3%)	23 (24.7%)
College/University	5 (9.8%)	4 (9.5%)	9 (9.7%)

\*Two LDS associates did not complete an intake interview.

## **PRIMARY OUTCOMES**

For associates training at the Humanitarian Center the primary goal is to move into employment. As employers have made clear, a necessary skill for most employment is basic English proficiency. Thus, the primary outcomes for this program include both English skill level gains and employment measures.

### **Employment**

As reported above, associate exits into unsubsidized employment remained relatively stable over two years, however, a decrease of 6.4% was seen in fully subsidized employment placements for

second year associates. Associates in the second year also had slightly higher rates of program exits due to health issues, low participation, and program time limits for DWS associates.

Impressively, of those hired more than 3 months prior to this report, 97.1% were able to retain their employment. This reflects a 6.6% increase in employment retention over the course of two years. This increase in retention could be attributed to many things including higher rates of previous U.S. work among second year associates, as well as additional programmatic emphasis on individualized job development.

**Table 4: Employment Outcomes**

<b>As of April, 2012</b>	<b>Year One</b>			<b>Year Two</b>		
<b>Program</b>	<b>LDS Associates N = 53</b>	<b>DWS Associates N = 48</b>	<b>Total N = 101</b>	<b>LDS Associates N = 53</b>	<b>DWS Associates N = 42</b>	<b>Total N = 95</b>
<b>Program Exits Reasons</b>						
Employment	29 (55.4%)	35 (72.9%)	64 (63.4%)	27 (50.9%)	29 (69.0%)	56 (58.9%)
Transfer to other training program	5 (9.4%)	-0-	5 (5.0%)	-0-	-0-	-0-
Health problems	2 (3.8%)	2 (4.2%)	4 (4.0%)	8 (15.1%)	2 (4.8%)	10 (10.5%)
Moved	5 (9.4%)	4 (8.3%)	9 (8.9%)	4 (7.5%)	-0-	4 (4.2%)
Lacked progress/low participation	8 (15.1%)		8 (7.9%)	9 (17.0%)		9 (9.5%)
End of training period	4 (7.5%)	7 (14.6%)	11 (10.9%)	2 (3.8%)	10 (23.8%)	12 (12.6%)
Other				3 (5.7%)	1 (2.4%)	4 (4.2%)
<b>EMPLOYMENT PROFILES</b>						
<b>Employment</b> (Range: \$7.25 - \$16.00)	N = 29	N = 35	N = 64	N = 27	N = 29	N = 56
Benefits available	24 (82.3%)	32 (91.4%)	56 (87.5%)	13 (48.1%)	21 (72.4%)	34 (60.7%)
Average Wage	\$8.81	\$9.76	\$9.34	\$9.11	\$9.36	\$9.24
<b>Exits into employment from each ESL instructional level:</b>						
Red (lowest)	-0-	3 (8.6%)	3 (4.7%)	1 (3.7%)	3 (10.3%)	4 (7.1%)
Yellow (mid-low)	3 (10.3%)	12 (34.3%)	15 (23.4%)	6 (22.2%)	9 (31.0%)	15 (26.8%)
Blue (mid-high)	10 (34.5%)	12 (34.3%)	22 (34.4%)	5 (18.5%)	10 (34.5%)	15 (26.8%)
Green (highest)	16 (55.2%)	8 (22.9%)	24 (37.5%)	15 (55.6%)	7 (24.1%)	22 (39.3%)
<b>Those working more than 3 months:</b>	N = 29	N = 35	N = 64	N = 17	N = 19	N = 36
Employment Retention at 3 months	24 (82.6%)	34 (97.1%)	57 (90.5%)	17 (100%)	18 (94.7%)	35 (97.1%)

Results indicate a particularly large decrease in the number of job placements with benefits over the course of two years, from 87.5% for first year associates to 60.7% for second year associates. This may be reflective of changes in the job market, as well as the previously mentioned demographic changes in the year two cohort. As with the population at large, many workers are

currently experiencing underemployment. Those who wish to be working full time are taking part time work as that is what is available. Of course besides fewer hours, part time work is also less desirable as benefits are generally not offered.

### ESL Level Gains

ESL levels associated with employment placements remained stable with a positive correlation between employment and higher English language skills.

**Table 5: English Language Gains**

ESL level gains	Year One			Year Two		
	LDS Associates N = 51	DWS Associates N = 47	Total N = 98*	LDS Associates N = 53	DWS Associates N = 42	Total N = 91*
Number of level gains						
0 level gains	6 (11.8%)	6 (12.8%)	12 (12.3%)	5 (9.4%)	11 (26.2%)	16 (17.6%)
1 level gain	16 (31.4%)	13 (27.6%)	29 (29.6%)	12 (22.6%)	6 (14.3%)	18 (19.8%)
2 level gains	15 (29.4%)	16 (34.0%)	31 (31.6%)	10 (18.9%)	13 (31.0%)	23 (26.4%)
3 level gains	8 (15.7%)	6 (12.8%)	14 (14.3%)	11 (20.8%)	7 (16.7%)	18 (19.8%)
4 level gains	5 (9.8%)	5 (10.6%)	10 (10.2%)	5 (9.4%)	5 (11.9%)	10 (11.0%)
5 level gains	1 (2.0%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (2.0%)	3 (5.7%)	-0-	3 (3.3%)
7 level gains				3 (5.7%)	-0-	3 (3.3%)
Associates with at least one level gain	45 (88.2%)	41 (87.2%)	86 (87.8%)	44 (83.0%)	31 (73.8%)	75 (82.4%)

\*3 associates left prior to testing

\*4 associates left prior to testing

While associates gaining at least one English level decreased by 5.4% from year one, three associates in year two were able to achieve 7 level gains. These types of level gains are unprecedented in such a short amount of time and reflect incredible strides made by year two associates in improving their English proficiency.

Of the 16 associates who did not achieve any level gains, 8 initially tested at the lowest level (ESOL = 0) and did not advance to level one while participating in the Humanitarian Center program. This group of associates had less background education, spent a longer period of time in the program, and had lower rates of successful employment outcomes than their higher-level counterparts (see Table 6). That said, it should be noted that 2 DWS associates and 1 LDS associate starting at this lowest level made progress of 10 points or more which is generally equivalent to one level gain.

The remaining 8 associates who achieved no level gains tested into higher levels initially (ESOL > 0), thus, their potential employability was potentially higher as they began the program with more advanced ESL skills.

**Table 6: No Level Gain Group Comparison**

	<b>English Level Start = 0 N = 8</b>	<b>English Level Start &gt; 0 N = 8</b>
No Background Education	7 (87.5%)	4 (50.0%)
Length of Time in Program	10.5 months	7 months
Employment Placement	5 (62.5%)	7 (87.5%)

Also of note, 4 associates exited the program prior to being tested. Two of these associates left the program due to health reasons, one moved into a different training program, and the last moved to another state.

As noted in the findings from year one, educational attainment prior to program participation had a positive correlation to successful employment placement.

## **DISCUSSION**

A review of the data highlights several key pieces of information relative to the Humanitarian Center Program. Changes in the demographic make-up of the population (more females and fewer single adult men) could certainly have had an impact on program outcomes as some cultural elements relative to the roles of women in the home and work force come into play.

The primary factor for the LDS referred associates was that significantly more females were referred in year two and 8 of these female associates had to exit due to health reasons (5 due to pregnancy). There were also significant changes in the work and education histories which could impact current employment outcomes. Often, little is known about these aspects of a potential associate's background when being referred to the program. Changes in DWS employment rates generally resulted from a higher percentage of associates coming to the end of their 12 month program and exiting the program prior to securing a job of any type.

Changes in programmatic components could also explain some of the shifts in outcomes. While all changes were initiated based on lessons learned during the first year, there is no guarantee that these changes improved program outcomes.

Overall, the second year of the program involved a great deal of change. Many workers have noted that regular meetings to discuss associate progress, especially as each associate reaches the nine month mark, contributed to the overall success in matching associates with employment for which they are both qualified and that meets their interests at least to some degree. Issues such as child care, transportation and cultural norms also need to be addressed. Ongoing conversations with associates as they near the end of their training period are critical to providing a smooth transition from training to employment.

In addition to analyzing outcome measures, feedback was elicited from many of those actively involved with the program during this second year of the Humanitarian Center program.

Feedback from both the first and second years, in conjunction with the findings relative to outcome measures, resulted in several recommendations and future program considerations.

### **Future Considerations**

- **Increase Job Rotation:** In feedback received from both job coaches and associates, it was expressed that associates would benefit from having more opportunity to rotate tasks within the Humanitarian Center (i.e. sorting, mattresses, etc.) Increased capacity for rotation would allow for associate training in a variety of areas.
- **Enhance Communication:** In response to year one findings, much effort was placed into increasing communication between the many service providers connected to the associates and significant progress was made with this focus of energy. In light of feedback and analysis, it is imperative that clear and honest communication continue to be prioritized to provide the most appropriate, effective assistance to associates in the program.
- **Continued Refinement of the Screening Process:** Many positive modifications have been made to the DWS screening/referral process, however, continued evaluation and fine tuning of this process will benefit the program and associates by ensuring that the most appropriate individuals are selected for participation. As the continuum of service expands and new programs are developed for individuals in need of other types of assistance and/or more intensive ESL services, this process will continue to be refined.
- **Enhance Job Development:** As is apparent over time, the job development component of the Humanitarian Center Program is crucial to successful placements into employment. The job developer is crucial for two reasons, the first involves simply increasing the opportunities for associate placements through an intense focus on employer relationship development. The second reason, however, has become more apparent in the last year and manifests itself in retention rates. With a 6.6% increase in employment retention over year one, it seems as though focusing on individualized job development can also impact the ability/desire for associates to keep their jobs on a long-term basis.
- **Ongoing Informal Evaluation:** The population at the Humanitarian Center is not static; nor are the external agencies responding to this community. It is important, therefore, to continue to evaluate the program and its effectiveness on an ongoing basis and make adjustments as necessary. Informal means of analysis and evaluation can help guide program efforts into avenues that will be most beneficial to everyone involved.

### **Conclusion**

As the Humanitarian Center Program moves forward, it will be important to continue evaluating the effectiveness and benefit of various activities and fine tune program components as things evolve and new groups of associates are accepted into the program. Many positive changes have already been implemented while maintaining the more fundamental and foundational aspects of the program. Through ongoing informal evaluation, decisions can be made with the best interest of both associates and administrators in mind.

**Appendix A. Year One Statistics – Tables & Extended Information**

**Table 1: Demographics of Associates (October 2009)**

	<b>LDS Associates N = 53</b>	<b>DWS Associates N = 48</b>	<b>Total N = 101</b>
Gender			
Male	30 (56.6%)	30 (62.5%)	60 (59.4%)
Female	23 (43.4%)	18 (37.5%)	41 (40.6%)
Average age at program start (range: 18 – 65)	35.8 yrs	39.7 yrs	37.7 yrs
Primary Languages (top 9 of 19)			
Nepali	14	14	28
Karen	4	6	10
Burmese	1	8	9
Kayah	0	9	9
Arabic	3	3	6
Farsi	3	3	6
Kirundi	5	0	5
Spanish	5	0	5
Chuukese	5	0	5
Years of formal education			
None	7 (13.2%)	24 (50.0%)	31 (30.7%)
1 year	5 (9.4%)	4 (8.3%)	9 (8.9%)
2 – 5 years	3 (5.7%)	10 (20.8%)	13 (12.9%)
6 – 9 years	15 (28.3%)	2 (4.2%)	17 (16.8%)
10 – 12 years	13 (24.5%)	4 (8.3%)	17 (16.8%)
13 or more years	10 (18.9%)	4 (8.3%)	14 (13.9%)
Time In US prior to program: (Range 2 – 59 months)			
8 months or less	15 (28.3%)	27 (56.3%)	42 (41.6%)
9 months - 2 years	13 (24.5%)	17 (35.4%)	30 (29.7%)
More than 2 years	25 (47.2%)	4 (8.3%)	29 (28.7%)
Average Family size	2.7 people	5.4 people	4.0 people
Total household members impacted by program	127 people	252 people	379 people

**Table 2: Job Training Outcomes (October 2009)**

<b>Program</b>	<b>LDS Associates N = 53</b>	<b>DWS Associates N = 48</b>	<b>Total N = 101</b>
Program Exits Reasons			
Unsubsidized employment	29 (54.7%)	35 (72.9%)	64 (63.4%)
Fully subsidized employment	5 (9.4%)	-0-	5 (5.0%)
Health problems	2 (3.8%)	2 (4.2%)	4 (4.0%)
Moved	5 (9.4%)	4 (8.3%)	9 (8.9%)
Program time ended/low participation	12 (22.6%)	7 (14.6%)	19 (18.8%)
Unsubsidized Employment	N = 29	N = 35	N = 64
Benefits available	24 (82.8%)	32 (91.4%)	56 (87.5%)
Average Wage (Wage range \$7.50 - \$12.00)	\$8.81	\$9.76	\$9.34
Those working more than 3 months	N = 29	N = 35	N = 64
Employment Retention at 3 months	24 (82.6%)	34 (97.1%)	57 (90.5%)

**Table 3: English Language Gains (October 2009)**

<b>ESL level gains</b>	<b>LDS Associates N = 51</b>	<b>DWS Associates N = 47</b>	<b>Total N = 98*</b>
Number of level gains			
0 level gains	6 (11.8%)	6 (12.8%)	12 (12.3%)
1 level gain	16 (31.4%)	13 (27.6%)	29 (29.6%)
2 level gains	15 (29.4%)	16 (34.0%)	31 (31.6%)
3 level gains	8 (15.7%)	6 (12.8%)	14 (14.3%)
4 level gains	5 (9.8%)	5 (10.6%)	10 (10.2%)
5 level gains	1 (2.0%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (2.0%)
Associates with at least one level gain	45 (88.2%)	41 (87.2%)	86 (87.8%)