

# HUMANITARIAN CENTER PROGRAM

## ONE YEAR EVALUATION



February 2011

Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson, Ph.D. - Principal Investigator  
Social Research Institute  
College of Social Work - University of Utah

# **HUMANITARIAN CENTER PROGRAM**

## **INITIAL EVALUATION**

Principal Investigator:  
Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson, Ph.D.  
[mvogel@socwk.utah.edu](mailto:mvogel@socwk.utah.edu)

Research Assistant:  
Genna Speno, MSW

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

February 2011

# HUMANITARIAN CENTER PROGRAM: ONE YEAR EVALUATION

## Executive Summary

The Humanitarian Center Program is a partnership between Utah's Department of Workforce Services (DWS) and the LDS Church with a mission 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."

To determine which factors most supported this goal, two models of program involvement were developed. In October 2009, 48 associates (the term used for program participants) were referred by DWS and 53 associates referred by LDS bishops (and already working at the Humanitarian Center) started the pilot program. The composition of the two groups was quite different as LDS associates were more likely to be singles and couples, have more education and have been in the U.S. for longer. Nearly one third of the original LDS associates were not refugees. DWS associates had larger families, a higher percentage of males, and to have lower literacy skills in their own language.

All associates received 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 with each associate to help them gain the work and English skills needed for future employment.

Funding for the program was provided through the Refugee Services Office (RSO), DWSs' TANF grant and the LDS Church. In the first year, the total program costs came to \$1,827,749. Of this total, \$1,626,839 went directly to associates in the form of wages. This total does not include the staff time, facility costs or supplies provided by the funding agencies.

The primary outcome measures for this program are English language level gains and employment rates. These outcomes at the one year mark indicate significant progress in both areas.

### Employment Outcomes

- 60 (59.4%) associates got full-time employment (LDS referred = 47.2%) (DWS referred = 72.9%)
  - Nearly all (91.7%) positions offering benefits
  - The average wage, \$9.38, 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 86.7%
  - 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

### English Language Outcomes

- 58.1% made 2 or more level gains (one 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 all associated with no ESL gains; further, older age and less time in the U.S. were also predictive

Moving forward into the next year presents many opportunities for growth. During the pilot year, efforts were made to improve communication between team members working with individual associates, specifically, greater inclusion of the case manager from the resettlement agency. These efforts need to continue so that associates are not pulled in different directions by service providers.

A job developer was brought on board by the RSO to facilitate DWS associates connection to the labor force. This role is critical for achieving employment success and retention. The most likely place to lose an employment placement is at the end of an associate's year and right after a job begins. A skilled job developer is needed to maintain strong relationships and support all parties through this transition time.

The data show that the Humanitarian Center Program is best suited for individuals with specific skills. There are gaps in services, especially for those needing the most assistance which should be evaluated by the larger community of refugee service providers. In this way those who can benefit from this particular program will be able to do so, while others are served by more appropriate resources. The findings of this program evaluation have led to the following recommendations.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. **Strengthen the communication and partnerships between the many service providers working with each associate.** Associates exiting the program expressed a desire for more opportunities to speak English during training and to learn more skills. Clarifying and coordinating the roles of program partners will help associates make the most of this opportunity.
2. **Re-evaluate screening process for admitting associates into the program.** Continue to focus on refugees who are willing and able to be the primary wage earner for the family or a vital secondary wage earner. Consistently communicate the goal of employment beyond the training program. Focus on candidates who are best suited to the unique strengths of this program.
3. **Develop a process to begin formally discussing employment approximately three months prior to leaving The Humanitarian Center.** Job developers need this time to build a relationship with the associate and work toward an appropriate match with a business partner. Associates will benefit from knowing that they have a partner in seeking employment, as they anticipate their pending exit from the training experience.
4. **Call together community service providers to evaluate the continuum of care in the areas of ESL programs and employment development.** The ongoing expansion of refugee programs and services calls us to step back and evaluate areas where programs are complementary, competing, over-lapping, or missing.
5. **Reactivate the Employment Subcommittee of the Governor's Refugee Advisory Committee.** Gather refugee service providers, especially those focused on employment, on a quarterly basis to discuss and coordinate employment programs and other efforts.
6. **Provide a skilled, trained job developer to work with all associates leaving the Humanitarian Center Program.** The success of the current DWS job developer exemplifies the critical role this person plays to the success of this program. This position requires a person able to develop and maintain ongoing relationships with both associates and business partners and knowledgeable of the needs of employers. This person must be available for the long haul – able to intervene, reassure, and problem-solve as the bumps in the road (for employers and employees) appear. This includes knowing what to do to retain employment and what to do if the job ends. They need to know who to call and what resources are available for these situations.

# HUMANITARIAN CENTER PROGRAM: ONE YEAR 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 Spring 2009 the Refugee Services Office (RSO) was actively developing leadership within individual refugee communities as well as implementing the new 24-month case management structure. While these programs carried great potential, the downturn in the economy exacerbated the challenges faced in helping refugees find employment. Both state and resettlement agency budgets were severely taxed by the number of requests for help. No one wanted to see refugees being evicted, yet such a scenario was eminent. Generous donors provided help to some two-parent families but expanding employment opportunities was perceived as a preferred long term solution. It was believed that by providing work skill and English language training, a member of a refugee family would gain the skills needed for placement into permanent employment.

With the encouragements of 50 plus community stakeholders involved with refugee services, leaders from the RSO approached management from the LDS Humanitarian Center and began a dialogue regarding a potential partnership between Utah’s Department of Workforce Services (DWS) and the LDS Church. Several refugee service providers participated in these early discussions including: Catholic Community Services (CCS), The International Rescue Committee (IRC), the Asian Association of Utah (AAU), Granite Peaks, and the English Skills Center. The proposal was to design a program for providing training and placement services (with work and language skill components) to refugee families.

## Best Practices

The Humanitarian Center Program represents an expression of the well researched principle that English skills are a necessary part of obtaining long term, stable employment. Various organizations have attempted to bridge the English gap through two primary program models. The first is on-site, workplace based literacy training with ESL teachers. This involves traveling to various locations to teach English skills in the workplace. The second model is classroom based vocational training (usually community college based) that includes ESL components as necessary.

A well-known example of on-site ESL training is found in the Arlington Education and Employment Program (REEP) / Hotel Workplace Literacy Project. This project provided on-site workplace literacy training to functionally illiterate, non-English speakers employed in hotels in Arlington, VA. Twenty-six on-site courses provided 60 hours of training over 12 - 15 weeks (4 - 5 hours/week). As a result of this training, “instructor ratings for specific competencies clearly indicate that the trainees achieved a majority of the job focused learning objectives for courses.” Furthermore, “the most positive impacts were on *employee morale* and *overall employee performance*.” “Supervisors reported that *productivity/efficiency* increased and that *safety* improved as a result of the literacy training.” Supervisors noted that “productivity has increased because communication has increased” and “supervisors and employees can understand each other better” (Peterson, 1990, p 13). All in all, REEP demonstrates that workplace literacy classes favorably impact trainee performance on the job (Mansoor, 1995).

The currently popular Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training (I-BEST) program in Washington State provides an example of successful classroom based vocational training. This model allows low skill students to concurrently receive work skills training and other basic instruction such as ESL (similar to the training provided at the Humanitarian Center, but at a college level). Students in the

I-BEST program are more likely to “reach the ‘tipping point’” in terms of vocational education level (represented by number of vocational college credits accrued). The tipping point is reached when the student has received just enough vocational education to potentially experience a substantial increase in earnings and higher levels of employability (Jenkins, Zeidenberg & Kienzl, 2009, p 1).

In the words of nationally renowned workplace literacy guru, Allene Groonet, “language-minority students are a diverse group — ethnically, linguistically, and culturally. Some are ready to acquire skills...but others need special support or the opportunity for language development before they are ready to compete (in the workplace) with native English-speaking peers (Groonet, 1997, p 2).

The Humanitarian Center Pilot Program is an intensive hybrid of these two program types. While traditional on-site training offers limited, job-specific English to low level speakers, the Humanitarian Center offers a broader approach to English learning for non-native speakers. While classroom based vocational training is generally reserved for higher level ESL speakers with fewer work skills, the Humanitarian Center provides work training to those who are not yet ready for community college level ESL. Furthermore, the Humanitarian Center is completely unique in the level of intensity of services offered.

## **Design and Implementation**

After several months of discussion and negotiations, in October 2009 an agreement was signed and the Humanitarian Center Program partnership began. A mission statement was designed to keep all parties focused on the primary purpose of the program:

“The Humanitarian Center Program provides 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 such 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.”

### **Program Design**

The introduction of the Humanitarian Center Program involved a significant expansion of ongoing services. In the past, 50 associates (the term used for program participants) received approximately 7 hours per day in work skills training, and less than one hour of ESL instruction. The introduction of the Humanitarian Center Program reduced the work skills training to 4 hours per day and increased the intensity of the language component to approximately 4 hours per day. This expanded model created space for 100 associates to engage in the program at any one time.

**Program Participants:** Of the 101 original program openings, 48 were filled with associates referred through the resettlement agencies and approved by the RSO at DWS and 53 were filled with associates who were already training at the Humanitarian Center and had been referred by local LDS bishops. As spaces became open, a new associate from the same referral group as the person who exited, was accepted into the program.

The 53 LDS referred associates who joined the program were already participating in Humanitarian Center training. LDS associates in this program are typically referred due to a history of difficulty obtaining employment and the need to improve English skills. Some LDS associates are also TANF eligible, while others (single adults or couples with no dependent child) were not.

The 48 DWS referred associates were required to be: 1) categorically TANF eligible (generally meaning they are low income, have a child under age 18 in the home), 2) able to work M – F from 7am – 4 pm, 3) in generally good health and 4) case managed through a resettlement agency. Additional factors such as family size, income level, and length of time in the U.S. were also considered. In practice, the criteria for program entry have fluctuated significantly with many exceptions extended over time. Regardless of the referral source, all associates had a similar experience in the program. Each person participated 8 hours per day: 4 hours in job skills training and 4 hours expanding language skills for work.

**Job Skills Training:** Associates are assigned to specific job skill training positions (bailers, manufacturing, production, cafeteria, etc.) and are assigned a job coach. Assignments are made based on the physical demands of each position, the new associate's past experience and specific interests for future employment, and current openings available. The job coach works closely with each associate, developing short and longer term employment related goals. These goals focus both on gaining job skills as well as practicing the "soft skills" necessary to be successful in the American job market. Progress plans are reviewed weekly to keep the associate focused on his or her goals and moving forward. Resettlement agency case managers work in partnership with the job coaches. Case managers assist in registering new associates in the program and participate in quarterly meetings to ensure continuity of care to the associate and the family as a whole.

**English Skills Development:** Associates engaged in ESL classroom activities for three hours per day, with one additional hour of English practice in small groups with volunteers or on the computer. Associates were assigned a group according to skill level at program entry. Many entering associates have had some recent experience in ESL and have scores which can be used as a baseline. Those with no recent ESL involvement were tested to determine a starting point. The CASAS and TABE<sup>1</sup> tests were used for all initial testing and all subsequent progress tests.

The intensity of the language component is a significant change from previous practice at the Humanitarian Center. Previously, LDS Humanitarian Center associates engaged in approximately 40 minutes per day of ESL activities, which generally meant about 20 – 30 minutes of actual instruction once the class was settled and focused. This unique combination of intensive language development and employment skills training has attracted the attention of national experts in the area of employment focused adult language training.

About two months after the start of the program, Burna Dunn<sup>2</sup> (Project Director for the English Language Training Programs) and other leaders of the Spring Institute, observed the program in process. Ms. Dunn indicated that transitioning from 1 hour per day to 4 hours per day of ESL meant more than simply multiplying the effects by four. In her estimation, the combination of classroom instruction, intensive interaction with the volunteers, and the work site learning created an even opportunity for success. Together, various components could multiply the overall effects. This was a very hopeful endorsement for the future prospects of the program.

**Moving Into Employment:** As associates progress in their work and language skills, they are assisted in developing resumes and preparing for job search activities. Quarterly meetings focused on developing a solid exit strategy for movement into unsubsidized employment. These meetings include the associate, job coach, English teacher, resettlement agency case manager, and job developers. Each partner in this process contributed to the conversation regarding the associate and the time line for exit.

For some associates the transition into employment required a "trial period" either for the employer, the associate or both. Business partnerships (subsidized employment) provided opportunities for employers to try out having a refugee join their business, and for associates to perhaps explore a new type of work. While not all business partnerships led directly to employment, many associates did become employed through this process. Those who did not get hired gained valuable on the job experience.

---

<sup>1</sup> CASAS (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment Systems) is a tool providing life-skills context-based assessment often used to evaluate basic skills levels focusing primarily on language skills. TABE (Tests of Adult Basic Education) assesses adult basic skills in vocabulary, reading, language, language mechanics, mathematics, and spelling. Both are nationally recognized assessment tools.

<sup>2</sup> Burna L. Dunn, ELT/TA Project Director, has been at the Spring Institute for Intercultural Learning since 1991. She has had extensive teaching experience overseas and in the U.S. Since May 1998, Ms. Dunn has been the Project Director for the ELT/TA grant.

## Funding

Both DWS (through the RSO) and the LDS Humanitarian Center have made substantial financial commitments to the success of this partnership. Table 1 reflects the actual dollars spent on current contracts and associate wages during the first 12 months of the program. TANF dollars have been used to pay the vocational English portion of the wages for TANF eligible associates. As outlined in the referral process, all DWS associates must be TANF eligible, however, some LDS associates also met this criteria and were paid from TANF funds. During the first year the number of TANF eligible associates ranged from 61 to 74 per month. TANF dollars were also used to hire a full-time job developer to assist with the placement of associates leaving the program. This position started at the end of August 2010.

The RSO has contributed monies from the Social Services Block Grant to cover the Granite Peaks and English Skills Learning Center (ESLC) contracts. In addition, the RSO contributes to the program by providing personnel paid through Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) funds. This includes approximately 25% time from a DWS program specialist.

Through Humanitarian Center funds, the LDS Church contributes approximately \$68,500 per month to fund the job skills portion for all workers. The Humanitarian Center has an annual contract with Granite Peaks to provide ESL classes. These are not new dollars but have been transferred from the program already in place. The Humanitarian Center provides all classroom and worksite space and assumes all utility and maintenance expenses. They also provide all computers, books and materials needed for the classrooms and learning areas.

**Table 1: Financial Commitment to Humanitarian Center Program: Oct. 15, 2009 – Oct. 15, 2010**

Humanitarian Center Program	DWS		Humanitarian Center	
	Average Monthly	12-month Total	Average Monthly	12-month Total
English for work skills: (TANF eligible)	\$46,800	\$561,500		
English for work skills: (Non-TANF eligible)			\$20,253	\$243,039
Employment work skills training			\$68,500	\$822,000*
Granite Peaks ESL services contract	\$13,333	\$160,000	\$1667	\$20,000
English Skills Learning Center (ESLC)	\$1250	\$15,000		
Job Developer (Start date: 8/31/10)	\$3500	\$6210		
Total	\$64,883	\$742,710	\$90,420	\$1,085,039

\* - This figure reflects ongoing production costs to the Humanitarian Center regardless of current program

Coordinating the program onsite requires approximately 20% of an LDS Humanitarian Center mid-level manager's time. Individual job coaches have experienced a 30% increase in their caseloads, and support staff and cafeteria services have expanded to accommodate additional associates. There was also a need to hire a new full time job coach and designate 25 hours per week of one Development Specialist's time to this group. In addition, there are many community volunteers who donate, on average, 65 hours per week assisting with the ESL classes.

## **Preliminary Findings and Program Adjustments**

In Spring 2010, a preliminary report was presented to key stakeholders in the program. As of April 15, 2010 (6 months into the program):

- 121 refugees had participated in the program
- 468 family members benefited from the income received during this period
- 10 associates moved into full time employment – all positions offering benefits
- 74 (69.2%) associates made at least one level gain in their English achievement (a level of achievement which typically takes at least a year to complete)
- 14 lower level participants who have not shown actual level gains have in fact made a degree of progress equivalent to at least one level gain

Program partners were generally very pleased with the early progress of the associates, especially relative to English gains. The program was running well, yet areas of improvement were also recognized.

Given the many partners involved in the program it was understandable that coordination of services was an initial area in need of improvement. The goal was to have all partners involved with a particular associate work together as a team. Resettlement agency case managers were invited to the Humanitarian Center to meet job coaches and tour the facility. Throughout the year, there have been efforts to further clarify roles to improve efficiency.

There were also concerns raised regarding the unique needs of associates who were pre-literate (persons with no education in any language). Preliminary outcomes indicated these participants were not progressing as quickly as other associates, either in work or English language skills. It was decided to refrain from making any changes at that time and to evaluate outcomes again at the one year mark.

A third area of concern centered on the capacity of the program to obtain placements for exiting associates. The “placement” aspect of the program does not work unless businesses are willing to hire program associates. This requires building strong relationships with employers and providing ongoing post-employment support to manage issues that may arise. In response to this concern, a job developer was added to the team in August 2010. Her focus was on finding employers who were willing and able to hire TANF eligible associates.

## **First Year Findings – Primary Outcome Measures**

The mission statement for the Humanitarian Center Program suggests that improvements in English language and work skills leading to employment are the primary goals of the program. The current findings related to these outcome measures will be presented here using two sets of data. The first data set provides information and outcomes for the initial 101 associates who started the program in October 2009.

The second data set focuses on the 95 associates who joined the program between November 2009 and December 2010. Outcomes for this group are somewhat preliminary as more than half (51.6%) have entered the program since September 2010. It should also be noted that 15 associates joined in the month of January 2011. Outcomes for this group and other new arrivals will be presented in the future. These preliminary data are presented in Appendix 2.

### **Original Program Associates**

#### **Demographics**

The demographic composition of the original program participants is presented in Table 2. From the beginning the two methods of referral into the program resulted in significant differences between associates entering the program through DWS and LDS referrals. Notable differences between the DWS and LDS associates include:

- 15 LDS associates were not members of the refugee community
- Of the original 53 LDS associates, 39 had been at the Humanitarian Center for some length of time prior to starting this program (range : 1–19 months; average = 6 months)
- DWS associates had significantly less education prior to entering the program
- On average, DWS associates had been in the U.S. for less time
- 31 (58.5%) of the LDS associates were from households of only one or two persons. DWS associate households, by definition, contained two adults and at least one child

**Table 2: Demographics Of Initial Group: October 2009**

	LDS Associates N = 53	DWS Associates N = 48	Total N = 101
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
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

### Associate Background Information

New associates are assisted in completing a short questionnaire that provides a more holistic view of the experiences each person brings to the program. Associates are asked about their educational background, literacy skills in their native and other languages, ESL experiences, employment history and parental education background. DWS and LDS associates varied significantly in several areas. Information from this survey is presented here and in Appendix 1.

**Previous Employment:** The idea of working is not foreign to most program associates. As shown in Table 3, all DWS associates and most LDS associates worked at least one job in their home country prior to coming to the U.S. Of the original group, 39% had more than one job and 23% listed three jobs prior to U.S. arrival. The types of jobs most commonly listed were farmers (either for their own food or as a paid job), housekeepers, cooks and construction workers. There were also some who had been teachers, artists and small business owners. Some refugee camps did not allow residents to work at all.

**Table 3: Previous Work History**

		<b>LDS Associates N = 39</b>	<b>DWS Associates N = 44</b>	<b>Total N = 83</b>
Ever work in native country: (Range: 4 months to 50 years)	Yes	36 (92.3%)	44 (100.0%)	80 (96.4%)
	No	3 (7.7%)	-0-	3 (3.6%)
Ever work in United States: (Range: 1 month to 7 years)	Yes	12 (30.8%)	6 (13.6%)	18 (21.7%)
	No	27 (69.2%)	38 (86.4%)	65 (78.3%)

One fifth of the sample reported previous work in the U.S. Of this group, 19% reported having had a second job and 7% reported a third U.S. job prior to starting this program. Most of these jobs focused on the service industry with a few having worked at Dessert Industries or on a DWS worksite.

**Education Background:** Previous experience with any form of education is a significant help when attempting to learn a new language. Educational background was an area of difference between the initial DWS and LDS associates as just over one third of DWS associates had any educational background while two thirds of LDS associates arrived with previous education. (A more extensive review of the issues related to educational background and parent's education can be found after Appendix 1-Table C.) Associates in this program have significantly less education than the range typically found in ESL classes. With nearly one third of the whole group never having had any formal education, the challenges that come with beginning the process of "learning to learn" are greater.

**Table 4: Education History**

		<b>LDS Associates N = 39</b>	<b>DWS Associates N = 44</b>	<b>Total N = 83</b>
Attended any school prior to U.S. arrival		26 (66.7%)	16 (36.4%)	42 (50.6%)
Average years of formal education (Range 2 – 18)		8.9 years	7.8 years	8.5 years
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%)
Attended school in refugee camp		14 (35.9%)	8 (18.2%)	22 (26.5%)
Average years of school in refugee camp (Range .25 – 13 years)		6.9 years	4.0 years	5.9 years
Taught by family at home		7 (17.95)	2 (4.5%)	9 (10.8%)
Highest level of schooling completed:	None	9 (23.1%)	27 (61.4%)	36 (43.4%)
	Primary	14 (35.9%)	8 (18.2%)	22 (26.5%)
	Secondary	9 (23.1%)	3 (6.8%)	12 (14.5%)
	College/University	7 (17.9%)	5 (11.4%)	12 (14.5%)

**Language Skills - Native Language and English:** The levels of education attained are mirrored in the associates' abilities to read and write in their own language (Appendix 1- Table A). The inability to read or write in one's own language has an impact on a person's ability to learn a new language. DWS associates were more than twice as likely to report no ability to read or write in their own language. LDS associates were more likely to speak an additional language. Perhaps because of their capacity to read and/or write in their own language, these associates were more likely to report these skills in a second language as well. Overall, approximately 40% of the sample reported speaking third language and 10% knew a fourth language.

Prior to coming to the U.S., 41% of associates (59% LDS referred and 25% DWS referred) had formally studied English. This experience prior to coming to the U.S. could certainly make a difference in their starting point in the program. In addition, a significantly higher number of LDS associates were co-enrolled in the Humanitarian Center program and another ESL class. On the other hand, nearly half of the group had never attended any other ESL class prior to coming to the Humanitarian Center.

## **Primary Outcomes**

Associates who train at the Humanitarian Center have many beneficial experiences, however, the primary goal of the Humanitarian Center Program is to move associates 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 exits into employment.

### **English Language Gains**

The progress made in language acquisition was measured through testing. After an initial test, retesting occurred as the student completed each 100 – 120 hours of additional instruction. Table 5 reflects level gains which have been reported for program participants. Both the number of individuals who have made any level gains, and the actual number of level gains achieved, are significantly higher than is typical. B. Dunn, an ESL program expert from the Spring Institute, noted that one level gain over the course of an entire year is usually considered "success." By this definition, 88% of the initial associates have been "successful" in the ESL portion of their training.

Jennifer Christenson, the full time instructor and site coordinator from Granite Peaks, has been an adult ESL instructor for 11 years. She credits the extraordinary levels of success to the intensity of the language program coupled with a highly stable learning environment. Since the ESL class is part of the work day, students rarely miss class and are regularly on time. Because students are earning a wage, they are less likely to be stressed by financial concerns and are more able to focus on learning. The encouragement of job coaches to use English during the skills training portion of the day extends the learning experience (J. Christenson, personal communication, April 25, 2010).

Of the 12 associates who made no level gains, 2 returned to their home country, 2 left due to health issues, 2 were not participating at an adequate level, and 6 were released at the end of their eligibility period. It should be noted that of the 6 who were released after a full year, 4 had increased their test scores by 10 points or more. At a higher level, this amount of change equals a level gain. To better understand the circumstances of those who made no level gains during the year additional data were reviewed.

The data show that those who completed the program with no level gains also had several other factors in common: no previous education, no previous connections to an ESL program, and no formal education for either of their parents. Yet, there were some associates with similar profiles who made level gains. Further analysis revealed that age and length of time in the U.S. were also related to level gains. The average age of those with no level gains was 10 years older than those who did make gains. Those who had been in the U.S. for less time were less likely to make level gains. Unfortunately, all six associates who remained in the program with no level gain also left the program without employment.

**Table 5: English Language Gains – Original Participants**

<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%)

\* Three associates left the program prior to testing

#### **Job Training Program Exits**

As each associate leaves the program the exit type is noted as the outcome measure for the job training portion of the program. The exit outcomes for the Humanitarian Center Program are presented in Table 6. There were 60 associates who exited the program into unsubsidized, full-time employment. Nearly all (91.7%) had health benefits available at their new job. The average starting wage, \$9.38/hour, was more than \$2.00/hour higher than the current minimum wage. As noted above, almost every associate (96%) had been employed before coming to the U.S., yet for 42 of the 60 associates who exited into unsubsidized employment; this was their first job in the U.S.

**Table 6: Job Training Outcomes – Original Participants**

<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	25 (47.2%)	35 (72.9%)	60 (59.4%)
Fully subsidized employment	6 (11.3%)	-0-	6 (5.9%)
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	8 (15.1%)	7 (14.6%)	15 (14.6%)
Still Open	7 (13.2%)	-0-	7 (6.9%)
Unsubsidized Employment (Range: \$7.50 - \$12.00)	N = 25	N = 35	N = 60
Benefits available	23 (92.0%)	32 (91.4%)	55 (91.7%)
Average Wage	\$8.84	\$9.76	\$9.38
Exits into unsubsidized employment from each ESL instructional level:			
Red (lowest)	-0-	3 (8.6%)	3 (5.0%)
Yellow (mid-low)	2 (8.0%)	12 (34.3%)	14 (23.3%)
Blue (mid-high)	8 (32.0%)	12 (34.3%)	20 (33.3%)
Green (highest)	15 (60.0%)	8 (22.9%)	23 (38.3%)
For those hired prior to October 2010:	N = 16	N = 14	N = 30
Employment Retention at 3 months	12 (75%)	14 (100%)	26 (86.7%)

For those who exited into unsubsidized employment, the average length of time *spent in the pilot* was 8.5 months for the LDS associates and 11.2 months for the DWS associates. Most of the LDS associates were at the Humanitarian Center prior to the start of the pilot. After combining the time in the pilot with the time prior to entering the pilot, the 25 LDS associates exiting with unsubsidized employment spent an average of 14 months at the Humanitarian Center.

As shown in Table 6, most associates moving into unsubsidized employment came from the higher skill language groups, reflecting the substantial relationship between higher level language skills and employability. However there were significant differences between the LDS and DWS exits.

Of the six LDS associates who exited into subsidized employment, 2 returned to the Humanitarian Center to work but did not return to the ESL classes. One associate moved on to a local Deseret Industries position. Three of the six associates had been in the green group prior to exit and only one was from the red group.

Connecting associates with business partnerships is one tool used to enhance exits into employment. There were 8 LDS associates and 7 DWS associates who spent time in a business partnership during this first year. Six of the 8 LDS associates who had a business partnership exited into unsubsidized employment. Six of the 7 DWS associates with business partnership experience exited into unsubsidized employment.

Retention rates for both groups were impressive, however the data are incomplete as many associates exited the program at the end of the study period and the follow-up time period (3 months) has not elapsed. It will be important to carefully track retention to determine what factors might be most important in helping associates stay attached to the workforce.

## **Exit Surveys**

The exit survey was introduced in early summer 2010. Challenges in communication resulted in no surveys being completed until August 2<sup>nd</sup>. Since that time 65 associates have exited the program and 21 surveys have been completed (3 LDS and 18 DWS). The feedback has provided some trends regarding both the ESL and work training portion of the program.

Participants leaving the program were generally pleased with all aspects of the ESL program. Actually speaking English was repeatedly noted as the “best” part of the program. Pleasure in speaking English extended beyond the ESL classroom and was also appreciated in the work environment. Several mentioned how helpful it was to speak English while doing “quality checks” during the training part of the day. Others very much appreciated job coaches who provided opportunities for them to speak English while in training. Associates spoke of how this practice led to greater comfort in speaking English in the grocery store and other public places.

While the associates in general enjoyed learning and the challenges of the classroom, many also spoke of how difficult English is to learn. Many wished for more time in developing their English and more opportunities to practice skills.

The training portion of the program was also very helpful to most associates. Several spoke of appreciating the specific skills learned in training programs: bailing, sorting, assembly, etc. Some noted feeling more confident as they were recognized for being good workers or quick learners.

Some associates spoke of a desire to learn other skills through the Humanitarian Center. For some, sorting clothes for an entire year felt like too long in one position. There were suggestions that perhaps associates could be moved into other parts of the program to expand their experiences and learn additional skills. Of course, a few wished the program was longer while one associate commented, “No changes, I feel confident to work now!”

## DISCUSSION

One vision of the Humanitarian Center “transforming lives” sums up well the experience of associates involved in this program during the past year. This year has been filled with victories small and large as each individual benefited from one or many aspects of the program. The foundational principles of the Humanitarian Center encourage all involved to think beyond “band-aid solutions” and about the bigger picture of helping people move toward self-sufficiency through employment. The data above show that most program participants are well on their way to reaching this goal.

In addition to all that has been accomplished this year, there are areas which have surfaced as ripe for future growth. These areas include increased communication and integration of the two primary parts of the program, evaluation of the continuum of services being provided to the refugee community and determining the most appropriate referrals to the program and enhancing the link between the Humanitarian Center program and the business community.

### **Enhanced Communication and Program Integration**

The Humanitarian Center program is a training program designed to develop each associates English language and job skills. The integration of the two components of the program was one of the original strengths of the design. In the past year efforts have been made to better integrate the two parts of the program however associates still recognize a gap. In the exit survey there was a consistent desire expressed for more opportunities to use English in the workplace and to practice workplace vocabulary. While some of the job training opportunities lend themselves well to using English, others do not. In addition, associates expressed a desire to expand the number of skills learned over the course of the year. English integration into a variety of skill development opportunities could potentially expand an associates English capacity and marketable skill base. This level of integration would require more coordination on the part of the “team” working with each associate.

Each associate at the Humanitarian Center is connected with an extensive group of service providers. All associates have an ESL instructor, a job coach and a development specialist. DWS associates (and some LDS associates) are also connected with DWS employment counselors and eligibility workers, resettlement agency case managers and eventually the DWS job developer. It is not surprising that communication and coordination of all these partners has emerged as an area of growth.

Program associates are generally very eager to respond to the requests of those providing assistance. However, lack of coordination sometimes leaves the associate caught between the directions of one provider and another. This can be especially difficult toward the end of an associate’s time at the Humanitarian Center when securing employment takes on greater urgency.

The experiences of the past year have provided examples of opportunities to better coordinate and integrate services. Associates have expressed a desire for such enhancements. This step, while not easy, could provide great benefits especially as associates prepare to exit the program.

### **The Continuum of Community Services**

The Humanitarian Center program is unique in many ways, yet it is also one of many services available to assist refugees in Salt Lake City. As refugee programs and services continue to grow it becomes important to evaluate the scope of services being provided. In addition, it will be essential to assess the spectrum of services to learn if segments of the refugee community are becoming over-saturated or are still under served.

The English level gain and employment data from this evaluation suggest that while every associate benefited from this program, it was a better fit for some than others. Would those entering the program with no literacy in their native language (pre-literate) gain additional benefit from a more intensive program directed at their level of need and at their pace? Especially those who are older and less likely to have the urgency of being the primary wage earner for the family? Unfortunately, at this time there is no program directed toward incoming refugees who are pre-literate. This is a gap in

services. Other programs have vacancies at higher levels which are not being filled. This was particularly an issue for early DWS referrals.

Over the past couple of years more refugees have been coming to the Salt Lake area from countries where the lack of resources, frequent migration and long years in refugee camps, have prevented access to educational opportunities. These families struggle in many ways upon arrival to the U.S. For those making referrals from DWS, The Humanitarian Center Program was viewed as a way to provide a source of income regardless of the "fit" of the program. As no appropriate programs were available, this was better than nothing.

Using the preliminary data presented in May 2010, DWS has reformulated the criteria for entry of DWS associates into the program. (See Appendix 3) It is hoped that, through community dialogue, a program can be designed and funded to assist newly arriving pre-literate refugees. Such a program could give incoming refugees the opportunity to focus only on English skill development and "learning to learn" while they are settling into their new country. The Humanitarian Center could be a good next step, once they are settled and have started the learning process.

There were also differences between the LDS associates and DWS associates in the method of referral used for program entry. For many incoming LDS associates this is a program of last resort; a final effort after the referring bishop has been unsuccessful with all other means of assistance. It could be suggested that some of these participants might have become accustomed to their situation or simply given up hope of moving toward self-sufficiency. Multiple members of one family have been in the program simultaneously suggesting that perhaps another family member will ultimately take the role of wage earner for the family. This reduces the sense of urgency to fully engage in the process of seeking skills for ones' own future employment. Mental health issues, physical disabilities, and learning problems also make success in this program more difficult.

Finally, there are a few associates who entered the Humanitarian Center program with extensive educational and employment backgrounds. Evaluating the continuum of community services certainly needs to look at how services are being provided to those who bring this level of skill. This group tends to enter the program to gain English skills however efforts to evaluate their already well developed work skills should not be delayed. These associates still need assistance navigating our educational systems, job market and social networks. Assistance through this program allows associates to fully use their skills. The Employment Subcommittee of the Governor's Refugee Advisory Committee worked diligently to expand employment opportunities for refugees at all skill levels. While this group has been on hiatus, their activities were vital and effective and should be continued as soon as possible to assist in the expansion of job opportunities for refugees.

### **Linking to the Business Community**

The goal of the Humanitarian Center Program is for associates to exit the program into unsubsidized, full-time employment with benefits. The hope is that the wage earner can make enough to support his/her family. The greatest period of risk for an associate is in the final stage of transitioning from the Humanitarian Center into employment. Data from the first year shows that most associates remained in the program for as long as they were able. Thus, most associates seem to be focusing on the training experience and learning all they can. This also suggests that most associates enter the last few months of their training period having had little experience exploring their next steps.

As 25 – 30 DWS associates ended their training period at the same time DWS was prompted to hire a job developer. Had this job developer not started when she did, it is very likely that most of these DWS associates would not have exited into unsubsidized employment. The DWS job developer's previous experience and connections allowed her to move quickly and effectively match refugee associates with businesses willing to open their door to a new employee. Ongoing support and resources to both the refugee and the business partner was vital to her success. Sometimes simply taking the time for a conversation saves a job. A portion of the success comes from simply having a person focused specifically on matching the needs of particular associates with particular jobs. However, part comes from how it was done.

Job development is not just about creating employment slots, it is about building relationships with associates, job coaches, and business partners in the community. The job developer valued her business partners and always ensured that the associate was ready, willing and able prior to referring them to a business. The job developer clearly outlined the resources and supports she could provide to the business partner so they did not feel alone in working through issues that may arise with her associate referral.

While the job developer was ultimately successful in her efforts, there were many struggles. This experience led her to redesign how she plans to engage with associates in the future. Associates need to start thinking about their transition from training to employment long before the end of their training period. In the future, the job developer will meet all new DWS associates as they arrive. She will be part of their first meeting for basic introductions and to build rapport. At the 9 month R and D meeting the job developer will again meet with begin working with the associate to plan for the exit that will happen in about 3 months. The job developer will do a short work assessment to learn more about the associates interests, talents, and limitations. She will consult with the English teacher and job coach to assess the associate's progress and skills. The goal is to find an employer that will be a good fit for this particular associate in as many ways as possible. The future success of this program at the levels experienced to date will depend on the presence of job developers for both DWS and LDS associates.

## CONCLUSION

This evaluation of the Humanitarian Center Program has focused on the 101 original associates who started in October 2009. However the program has extended far beyond this group of individuals. These 101 associates provide income and resources for 278 additional family members, thus the children and other family members benefit in many ways as well.

As the program moves into its second year there is much more to be learned. What will happen to retention rates over time? How will new selection criteria affect overall outcomes? How will the community respond to identified gaps in services? These and many more questions will be answered in the future.

For now, we know that more refugees are speaking better English, working to support their families, and passing their new found skills and talents to the next generation.

## References

- Grognet, A. (1997). *Preparing limited English proficient adults for the workplace and SCANS skills*. Spring Institute for International Studies. Denver, CO.
- Jenkins, D. Zeidenberg, M. & Kienzel, G. (2009). Building bridges to postsecondary training for low-skills adults: Outcomes of Washington state's I-BEST program. *Community College Research Center Brief*, 42, p 1-4.
- Mansoor, I. (1995). Program profile: The evolution of a workplace ESL program. *The Connector*, Fall/Winter (3), p 13-16.
- Peterson, M. (1990). *REEP/Hotel workplace literacy project. Evaluation report*. Office of Vocational and Adult Education. Arlington, VA.
- Van Duzer, C. (2002). *Issues in accountability and assessment for adult ESL instruction*. Center for Applied Linguistics.

## Appendix 1: Additional Background Survey Data

**Table A: Native and Other Language Skills**

	LDS Associates N = 39	DWS Associates N = 44	Total N = 83
<b>Native Language</b>			
Ability to read in native language			
None	5 (12.8%)	13 (29.5%)	18 (21.7%)
A little	3 (7.7%)	13 (29.5%)	16 (19.3%)
A lot	31 (79.5%)	18 (40.9%)	49 (59.0%)
Ability to write in native language			
None	5 (12.8%)	15 (34.1%)	20 (24.1%)
A little	4 (10.3%)	16 (36.4%)	20 (24.1%)
A lot	30 (76.9%)	13 (29.5%)	43 (51.8%)
<b>Second Language</b>			
Ability to speak a second language			
None	8 (20.5%)	16 (36.4%)	24 (28.9%)
Yes - English	13 (33.3%)	8 (18.2%)	21 (25.3%)
Yes – Other	18 (46.2%)	20 (45.5%)	38 (45.8%)
Ability to read in second language	<b>N = 31</b>	<b>N = 28</b>	<b>N = 59</b>
None	4 (12.9%)	15 (53.6%)	19 (32.2%)
Yes	27 (87.1%)	13 (46.4%)	40 (67.8%)
Ability to write in second language			
None	6 (19.4%)	14 (50.0%)	20 (33.9%)
Yes	25 (80.6%)	14 (50.0%)	39 (66.1%)

**Table B: English Language Studies**

	LDS Associates N = 39	DWS Associates N = 44	Total N = 83
Studied English prior to coming to U.S.			
Yes	23 (59.0%)	11 (25.0%)	34 (41.0%)
No	16 (41.0%)	33 (75.0%)	49 (59.0%)
Currently attending another English class (Range: 2 to 16 hours per week)			
Yes	11 (28.2%)	4 (9.1%)	15 (18.1%)
No	28 (71.8%)	40 (90.9%)	68 (81.9%)
Ever attended ESL previously (Range: 1 month to 4 years)			
Yes	22 (56.4%)	21 (47.7%)	43 (51.8%)
No	17 (43.65)	23 (52.3%)	40 (48.2%)

**Table C: Parent's Education**

	LDS Associates N = 39	DWS Associates N = 44	Total N = 83
Father had any schooling			
Yes	19 (48.7%)	10 (22.7%)	29 (34.9%)
No	20 (51.3%)	34 (77.3%)	54 (65.1%)
Highest level of school father completed			
None	22 (56.4%)	37 (84.1%)	59 (71.1%)
Primary	6 (15.4%)	4 (9.1%)	10 (12.0%)
Secondary	4 (10.3%)	1 (2.3%)	5 (6.0%)
College/University	7 (17.9%)	2 (4.5%)	9 (10.8%)
Father's ability to read his native language			
A lot	19 (48.7%)	11 (25.0%)	30 (36.1%)
A little	8 (20.5%)	9 (20.5%)	17 (20.5%)
Not at all	12 (30.8%)	24 (54.5%)	36 (43.4%)
Father's ability to write native language			
A lot	18 (46.2%)	12 (27.3%)	30 (36.1%)
A little	9 (23.1%)	9 (20.5%)	18 (21.7%)
Not at all	12 (30.8%)	23 (52.3%)	35 (42.2%)
Father's ability to read/write English			
Yes	7 (17.9%)	4 (9.1%)	11 (13.3%)
No	32 (82.1%)	40 (90.9%)	72 (86.7%)
Father's ability to speak English			
Yes	9 (23.1%)	3 (6.8%)	12 (14.5%)
No	30 (76.9%)	41 (93.2%)	71 (85.5%)
Mother had any schooling			
Yes	12 (30.8%)	7 (15.9%)	19 (22.9%)
No	27 (69.2%)	37 (84.1%)	64 (77.1%)
Highest level of school Mother completed			
None	28 (71.8%)	39 (88.6%)	67 (80.7%)
Primary	4 (10.3%)	3 (6.8%)	7 (8.4%)
Secondary	5 (12.8%)	1 (2.3%)	6 (7.2%)
College/University	2 (5.1%)	1 (2.3%)	3 (3.6%)
Mother's ability to read native language			
A lot	12 (30.8%)	8 (18.2%)	20 (24.1%)
A little	6 (15.4%)	7 (15.9%)	13 (15.7%)
Not at all	21 (53.8%)	29 (56.9%)	50 (60.2%)
Mother's ability to read native language			
A lot	12 (30.8%)	10 (22.7%)	22 (26.5%)
A little	6 (15.4%)	7 (15.9%)	13 (15.7%)
Not at all	21 (53.8%)	27 (61.4%)	48 (57.8%)
Mother's ability to read/write English			
Yes	2 (5.1%)	2 (4.5%)	4 (4.8%)
No	37 (94.9%)	42 (95.5%)	75 (95.2%)
Mother's ability to speak English			
Yes	6 (15.4%)	4 (9.1%)	10 (12.0%)
No	33 (84.6%)	40 (90.9%)	73 (88.0%)

## **Parent Education and Other Factors Effecting Education**

In general, children's education levels are strongly correlated to their parents' education levels. Parents who go to college are more likely to have children who go to college. The relationship between parental education and associate education reflects this general rule but with some interesting nuances.

As noted earlier, DWS associates and LDS associates started the program with significantly different levels of education. Yet, as the theory predicts, having had an educated father was predictive of both DWS and LDS associates completing a higher level of education and having more ability to read and write in their own language. However, the strength of the relationship was greater for LDS associates than for DWS associates. Mothers did not have as strong of an influence as fathers. For LDS associates their mother's level of education still predicted stronger education outcomes, however, this did not hold true for the DWS associates. Higher levels of maternal education and reading/writing capacity did not predict educational levels for DWS associates.

To explore other potential factors associated with education levels the sample was analyzed from several perspectives. Functionality in reading and writing in ones' own language and the level of education completed was evaluated relative to gender and native language. Interestingly, gender did not predict any difference in education levels or abilities in reading or writing. On the other hand, native language did predict differences as those who spoke Kayah, Kirundi, Burmese and Nepali were least likely to have received any type of education. Those speaking Kayah, Kirundi and Burmese were also least likely to be able to read or write in their own language.

These data suggest that factors beyond the scope of this study could certainly be affecting the outcomes found here. For example, parents who grew up in a relatively stable environment and went to school may not have been able to provide the same opportunities to their children when forced out of their country into refugee camps. The influence of parents can change when families are split up for great lengths of time or when families experience significant long term trauma. These types of issues can be concentrated in particular parts of the world and may, to some degree, explain why certain language groups have common levels of education.

## Appendix 2: Year Two Participants Preliminary Results

The group referred to as “year two” associates entered the Humanitarian Center Pilot program between November 2009 and December 2010. Data for this group is presented here to better understand some of the shifts which have already taken place. This group includes most of the associates replacing the original pilot program participants.

Based on information presented in the six-month preliminary report of April 2010, programmatic changes were made both by the Humanitarian Center and DWS personnel. Renewed emphasis was placed on communication between all parties working with each associate. The criteria for program entry from the DWS side was evaluated and adjusted. DWS hired a job developer who started the end of August 2010 to help DWS associates in finding employment. Tracking outcomes for this group will help gain insight into how well these changes are working to assist associates in reaching the program goals.

**Table D: Demographics for Round Two Associates**

	LDS Associates N = 52	DWS Associates N = 43	Total N = 95
Gender			
Male	20 (38.5%)	28 (65.1%)	48 (50.5%)
Female	32 (61.5%)	15 (34.9%)	47 (49.5%)
Average age at program start (range: 18 – 60)	36.4 yrs	40.0 yrs	38.0 yrs
24 languages spoken Primary Languages (top 8)			
Nepali	7	12	19
Kirundi	8	3	11
Arabic	1	8	9
French	7	1	8
Karen	5	3	8
Spanish	7	0	7
Swahili	7	0	7
Farsi	1	4	5
Years of formal education			
None	19 (36.5%)	17 (39.5%)	36 (37.9%)
1 year	1 (1.9%)	3 (7.0%)	4 (4.2%)
2 – 5 years	6 (11.5%)	6 (14.0%)	12 (12.6%)
6 – 9 years	6 (11.5%)	7 (16.3%)	13 (13.7%)
10 – 12 years	14 (27.9%)	5 (11.6%)	19 (20.0%)
13 or more	6 (11.5%)	5 (11.6%)	11 (11.6%)
Time In US prior to program: (Range 1 – 339 months)			
8 months or less	9 (17.3%)	6 (14.0%)	15 (15.8%)
9 months - 2 years	15 (28.8%)	25 (58.1%)	40 (42.1%)
More than 2 years	20 (38.5%)	10 (23.3%)	30 (31.6%)
Average Family size	3.9 people	5.3 people	4.6 people
Total household member impacted by program	164 people	223 people	387 people

The Round 2 group of associates is slightly different than the original group in that only 8 LDS associates were not members of the refugee community and only 11 LDS associates had been at the Humanitarian Center prior to entering the ESL program. The months of previous of experience for this group ranged from 1 – 5 months. In this second round there are significantly more associates with “0” years of education and most associates have been in the U.S. longer than in the original group. Associates referred from the LDS side are more likely to be female and the average size of the LDS associate’s family has increased.

**Table E: English Language Gains – Year Two Participants**

ESL level gains	LDS Associates N = 32	DWS Associates N = 20	Total N = 52
Number of level gains			
0 level gains	6 (18.8%)	8 (40.0%)	12 (26.9%)
1 level gain	9 (28.1%)	6 (30.0%)	15 (28.8%)
2 level gains	9 (28.1%)	1 (5.0%)	10 (19.2%)
3 level gains	6 (18.8%)	2 (10.0%)	8 (15.4%)
4 level gains	2 (6.3%)	3 (15.0%)	5 (9.6%)
Associates with at least one level gain	26 (81.3%)	12 (60.0%)	38 (73.1%)

It should be noted that 2 LDS associates have progressed 10 points or more within the lowest level. There were also 6 LDS associates who exited the program prior to being tested. Three of the six left for employment, the other 3 left due to medial issues.

**Table F: Job Training Outcomes – Year 2 Participants**

Program	LDS Associates N = 52	DWS Associates N = 43	Total N = 95
Program Exits Reasons			
Unsubsidized employment	7 (13.5%)	2 (4.7%)	9 (9.5%)
Fully subsidized employment	-0-	-0-	-0-
Health problems	4 (7.7%)	-0-	4 (4.2%)
Moved	1 (1.9%)	-0-	1 (1.1%)
Program time ended/low participation	1 (1.9%)	1 (2.3%)	2 (2.1%)
Died	1 (1.9%)	-0-	1 (1.1%)
Still in Program	38 (73.1%)	40 (93.0%)	78 (82.1%)
Unsubsidized Employment	N = 7	N = 2	N = 9
Benefits available	5 (71.4%)	2 (100.0%)	7 (77.8%)
Average Wage (Wage range \$8.00 - \$10.00)	\$8.61	\$10.00	\$8.92
Exits into unsubsidized employment from each ESL instructional level:			
Red (lowest)	-0-	-0-	-0-
Yellow (mid-low)	1 (14.3%)	-0-	1 (11.1%)
Blue (mid-high)	4 (57.1%)	2 (100%)	6 (6.7%)
Green (highest)	2 (28.6%)	-0-	2 (22.2%)
For those hired prior to October 2010: Employment Retention at 3 months	N = 3 3 (100%)		

### **Appendix 3: DWS Humanitarian Center Entry Criteria**

**State Date: March 2011**

New criteria for entry of DWS associates into program:

**Required Criteria:**

- Family must TANF eligible (as documented through a completed Form 300)
- Have been in the United States a minimum of 8 months
- Open to taking full time employment
- Have NO earned income reported by parents,
- Must be assigned to a resettlement agency case manager
- Must be to work Monday through Friday: 7 am – 4 pm

**Preferences:**

When all else is equal the following characteristics will give a family preference:

- Larger family size
- Referral is for primary wage earner for family
- Previous experience in ESL classes
- Family has little or no access to unearned income
- DWS shows strong history or participation in DWS activities
- Resettlement agency indicates history of cooperation with agency activities