

April 2010

## **The Employment Retention and Advancement Project How Effective Are Different Approaches Aiming to Increase Employment Retention and Advancement? Final Impacts for Twelve Models**

Richard Hendra, Keri-Nicole Dillman, Gayle Hamilton, Erika Lundquist,  
Karin Martinson (Urban Institute), and Melissa Wavelet

With

Aaron Hill and Sonya Williams

This report summarizes the final impact results for the national Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA) project. This project tested, using a random assignment design, the effectiveness of numerous programs intended to promote steady work and career advancement. All the programs targeted current and former welfare recipients and other low-wage workers, most of whom were single mothers. Given that earlier retention and advancement initiatives studied for these groups were largely not effective, ERA sought to examine a variety of programs that states and localities had developed for different populations, to determine whether effective strategies could be identified. In short, nine of the twelve programs examined in this report do not appear to be effective, but three programs increased employment levels, employment stability, and/or earnings, relative to control group levels, after three to four years of follow-up.

### **The ERA Project: Origin and Context**

Research completed since the 1980s has resulted in much being learned about how to help welfare recipients and other low-income individuals prepare for and find jobs. While job preparation and placement programs have improved employment and earnings among participants, they primarily moved individuals into unstable, low-paying jobs. Moreover, research prior to ERA that examined programs explicitly designed to increase employment retention among newly employed welfare recipients found that the programs had few effects on retention or advancement.

The ERA project was intended to build and improve on past efforts in the employment retention and advancement area. It was conceived and funded by the Administration for

Children and Families (ACF) in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The project was also supported by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). MDRC — a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization — is conducting ERA under contract to ACF.

From 2000 to 2003, a total of 16 innovative ERA programs were implemented in eight states as part of ERA. This report presents effectiveness estimates for 12 of the 16 ERA programs and for the main group of individuals targeted for services: low-income single parents.<sup>1</sup> The results cover a three- to four-year follow-up period and examine the programs' effects on employment retention, earnings, advancement (defined here primarily as earnings increases not fully explained by employment increases), and the receipt of welfare and food stamp benefits.

This impact report is the document of record for the ERA programs' impacts. Its purpose is to describe what was tested and what was found. A series of special topic papers and practitioner briefs will further examine the results contained in this document, to try to provide more clues as to why some programs may have had positive effects and others did not and to offer lessons for policy and practice.

## **The ERA Programs**

The ERA programs embodied states' and localities' choices of program goals, target populations, and program components and were largely paid for through existing funding streams. The programs were thus “real-world” ones initiated by practitioners and not ones set up and funded solely for research purposes. The diversity of the programs presents an opportunity to explore the effectiveness of a variety of strategies implemented for different populations, in order to identify what might work. The programs' target groups and general strategies are briefly described below. Table ES.1 provides a summary of the points of service provision, selected ways of delivering services, and selected types of services for each of the ERA programs included in the report.

### **Target Groups**

Almost all the ERA programs targeted current or former recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), the cash welfare program that mainly serves single mothers and their children. The programs differed, however, in terms of when services were first provided and to whom. In this report, findings are presented in three groupings of programs, reflecting the programs' target populations: (1) programs that served unemployed TANF recipients, (2) programs that served employed TANF recipients, and (3) programs that served

---

<sup>1</sup>Findings for two-parent families served by these programs and for programs that targeted “harder-to-employ” individuals are not included here but will be presented in other reports.

The Employment Retention and Advancement Project

Table ES.1

ERA Models: Overview of Target Populations,  
Selected Ways of Delivering Services, and Selected Types of Services

	Target Populations													
	Not employed and receiving TANF					Employed and receiving TANF				Employed and not receiving TANF				
	Texas					Chicago	Los Angeles RFS	Riverside Training Focused	Riverside Work Plus	Cleveland	Eugene	Medford	Riverside PASS	South Carolina
	Corpus Christi	Fort Worth	Houston	Los Angeles EJC	Salem									
<b>Ways of delivering services</b>														
Nongovernmental organization as a provider of services	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Flexible staff hours and/or locations	✓	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
Employer linkages	✓	✓				✓				✓				
<b>Types of services</b>														
Financial work incentives	✓	✓	✓			✓								✓
Supported advancement through job change	✓	✓				✓						✓		
Education and training referrals and/or incentives						✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Staff counseling on job-related issues	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓		✓

SOURCES: Site-specific reports. For citations, see Appendix E in the complete report.

NOTES: For discussion of the full set of features, by model, see Chapters 3, 4, and 5. For the definitions of these features, see Chapter 2.

Check marks indicate that the feature is present in the ERA model.

The models and their implementation often evolved over the study period. This table presents the features experienced by the majority of the study participants for the greatest extent of time.

The Corpus Christi, Fort Worth, and Houston sites all operated the Texas ERA model.

individuals who were employed and not receiving TANF. Presenting the results in these three target groupings allows practitioners who are planning to implement a program for a specific target population to easily see the range of ERA program models that were implemented for that population and the programs' results. In addition, it facilitates an assessment of how well similar or different strategies worked in achieving similar goals for roughly similar populations, and it suggests whether ERA programs work better when initiated at one or another point in individuals' employment careers — for example, when people are looking for work or when they are already in work.

### **General Strategies**

The different strategies adopted by states and localities to promote employment retention and advancement were developed in accordance with program operators' views of the primary impediments to retention and advancement faced by individuals in their chosen target populations. None of the strategies, however, attempted to address labor market, or demand-side, issues. Rather, they all sought to address supply-side, or “worker-based,” obstacles to economic success. Within the broad category of worker-based strategies, the ERA programs delivered services in new ways and/or provided new types of services or new combinations of services compared with what was already available at the time.

#### *Delivering Services in New Ways*

A number of programs provided services through **partnerships between welfare agency staff and staff from other organizations**, such as community colleges, Workforce Investment Act (WIA) One-Stop contractors, nonprofit employment service providers, and/or community-based organizations, depending on the program. The rationales for using these service delivery arrangements were severalfold: partnerships increased the chances of leveraging resources; these arrangements could bring together different types of services and expertise in one location, and thus better serve program participants; and it was thought that nongovernmental organizations might be more familiar than governmental agencies with the jobs and services available in a community and, furthermore, that individuals might be more likely to engage with staff from nonwelfare organizations after leaving TANF. Many ERA programs also implemented **new staff practices**, giving staff more flexibility in when and where to meet with clients, to make it easier for working program participants to meet with staff.

Finally, a few ERA programs sought to develop **linkages with employers**. These linkages took the form of engaging a for-profit company that had strong relationships with local employers, to facilitate the identification of openings in higher-paying jobs; meeting with clients at their employer and sometimes with clients' employers, to discuss opportunities for advance-

ment; or situating ERA services at individuals' places of employment to make it easy and convenient for people to participate in retention-related services.

### *Delivering New Types of Services or New Combinations of Services*

The ERA programs provided some common services, most of which have been offered in previous and current programs. All the programs used one-on-one staff-client interactions as the means by which program services were delivered, although they differed regarding how this was done, that is, what was discussed during staff-client interactions, the intensity of the interactions, and staff configurations and roles. In addition, job search assistance of some type was provided in almost all the programs, to initially get individuals into jobs, to get them new jobs if they left or lost a job, and/or to find people better jobs while they were working. In-depth assessments of individuals' needs, interests, and employment barriers were also done in many sites, and referrals were made to mental health or substance abuse treatment or counseling.

All the programs, however, experimented with providing new types of services or combinations of services. Several programs provided **financial incentives or rewards** — of a substantial amount in only one program — connected to employment, to encourage employment entry, promote employment retention, and raise individuals' implicit wage levels. Other programs provided **encouragement and support to change jobs**, from lower-paying jobs to higher-paying ones or to ones with better opportunities for advancement. A number of programs provided **encouragement for employed individuals to participate in education and training**, under the theory that working single parents may need support to engage and persist in education or training, given the difficulty of balancing parenting, work, and schooling. Finally, many of the programs provided individuals with **counseling on job-related issues**, under the expectation that this could both prevent unnecessary job loss and educate workers on how to advance at their current job.

## **The Evaluation's Design**

Each of the ERA programs discussed in this report was studied using a random assignment evaluation design, a methodology that allows practitioners and policymakers to have a high degree of confidence in the results. In each site, individuals who met the ERA eligibility criteria (which varied by site) were assigned, at random, to a program group or to a control group. Members of the program group were recruited for (and, in some sites, were required to participate in) the services offered by the ERA program, while those in the control group were not eligible for ERA services but were eligible for other services and supports. The control group services and supports were always those generally available in the site's community but could also include the site's standard welfare-to-work program or, in some cases, minimal efforts that the site already had in place to provide assistance to individuals who found jobs. As

a result, none of the control groups can be strictly considered to be a “no service” group. Each site’s control group thus represents the benchmark against which that site’s ERA approach is assessed.<sup>2</sup>

In total, over 45,000 individuals were randomly assigned to research groups as part of ERA, starting in 2000 in the earliest-starting test and ending in 2004 in the latest-starting test.<sup>3</sup> In each site, MDRC tracked individuals in both research groups for three to four years following their random assignment, using administrative records — such as unemployment insurance (UI), welfare, and food stamp records — and sample member surveys. The random assignment process ensured that when individuals entered the study, there were no systematic differences in sample members’ characteristics, measured or unmeasured, between the research groups. Thus, any differences between them that emerge after random assignment (for example, in employment rates or average earnings) can be attributed to the site’s ERA program — in contrast to services and supports already available in the site. These differences are referred to here as “impacts.”

## Key Findings

The implementation, participation, and economic impact analyses in this report yielded the following key findings.

### Implementation Findings

- **Engaging individuals in employment and retention services was a consistent challenge.**

Staff in the ERA programs expended considerable energy trying to engage individuals in program activities. Many ERA programs, particularly those targeting individuals outside the TANF system, included intensive marketing and outreach strategies. The ERA programs also used a variety of strategies to maintain staff-client relationships and encourage ongoing participation in program activities, including, in some programs, offering financial incentives to encourage contact and working with individuals at their workplaces. However, while most program group members reported having at least one contact with ERA program staff, maintaining contact over the course of the first year following random assignment was less common. Only five programs increased the percentage of program group members, compared with

---

<sup>2</sup>There was significant variation across sites in terms of the types of services for which control group members were eligible, the extent of services, and how well known and readily accessible the services were.

<sup>3</sup>Outcomes for approximately 27,000 sample members are analyzed in this report. Other documents will present results for the remaining sample members.

control group members, who were having contact with staff from an employment program as of the end of the first year of follow-up. Moreover, even in these five programs, increases in ongoing engagement were modest.

- **Rates of job loss were very high, and job loss occurred quickly in all the ERA programs, requiring staff to spend a significant amount of their time providing reemployment services.**

In a number of the ERA programs that attempted to provide services to individuals when they were employed (referred to as “postemployment programs” in this report), high levels and fast rates of job loss had several implications. One implication was that staff had less time available to work with individuals on advancement services. Another implication was that the volume of demands for reemployment services disrupted programs’ staffing plans. Staff in postemployment programs were prepared for and anticipated working with employed clients to aid their placement into better jobs or ones positioned for advancement. Staff were also prepared to provide employment retention services to attempt to prevent job loss. In practice, many individuals had lost their jobs by the time program staff first made contact with them, forcing staff to focus on immediate placement needs instead.

- **The staffing of the ERA programs was critical, as most services hinged on staff actions and many welfare agency staff lacked skills and experience relevant to retention and advancement aims.**

In most of the ERA programs, staff were responsible for providing a range of services, rather than specializing in one or a few. Many of these services — such as recruitment, career counseling, labor market assessment, and job development — were not typically provided in standard welfare-to-work programs. Thus, the ERA programs often demanded skill sets and facilities in arenas or with populations that were new to staff. Despite efforts to hire and train qualified staff, providing the various retention and advancement services was a struggle for many ERA program staff.

### **Participation Findings**

- **Increases in participation beyond control group levels were not consistent or large, which may have made it difficult for the programs to achieve impacts on employment retention and advancement.**

Overall, most of the ERA programs produced relatively small increases in participation in program activities and in the receipt of various types of retention and advancement assistance, but the reasons for this differed by the type of activity or “help” provided in the programs. Many of the control groups in this study were eligible for welfare-to-work programs that

often provided such services as job search and education and training referrals. Therefore, the control group levels of participation in these services was often high (with participation levels in education and training being unexpectedly high in the case of programs serving employed individuals), and few ERA programs significantly raised participation above these levels.

In addition to encouraging participation in job search and education and training, most ERA programs offered other types of retention and advancement assistance, such as help resolving problems on the job or help finding a better job while working. While a 12-month client survey showed that few control group members received these types of assistance, few ERA programs increased the levels of receipt of these services by a substantial amount above the control group levels.

While the increases in participation in ERA services in a number of program tests were infrequent and small for two different reasons — high levels of control group participation in some activities and low levels of program group participation in others — the end result was the same: little impact on participation in services in these tests made it unlikely that these particular programs would improve economic outcomes (though there is no guarantee that these programs would have improved economic outcomes even if they had been able to boost participation more substantially). A few programs, however, did produce some sizable participation increases and also increased employment retention and advancement, as discussed in more detail below.

### **Effectiveness Findings**

Several types of economic effects are examined in this report. Effects on employment retention (defined here as impacts on the extent of individuals' labor force participation) are primarily based on two key outcomes, both using UI data: the average quarterly employment rate and the extent to which people worked in four consecutive quarters. Any impacts on the average quarterly employment rate would indicate that program group members, compared with control group members, worked in more quarters. Any impacts on working four consecutive quarters would indicate that program group members, compared with control group members, were more likely to remain consistently employed, though not necessarily in the same job.

Effects on advancement are defined here primarily in terms of increases in earnings that cannot be fully explained by increases in quarters of employment. When a program increases total earnings, it can reflect either or both the program's effect on employment retention and its effect on advancement. Any increases in total earnings would indicate that program group members, compared with control group members, had more quarters of employment, worked more hours or weeks, or worked at higher wages. Because most advancement measures are created using UI data, it is impossible to separate out how much of the increase in earnings was due to more hours or weeks or working at higher wages, but it is possible to estimate how much was due to an increase in quarters of employment. Therefore, if the increases in total earnings



are not fully explained by the effects on the number of quarters employed, it is likely that “advancement” (defined as individuals’ working more hours or weeks or working at higher wages) occurred. In this report, advancement is secondarily defined as improvements in fringe benefits received, working conditions, or opportunities for promotions.

Table ES.2 indicates which ERA programs produced impacts on three of the above outcomes: average quarterly employment, working four consecutive quarters, and average annual earnings. (Survey-based impacts are not shown.) Only statistically significant impacts are shown in the table and are discussed in this summary and the report, except where otherwise indicated.<sup>4</sup>

- **Out of the twelve ERA programs included in the report, three programs — one in each target grouping — produced positive economic impacts: the Texas (Corpus Christi and Fort Worth sites), Chicago, and River-side PASS ERA programs.**

The Texas ERA program offered a monthly stipend of \$200 for former TANF recipients working at least 30 hours per week, in addition to other pre- and postemployment services. As implemented in Corpus Christi, the program had consistent effects on employment retention and earnings. There is also evidence that the program may have led to advancement gains — meaning gains in hours worked, weeks worked, or wages — compared with the level of advancement seen in the control group. (Increases in earnings could not be fully explained by increases in the number of quarters employed.) In Corpus Christi, the program increased average annual earnings by \$640 over the four-year follow-up period, or by almost 15 percent relative to control group earnings. In addition, the program generated its largest effects on earnings in the fourth year of follow-up, when it increased earnings by \$900, or by 18 percent relative to the control group level. This suggests that the impacts may continue in the longer term. The Texas ERA program in Fort Worth also produced increases in these measures, but the effects were concentrated in the second and third years of follow-up. In Fort Worth, the program increased earnings in the third year of follow-up by \$900, or by 17 percent relative to the control group level. The implementation of the Texas program in Fort Worth started out weak and improved over time, which may have diluted the strength of the impacts because many program group members went through the program before implementation improved.

The program in Chicago was a mandatory, work-focused advancement program, offering targeted job search assistance and help to identify and access career ladders, provided by

---

<sup>4</sup>An impact is considered to be statistically significant if there is less than a 10 percent probability that the estimated difference would have occurred by chance in the absence of any effect of the program. The tables and figures in this report note statistical significance at the 10 percent, 5 percent, and 1 percent levels.

Table ES.2

ERA Models: Summary of Economic Impact Results

Model	Average Quarterly Employment					Employed 4 Consecutive Quarters					Average Annual Earnings				
	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Cumulative follow-up	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Cumulative follow-up	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Cumulative follow-up
<b><u>Not employed and receiving TANF</u></b>															
Texas															
Corpus Christi	•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fort Worth		•						•					•		
Houston															
Los Angeles EJC				—		•		—						—	
Salem				—				—						—	
<b><u>Employed and receiving TANF</u></b>															
Chicago	•	•			•	•						•			•
Los Angeles RFS				—				—						—	
Riverside Phase 2															
Riverside Training Focused <sup>a</sup>															
Riverside Work Plus															
<b><u>Employed and not receiving TANF</u></b>															
Cleveland				—				—						—	
Eugene <sup>a</sup>				—				—						—	
Medford				—				—						—	
Riverside PASS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
South Carolina															

(continued)

### Table ES.2 (continued)

SOURCES: MDRC calculations from the state administrative records.

NOTES: A dash indicates “not available” or that the sample size is too small to yield meaningful results.

Bullets indicate positive statistically significant differences between outcomes for the program and control groups up to the 10 percent level.

<sup>a</sup>The negative impacts for the Eugene and Riverside Training Focused programs are not shown on this table. For negative impacts, see the site-specific summary tables in the complete report.

staff in a private, for-profit firm. This program produced increases in employment retention and earnings. In addition, there is evidence that the program may have led to advancement gains, compared with the level of advancement seen in the control group. But while the Chicago ERA program raised average annual earnings by almost \$500, or by 7 percent relative to the control group level, these effects weakened over time. Impacts on employment were no longer statistically significant in Year 4 as a whole, but positive earnings impacts persisted in some quarters, suggesting that the Chicago program may have had a long-term effect on advancement. It also achieved the largest reductions in welfare receipt among all the ERA programs. Program group levels of welfare receipt were approximately 25 percent lower than control group levels.

Increases in employment retention and earnings were large and consistent in the Riverside PASS ERA program, which was a voluntary, individualized, retention and advancement program provided primarily by three community-based organizations and a community college. There is also evidence that the program may have led to increases in advancement, compared with what was seen in the control group. This program increased average annual earnings by \$870 over the four-year follow-up period, an increase of 10 percent relative to the control group level. In addition, the program generated its largest effects on earnings (\$970) in the fourth year of follow-up, suggesting that the program may lead to even longer-term earnings gains.

- **In the Chicago and Riverside PASS ERA programs, which provided services to employed individuals, impacts were driven by entering another job after random assignment — not by staying stably employed at the original job.**

Of the three programs that produced positive impacts, two of them initiated services after people had found jobs (postemployment programs), and one of them (referred to here as a “preemployment program”) initiated services before people found jobs. It might be expected that the postemployment programs would achieve their impacts by lengthening the amount of time that people stayed in the job they held when they entered the program. However, in both of these postemployment programs, the impacts reflect participants’ entering new jobs at greater rates than control group members, either directly from another job or after a period of unemployment.

This result suggests that even programs designed to affect employment retention and advancement among those already working should be very deliberate about how job change and job

loss are addressed. Job changes and reemployment needs may present opportunities to improve outcomes. Job loss, for example, can be analyzed to understand the reasons why people lost their job and can lead to developing plans to avoid job loss in the future. Similarly, job changes can be used as a way to place individuals into better jobs. In addition, this result suggests that a focus on employment retention, rather than job retention, may be more effective or more realistic.

## Conclusions

The reports' findings suggest several conclusions.

- **The results revealed some strategies that can be effective in promoting employment retention and advancement for welfare recipients and other low-income groups.**

Increases in employment retention and earnings were largest and most consistent over time in the Texas ERA program in Corpus Christi, the Chicago ERA program, and the Riverside PASS ERA program. The Texas program in Fort Worth improved over time and produced gains in Years 2 and 3. Each of these three ERA programs served a different target group, which suggests that employment retention and advancement programs can work for a range of populations.

Table ES.3 highlights the features of these three programs. Caution should be exercised when trying to identify promising program features, however, as some of the programs lacking positive impacts also contained some of these features and it is not clear which features “drove” the impacts in any given site. Two findings from the research literature can help place these findings in context. With regard to the Texas findings, several studies have now shown that programs that provide financial incentives to supplement earnings in combination with services can promote employment retention among low-wage workers.<sup>5</sup> With regard to the Chicago program, nonexperimental work has suggested that low-wage workers often advance by changing jobs and that matching individuals with jobs in particular firms that pay higher wages can be an effective strategy to promote advancement.<sup>6</sup> The fact that these strategies have been found to be effective in previous research as well as in this study lends additional evidence that these are promising strategies to promote employment retention and advancement.

- **Improving employment retention and advancement remains a challenge.**

---

<sup>5</sup>Gennetian, Miller, and Smith (2005); Huston et al. (2003); Michalopoulos et al. (2002); Riccio et al. (2008).

<sup>6</sup>Andersson, Holzer, and Lane (2005). Indeed, a recent nonexperimental analysis of the employment patterns of ERA sample members confirmed that job change was associated with higher wages for median-earning sample members (Miller, Deitch, and Hill, 2010).

**The Employment Retention and Advancement Project**

**Table ES.3**

**Highlights of Programs That Increased Employment Retention and Advancement**

	<b>Corpus Christi, Texas Fort Worth, Texas</b>	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Riverside PASS</b>
<b>Strategy</b>	Placement, retention, and advancement: job search assistance, stipend for employed former TANF recipients, reemployment assistance, and work site visits	Advancement: job search assistance, career counseling, and reemployment assistance	Retention and advancement: reemployment assistance, career counseling, and referrals to education and training
<b>Target population</b>	Unemployed TANF applicants and recipients	TANF recipients who had worked at least 30 hours per week for at least 6 consecutive months	Employed former TANF recipients who recently left TANF
<b>Service providers</b>	Local workforce development boards under contract with nonprofit organizations	Experienced, for-profit, employment intermediary	Primarily community-based organizations and a community college
<b>Control services</b>	Relatively strong welfare-to-work program	Standard welfare-to-work program	Limited postemployment services
<b>Participation highlights</b>	In Corpus Christi, 30 percent took up the financial incentive; 20 percent did so in the other Texas sites. Increased percentages receiving help with retention and advancement in Corpus Christi and Fort Worth.	Increased percentages receiving help in finding a better job while working and in getting other forms of retention and advancement help.	While increases in participation were not large, participation data are for a cohort that had few positive economic impacts. <sup>a</sup>
<b>Economic impacts</b>	Increased employment retention and advancement in Corpus Christi and Fort Worth but not in Houston	Increased employment retention and advancement and reduced welfare receipt	Increased employment retention and advancement

SOURCES: ERA 12-Month Survey, administrative records, and interim reports.

NOTES: <sup>a</sup>Participation impacts in this report are based on client survey data. As detailed in the text, survey response issues were present in the Riverside PASS site. Analysis of program data suggested that only the Riverside PASS program may have increased the use of a broader range of services. These data are not used in this report because they only capture services reported to the welfare department by ERA service providers.

Three-fourths of the ERA programs included in this report did not produce gains in the targeted outcomes beyond what control group members were able to attain on their own with the existing set of services and supports. This suggests that, despite a range of programs and approaches and significant effort by staff and program managers, gains in employment retention and advancement are difficult to attain. In addition, even among the programs that produced improvements in retention and advancement outcomes, wages remained very low, and many of these families remained in poverty at the end of the follow-up period. It is also important to consider, however, that ERA was a test of multiple strategies rather than a demonstration of a few promising programs. As noted above, before the ERA project began, there was not much evidence of programs that could improve employment retention and advancement outcomes for current or former welfare recipients. The ERA evaluation has revealed three distinct approaches that seem promising and worthy of further exploration.

\* \* \*

While this report presents the final impact estimates of many of the ERA programs, it is not the final word from the ERA project. Further analysis is being conducted of the rich ERA databases to try to shed light on which program features, participant characteristics, institutional arrangements, or economic contexts were most associated with improvements in employment retention and advancement. In addition, other publications will consider the costs and benefits of selected ERA programs, the employment and training dynamics of the ERA sample, and the employment patterns of ERA sample members in two-parent families. A series of practice briefs will also probe more deeply and extract lessons for those who operate and staff retention and advancement programs. Finally, a synthesis document will consider the policy, practice, and research lessons learned from the whole of the ERA project.

## References for the Executive Summary

- Andersson, Fredrik, Harry J. Holzer, and Julia I. Lane. 2005. *Moving Up or Moving On: Who Advances in the Low-Wage Labor Market?* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gennetian, Lisa A., Cynthia Miller, and Jared Smith. 2005. *Turning Welfare into a Work Support: Six-Year Impacts on Parents and Children from the Minnesota Family Investment Program*. New York: MDRC.
- Huston, Aletha C., Cynthia Miller, Lashawn Richburg-Hayes, Greg J. Duncan, Carolyn A. Eldred, Thomas S. Weisner, Edward Lowe, Vonnie A. McLoyd, Danielle A. Crosby, Marika N. Ripke, and Cindy Redcross. 2003. *New Hope for Families and Children: Five-Year Results of a Program to Reduce Poverty and Reform Welfare*. New York: MDRC.
- Michalopoulos, Charles, Doug Tattrie, Cynthia Miller, Philip K. Robins, Pamela Morris, David Gyarmati, Cindy Redcross, Kelly Foley, and Reuben Ford. 2002. *Making Work Pay: Final Report on the Self-Sufficiency Project for Long-Term Welfare Recipients*. Ottawa: Social Research and Demonstration Corporation.
- Miller, Cynthia, Victoria Deitch, and Aaron Hill. 2010. *Paths to Advancement for Single Parents in the Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA) Project*. New York: MDRC.
- Riccio, James A., Helen Bewley, Verity Campbell-Barr, Richard Dorsett, Gayle Hamilton, Lesley Hoggart, Alan Marsh, Cynthia Miller, Kathryn Ray, and Sandra Vegeris. 2008. *Implementation and Second-Year Impacts for Lone Parents in the UK Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA) Demonstration*. Department for Work and Pensions Research Report No. 489. Leeds, UK: Corporate Document Services.