

The Right Tool for the Job: A Meta-Regression of Employment Strategies' Effects on Different Outcomes— Appendices

Lauren Vollmer, Annalisa Mastri, Alyssa Maccarone, and Emily Sama-Miller

This document contains three appendices to the ESER meta-regression brief:

Appendix A: Technical Details describes in detail the calculations used to obtain the results reported in the brief. This section includes information about how we rescaled the impact estimates from the original studies, developed and fit a Bayesian meta-regression model, and calculated intervention-specific impact estimates from the meta-regression output.

Appendix B: Supplementary Material lists full results for each analysis presented in the brief. These results include relationship estimates, their standard errors, and their uncertainty intervals as well as probabilities that each relationship estimate meets certain meaningful thresholds.

Appendix C: Studies Analyzed lists the studies included in the meta-regression data set.

APPENDIX A: TECHNICAL DETAILS

A.1: Risk Ratio Calculation

For binary outcomes, we standardize the impact estimate by dividing the regression-adjusted outcome rate in the treatment group by the regression-adjusted outcome rate in the comparison group:

$$RR = \frac{\hat{P}_T}{\hat{P}_C}$$

where \hat{P}_G is, for example, the regression-adjusted probability of employment in group G . G is either the treatment group (T) or the comparison group (C).

To ensure that the meta-regression results are consistent and interpretable, a large effect size must represent a favorable result for every outcome. For example, we might consider a higher rate of public benefit receipt to be an unfavorable outcome. To make a higher rate a negative outcome on this variable, we treated the percentage of sample members who did not receive public benefits as the outcome of interest. We renamed the domain “independence from public assistance” to make this reversal clear.

We can interpret the risk ratio minus one as the percent difference between the treatment group and the comparison group. For example, a risk ratio of 0.05 implies that the outcome rate is 5 percent higher in the treatment group than in the comparison group, whereas a risk ratio of -0.05 implies that the outcome rate is 5 percent lower in the treatment group than in the comparison group.

In practice, we use the logarithm of the risk ratio as the effect size and calculate its standard error as:¹

$$s = SE(\ln(RR)) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\hat{P}_T * N_T} + \frac{1}{\hat{P}_C * N_C} - \frac{1}{N_T} - \frac{1}{N_C}}$$

The standard error of the effect size represents the uncertainty in the estimate of the intervention’s effect. In the meta-regression, we use the natural logarithm of the risk ratio as the outcome variable and the standard error of the log risk ratio as a weight, placing greater emphasis on risk ratios that are more certain and less emphasis on risk ratios that are less certain.

A.2: Meta-Regression Model

The Bayesian meta-regression model represents the natural logarithm of the risk ratio, denoted y , for an outcome i measured for intervention j as a linear function of an overall intercept α and effects of the intervention (a_j), outcome type ($b_{d[i]}$), employment strategy (c_s), and target population (g_p) according to the equation:

$$y_{ij} = \alpha + a_j + b_{d[i]} + \sum_{s=1}^S c_s I_{s[j]} + \sum_{p=1}^P g_p I_{p[j]} + \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{d=1}^D f_{sd} I_{s[j]} I_{d[i]} + \sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{d=1}^D h_{pd} I_{p[j]} I_{d[i]} \\ + \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{p=1}^P l_{sp} I_{s[j]} I_{p[j]} + \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{p=1}^P m_{dsp} I_{d[i]} I_{s[j]} I_{p[j]} + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

$$\varepsilon_{ij} \sim N(0, \tau^2 + s_{ij}^2)$$

The summations over c_s , g_p , and the associated interaction terms denote that many interventions implemented more than one employment strategy or targeted populations with more than one characteristic, for example, welfare recipients who are also parents. The terms $I_{s[j]}$, $I_{p[j]}$, $I_{d[i]}$ are indicators for the presence of a characteristic. For example, $I_{s[j]} = 1$ if intervention j implemented strategy s and $I_{s[j]} = 0$ otherwise. The subscripts $d[i]$ and $p[j]$ refer to whether the outcome i is of type d and whether intervention j targeted a population with characteristic p . The intervention-specific term a_j controls for intervention-level clustering.

The specification of the variance of the error term ε_{ij} includes an overall variance parameter τ^2 and the squared standard error of the log-risk ratio s_{ij}^2 , which acts as an inverse variance weight.

As already described, this equation includes many two- and three-way interactions. The f_{sd} coefficients allow the effect of each employment strategy to vary by outcome type. The h_{pd} coefficients allow the effect of each population to vary by outcome type. The l_{sp} coefficients allow the effect of each employment strategy to vary by population. Finally, the m_{dsp} coefficients allow the effect of each employment strategy to vary by outcome type and population.

In the Bayesian framework we must also specify prior distributions for each model parameter. We selected these weakly-informative priors to increase precision, establish relationships among related features, correct for multiple comparisons, and facilitate computation without unduly influencing the results.²

- $\alpha \sim N(0, 10)$
- $a_j \sim N(0, \sigma_a^2)$
- $b_{d[i]} \sim N(0, \sigma_b^2)$
- $c_s \sim N(\mu_c, \sigma_c^2)$
- $g_p \sim N(\mu_g, \sigma_g^2)$
- $f_{sd} \sim N(0, \sigma_f^2)$
- $h_{pd} \sim N(0, \sigma_h^2)$
- $l_{sp} \sim N(\mu_l, \sigma_l^2)$
- $m_{dsp} \sim N(0, \sigma_m^2)$
- $\tau \sim \text{half-Normal}(0, 2.5)$
- $\mu_c \sim N(0, 1)$
- $\mu_g \sim N(0, 1)$
- $\mu_l \sim N(0, 1)$

All remaining variance parameters— $\sigma_a, \sigma_b, \sigma_c, \sigma_g, \sigma_f, \sigma_h, \sigma_l, \sigma_m$ —share a common half-Normal prior centered at zero with standard deviation ϕ estimated from the data. This structure does not assume all variance parameters to be the same; rather, it assumes that all the variance parameters come from a half-Normal distribution with mean 0 and variance ϕ^2 . If ϕ is small, all the variances are similar, but if ϕ is large, the variances could be quite different. Estimating ϕ rather than fixing it in advance allows the data to determine how similar the variance parameters are.

Some of the main effect terms, like the change in impact associated with different outcome types ($b_{d[i]}$), have a prior mean of zero, while others do not. Specifying a non-zero prior mean represents the belief that, for example, each additional strategy that an intervention implements should increase the intervention’s impact by some amount; if additional strategies do not improve effectiveness, the model will estimate this amount to be zero. The same logic holds for other main effects and interaction terms.

We fit the model using the Stan probabilistic programming language through R software.

A.3: Calculating Intervention Effectiveness

In the meta-regression, we conceive of an intervention’s effectiveness as comprising the effects of the outcome types it measures, the effects of the strategies it implements, and the effects of the populations it targets, plus interactions among these features and a residual or idiosyncratic intervention-specific effect. To estimate an intervention’s overall effectiveness we must therefore account for all of these dimensions.

In particular, to compare interventions fairly, we must not give interventions “extra credit” for measuring primarily outcomes that are relatively easy to improve. Suppose, for example, that education and training outcomes are easier to improve than outcomes on long-term independence from public assistance. An intervention that reported only education

and training outcomes might appear more effective than an intervention that reported only long-term independence from public assistance outcomes simply because those outcomes are easier to improve, not because the intervention is truly more effective.

To circumvent this potential confound, we use the Bayesian meta-regression model to predict the estimated impact as a log risk ratio for each intervention in each outcome type. For each intervention, we combine the estimated parameters from the model with data about the intervention—the strategies it implemented and the populations it targeted—once in each outcome type. With this intermediate information, an estimate of each intervention’s effectiveness in each outcome type, we can identify the interventions with the greatest potential to improve certain outcomes. To estimate each intervention’s overall effectiveness, we average across its predicted effectiveness in each outcome type.

By the same logic, if some populations were easier or more difficult to help than others, we would also want to control for the characteristics of the populations each intervention targeted. However, because we attributed a characteristic to a population only if the entire population had that characteristic—for example, if the sample members were all female—the presence or absence of a characteristic may not correspond to a practical difference in the population’s composition. Further, the large number of possible combinations of population characteristics makes this approach computationally intractable.

Consider an intervention that offered one strategy and targeted a population with a single characteristic. We would calculate its effectiveness in each outcome type as:

Outcome type	Estimated effectiveness
1	$\widehat{y}_{1j} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\alpha}_j + \hat{b}_1 + \hat{c}_{s1} + \hat{g}_{p1} + \hat{f}_{s1d1} + \hat{h}_{p1d1} + \hat{l}_{s1p1} + \hat{m}_{s1p1d1}$
2	$\widehat{y}_{2j} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\alpha}_j + \hat{b}_2 + \hat{c}_{s1} + \hat{g}_{p1} + \hat{f}_{s1d2} + \hat{h}_{p1d2} + \hat{l}_{s1p1} + \hat{m}_{s1p1d2}$
...	...
5	$\widehat{y}_{5j} = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\alpha}_j + \hat{b}_5 + \hat{c}_{s1} + \hat{g}_{p1} + \hat{f}_{s1d5} + \hat{h}_{p1d5} + \hat{l}_{s1p1} + \hat{m}_{s1p1d5}$
Overall	$\bar{y}_j = \hat{\alpha} + \hat{\alpha}_j + \bar{\hat{b}} + \hat{c}_{s1} + \hat{g}_{p1} + \bar{\hat{f}}_{s1} + \bar{\hat{h}}_{p1} + \hat{l}_{s1p1} + \bar{\hat{m}}_{s1p1}$

The overall effectiveness estimate reflects the effectiveness of the intervention’s components—its idiosyncratic effect, its strategies, and its populations—and it averages across outcome types to ensure that no intervention gets “extra credit” for measuring outcomes that are easy to improve.

¹ See Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, “Systematic Reviews: CRD’s Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Health Care.” University of York, 2008, p. 56. Available at https://www.york.ac.uk/media/crd/Systematic_Reviews.pdf.

² When developing the prior structure, we relied on guidance from Andrew Gelman, a renowned Bayesian scholar, as elaborated in this article: <https://github.com/stan-dev/stan/wiki/Prior-Choice-Recommendations>.

Appendix B: Supplementary Material

Table B.1: Intervention Effectiveness Estimates

Intervention Name	Estimate	SE	Uncertainty interval
<i>Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) Plus vs. Comparison</i>	1.254*	0.046	(1.167, 1.347)
<i>Riverside Labor Force Attachment (LFA) vs. Comparison</i>	1.162*	0.034	(1.096, 1.229)
<i>SSP vs. Comparison</i>	1.150*	0.026	(1.100, 1.201)
<i>Portland Job Opportunities and Basic Skills vs. Comparison</i>	1.137*	0.031	(1.078, 1.200)
<i>SSP Plus vs. SSP</i>	1.131*	0.040	(1.057, 1.212)
<i>Job Corps vs. Comparison</i>	1.130*	0.016	(1.098, 1.162)
<i>Jobs First—Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) vs. Comparison</i>	1.128*	0.040	(1.052, 1.209)
<i>Riverside Human Capital Development (HCD) vs. Comparison</i>	1.113*	0.031	(1.053, 1.175)
<i>Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation vs. Comparison</i>	1.112*	0.035	(1.045, 1.183)
<i>Strengthening Families NY vs. Comparison</i>	1.104*	0.052	(1.005, 1.210)
<i>Center for Employment Opportunities vs. Comparison</i>	1.104*	0.044	(1.020, 1.193)
<i>Atlanta (LFA) vs. Comparison</i>	1.097*	0.030	(1.040, 1.158)
<i>Center for Employment and Training (CET) Replication Sites vs. Comparison</i>	1.096*	0.050	(1.001, 1.196)
<i>Atlanta (HCD) vs. Comparison</i>	1.094*	0.026	(1.044, 1.146)
<i>Reach For Success (RFS)—LA (b) vs. Comparison</i>	1.085*	0.038	(1.012, 1.162)
<i>RFS—LA (a) vs. Comparison</i>	1.083*	0.037	(1.013, 1.158)
<i>Work Plus vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (b)</i>	1.082*	0.038	(1.008, 1.158)
<i>Structured Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice</i>	1.082*	0.038	(1.010, 1.159)
<i>Columbus Integrated Case Management (ICM) vs. Comparison</i>	1.067*	0.033	(1.004, 1.133)
<i>Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) vs. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)</i>	0.920*	0.034	(0.855, 0.988)
<i>Minority Female Single Parent (MFSP)—CET vs. Comparison</i>	1.091	0.056	(0.988, 1.207)
<i>Public Health Nursing vs. Comparison</i>	1.090	0.058	(0.979, 1.208)
<i>Riverside Postemployment Services Demonstration (PESD) vs. Comparison</i>	1.078	0.041	(0.999, 1.161)
<i>Detroit Michigan Opportunity and Skills Training and Work First vs. Comparison</i>	1.077	0.041	(0.998, 1.161)
<i>Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment vs. Comparison</i>	1.077	0.050	(0.985, 1.180)
<i>Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA)—Eugene (b) vs. Comparison</i>	1.076	0.053	(0.978, 1.183)
<i>ERA—Chicago (b) vs. Comparison</i>	1.075	0.055	(0.972, 1.187)
<i>ERA—Cleveland vs. Comparison</i>	1.075	0.040	(0.997, 1.156)
<i>ERA—Chicago (a) vs. Comparison</i>	1.073	0.055	(0.970, 1.185)
<i>Columbus ICM vs. Traditional Case Management (TCM)</i>	1.073	0.042	(0.993, 1.158)
<i>Welfare Restructuring Project (WRP) vs. WRP Incentives Only [one parent]</i>	1.073	0.048	(0.981, 1.170)
<i>Academy for Career Advancement—CT vs. Comparison</i>	1.072	0.040	(0.994, 1.154)

(continued)

Intervention Name	Estimate	SE	Uncertainty interval
<i>Working Toward Wellness vs. Comparison</i>	1.069	0.047	(0.978, 1.163)
<i>Chicago PESD vs. Comparison</i>	1.068	0.042	(0.989, 1.153)
<i>Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration vs. Comparison</i>	1.066	0.048	(0.976, 1.164)
<i>Job Search Assistance Demonstration—Individualized JSA + Training vs. Comparison</i>	1.066	0.040	(0.989, 1.148)
<i>San Antonio PESD vs. Comparison</i>	1.064	0.045	(0.977, 1.155)
<i>New Hope Project (a) vs. Comparison</i>	1.062	0.051	(0.966, 1.165)
<i>Family Transition Program (b) vs. Comparison</i>	1.060	0.042	(0.979, 1.144)
<i>GAIN vs. Comparison</i>	1.058	0.035	(0.991, 1.130)
<i>New Hope Project (c) vs. Comparison vs. Comparison</i>	1.058	0.048	(0.967, 1.154)
<i>Grand Rapids (HCD) vs. Comparison vs. Comparison</i>	1.056	0.039	(0.983, 1.134)
<i>Post-Assistance Self-Sufficiency—Riverside, CA vs. Comparison</i>	1.056	0.044	(0.973, 1.146)
<i>Grand Rapids (LFA) vs. Comparison</i>	1.055	0.035	(0.988, 1.125)
<i>Move Up/Career Advancement Unit—OH vs. Comparison</i>	1.055	0.038	(0.982, 1.130)
<i>MFIP vs. MFIP Incentives Only</i>	1.054	0.044	(0.970, 1.143)
<i>ERA—SC (b) vs. Comparison</i>	1.053	0.047	(0.963, 1.148)
<i>Work Plus vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (a)</i>	1.049	0.035	(0.983, 1.118)
<i>Guided Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice</i>	1.049	0.044	(0.963, 1.139)
<i>Job Search Assistance Demonstration—Structured JSA vs. Comparison</i>	1.048	0.040	(0.972, 1.127)
<i>Transitional Jobs Program at the Transitional Work Corporation vs. Comparison</i>	1.048	0.045	(0.962, 1.139)
<i>WRP Incentives Only vs. Aid to Needy Families with Children (ANFC) [two parent]</i>	1.046	0.041	(0.967, 1.128)
<i>New Hope Project (b) vs. Comparison</i>	1.044	0.052	(0.945, 1.149)
<i>Career Builders—Portland vs. Comparison</i>	1.043	0.045	(0.957, 1.134)
<i>A Better Chance—Delaware vs. Comparison</i>	1.043	0.045	(0.957, 1.134)
<i>WRP vs. ANFC [two parent]</i>	1.042	0.039	(0.968, 1.122)
<i>Job Search Assistance Demonstration—Individualized JSA vs. Comparison</i>	1.041	0.040	(0.965, 1.123)
<i>Structured Customer Choice vs. Guided</i>	1.038	0.033	(0.975, 1.103)
<i>Building Nebraska Families vs. Comparison</i>	1.034	0.045	(0.948, 1.125)
<i>Connecticut's Jobs First Program vs. Comparison</i>	1.033	0.058	(0.922, 1.151)
<i>Columbus TCM vs. Comparison</i>	1.033	0.032	(0.972, 1.096)
<i>Training Focused vs. Work Plus—Riverside, CA</i>	1.031	0.049	(0.939, 1.131)
<i>WRP vs. ANFC [one parent]</i>	1.030	0.042	(0.949, 1.114)
<i>Portland PESD vs. Comparison</i>	1.029	0.041	(0.950, 1.110)
<i>MFSP—Atlanta Urban League vs. Comparison</i>	1.025	0.056	(0.919, 1.138)
<i>Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership vs. Comparison</i>	1.024	0.054	(0.921, 1.135)
<i>Family Transition Program (a) vs. Comparison</i>	1.023	0.032	(0.962, 1.088)
<i>ERA—Medford vs. Comparison</i>	1.022	0.037	(0.949, 1.098)
<i>Opportunity NYC—Family Rewards Demonstration vs. Comparison</i>	1.021	0.041	(0.943, 1.102)

(continued)

Intervention Name	Estimate	SE	Uncertainty interval
<i>ERA—SC (a) vs. Comparison</i>	1.020	0.041	(0.943, 1.101)
<i>Project Independence vs. Comparison</i>	1.017	0.036	(0.948, 1.090)
<i>Enhanced Early Head Start vs. Comparison</i>	1.014	0.044	(0.931, 1.102)
<i>Success through Employment Preparation vs. Comparison</i>	1.011	0.044	(0.928, 1.101)
<i>MFSP - Opportunities Industrialization Center vs. Comparison</i>	1.011	0.053	(0.911, 1.120)
<i>WRP Incentives Only vs. ANFC [one parent]</i>	1.008	0.040	(0.931, 1.090)
<i>Jobs-Plus Community Revitalization Initiative for Public Housing Families vs. Comparison</i>	1.005	0.047	(0.916, 1.099)
<i>ERA—Eugene (a) vs. Comparison</i>	1.004	0.047	(0.915, 1.101)
<i>Training Focused vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (b)</i>	1.004	0.030	(0.945, 1.064)
<i>MFSP—Wider Opportunities for Women vs. Comparison</i>	1.003	0.047	(0.914, 1.098)
<i>Enhanced Job Club—Los Angeles vs. Comparison</i>	0.999	0.039	(0.925, 1.080)
<i>WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [two parent]</i>	0.999	0.035	(0.930, 1.070)
<i>Parents' Fair Share vs. Comparison</i>	0.997	0.046	(0.910, 1.089)
<i>Iowa Family Investment Program vs. Comparison</i>	0.997	0.047	(0.907, 1.091)
<i>Training Focused vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (a)</i>	0.996	0.032	(0.934, 1.061)
<i>Project Earnings, Retention, Advancement Now!—San Diego, CA vs. Comparison</i>	0.994	0.044	(0.911, 1.082)
<i>ERA—Minnesota vs. Comparison</i>	0.993	0.044	(0.909, 1.081)
<i>New Visions Self-Sufficiency and Lifelong Learning Project vs. Comparison</i>	0.991	0.048	(0.900, 1.089)
<i>Welfare to Work Voucher Program vs. Comparison</i>	0.990	0.041	(0.910, 1.072)
<i>ERA—Texas vs. Comparison</i>	0.988	0.030	(0.930, 1.048)
<i>Future Steps vs. Comparison</i>	0.983	0.039	(0.909, 1.061)
<i>Oklahoma City Education, Training, and Employment vs. Comparison</i>	0.977	0.035	(0.909, 1.047)
<i>ERA—Salem vs. Comparison</i>	0.963	0.031	(0.903, 1.026)
<i>MFIP Incentives Only vs. AFDC</i>	0.951	0.036	(0.882, 1.024)

Note: All values reported in this and the subsequent tables derive from meta-regression calculations, not the original evaluation reports. Interventions are ordered by estimate magnitude and statistical significance. Estimates marked with an asterisk (*) are statistically significant at the 5% level, that is, the corresponding uncertainty intervals do not contain 0. Uncertainty intervals are reported as an empirical 95% credible interval defining the range between the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles of the posterior distribution of the estimates.

Lowercase (a), (b), and (c) distinguish among instances of an intervention applied to different populations.

Table B.2: Intervention Effectiveness Probabilities

Intervention Name	Probability of impact greater than:			
	0%	5%	10%	20%
<i>Job Corps vs. Comparison</i>	100.00	100.00	96.63	0.00
<i>Portland Job Opportunities and Basic Skills vs. Comparison</i>	100.00	99.82	88.84	2.47
<i>Riverside Labor Force Attachment (LFA) vs. Comparison</i>	100.00	99.97	96.64	12.39
<i>Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) Plus vs. Comparison</i>	100.00	100.00	99.99	87.65
<i>SSP vs. Comparison</i>	100.00	99.99	97.55	2.78
<i>SSP Plus vs. SSP</i>	99.99	98.40	78.22	4.44

(continued)

Intervention Name	Probability of impact greater than:			
	0%	5%	10%	20%
<i>Atlanta Human Capital Development (HCD) vs. Comparison</i>	99.97	95.68	40.68	0.03
<i>Jobs First—Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) vs. Comparison</i>	99.97	97.83	75.63	4.05
<i>Riverside (HCD) vs. Comparison</i>	99.96	98.04	65.49	0.31
<i>Atlanta (LFA) vs. Comparison</i>	99.94	94.61	45.53	0.09
<i>Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation vs. Comparison</i>	99.91	96.64	62.80	1.02
<i>Center for Employment Opportunities vs. Comparison</i>	99.29	89.01	52.30	1.79
<i>Reach For Success (RFS)—LA (a) vs. Comparison</i>	99.00	81.01	31.39	0.13
<i>RFS—LA (b) vs. Comparison</i>	98.97	82.10	33.78	0.14
<i>Work Plus vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (b)</i>	98.56	80.43	31.83	0.20
<i>Structured Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice</i>	98.54	80.18	31.51	0.19
<i>Strengthening Families NY vs. Comparison</i>	98.17	85.57	51.98	3.85
<i>Columbus Integrated Case Management (ICM) vs. Comparison</i>	98.15	70.10	15.75	0.00
<i>Center for Employment and Training (CET) Replication Sites vs. Comparison</i>	97.61	82.41	45.55	2.13
<i>Riverside Postemployment Services Demonstration (PESD) vs. Comparison</i>	97.36	74.95	28.99	0.24
<i>Detroit Michigan Opportunity and Skills Training and Work First vs. Comparison</i>	97.22	74.50	28.19	0.23
<i>Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA)—Cleveland vs. Comparison</i>	97.05	72.53	26.09	0.19
<i>Academy for Career Advancement—CT vs. Comparison</i>	96.65	70.18	23.79	0.13
<i>Columbus ICM vs. Traditional Case Management (TCM)</i>	96.14	71.19	26.12	0.19
<i>GAIN vs. Comparison</i>	95.60	58.71	11.91	0.01
<i>Job Search Assistance Demonstration—Individualized JSA + Training vs. Comparison</i>	95.57	65.34	19.39	0.11
<i>Minority Female Single Parent (MFSP) - CET vs. Comparison</i>	95.47	76.39	42.15	3.19
<i>Chicago PESD vs. Comparison</i>	95.34	66.17	21.58	0.22
<i>Grand Rapids (LFA) vs. Comparison</i>	94.59	55.44	10.06	0.01
<i>Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment vs. Comparison</i>	94.58	69.71	31.18	0.99
<i>Public Health Nursing vs. Comparison</i>	94.19	75.35	42.43	3.33
<i>Welfare Restructuring Project (WRP) vs. WRP Incentives Only [one parent]</i>	94.04	68.60	28.18	0.67
<i>Working Toward Wellness vs. Comparison</i>	93.31	64.61	24.59	0.40
<i>ERA—Eugene (b) vs. Comparison</i>	93.28	68.21	32.11	1.16
<i>Grand Rapids (HCD) vs. Comparison</i>	93.08	55.37	13.05	0.03
<i>Move Up/Career Advancement Unit—OH vs. Comparison</i>	92.70	54.27	11.63	0.02
<i>Family Transition Program (b) vs. Comparison</i>	92.60	58.90	16.87	0.11
<i>San Antonio PESD vs. Comparison</i>	92.48	61.64	20.15	0.19
<i>Work Plus vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (a)</i>	92.38	48.68	7.26	0.01
<i>Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration vs. Comparison</i>	92.19	62.32	23.70	0.51
<i>ERA—Chicago (b) vs. Comparison</i>	92.03	66.66	31.02	1.49
<i>ERA—Chicago (a) vs. Comparison</i>	91.79	65.70	30.20	1.43
<i>Post-Assistance Self-Sufficiency—Riverside, CA vs. Comparison</i>	89.75	54.46	15.64	0.15
<i>Job Search Assistance Demonstration—Structured JSA vs. Comparison</i>	89.20	47.67	9.74	0.03
<i>New Hope Project (a) vs. Comparison</i>	89.11	59.06	22.37	0.53

(continued)

Intervention Name	Probability of impact greater than:			
	0%	5%	10%	20%
<i>Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) vs. MFIP Incentives Only</i>	89.01	52.41	14.76	0.19
<i>New Hope Project (c) vs. Comparison</i>	88.73	56.23	19.05	0.30
<i>Structured Customer Choice vs. Guided</i>	87.96	34.57	2.93	0.00
<i>WRP Incentives Only vs. Aid to Needy Families with Children (ANFC) [two parent]</i>	87.09	45.13	9.05	0.02
<i>ERA—SC (b) vs. Comparison</i>	86.78	51.60	16.03	0.16
<i>Guided Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice</i>	86.67	48.12	12.29	0.08
<i>Transitional Jobs Program at the Transitional Work Corporation vs. Comparison</i>	86.27	47.48	12.27	0.13
<i>WRP vs. ANFC [two parent]</i>	85.97	41.73	7.32	0.03
<i>Columbus TCM vs. Comparison</i>	85.33	28.73	1.85	0.00
<i>Job Search Assistance Demonstration—Individualized JSA vs. Comparison</i>	84.73	39.83	7.24	0.03
<i>Career Builders—Portland vs. Comparison</i>	83.59	43.03	10.45	0.09
<i>A Better Chance—Delaware vs. Comparison</i>	83.16	42.86	10.43	0.07
<i>New Hope Project (b) vs. Comparison</i>	79.88	44.44	14.38	0.23
<i>Building Nebraska Families vs. Comparison</i>	77.26	35.30	7.41	0.04
<i>Family Transition Program (a) vs. Comparison</i>	76.13	20.39	1.03	0.00
<i>WRP vs. ANFC [one parent]</i>	75.92	30.93	4.76	0.03
<i>Portland PESD vs. Comparison</i>	75.45	29.74	4.37	0.00
<i>Training Focused vs. Work Plus—Riverside, CA*</i>	73.23	34.06	8.11	0.05
<i>ERA—Medford vs. Comparison</i>	72.24	22.11	2.26	0.00
<i>Connecticut's Jobs First Program vs. Comparison</i>	71.06	37.65	12.46	0.49
<i>Opportunity NYC—Family Rewards Demonstration vs. Comparison</i>	69.69	23.67	2.81	0.00
<i>ERA—SC (a) vs. Comparison</i>	68.61	22.53	2.69	0.01
<i>Project Independence vs. Comparison</i>	67.47	17.75	1.27	0.00
<i>MFSP—Atlanta Urban League vs. Comparison</i>	67.21	31.88	9.39	0.15
<i>Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership vs. Comparison</i>	67.05	30.47	8.18	0.11
<i>Enhanced Early Head Start vs. Comparison</i>	61.56	20.21	2.88	0.01
<i>Success through Employment Preparation vs. Comparison</i>	58.96	18.74	2.64	0.01
<i>WRP Incentives Only vs. ANFC [one parent]</i>	57.79	14.91	1.45	0.00
<i>MFSP—Opportunities Industrialization Center vs. Comparison</i>	57.03	22.28	5.12	0.09
<i>Training Focused vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (b)</i>	54.12	6.38	0.11	0.00
<i>Jobs-Plus Community Revitalization Initiative for Public Housing Families vs. Comparison</i>	53.16	16.26	2.41	0.01
<i>ERA—Eugene (a) vs. Comparison</i>	52.40	15.89	2.63	0.01
<i>MFSP—Wider Opportunities for Women vs. Comparison</i>	51.69	15.21	2.32	0.01
<i>WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [two parent]</i>	48.82	8.01	0.29	0.00
<i>Enhanced Job Club—LA vs. Comparison</i>	48.72	9.97	0.79	0.00
<i>Parents' Fair Share vs. Comparison</i>	46.76	12.36	1.52	0.00
<i>Iowa Family Investment Program vs. Comparison</i>	46.06	12.73	1.59	0.01
<i>Training Focused vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (a)</i>	44.31	4.94	0.14	0.00
<i>Project Earnings, Retention, Advancement Now!—San Diego, CA vs. Comparison</i>	43.11	9.99	0.97	0.00

(continued)

Intervention Name	Probability of impact greater than:			
	0%	5%	10%	20%
<i>ERA—Minnesota vs. Comparison</i>	42.43	9.99	0.96	0.00
<i>New Visions Self-Sufficiency and Lifelong Learning Project vs. Comparison</i>	41.95	10.75	1.42	0.01
<i>Welfare to Work Voucher Program vs. Comparison</i>	39.05	7.29	0.48	0.00
<i>ERA—Texas vs. Comparison</i>	34.55	2.21	0.03	0.00
<i>Future Steps vs. Comparison</i>	32.46	4.43	0.25	0.00
<i>Oklahoma City Education, Training, and Employment vs. Comparison</i>	25.07	2.04	0.04	0.00
<i>ERA—Salem vs. Comparison</i>	12.35	0.39	0.00	0.00
<i>MFIP Incentives Only vs. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)</i>	8.91	0.43	0.01	0.00
<i>MFIP vs. AFDC</i>	1.12	0.04	0.00	0.00

Note: Lowercase (a), (b), and (c) distinguish among instances of an intervention applied to different populations.

Table B.3: Strategy Effectiveness Estimates

Strategy	Estimate	SE	Uncertainty interval
<i>Financial incentives and sanctions</i>	0.017	0.013	(-0.006, 0.045)
<i>Work experience</i>	0.017	0.012	(-0.006, 0.044)
<i>Education</i>	0.016	0.012	(-0.006, 0.042)
<i>Training</i>	0.016	0.012	(-0.007, 0.041)
<i>Job development</i>	0.014	0.012	(-0.010, 0.039)
<i>Work readiness activities</i>	0.014	0.012	(-0.009, 0.037)
<i>Health services</i>	0.014	0.013	(-0.011, 0.039)
<i>Case management</i>	0.013	0.012	(-0.010, 0.037)
<i>Employment and retention services</i>	0.011	0.013	(-0.018, 0.035)
<i>Supportive services</i>	0.010	0.012	(-0.016, 0.032)

Note: Estimates marked with an asterisk (*) are statistically significant at the 5% level, that is, the corresponding uncertainty intervals do not contain 0. Uncertainty intervals are reported as an empirical 95% credible interval defining the range between the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles of the posterior distribution of the estimates.

Table B.4: Strategies' Probability of Improving Impacts

Strategy	Any improvement	Improvement of 5% or more	Improvement of 10% or more
<i>Financial incentives and sanctions</i>	93.02	1.40	0.01
<i>Education</i>	92.77	0.69	0.00
<i>Work experience</i>	92.59	1.20	0.00
<i>Training</i>	92.19	0.73	0.00
<i>Work readiness activities</i>	89.63	0.25	0.00
<i>Job development</i>	88.73	0.41	0.00
<i>Case management</i>	88.33	0.33	0.00
<i>Health services</i>	88.13	0.64	0.00
<i>Employment and retention services</i>	81.59	0.18	0.00
<i>Supportive services</i>	81.05	0.05	0.00

Table B.5: Outcome Effect Estimates

Outcome type	Estimate	SE	Uncertainty interval
<i>Education and training</i>	1.062*	0.030	(1.010, 1.129)
<i>Short-term employment</i>	1.011	0.020	(0.969, 1.052)
<i>Long-term employment</i>	0.992	0.020	(0.950, 1.033)
<i>Long-term independence from public assistance</i>	0.975	0.020	(0.934, 1.015)
<i>Short-term independence from public assistance</i>	0.965	0.020	(0.924, 1.004)

Note: Estimates marked with an asterisk (*) are statistically significant at the 5% level, that is, the corresponding uncertainty intervals do not contain 0. Uncertainty intervals are reported as an empirical 95% credible interval defining the range between the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles of the posterior distribution of the estimates.

Table B.6: Intervention Effectiveness by Outcome Type

Intervention name	Overall	Education and training	Short-term independence from public assistance	Long-term independence from public assistance	Short-term employment	Long-term employment
<i>Academy for Career Advancement—CT vs. Comparison</i>	0.072 (0.040)	0.147 (0.061)*	0.050 (0.042)	0.057 (0.042)	0.033 (0.042)	0.073 (0.043)
<i>A Better Chance—Delaware vs. Comparison</i>	0.043 (0.045)	0.092 (0.075)	0.019 (0.064)	-0.003 (0.054)	0.002 (0.054)	0.104 (0.056)*
<i>Atlanta Human Capital Development (HCD) vs. Comparison</i>	0.094 (0.026)*	0.149 (0.048)*	0.071 (0.029)*	0.095 (0.029)*	0.049 (0.032)	0.106 (0.032)*
<i>Atlanta Labor Force Attachment (LFA) vs. Comparison</i>	0.097 (0.030)*	0.147 (0.047)*	0.081 (0.033)*	0.097 (0.033)*	0.037 (0.033)	0.125 (0.035)*
<i>Building Nebraska Families vs. Comparison</i>	0.034 (0.045)	0.045 (0.056)	0.027 (0.050)	0.034 (0.054)	0.035 (0.050)	0.028 (0.052)
<i>Career Builders—Portland vs. Comparison</i>	0.043 (0.045)	0.092 (0.056)	0.019 (0.045)	0.043 (0.046)	-0.008 (0.045)	0.069 (0.048)
<i>Center for Employment and Training (CET) Replication Sites vs. Comparison</i>	0.096 (0.050)*	0.152 (0.067)*	0.049 (0.050)	0.095 (0.052)	0.072 (0.052)	0.110 (0.054)*
<i>Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) vs. Comparison</i>	0.104 (0.044)*	0.166 (0.067)*	0.067 (0.045)	0.089 (0.045)*	0.081 (0.047)	0.114 (0.048)*
<i>Chicago Postemployment Services Demonstration (PESD) vs. Comparison</i>	0.068 (0.042)	0.137 (0.062)*	0.018 (0.042)	0.064 (0.044)	0.028 (0.044)	0.092 (0.046)*
<i>Columbus ICM vs. Traditional Case Management (TCM)</i>	0.073 (0.042)	0.131 (0.065)*	0.016 (0.042)	0.068 (0.044)	0.049 (0.045)	0.104 (0.048)*
<i>Columbus Integrated Case Management (ICM) vs. Comparison</i>	0.067 (0.033)*	0.130 (0.062)*	0.020 (0.034)	0.049 (0.035)	0.044 (0.037)	0.094 (0.038)*
<i>Columbus TCM vs. Comparison</i>	0.033 (0.032)	0.100 (0.053)	-0.015 (0.033)	0.029 (0.034)	-0.006 (0.035)	0.056 (0.037)

(continued)

Intervention name	Overall	Education and training	Short-term independence from public assistance	Long-term independence from public assistance	Short-term employment	Long-term employment
<i>Connecticut's Jobs First Program vs. Comparison</i>	0.033 (0.058)	0.089 (0.101)	-0.008 (0.085)	0.015 (0.086)	0.013 (0.087)	0.056 (0.075)
<i>Detroit Michigan Opportunity and Skills Training and Work First vs. Comparison</i>	0.077 (0.041)	0.146 (0.074)*	0.060 (0.064)	0.053 (0.056)	0.043 (0.051)	0.083 (0.053)
<i>Enhanced Early Head Start vs. Comparison</i>	0.014 (0.044)	0.073 (0.073)	-0.009 (0.052)	0.002 (0.049)	-0.008 (0.053)	0.012 (0.048)
<i>Enhanced Job Club—LA vs. Comparison</i>	-0.001 (0.039)	0.104 (0.069)	-0.034 (0.043)	-0.018 (0.043)	-0.061 (0.044)	0.007 (0.043)
<i>ERA—Medford vs. Comparison</i>	0.022 (0.037)	0.090 (0.055)	-0.005 (0.039)	-0.001 (0.039)	-0.002 (0.041)	0.029 (0.042)
<i>ERA—Chicago (a) vs. Comparison</i>	0.073 (0.055)	0.083 (0.097)	0.045 (0.087)	0.148 (0.071)*	0.024 (0.085)	0.067 (0.066)
<i>ERA—Chicago (b) vs. Comparison</i>	0.075 (0.055)	0.148 (0.093)	0.026 (0.062)	0.070 (0.063)	0.031 (0.063)	0.098 (0.062)
<i>ERA—Cleveland vs. Comparison</i>	0.075 (0.040)	0.158 (0.068)*	0.029 (0.042)	0.057 (0.042)	0.043 (0.044)	0.085 (0.044)*
<i>ERA—Eugene (a) vs. Comparison</i>	0.004 (0.047)	0.064 (0.071)	-0.008 (0.054)	0.003 (0.054)	-0.043 (0.051)	0.003 (0.051)
<i>ERA—Eugene (b) vs. Comparison</i>	0.076 (0.053)	0.187 (0.096)*	0.051 (0.066)	0.055 (0.068)	0.012 (0.054)	0.075 (0.057)
<i>ERA—Minnesota vs. Comparison</i>	-0.007 (0.044)	0.153 (0.078)*	-0.058 (0.051)	-0.028 (0.047)	-0.066 (0.048)	-0.038 (0.044)
<i>ERA—Salem vs. Comparison</i>	-0.037 (0.031)	0.000 (0.047)	-0.052 (0.034)	-0.030 (0.034)	-0.089 (0.034)*	-0.012 (0.035)
<i>ERA—SC (a) vs. Comparison</i>	0.020 (0.041)	0.095 (0.068)	-0.004 (0.053)	0.028 (0.050)	-0.029 (0.049)	0.011 (0.051)
<i>ERA—SC (b) vs. Comparison</i>	0.053 (0.047)	0.186 (0.082)*	0.020 (0.061)	0.015 (0.056)	-0.007 (0.061)	0.050 (0.058)
<i>ERA—Texas vs. Comparison</i>	-0.012 (0.030)	0.082 (0.065)	-0.050 (0.039)	-0.034 (0.036)	-0.047 (0.040)	-0.009 (0.036)
<i>Family Transition Program (a) vs. Comparison</i>	0.023 (0.032)	0.123 (0.065)*	0.005 (0.037)	0.008 (0.036)	-0.027 (0.037)	0.008 (0.035)
<i>Family Transition Program (b) vs. Comparison</i>	0.060 (0.042)	0.163 (0.073)*	0.041 (0.046)	0.044 (0.045)	0.008 (0.046)	0.044 (0.044)
<i>Future Steps vs. Comparison</i>	-0.017 (0.039)	0.064 (0.068)	-0.046 (0.049)	-0.020 (0.044)	-0.063 (0.048)	-0.018 (0.043)
<i>Grand Rapids (HCD) vs. Comparison</i>	0.056 (0.039)	0.125 (0.071)	0.022 (0.044)	0.036 (0.043)	0.051 (0.044)	0.048 (0.041)
<i>Grand Rapids (LFA) vs. Comparison</i>	0.055 (0.035)	0.128 (0.064)*	0.029 (0.041)	0.044 (0.039)	0.035 (0.039)	0.042 (0.038)
<i>Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) vs. Comparison</i>	0.058 (0.035)	0.128 (0.070)*	0.024 (0.041)	0.038 (0.039)	0.053 (0.040)	0.050 (0.037)
<i>Guided Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice</i>	0.049 (0.044)	0.140 (0.081)	0.024 (0.054)	0.035 (0.056)	-0.004 (0.049)	0.051 (0.052)

(continued)

Intervention name	Overall	Education and training	Short-term independence from public assistance	Long-term independence from public assistance	Short-term employment	Long-term employment
<i>Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation vs. Comparison</i>	0.112 (0.035)*	0.153 (0.056)*	0.092 (0.040)*	0.102 (0.039)*	0.071 (0.041)	0.142 (0.042)*
<i>Iowa Family Investment Program vs. Comparison</i>	-0.003 (0.047)	0.059 (0.074)	-0.029 (0.059)	-0.011 (0.055)	-0.036 (0.052)	-0.001 (0.057)
<i>Job Corps vs. Comparison</i>	0.130 (0.016)*	0.529 (0.053)*	0.020 (0.018)	0.023 (0.027)	0.025 (0.025)	0.056 (0.043)
<i>Job Search Assistance Demonstration— Individualized JSA vs. Comparison</i>	0.041 (0.040)	0.121 (0.063)*	0.003 (0.040)	0.017 (0.040)	0.002 (0.041)	0.060 (0.043)
<i>Job Search Assistance Demonstration— Individualized JSA + Training vs. Comparison</i>	0.066 (0.040)	0.137 (0.061)*	0.039 (0.041)	0.058 (0.042)	0.024 (0.041)	0.072 (0.043)
<i>Job Search Assistance Demonstration— Structured JSA vs. Comparison</i>	0.048 (0.040)	0.110 (0.059)	0.021 (0.042)	0.048 (0.042)	0.008 (0.041)	0.054 (0.043)
<i>Jobs First—GAIN vs. Comparison</i>	0.128 (0.040)*	0.150 (0.051)*	0.122 (0.046)*	0.123 (0.048)*	0.120 (0.043)*	0.127 (0.045)*
<i>Jobs-Plus Community Revitalization Initiative for Public Housing Families vs. Comparison</i>	0.005 (0.047)	0.024 (0.054)	-0.001 (0.051)	0.000 (0.054)	-0.003 (0.049)	0.003 (0.051)
<i>MFIP vs. AFDC</i>	-0.080 (0.034)*	-0.064 (0.064)	-0.090 (0.057)	-0.079 (0.038)*	-0.099 (0.056)	-0.066 (0.035)
<i>MFIP vs. MFIP Incentives Only</i>	0.054 (0.044)	0.072 (0.077)	0.041 (0.068)	0.055 (0.049)	0.032 (0.067)	0.069 (0.046)
<i>MFSP—CET vs. Comparison</i>	0.091 (0.056)	0.133 (0.073)	0.090 (0.080)	0.055 (0.067)	0.070 (0.078)	0.108 (0.076)
<i>MFSP—Opportunities Industrialization Center vs. Comparison</i>	0.011 (0.053)	0.024 (0.078)	-0.002 (0.071)	-0.007 (0.058)	-0.013 (0.070)	0.051 (0.060)
<i>MFSP—Wider Opportunities for Women vs. Comparison</i>	0.003 (0.047)	0.166 (0.080)*	-0.048 (0.053)	-0.018 (0.050)	-0.056 (0.050)	-0.028 (0.047)
<i>Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) Incentives Only vs. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)</i>	-0.049 (0.036)	-0.070 (0.046)	-0.050 (0.043)	-0.033 (0.046)	-0.048 (0.041)	-0.047 (0.041)
<i>Minority Female Single Parent (MFSP)—Atlanta Urban League vs. Comparison</i>	0.025 (0.056)	0.069 (0.079)	0.011 (0.073)	0.009 (0.060)	0.001 (0.071)	0.036 (0.059)
<i>Move Up/Career Advancement Unit—OH vs. Comparison</i>	0.055 (0.038)	0.137 (0.062)*	0.030 (0.045)	0.051 (0.045)	0.011 (0.043)	0.043 (0.043)
<i>New Hope Project (a) vs. Comparison</i>	0.062 (0.051)	0.190 (0.085)*	0.037 (0.066)	0.026 (0.059)	-0.028 (0.063)	0.085 (0.070)
<i>New Hope Project (b) vs. Comparison</i>	0.044 (0.052)	0.162 (0.087)*	0.008 (0.061)	0.017 (0.059)	-0.037 (0.062)	0.072 (0.069)

(continued)

Intervention name	Overall	Education and training	Short-term independence from public assistance	Long-term independence from public assistance	Short-term employment	Long-term employment
<i>New Hope Project (c) vs. Comparison</i>	0.058 (0.048)	0.156 (0.080)*	0.033 (0.062)	0.048 (0.058)	-0.023 (0.057)	0.079 (0.062)
<i>New Visions Self-Sufficiency and Lifelong Learning Project vs. Comparison</i>	-0.009 (0.048)	0.082 (0.083)	-0.037 (0.066)	-0.005 (0.059)	-0.090 (0.057)	0.005 (0.062)
<i>Oklahoma City Education, Training, and Employment vs. Comparison</i>	-0.023 (0.035)	0.040 (0.073)	-0.040 (0.060)	-0.039 (0.041)	-0.062 (0.042)	-0.016 (0.038)
<i>Opportunity NYC—Family Rewards Demonstration vs. Comparison</i>	0.021 (0.041)	0.087 (0.078)	0.004 (0.066)	0.005 (0.047)	-0.019 (0.047)	0.029 (0.043)
<i>Parents' Fair Share vs. Comparison</i>	-0.003 (0.046)	0.062 (0.080)	-0.020 (0.067)	-0.019 (0.051)	-0.042 (0.052)	0.004 (0.048)
<i>Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment vs. Comparison</i>	0.077 (0.050)	0.095 (0.071)	0.068 (0.054)	0.092 (0.058)	0.053 (0.056)	0.076 (0.057)
<i>Portland Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) vs. Comparison</i>	0.137 (0.031)*	0.187 (0.051)*	0.103 (0.032)*	0.122 (0.032)*	0.102 (0.035)*	0.170 (0.036)*
<i>Portland PESD vs. Comparison</i>	0.029 (0.041)	0.101 (0.061)	-0.017 (0.040)	0.017 (0.042)	-0.007 (0.041)	0.049 (0.044)
<i>Post-Assistance Self-Sufficiency—Riverside, CA vs. Comparison</i>	0.056 (0.044)	0.113 (0.080)	0.031 (0.059)	0.052 (0.053)	0.021 (0.070)	0.061 (0.053)
<i>Project Earnings, Retention, Advancement Now! —San Diego, CA vs. Comparison</i>	-0.006 (0.044)	-0.022 (0.064)	0.003 (0.053)	0.020 (0.057)	-0.040 (0.058)	0.007 (0.055)
<i>Project Independence vs. Comparison</i>	0.017 (0.036)	0.034 (0.059)	0.008 (0.041)	0.031 (0.045)	-0.005 (0.043)	0.016 (0.045)
<i>Public Health Nursing vs. Comparison</i>	0.090 (0.058)	0.225 (0.089)*	0.084 (0.066)	0.048 (0.063)	0.004 (0.063)	0.089 (0.068)
<i>Reach For Success (RFS)—LA (a) vs. Comparison</i>	0.083 (0.037)*	0.139 (0.052)*	0.066 (0.038)	0.057 (0.037)	0.061 (0.039)	0.090 (0.040)*
<i>RFS—LA (b) vs. Comparison</i>	0.085 (0.038)*	0.141 (0.052)*	0.068 (0.039)	0.059 (0.038)	0.063 (0.040)	0.092 (0.041)*
<i>Riverside (HCD) vs. Comparison</i>	0.113 (0.031)*	0.200 (0.059)*	0.076 (0.033)*	0.087 (0.032)*	0.084 (0.037)*	0.116 (0.035)*
<i>Riverside (LFA) vs. Comparison</i>	0.162 (0.034)*	0.227 (0.054)*	0.140 (0.037)*	0.149 (0.036)*	0.122 (0.038)*	0.170 (0.039)*
<i>Riverside PESD vs. Comparison</i>	0.078 (0.041)	0.134 (0.057)*	0.050 (0.041)	0.056 (0.041)	0.057 (0.043)	0.092 (0.044)*
<i>San Antonio PESD vs. Comparison</i>	0.064 (0.045)	0.119 (0.058)*	0.047 (0.046)	0.039 (0.044)	0.042 (0.047)	0.071 (0.047)
<i>Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) Plus vs. Comparison</i>	0.254 (0.046)*	0.334 (0.063)*	0.231 (0.047)*	0.231 (0.046)*	0.210 (0.048)*	0.262 (0.049)*

(continued)

Intervention name	Overall	Education and training	Short-term independence from public assistance	Long-term independence from public assistance	Short-term employment	Long-term employment
<i>SSP Plus vs. SSP</i>	0.131 (0.040)*	0.181 (0.055)*	0.109 (0.041)*	0.113 (0.040)*	0.096 (0.042)*	0.157 (0.044)*
<i>SSP vs. Comparison</i>	0.150 (0.026)*	0.214 (0.047)*	0.124 (0.028)*	0.138 (0.028)*	0.098 (0.030)*	0.177 (0.030)*
<i>Strengthening Families NY vs. Comparison</i>	0.104 (0.052)*	0.188 (0.076)*	0.052 (0.051)	0.069 (0.052)	0.098 (0.055)	0.113 (0.055)*
<i>Structured Customer Choice vs. Guided Customer Choice</i>	0.038 (0.033)	0.115 (0.049)*	0.011 (0.034)	0.007 (0.034)	0.012 (0.036)	0.044 (0.037)
<i>Structured Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice</i>	0.082 (0.038)*	0.124 (0.056)*	0.052 (0.039)	0.081 (0.040)*	0.054 (0.041)	0.101 (0.043)*
<i>Success through Employment Preparation vs. Comparison</i>	0.011 (0.044)	0.112 (0.080)	-0.016 (0.061)	-0.021 (0.052)	0.011 (0.059)	-0.030 (0.049)
<i>Training Focused vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (a)</i>	-0.004 (0.032)	0.109 (0.068)	-0.045 (0.042)	-0.034 (0.037)	-0.017 (0.039)	-0.033 (0.035)
<i>Training Focused vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (b)</i>	0.004 (0.030)	0.118 (0.068)	-0.038 (0.044)	-0.026 (0.034)	-0.010 (0.033)	-0.026 (0.032)
<i>Training Focused vs. Work Plus—Riverside, CA*</i>	0.031 (0.049)	0.131 (0.080)	0.000 (0.061)	0.002 (0.055)	0.029 (0.056)	-0.006 (0.051)
<i>Transitional Jobs Program at the Transitional Work Corporation vs. Comparison</i>	0.048 (0.045)	0.116 (0.082)	0.030 (0.068)	0.032 (0.051)	0.007 (0.051)	0.056 (0.048)
<i>Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration vs. Comparison</i>	0.066 (0.048)	0.151 (0.066)*	0.020 (0.047)	0.042 (0.048)	0.033 (0.049)	0.086 (0.051)
<i>Welfare Restructuring Project (WRP) Incentives Only vs. Aid to Needy Families with Children (ANFC) [one parent]</i>	0.008 (0.040)	0.002 (0.072)	-0.003 (0.049)	0.049 (0.055)	-0.031 (0.042)	0.025 (0.048)
<i>Welfare to Work Voucher Program vs. Comparison</i>	-0.010 (0.041)	0.150 (0.075)*	-0.061 (0.049)	-0.031 (0.044)	-0.068 (0.046)	-0.041 (0.041)
<i>Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership vs. Comparison</i>	0.024 (0.054)	0.080 (0.085)	0.001 (0.065)	0.020 (0.061)	-0.009 (0.074)	0.029 (0.061)
<i>Work Plus vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (a)</i>	0.049 (0.035)	0.096 (0.053)	0.021 (0.035)	0.036 (0.036)	0.029 (0.037)	0.063 (0.037)
<i>Work Plus vs. Work Focused—Riverside, CA (b)</i>	0.082 (0.038)*	0.120 (0.058)*	0.058 (0.040)	0.076 (0.041)	0.043 (0.041)	0.115 (0.043)*
<i>Working Toward Wellness vs. Comparison</i>	0.069 (0.047)	0.128 (0.058)*	0.049 (0.048)	0.061 (0.047)	0.028 (0.047)	0.078 (0.049)
<i>WRP Incentives Only vs. ANFC [two parent]</i>	0.046 (0.041)	0.094 (0.069)	0.019 (0.054)	0.033 (0.052)	0.003 (0.047)	0.079 (0.055)
<i>WRP vs. ANFC [one parent]</i>	0.030 (0.042)	0.109 (0.074)	0.011 (0.063)	0.013 (0.054)	-0.008 (0.061)	0.024 (0.050)

(continued)

Intervention name	Overall	Education and training	Short-term independence from public assistance	Long-term independence from public assistance	Short-term employment	Long-term employment
<i>WRP vs. ANFC [two parent]</i>	0.042 (0.039)	0.118 (0.059)*	0.008 (0.042)	0.034 (0.045)	-0.008 (0.043)	0.059 (0.046)
<i>WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [one parent]</i>	0.073 (0.048)	0.148 (0.086)	0.031 (0.073)	0.053 (0.072)	0.032 (0.073)	0.103 (0.064)
<i>WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [two parent]</i>	-0.001 (0.035)	0.033 (0.054)	-0.015 (0.042)	-0.010 (0.043)	-0.011 (0.043)	0.000 (0.044)

Note: Estimates followed by standard errors in parentheses. Estimates marked with an asterisk (*) are statistically significant at the 5% level, that is, the corresponding uncertainty intervals do not contain 0. Lowercase (a), (b), and (c) distinguish among instances of an intervention applied to different populations.

Table B.7: Estimates of Strategy Effectiveness by Outcome Type

Strategy	Overall	Education and training	Short-term independence from public assistance	Long-term independence from public assistance	Short-term employment	Long-term employment
<i>Financial incentives and sanctions</i>	1.017 (0.013)	1.012 (0.017)	1.017 (0.015)	1.022 (0.016)	1.023 (0.016)	1.017 (0.014)
<i>Work experience</i>	1.017 (0.012)	1.014 (0.017)	1.025 (0.017)	1.019 (0.015)	1.018 (0.015)	1.012 (0.015)
<i>Education</i>	1.016 (0.012)	1.026 (0.020)	1.012 (0.014)	1.022 (0.015)	1.014 (0.014)	1.012 (0.014)
<i>Training</i>	1.016 (0.012)	1.021 (0.017)	1.010 (0.015)	1.019 (0.014)	1.014 (0.014)	1.018 (0.014)
<i>Job development</i>	1.014 (0.012)	1.013 (0.016)	1.016 (0.015)	1.010 (0.015)	1.017 (0.015)	1.013 (0.014)
<i>Work readiness activities</i>	1.014 (0.012)	1.007 (0.017)	1.013 (0.014)	1.013 (0.014)	1.017 (0.014)	1.019 (0.014)
<i>Health services</i>	1.014 (0.013)	1.019 (0.018)	1.008 (0.016)	1.010 (0.015)	1.014 (0.015)	1.018 (0.016)
<i>Case management</i>	1.013 (0.012)	1.011 (0.016)	1.018 (0.015)	1.018 (0.014)	1.007 (0.014)	1.011 (0.014)
<i>Employment and retention services</i>	1.011 (0.013)	1.012 (0.017)	1.007 (0.016)	1.009 (0.016)	1.005 (0.016)	1.014 (0.016)
<i>Support services</i>	1.010 (0.012)	1.014 (0.017)	1.009 (0.014)	1.003 (0.015)	1.007 (0.014)	1.01 (0.014)

Note: Estimates followed by standard errors in parentheses. Estimates marked with an asterisk (*) are statistically significant at the 5% level, that is, the corresponding uncertainty intervals do not contain 0.

Table B.8: Probability of Strategy Effectiveness by Outcome Type

Strategy	Threshold	Education and training	Short-term independence from public assistance	Long-term independence from public assistance	Short-term employment	Long-term employment
<i>Financial incentives and sanctions</i>	0.00	79.53	88.54	93.67	94.53	89.21
	0.05	1.65	2.69	5.03	5.01	2.05
<i>Work experience</i>	0.00	82.41	95.20	90.80	89.71	80.53
	0.05	2.04	8.11	2.87	2.55	0.91
<i>Education</i>	0.00	94.84	80.57	94.79	86.06	82.27
	0.05	11.15	0.57	4.49	0.83	0.45

(continued)

Strategy	Threshold	Education and training	Short-term independence from public assistance	Long-term independence from public assistance	Short-term employment	Long-term employment
Training	0.00	91.79	76.49	91.59	86.15	91.77
	0.05	5.93	0.41	2.09	1.09	2.13
Job development	0.00	81.55	87.62	75.58	88.51	83.54
	0.05	1.87	1.97	0.42	1.79	0.97
Work readiness activities	0.00	70.51	83.00	83.11	90.60	92.21
	0.05	0.31	0.63	0.57	1.58	2.49
Health services	0.00	88.7	70.41	76.83	82.86	89.01
	0.05	5.18	0.55	0.73	1.41	2.86
Case management	0.00	78.09	89.77	90.73	70.53	81.07
	0.05	0.85	2.66	2.13	0.17	0.39
Employment and retention services	0.00	79.09	69.73	73.33	65.42	83.01
	0.05	2.18	0.33	0.48	0.18	1.66
Support services	0.00	82.18	74.92	60.34	71.99	78.87
	0.05	2.75	0.20	0.03	0.11	0.32

Note: Values give the probability that the strategy is associated with effects on outcomes of the given type at or beyond the threshold value; for example, there is a 79.5 percent chance that financial incentives and sanctions are associated with higher education and training outcomes in the intervention group than the comparison group and only a 1.65 percent chance that this strategy is associated with intervention group gains of 5 percent or more. Probabilities of approximately 95% or more are given in red.

Table B.9: Estimated Percent Change in Impact for Strategy-Population Combinations

Strategy	Welfare recipients	General low-income population	Parents	Unemployed	Employed	Women	Men	Young adults	Hard-to-employ
Work readiness activities	0.011 (0.014)	0.010 (0.014)	0.011 (0.014)	0.010 (0.014)	0.011 (0.014)	0.010 (0.014)	0.010 (0.014)	0.010 (0.014)	0.010 (0.014)
Case management	0.011 (0.013)	0.010 (0.013)	0.011 (0.013)	0.011 (0.013)	0.009 (0.013)	0.010 (0.013)	0.011 (0.013)	0.010 (0.013)	0.011 (0.013)
Supportive services	0.005 (0.015)	0.007 (0.015)	0.007 (0.014)	0.006 (0.015)	0.007 (0.014)	0.006 (0.015)	0.006 (0.015)	0.007 (0.015)	0.007 (0.015)
Financial incentives and sanctions	0.014 (0.016)	0.013 (0.016)	0.014 (0.016)	0.014 (0.016)	0.015 (0.016)	0.014 (0.016)	0.014 (0.016)	0.013 (0.016)	0.014 (0.016)
Education	0.012 (0.015)	0.014 (0.015)	0.012 (0.015)	0.013 (0.015)	0.012 (0.014)	0.012 (0.015)	0.012 (0.015)	0.013 (0.015)	0.012 (0.015)
Employment retention services	0.004 (0.018)	0.004 (0.019)	0.004 (0.018)	0.006 (0.019)	0.004 (0.018)	0.005 (0.019)	0.005 (0.019)	0.005 (0.019)	0.005 (0.019)
Job development	0.007 (0.018)	0.008 (0.019)	0.008 (0.018)	0.008 (0.019)	0.008 (0.018)	0.008 (0.019)	0.009 (0.018)	0.008 (0.019)	0.007 (0.019)
Training	0.014 (0.013)	0.013 (0.013)	0.014 (0.013)	0.013 (0.013)	0.013 (0.013)	0.013 (0.013)	0.013 (0.013)	0.014 (0.013)	0.013 (0.013)
Work experience	0.012 (0.019)	0.010 (0.019)	0.012 (0.019)	0.010 (0.019)	0.011 (0.019)	0.010 (0.019)	0.010 (0.019)	0.010 (0.019)	0.011 (0.019)
Health services	0.006 (0.020)	0.008 (0.021)	0.006 (0.020)	0.008 (0.021)	0.008 (0.021)	0.007 (0.021)	0.008 (0.020)	0.008 (0.020)	0.006 (0.021)

Note: Estimates followed by standard errors in parentheses. Estimates marked with an asterisk (*) are statistically significant at the 5% level, that is, the corresponding uncertainty intervals do not contain 0.

Table B.10: Probability of Percent Change in Impact for Strategy-Population Combinations

Strategy	Threshold	Welfare recipients	General low-income population	Parents	Un-employed	Employed	Women	Men	Young adults	Hard-to-employ
<i>Work readiness activities</i>	0.00	78.38	75.81	78.82	75.79	78.53	77.02	76.64	76.67	77.75
	0.05	0.49	0.40	0.53	0.37	0.45	0.45	0.55	0.50	0.50
<i>Case management</i>	0.00	80.63	78.93	79.97	80.09	77.29	79.37	79.93	79.49	79.65
	0.05	0.35	0.29	0.31	0.36	0.31	0.30	0.35	0.29	0.33
<i>Supportive services</i>	0.00	65.99	68.91	68.94	67.99	70.02	67.55	68.41	68.88	68.45
	0.05	0.11	0.18	0.11	0.13	0.17	0.19	0.15	0.14	0.13
<i>Financial incentives and sanctions</i>	0.00	82.29	81.04	83.31	82.93	83.09	81.73	82.10	80.81	82.71
	0.05	1.77	1.64	1.83	1.78	2.18	1.79	1.84	1.69	1.91
<i>Education</i>	0.00	80.8	83.01	81.01	81.54	80.41	80.81	79.71	81.87	80.93
	0.05	0.91	1.36	0.89	1.01	0.81	1.03	0.90	0.99	0.94
<i>Employment retention services</i>	0.00	60.33	59.87	58.87	62.32	60.14	61.10	61.67	60.95	61.03
	0.05	0.68	0.76	0.47	1.08	0.56	0.82	0.93	0.92	0.97
<i>Job development</i>	0.00	65.51	67.47	67.77	66.45	67.87	67.28	68.21	66.88	65.50
	0.05	1.19	1.49	1.49	1.51	1.43	1.51	1.64	1.57	1.25
<i>Training</i>	0.00	85.96	85.65	86.47	85.30	85.05	85.14	85.28	85.78	85.27
	0.05	0.71	0.71	0.72	0.71	0.71	0.75	0.75	0.73	0.71
<i>Work experience</i>	0.00	73.97	70.71	73.67	70.34	72.17	70.80	69.62	71.09	71.52
	0.05	2.74	2.21	2.43	2.10	2.51	2.23	1.95	2.31	2.31
<i>Health services</i>	0.00	61.63	65.71	61.44	64.54	64.99	64.00	64.91	64.75	62.56
	0.05	1.69	2.33	1.59	2.25	2.15	2.31	2.12	2.18	1.91

Note: Values give the probability that the strategy is associated with effects on outcomes of the given type at or beyond the threshold value; for example, there is a 78.38 percent chance that work readiness activities are associated with improved impacts for welfare recipients and only an 0.49 percent chance that this strategy is associated with increases of 5 percent or more in impacts for welfare recipients.

Appendix C: Studies Analyzed

Table C.1: Evaluations Included in the Meta-Regression

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Center for Employment and Training (CET)	CET Replication Sites	Miller, Cynthia, Johannes M. Bos, Kristin E. Porter, Fannie M. Tseng, Fred C. Doolittle, Deana N. Tanguay, and Mary P. Vencill (2003). Working with disadvantaged youth: Thirty-month findings from the evaluation of the Center for Employment Training replication sites, Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
Employment Retention and Advancement Project (ERA)	ERA—Chicago (a) ERA—South Carolina b ERA—Texas Training Focused vs. Work Focused—Riverside, California (a) Training Focused vs. Work Plus—Riverside, California*	Bloom, Dan, Richard Hendra, Karin Martinson, and Susan Scrivener (2005). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Early results from four sites, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	ERA—South Carolina (b)	Scrivener, Susan, Gilda Azurdia, and Jocelyn Page (2005). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Results from the South ERA site, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	ERA—Chicago (b)	Bloom, Dan, Richard Hendra, and Jocelyn Page (2006). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Results from the Chicago ERA site, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Work Plus vs. Work Focused—Riverside, California a	Martinson, Karin, and Richard Hendra (2006). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Results from the Texas ERA site, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. [Corpus Christi]
	ERA—Minnesota	LeBlanc, Allen, Cynthia Miller, Karin Martinson, and Gilda Azurdia (2007). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Results from Minnesota’s tier 2 program, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment	Bloom, Dan, Cynthia Miller, and Gilda Azurdia (2007). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Results from the Personal Roads to Individual Development and Employment (PRIDE) program in New York City, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Post-Assistance Self-Sufficiency—Riverside, California	Navarro, David, Mark van Dok, and Richard Hendra (2007). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Results from the Post-Assistance Self-Sufficiency (PASS) program in Riverside, California, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Training Focused vs. Work Focused—Riverside, California (b) Work Plus vs. Work Focused—Riverside, California (b)	Navarro, David, Stephen Freedman, and Gayle Hamilton (2007). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Results from two education and training models for employed welfare recipients in Riverside, California, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Employment Retention and Advancement Project (ERA) <i>(continued)</i>	Achieve—Cleveland	Miller, Cynthia, Vanessa Martin, Gayle Hamilton, Lauren Cates, and Victoria Deitch (2008). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Findings for the Cleveland Achieve model: Implementation and early impacts of an employer-based approach to encourage employment retention among low-wage workers, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Career Builders—Portland	Azurdia, Gilda and Zakia Barnes (2008). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Impacts for Portland’s Career Builders program, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Enhanced Job Club—Los Angeles	Navarro, David, Gilda Azurdia, and Gayle Hamilton (2008). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: A comparison of two job club strategies: The effects of enhanced versus traditional job clubs in Los Angeles, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	ERA—Salem	Molina, Frieda, Wan-Lae Cheng, and Richard Hendra (2008). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Results from the Valuing Individual Success and Increasing Opportunities Now (VISION) program in Salem, Oregon, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
ERA—Eugene (b) ERA—Medford		Molina, Frieda, Mark van Dok, Richard Hendra, Gayle Hamilton, and Wan-Lae Cheng (2009). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Findings for the Eugene and Medford, Oregon, models: Implementation and early impacts for two programs that sought to encourage advancement among low-income workers, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Reach For Success (RFS)—Los Angeles (b)		Anderson, Jacquelyn, Stephen Freedman, and Gayle Hamilton (2009). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: Results from the Los Angeles Reach For Success program, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Achieve—Cleveland ERA—Chicago (a) Enhanced Job Club—Los Angeles ERA—South Carolina (a) Post-Assistance Self-Sufficiency—Riverside, California ERA—Eugene (a) Reach For Success (RFS)—Los Angeles (a) ERA—Texas Training Focused vs. Work Focused—Riverside, California (a) ERA—Medford ERA—Salem Work Plus vs. Work Focused—Riverside, California (a)		Hendra, Richard, Keri-Nicole Dillman, Gayle Hamilton, Erika Lundquist, Karin Martinson, Melissa Wavelet, Aaron Hill, and Sonya Williams (2010). The Employment Retention and Advancement project: How effective are different approaches aiming to increase Employment Retention and Advancement? Final impacts for twelve models. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Employment Retention and Advancement Project (ERA) <i>(continued)</i>	ERA—Minnesota	Butler, David, Julianna Alson, Dan Bloom, Victoria Deitch, Aaron Hill, JoAnn Hsueh, Erin Jacobs, Sue Kim, Reanin McRoberts, and Cindy Redcross (2012). What strategies work for the hard-to-employ? Final results of the hard-to-employ demonstration and evaluation project and selected sites from The Employment Retention and Advancement project, OPRE Report 2012-08, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Florida's Project Independence	Project Independence	Kemple, James, and Joshua Haimson (1994). Florida's Project Independence: Program implementation, participation patterns, and first-year impacts, New York: MDRC. Kemple, James, Daniel Friedlander, and Veronica Fellerath (1995). Florida's Project Independence: Benefits, costs, and two-year impacts of Florida's JOBS program, New York: MDRC.
Family Transition Program	FTP (a)	Bloom, Dan, James J. Kemple, and Robin Rogers-Dillon (1997). The Family Transition Program: Implementation and early impacts of Florida's initial time-limited welfare program, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	FTP (a)	Bloom, Dan, Mary Farrell, James J. Kemple, and Nandita Verma (1998). The Family Transition Program: Implementation and interim impacts of Florida's initial time-limited welfare program, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	FTP (a)	Bloom, Dan, Mary Farrell, James J. Kemple, and Nandita Verma (1999). The Family Transition Program: Implementation and three-year impacts of Florida's initial time-limited welfare program, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	FTP (b)	Bloom, Dan, James J. Kemple, Pamela Morris, Susan Scrivener, Nandita Verma, Richard Hendra, Diana Adams-Ciardullo, David Seith, and Johanna Walter (2000). The Family Transition Program: Final report on Florida's initial time-limited welfare program, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN)	GAIN	Riccio, James, and Daniel Friedlander (1992) GAIN: Program strategies, participation patterns, and first-year impacts in six counties, New York: MDRC. Friedlander, Daniel, James Riccio, and Stephen Freedman (1993). GAIN: Two-year impacts in six counties, New York: MDRC. Riccio, James, Daniel Friedlander, and Stephen Freedman (1994). GAIN: Benefits, costs, and three-year impacts of a welfare-to-work program, New York: MDRC. Freedman, Stephen, Daniel Friedlander, Winston Lin, and Amanda Schweder (1996). The GAIN evaluation: Five-year impacts on employment, earnings, and AFDC receipt, Working paper 96.1, New York: MDRC.
Hard-to-Employ	Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO)	Bloom, Dan, Cindy Redcross, Janine Zweig, and Gilda Azurdia (2007). Transitional jobs for ex-prisoners: Early impacts from a random assignment evaluation of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) prisoner reentry program, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Hard-to-Employ <i>(continued)</i>	CEO	Redcross, Cindy, Dan Bloom, Gilda Azurdia, Janine Zweig, and Nancy Pindus. (2009). Transitional jobs for ex-prisoners: Implementation, two-year impacts, and costs of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) prisoner reentry program, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Success through Employment Preparation Transitional Jobs Program at the Transitional Work Corporation	Bloom, Dan, Sarah Rich, Cindy Redcross, Erin Jacobs, Jennifer Yahner, and Nancy Pindus (2009). Alternative welfare-to-work strategies for the hard-to-employ: Testing transitional jobs and pre-employment services in Philadelphia, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Working Toward Wellness	Kim, Sue, Allen LeBlanc, and Charles Michalopoulos (2009). Working toward Wellness: Early results from a telephone care management program for Medicaid recipients with depression, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Working Toward Wellness	Kim, Sue, Allen LeBlanc, Pamela Morris, Greg Simon, and Johanna Walter (2010). Working toward Wellness: Telephone care management for Medicaid recipients with depression, eighteen months after random assignment, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Enhanced Early Head Start	Hsueh, JoAnn, Erin Jacobs, and Mary Farrell. (2011). A two-generational child-focused program enhanced with employment services: Eighteen-month impacts from the Kansas and Missouri sites of the enhanced services for the Hard-to-Employ Demonstration and Evaluation project, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Success through Employment Preparation Transitional Jobs Program at the Transitional Work Corporation	Jacobs, Erin, and Dan Bloom (2011). Alternative employment strategies for hard-to-employ TANF recipients: Final results from a test of transitional jobs and preemployment services in Philadelphia, OPRE Report 2011-19, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Working Toward Wellness	Kim, Sue, Allen LeBlanc, Pamela Morris, Greg Simon, and Johanna Walter (2011). Working toward Wellness: Telephone care management for Medicaid recipients with depression, thirty-six months after random assignment, OPRE Report 2011-21, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	CEO	Redcross, Cindy, Megan Millenky, Timothy Rudd, and Valerie Levshin (2012). More than a job: Final results from the evaluation of the Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO) transitional jobs program OPRE Report 2011-18, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Enhanced Early Head Start	Hsueh, JoAnn, and Mary E. Farrell (2012). Enhanced Early Head Start with employment services: 42-month impacts from the Kansas and Missouri sites of the Enhanced Services for the Hard-to-Employ Demonstration and Research Project, OPRE Report 2012-05, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation	Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation	Fein, David, Erik Beecroft, William Hamilton, Wang Lee, Pamela Holcomb, Terri Thompson, and Caroline Ratcliffe (1998). The Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation: Program implementation and economic impacts after two years, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation	Beecroft, Erik, Wang Lee, David Long, Pamela Holcomb, Terri Thompson, Nancy Pindus, Carolyn O'Brien, and Jenny Bernstein (2003). The Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation: Five-year impacts, implementation, costs and benefits, Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Individual Training Accounts	Guided Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice Structured Customer Choice vs. Guided Structured Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice	McConnell, Sheena, Elizabeth Stuart, Kenneth Fortson, Paul Decker, Irma Perez-Johnson, Barbara Harris, and Jeffrey Salzman (2006). Managing customers' training choices: Findings from the Individual Training Account experiment, final report, Series: ETAOP 2007-01, Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
	Guided Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice Structured Customer Choice vs. Guided Structured Customer Choice vs. Maximum Customer Choice	Perez-Johnson, Irma, Quinn Moore, and Robert Santillano (2011). Improving the effectiveness of Individual Training Accounts: Long-term findings from an experimental evaluation of three service delivery models, Series: ETAOP 2012-06, Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
Job Corps	Job Corps	Schochet, Peter, John Burghardt, and Steven Glazerman (2000). National Job Corps study: The short-term impacts of Job Corps on participants' employment and related outcomes, Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
	Job Corps	Schochet, Peter Z., John Burghardt, and Steven Glazerman (2001). National Job Corps study: The impacts of Job Corps on participants' employment and related outcomes, Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
	Job Corps	Schochet, Peter, Sheena McConnell, and John Burghardt (2003). National Job Corps study: Findings using administrative earnings records data, Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
	Job Corps	Schochet, Peter, John Burghardt, and Sheena McConnell (2006). National Job Corps study and longer-term follow-up study: Impact and benefit-cost findings using survey and summary earnings records data, Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
Jobs First	Connecticut's Jobs First Program	Bloom, Dan, Laura Melton, Charles Michalopoulos, Susan Scrivener, and Johanna Walter (2000). Jobs First: Implementation and early impacts of Connecticut's welfare reform initiative, New York: MDRC.
	Connecticut's Jobs First Program	Hendra, Richard, Charles Michalopoulos, and Dan Bloom (2001). Three-year impacts of Connecticut's Jobs First welfare reform initiative, New York: MDRC.
	Connecticut's Jobs First Program	Bloom, Dan, Susan Scrivener, Charles Michalopoulos, Pamela Morris, Richard Hendra, Diana Adams-Ciardullo, and Johanna Walter (2002). Jobs First: Final report on Connecticut's welfare reform initiative, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Jobs Plus	Jobs-Plus Community Revitalization Initiative for Public Housing Families	Bloom, Howard S., James A. Riccio, Nandita Verma, and Johanna Walter (2005). Promoting work in public housing: The effectiveness of Jobs-Plus, Final report, New York: MDRC.
Job Search Assistance	Job Search Assistance Demonstration— Individualized Job Search Assistance [IJSA] Job Search Assistance Demonstration— Individualized Job Search Assistance with Training [IJSA+] Job Search Assistance Demonstration—Structured Job Search Assistance [SJSA]	Decker, Paul T., Lance Freeman, and Daniel H. Klepinger (1999). Assisting Unemployment Insurance claimants: The one-year impacts of the Job Search Assistance demonstration, Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
	Job Search Assistance Demonstration— Individualized Job Search Assistance [IJSA] Job Search Assistance Demonstration— Individualized Job Search Assistance with Training [IJSA+] Job Search Assistance Demonstration—Structured Job Search Assistance [SJSA]	Decker, Paul, Robert Olsen, Lance Freeman, and Daniel Klepinger (2000). Assisting Unemployment Insurance claimants: The long-term impacts of the Job Search Assistance Demonstration, Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
	Jobs First—GAIN	Freedman, Stephen, Marisa Mitchell, and David Navarro (1999). The Los Angeles Jobs-First GAIN evaluation: First-year findings on participation patterns and impacts, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Jobs-First GAIN	Jobs First—GAIN	Freedman, Stephen, Jean Knab, Lisa Gennetian, and David Navarro (2000). The Los Angeles Jobs-First GAIN evaluation: Final report on a work first program in a major urban center, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Jobs First—GAIN	Freedman, Stephen, Jean Knab, Lisa Gennetian, and David Navarro (2000). The Los Angeles Jobs-First GAIN evaluation: Final report on a work first program in a major urban center, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP)	MFIP vs. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) MFIP Incentives Only vs. AFDC MFIP vs. MFIP Incentives Only	Miller, Cynthia, Virginia Knox, Lisa A. Gennetian, Martey Dodoo, Jo Anna Hunter, and Cindy Redcross (2000). Reforming welfare and rewarding work: Final report on the Minnesota Family Investment Program—Volume 1: Effects on adults, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	MFIP vs. AFDC	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, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	MFSP—CET MFSP—Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC) MFSP—Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW)	Gordon, Anne, and John Burghardt (1990). The Minority Female Single Parent demonstration: Report on short-term economic impacts, Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
Minority Female Single Parent (MFSP)	MFSP—CET MFSP—Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC) MFSP—Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW)	Gordon, Anne, and John Burghardt (1990). The Minority Female Single Parent demonstration: Report on short-term economic impacts, Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Minority Female Single Parent (MFSP) <i>(continued)</i>	MFSP—Atlanta Urban League MFSP—CET MFSP—OIC MFSP—WOW	Burghardt, John, Anu Rangarajan, Anne Gordon, and Ellen Kisker (1992). Evaluation of the Minority Female Single Parent demonstration: Volume I—Summary report, Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc
	MFSP—CET	Zambrowski, Amy and Anne Gordon (1993). Evaluation of the Minority Female Single Parent demonstration: Fifth-year impacts at CET, Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
New Hope	New Hope Project (a)	Bos, Johannes M., Aletha C. Huston, Robert C. Granger, Greg J. Duncan, Thomas W. Brock, and Vonnie C. McLoyd (1999). New Hope for people with low incomes: Two-year results of a program to reduce poverty and reform welfare, New York: MDRC.
	New Hope Project (c)	Huston, Aletha C., Cynthia Miller, Lashawn Richburg-Hayes, Greg J. Duncan, Carolyn A. Eldred, Thomas S. Weisner, Edward Lowe, Vonnie C. 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.
	New Hope Project (b)	Duncan, Gregory, Cynthia Miller, Amy Classens, Mimi Engel, Heather Hill, and Constance Lindsay (2008). New Hope's eight-year impacts on employment and family income, New York: MDRC. Unpublished.
New Visions	New Visions Self-Sufficiency and Lifelong Learning Project	Fein, David J., Erik Beecroft, David A. Long, and Andree Rose Catalfamo (2000). College as a job advancement strategy: An early report of the New Visions Self-Sufficiency and Lifelong Learning Project, Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates Inc.
	New Visions Self-Sufficiency and Lifelong Learning Project	Fein, David, Erik Beecroft, David Long, and Anne Robertson (2003). College as a job advancement strategy: An interim report on the New Visions Self-Sufficiency and Lifelong Learning Project, Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc.
	New Visions Self-Sufficiency and Lifelong Learning Project	Fein, David J., and Erik Beecroft (2006). College as a job advancement strategy: Final report on the New Visions Self-Sufficiency and Lifelong Learning Project, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (NEWWS)	Atlanta Labor Force Attachment (LFA) vs. Comparison Atlanta Human Capital Development (HCD) vs. Comparison Grand Rapids (LFA) vs. Comparison Grand Rapids (HCD) vs. Comparison Riverside (LFA) vs. Comparison Riverside (HCD) vs. Comparison	Hamilton, Gayle, Thomas Brock, Mary Farrell, Daniel Friedlander, and Kristen Harknett (1997). National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies—Evaluating two welfare-to-work program approaches: Two-year findings on the labor force attachment and human capital development programs in three sites, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families and Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; and U.S. Department of Education.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (NEWWS) <i>(continued)</i>	Atlanta (LFA) vs. Comparison Atlanta (HCD) vs. Comparison Columbus Traditional Case Management (TCM) vs. Comparison Columbus Integrated Case Management (ICM) vs. Comparison Detroit Michigan Opportunity and Skills Training and Work First Grand Rapids (LFA) vs. Comparison Grand Rapids (HCD) vs. Comparison Oklahoma City Education, Training, and Employment Program Portland Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program Riverside (LFA) vs. Comparison Riverside (HCD) vs. Comparison	Freedman, Stephen, Daniel Friedlander, Gayle Hamilton, JoAnn Rock, Marisa Mitchell, Jodi Nudelman, Amanda Schweder, and Laura Storto (2000). National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies—Evaluating alternative welfare-to-work approaches: Two-year impacts for eleven programs, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families and Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; and U.S. Department of Education.
	Atlanta (LFA) vs. Comparison Atlanta (HCD) vs. Comparison Columbus TCM vs. Comparison Columbus ICM vs. Comparison Detroit Michigan Opportunity and Skills Training and Work First Grand Rapids (LFA) vs. Comparison Grand Rapids (HCD) vs. Comparison Portland Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program Riverside (LFA) vs. Comparison Riverside (HCD) vs. Comparison	Freedman, Stephen (2000). The National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies—Four-year impacts of ten programs on employment stability and earnings growth, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families and Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; and U.S. Department of Education.
	Detroit Michigan Opportunity and Skills Training and Work First	Farrell, Mary (2000). National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies—Implementation, participation patterns, costs, and two-year impacts of the Detroit welfare-to-work program, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families and Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; and U.S. Department of Education.
	Oklahoma City Education, Training, and Employment Program	Storto, Laura, Gayle Hamilton, Christine Schwartz, and Susan Scrivener (2000). National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies—Oklahoma City's ET & E program: Two-year implementation, participation, cost, and impact findings, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families and Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; and U.S. Department of Education.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (NEWWS) <i>(continued)</i>	Atlanta (LFA) vs. Comparison Atlanta (HCD) vs. Comparison Grand Rapids (LFA) vs. Comparison Grand Rapids (HCD) vs. Comparison Riverside (LFA) vs. Comparison Riverside (HCD) vs. Comparison Columbus ICM vs. Comparison Columbus TCM vs. Comparison Detroit Michigan Opportunity and Skills Training and Work First Oklahoma City Education, Training, and Employment Program Portland Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program	Hamilton, Gayle, Stephen Freedman, Lisa Gennetian, Charles Michalopoulos, Johanna Walter, Diana Adams-Ciardullo, Anna Gassman-Pines, Sharon McGroder, Martha Zaslow, Jennifer Brooks, and Surjeet Ahluwalia (2001). National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies—How effective are different welfare-to-work approaches? Five-year adult and child impacts for eleven programs, Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families and Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; and U.S. Department of Education.
	Columbus ICM vs. Comparison Columbus ICM vs. TCM Columbus TCM vs. Comparison	Scrivener, Susan, and Johanna Walter (2001). National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies—Evaluating two approaches to case management: Implementation, participation patterns, costs, and three-year impacts of the Columbus welfare-to-work program, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation; and the U.S. Department of Education.
Opportunity NYC	Opportunity NYC—Family Rewards Demonstration	Riccio, James, Nadine Dechausay, David Greenberg, Cynthia Miller, Zawadi Rucks, and Nandita Verma (2010). Toward reduced poverty across generations: Early findings from New York City’s conditional cash transfer program, New York: MDRC.
	Opportunity NYC—Family Rewards Demonstration	Riccio, James, Nadine Dechausay, Cynthia Miller, Stephen Nunez, Nandita Verma, and Edith Yang (2013). Conditional cash transfers in New York City: The continuing story of the Opportunity NYC-Family Rewards Demonstration, New York, NY: MDRC.
Parents' Fair Share	Parents' Fair Share	Doolittle, Fred, Virginia Knox, Cynthia Miller, and Sharon Rowser (1998). Building opportunities, enforcing obligations: Implementation and interim impacts of Parents' Fair Share, New York: MDRC.
	Parents' Fair Share	Martinez, John M., and Cynthia Miller (2000). Working and earning: The impact of Parents' Fair Share on low-income fathers' employment, New York: MDRC.
Public Health Nursing	Public Health Nursing Chicago PESD program	Kneipp, Shawn M., John A. Kairalla, and Amanda L. Sheely (2013). A randomized controlled trial to improve health among women receiving welfare in the U.S.: The relationship between employment outcomes and the economic recession, <i>Social Science & Medicine</i> 80: pp. 130-140.
Postemployment Services Demonstration (PESD)	Portland PESD Program Riverside PESD program	Rangarajan, Anu, Alicia Meckstroth, and Tim Novak (1998). The effectiveness of the Postemployment Services Demonstration: Preliminary findings, Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Human Services.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Postemployment Services Demonstration (PESD) <i>(continued)</i>	Chicago PESD program Portland PESD Program Riverside PESD program San Antonio PESD program	Rangarajan, Anu, and Tim Novak (1999). The struggle to sustain employment: The effectiveness of the Postemployment Services Demonstration, final report, Springfield, IL: Illinois Department of Human Services.
Rural Welfare-to-Work	Future Steps	Meckstroth, Alicia, Andrew Burwick, Michael Ponza, Shawn Marsh, Timothy Novak, Shannon Phillips, Nuria Diaz-Tena, and Judy Ng (2006). Paths to work in rural places: Key findings and lessons from the impact evaluation of the Future Steps rural welfare-to-work program. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Building Nebraska Families	Meckstroth, Alicia, Andrew Burwick, and Quinn Moore (2008). Teaching self-sufficiency: An impact and benefit-cost analysis of a home visitation and life skills education program. Findings from the rural welfare-to-work strategies demonstration evaluation, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	Future Steps	Meckstroth, Alicia, Ann Person, Quinn Moore, Andrew Burwick, Andrew McGuirk, Michael Ponza, Shawn Marsh, Timothy Novak, Zhanyun Zhao, and Justin Wheeler (2008). Testing case management in a rural context: An impact analysis of the Illinois Future Steps program: Findings from the Rural Welfare-to-Work Strategies Demonstration evaluation, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Sectoral Employment	Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership	Maguire, Sheila, Joshua Freely, Carol Clymer, Maureen Conway, and Deena Schwartz (2010). Tuning in to local labor markets: Findings from the Sectoral Employment impact study. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) (Including SSP Plus)	SSP vs. Comparison	Lui-Gurr, Susanna, Sheila Currie Vernon, and Tod Mijanovich (1994). Making work pay better than welfare: An early look at the Self-Sufficiency Project, Ottawa: SRDC.
	SSP vs. Comparison	Mijanovich, Tod, and David Long (1995). Creating an alternative to welfare: First-year findings on the implementation, welfare impacts, and costs of the Self-Sufficiency Project, Ottawa: SRDC.
	SSP vs. Comparison	Card, David, and Philip K. Robins (1996). Do financial incentives encourage welfare recipients to work? Initial 18-month findings from the Self-Sufficiency Project, Ottawa: SRDC.
	SSP vs. Comparison	Michalopoulos, Charles, Philip K. Robins, and David Card (1999). When financial work incentives pay for themselves: Early findings from the Self-Sufficiency Project's applicant study, Ottawa: SRDC.
	SSP vs. Comparison	Quets, Gail, Philip K. Robins, Elsie C. Pan, Charles Michalopoulos, and David Card (1999). Does SSP Plus increase employment? The effect of adding services to the Self-Sufficiency Project's financial incentives, Ottawa, Canada: SRDC.
	SSP vs. Comparison	Michalopoulos, Charles, David Card, Lisa A. Gennetian, Kristen Harknett, and Philip K. Robins (2000). The Self-Sufficiency Project at 36 months: Effects of a financial work incentive on employment and income, Ottawa: SRDC.
	SSP vs. Comparison	Lei, Ying, and Charles Michalopoulos (2001). SSP Plus at 36 months: Effects of adding employment services to financial work incentives, Ottawa, Canada: SRDC.
	SSP vs. Comparison	Michalopoulos, Charles, and Tracey Hoy (2001). When financial incentives pay for themselves: Interim findings from the Self-Sufficiency Project's applicant study, Ottawa: SRDC.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) (Including SSP Plus) <i>(continued)</i>	SSP vs. Comparison	Michalopoulos, Charles, Doug Tattrie, Cynthia Miller, Philip K. Robins, Pamela Morris, David Gyarmati, Cynthia Redcross, Kelly Foley, and Reuben Ford (2002). Making work pay: Final report on the Self-Sufficiency Project for long-term welfare recipients, Ottawa, Ontario: SDRC.
	SSP vs. Comparison	Ford, Reuben, David Gyarmati, Kelly Foley, Doug Tattrie, and Liza Jimenez (2003). Can work incentives pay for themselves? Final report on the Self-Sufficiency Project for welfare applicants, Ottawa, Canada: SDRC.
	SSP Plus vs. Comparison SSP Plus vs. SSP	Quets, Gail, Philip K. Robins, Elsie C. Pan, Charles Michalopoulos, and David Card (1999). Does SSP Plus increase employment? The effect of adding services to the Self-Sufficiency Project's financial incentives, Ottawa, Canada: SRDC.
	SSP Plus vs. Comparison SSP Plus vs. SSP	Lei, Ying, and Charles Michalopoulos (2001). SSP Plus at 36 months: Effects of adding employment services to financial work incentives, Ottawa, Canada: SRDC.
	SSP Plus vs. Comparison SSP Plus vs. SSP	Michalopoulos, Charles, Doug Tattrie, Cynthia Miller, Philip K. Robins, Pamela Morris, David Gyarmati, Cynthia Redcross, Kelly Foley, and Reuben Ford (2002). Making work pay: Final report on the Self-Sufficiency Project for long-term welfare recipients, Ottawa, Ontario: SDRC.
Strengthening Families	The New York Strengthening Families Through Stronger Fathers Initiative	Lippold, Kye and Elaine Sorensen (2011). Strengthening Families Through Stronger Fathers: Final impact report for the pilot employment programs, Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
The A Better Chance (ABC) Evaluation	Delaware's A Better Chance Welfare Reform Program	Fein, David J., David A. Long, Joy M. Behrens, and Wang S. Lee (2001). The ABC evaluation: Turning the corner: Delaware's A Better Chance welfare reform program at four years, Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration Evaluation	Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration	Redcross, Cindy, Dan Bloom, Erin Jacobs, Michelle Manno, Sara Muller-Ravett, Kristin Seefeldt, Jennifer Yahner, Alford A. Young Jr., and Janine Zweig (2010). Work after prison: One-year findings from the Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration, New York: MDRC.
	Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration	Jacobs, Erin (2012). Returning to work after prison: Final results from the Transitional Jobs Reentry Demonstration, New York: MDRC.
Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project (WRP)	WRP vs. Aid to Needy Families with Children (ANFC) [one parent] WRP vs. ANFC [two parent] WRP Incentives Only vs. ANFC [one parent] WRP Incentives Only vs. ANFC [two parent] WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [one parent] WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [two parent]	Bloom, Dan, Charles Michalopoulos, Johanna Walter, and Patricia Auspos (1998). WRP: Implementation and early impacts of Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
	WRP vs. ANFC [one parent] WRP vs. ANFC [two parent] WRP Incentives Only vs. ANFC [one parent] WRP Incentives Only vs. ANFC [two parent] WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [one parent] WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [two parent]	Hendra, Richard, and Charles Michalopoulos (1999). Forty-two-month impacts of Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

(continued)

Evaluation name	Intervention	Citation
Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project (WRP) <i>(continued)</i>	WRP vs. ANFC [one parent] WRP vs. ANFC [two parent] WRP Incentives Only vs. ANFC [one parent] WRP Incentives Only vs. ANFC [two parent] WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [one parent] WRP vs. WRP Incentives Only [two parent]	Scrivener, Susan, Richard Hendra, Cindy Redcross, Dan Bloom, Charles Michalopoulos, and Johanna Walter (2002). WRP: Final report on Vermont's Welfare Restructuring Project, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Work Advancement and Support Center	Move Up/Career Advancement Unit—Dayton, OH Project Earnings, Advancement, Retention Now!—San Diego, CA Academy for Career Advancement—Bridgeport, CT Move Up/Career Advancement Unit—Dayton, OH Project Earnings, Advancement, Retention Now!—San Diego, CA	Miller, Cynthia, Betsy L. Tessler, and Mark Van Dok (2009). Strategies to help low wage workers advance: Implementation and early impacts of the Work Advancement and Support Center (WASC) demonstration, New York: MDRC. Miller, Cynthia, Betsy L. Tessler, and Mark Van Dok (2012). Strategies to help low wage workers advance: Implementation and final impacts of the Work Advancement and Support Center (WASC) demonstration, New York: MDRC.
Welfare Reform in Iowa	Iowa Family Investment Program	Fraker, Thomas M., Christine M. Ross, Rita A. Stapulonis, Robert B. Olsen, Martha D. Kovac, M. Robin Dion, and Anu Rangarajan (2002). The evaluation of welfare reform in Iowa: Final impact report, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Welfare to Work Voucher Program	Welfare to Work Voucher Program Welfare to Work Voucher Program	Patterson, Rhiannon, Michelle Wood, Ken Lam, Satyendra Patrabansh, Gregory Mills, Steven Sullivan, Hiwotte Amare, and Lily Zandniapour (2004). Evaluation of the Welfare to Work Voucher program: Report to Congress, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Mills, Gregory, Daniel Gubits, Larry L. Orr, David Long, Judith Feins, Bulbul Kaul, Michelle Wood, Amy Jones and Associates, Cloudburst Consulting, and QED Group (2006). Effects of housing vouchers on welfare families: Final report, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Note: Lowercase (a), (b), and (c) distinguish among instances of an intervention applied to different populations.

.....

Submitted to:

Emily Schmitt and Kimberly Clum, Project Officers
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Contract Number: HHSP23320095642WC/HHSP2337044T

Submitted by:

Project Director: Emily Sama-Miller
Principal Investigator: Annalisa Matri
Mathematica Policy Research
1100 1st Street NE, 12th Floor
Washington, DC 20002

This brief is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested citation: Vollmer, Lauren, Annalisa Matri, Alyssa Maccarone, and Emily Sama-Miller (2017). Which Employment Strategies Work for Whom? A Meta-Regression—Appendices, OPRE Report #2017-40-B, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.