



**JOHNS HOPKINS**  
M E D I C I N E

**Accelerated GED Program:  
Return on Investment**  
Department of Human Resources

## Table of Contents

---

Brief History.....	3
Understanding the GED.....	3
Assessment.....	4
Job Opportunities.....	4
Return on Investment.....	5
Conclusion.....	6
Appendices.....	7
A: (Internal Benchmark)	
B: (Return on Investment)	

## Brief History

The accelerated General Education Development (GED) Program has allowed The Johns Hopkins Hospital the opportunity to engage learners for 12 hours per week for 12 weeks in a given level, representing 144 instructional hours. Based on this model, participants are typically earning diplomas within one year. Prior to the Department of Labor (DOL) Grant, students attended about 4 hours of class a week, for a total of 48 instructional hours in a 12-week session. If they attended 3 sessions per year, then they received 144 hours of instruction per year. In the past, it typically took employees about 3 years to earn a GED if they attended class regularly. Starting with the first session in the fall of 2004, there have been five sessions (Fall/Winter 2004, Winter/Spring 2005, Summer 2005, Fall 2005, and Spring 2006) that have produced 15 motivated Johns Hopkins Hospital employees to receive their high school diploma equivalent.

## Understanding the GED

In the Official GED Practice Test, students work toward scoring 450+ points on each section of the test before they are referred to apply for the GED Exam. There are 5 sections in the practice test; Math, Language Arts (Writing), Language Arts (Reading), Science, and Social Studies. On the practice test, if a student received a 'no score' in Language Arts-Writing, this means that they received a score of "1" or less out of a possible 4 points on the essay part of the Official GED Practice Test. No score is assigned if a student scores below a '2' on the essay. This scoring rubric applies to both the Official GED Practice Test and the GED Exam.

CASAS (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System) is a tool used for assessing adult basic reading, math, listening, writing, and speaking skills within a functional context. CASAS is the only adult assessment system of its kind to be approved and validated by the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Labor to assess both native and non-native speakers of English. While some correlation can be drawn between the approximate CASAS grade levels and scores on the Official GED Practice Test, it is commonly understood in the field of Adult Education, and supported by the Maryland State GED Office, that CASAS testing is less predictive of success on the GED exam than the Official GED Practice Test, and has little relevance to progress toward the GED once students reach higher levels. CASAS scoring method uses grade level equivalents (GLEs) and it has been reported that the competencies that are included in these academic achievement tests are not the same skills consistently required in a work setting ([www.casas.org](http://www.casas.org)). The CASAS system was used as a tool for placement into the accelerated GED classes (level 2) for Johns Hopkins Hospital employees. However, at this point, the official GED Practice Test scores are a much better indicator of the possible success of a student on the GED exam, as the practice test closely parallels testing format and difficulty level of the actual GED exam.

## Assessment

The accelerated GED Program has provided numerous success stories for employees at The Johns Hopkins Hospital. In an attempt to evaluate the program, the GED National Testing Center based out of Washington D C. was contacted for external benchmarking data. By looking at the number of hours in the classroom compared to practice GED test scores, each employee could be evaluated versus the national averages however, the GED Testing Center has not yet researched this information for their GED Practice Tests. When this information becomes available, this document will be updated. The following people and organizations were contacted.

Organization	Website	Name	Contact Information	Comments
United States Department of Education	<a href="http://www.casas.org">www.casas.org</a>	Jane Egüez CASAS Director Program Planning	<a href="mailto:jeguez@casas.org">jeguez@casas.org</a>  800-255-1036 x125	More familiar with learning gains and not GED Practice Test scores
American Council on Education, GED Testing Service (GEDTS)	<a href="http://www.acenet.edu">www.acenet.edu</a>	Carol E. Ezzelle, Ph D, Psychometri cian, GED Testing Service	<a href="mailto:carol_ezzelle@ace.nche.edu">carol_ezzelle@ace.nche.edu</a>  (202) 939-9482	No information currently available but research planned later this year

For now, an internal benchmark was done on the 15 GED recipients (See Appendix A: Internal Benchmark) Two types of internal benchmarking were done. The first used each person's session score and compared them against others within that same session. For instance, participant 1 was in the Summer Session (June 13 – September 18, indicated by the color green) and had an overall score of 70 points from the entire pre and post tests in that session. Other participants that took the same pre and post tests in that session had a lower post test score, leading to an average of negative 30 points. In this case, participant 1 had a 40 point positive variance (i.e.  $70 - 30 = 40$ ). Looking at the second internal benchmarking method, a participant's overall score was calculated from all pre and post test scores done while a candidate was in the program. For example, participant 1 had an overall score of 150 points from all their pre and post test scores. The internal benchmark however is a 105 point increase, meaning that participant 1 had a positive variance of 45 points (i.e.  $150 - 45 = 105$ ). There is a large variance among the 15 recipients which may indicate that another benchmarking tool may be needed to effectively evaluate people who take the GED.

## Job Opportunities

Beyond personal goals for taking the GED, many employees will use their GED diploma as a stepping stone to then further their education and skills to gain entry into higher paying positions, which are usually ones that require a high school diploma or equivalent. The American Council on Education, who administers the GED, says that two-thirds of GED candidates go on to seek more education through technical programs, nondegree

training programs, 2-year associate degree programs, and on-the-job training programs. For our 15 GED graduates, the process has just begun and many are now taking training classes to help them prepare for higher paying jobs. An analysis was done on the opportunities available for employees with and without a high school diploma with the assistance of the Career Services Department at The Johns Hopkins Hospital.

There are currently 1,500 different job types at The Johns Hopkins Hospital with 8,205 people working in those positions. A few miles down the street, at The Bayview Medical Campus, there are 3,276 employees with 691 different jobs. Currently, there is no information available on which job positions require a high school diploma but this information is being evaluated.

### Return on Investment

The 15 candidates that have successfully completed the accelerated GED Program with the aid of the Department of Labor Grant have completed over 3,500 hours of classroom instruction with an average of 234 hours of instruction per person. Thanks to various supportive departments within the hospital, employees have been able to take paid time away from work to have classroom instruction, which is defined as release time. Release time has totaled \$41,595. Course cost included books (\$50 per student per session), a fraction of the instructor's salary, and a fraction of the coach's salary. The total course time amount was \$80,180 and the average amount per employee was \$5,345. (See Table 1: Return on Investment)

Looking at wages, on average, our GED graduates were making \$10.82 in their entry-level positions. It is a policy of the union, which is the major employer of many of the GED graduates, to start their employees with a minimum wage of \$9.14 per hour. After receiving their GED, most candidates received a pay increase over the next few months of \$0.39, which is a 3% increase on average. It is important to note that it is still very early in their educational and professional development and that looking at the wage increase is not a fair depiction of the success of the GED Program or its participants. Employees do not receive a pay increase for completing the GED course but for gaining entry into a new position. An employee must apply for a new position and then it is up to the employer to decide if he or she is to be then hired. Also, many of the 15 employees are union employees and receive a pay increase of 3% annually, which is supported by the percent gain average for all 15 employees in Table 1. It will be important to revisit this information in the next few years to see how successful each of the employees have been in getting higher paying jobs.

The return on investment was calculated by looking at three different areas; project costs, wages, and Johns Hopkins Hospital HR Cost. The Human Resource Department at The Johns Hopkins Hospital calculates turnover by 30% of the annual salary of the employee. Taking the prewage pay of each employee who participated in the GED program, the total turnover costs was \$101,319, with an average of \$6,755 spent on each employee. In 2004, recruitment cost of entry level positions (no advertising, no bonuses, and no relocation) was \$900 per hire. This figure does not include backfill. Due to inflation and

other factors, the number has probably increased but this information is not available. Of the 15 GED recipients, there was a total return on investment of -13.3%.

The negative value of this investment does not grasp the total return on investment however. Employees that have participated and received their high school diploma equivalent are now able to take additional training and skills enhancement classes offered through the hospital to gain entry into higher pay grade positions. Also, the amount of self-worth that is gained is immeasurable. A dollar value can not capture the complete picture and importance of the accelerated GED Program. According to the Center on Education and Training for Employment, GED recipients tend to feel better about themselves and have an enhanced sense of self-esteem by knowing that they have accomplished requirements of educational certification. Also they have a greater satisfaction with their individual lives, being more apt to read, continue learning and be financially secure. These candidates are also more likely to encourage their children to finish school by relating to them their own handicaps by not completing high school.

## Conclusion

The accelerated GED Program offered at The Johns Hopkins Hospital has not only allowed employees to work on their GED for free but has eased the struggle of earning a GED by allowing employees to study while at work during paid leave time. The hospital not only strongly believes in the program but has a large financial investment in it. This investment may not show a positive return on investment but The Human Resource Department at The Johns Hopkins Hospital also recognizes that the full impact of the program is not reflected in the quantitative financial numbers but the qualitative impact is immeasurable.

# Appendix A

## **Internal Benchmarking**

**Pre and Post-Testing for Accelerated GED Classes  
The Johns Hopkins Hospital**

**Note: Scores color-coded by session**  
 Fall Session (November 28, 2004 - February 10, 2005)  
 Winter/Spring Session (February 28 - May 24, 2005)  
 Summer Session (June 1 - September 6, 2005)  
 Fall Session (September 12 - December 20, 2005)  
 Spring Session (March - May 2005)

**NOTE: Need a 450 on each test to pass or a total of 2250 points, but must score at least a 410 on each section to pass.**

Name	Status	Math	Lang Arts - Writing		Lang Arts - Reading		Science		Social Studies		Total Score	Total Hours by Session	Benchmarking						
			Pre/Post	Difference	Pre/Post	Difference	Pre/Post	Difference	Pre/Post	Difference			Pre/Post	Difference	Individual Session Score	Session Benchmark	Variance	Individual Overall Score	Overall Benchmark
Andie Johnson	Active	300/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	400/420	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>-100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>45</b>
Andie Robinson	Active	410/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	410/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-25</b>
Andie Williams	Active	300/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	300/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>-30</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>155</b>
Damon Wilson	Active	300/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	300/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>75</b>
Damon Wilson	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-65</b>
Damon Wilson	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-65</b>
Damon Wilson	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>-140</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>-20</b>	<b>-20</b>	<b>-20</b>	<b>-20</b>	<b>-130</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>-126</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>-130</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-235</b>
Damon Wilson	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-5</b>
Damon Wilson	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-185</b>
Damon Wilson	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-16</b>
Damon Wilson	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1700	123	70	-30	40	-98	150	105	45
	Active	400/410	480/500	20	450/500	50	450/500	50	450/500	50	1800	123	80	86	-6	25	150	105	45
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>-30</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>-55</b>





# Appendix B

## **Return On Investment**

Table 1: Return on Investment

APPLICANT	PROJECT COSTS				WAGES				JHH HR COST			HR MINUS TRNG COST (\$)	RETURN PER \$1 TRNG (%)		
	CLASSROOM HOURS	RELEASE (\$)	COURSE (\$)	COACHING (\$)	TOTAL (\$)	DIPLOMA DATE	LAST DATE of pay info before DIPLOMA	PRE (\$)	POST (\$)	GAIN (\$)	TURNOVER \$ (30% of annual salary)			RECRUITMENT (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
1	216	\$2,270	\$5,322	\$793	\$8,385	11/30/05	10/25/04	\$10.51	\$10.83	\$0.32	\$6,558	\$900	\$7,458	-\$927	-11.1%
2	144	\$1,377	\$5,322	\$793	\$7,492	1/31/06	12/11/04	\$9.56	\$9.56	\$0.00	\$5,965	\$900	\$6,865	-\$626	-8.4%
3	468	\$5,068	\$5,472	\$793	\$11,333	1/31/06	12/11/2005	\$10.83	\$10.83	\$0.00	\$6,758	\$900	\$7,658	-\$3,675	-32.4%
4	327	\$3,486	\$5,322	\$793	\$9,601	7/29/05	6/30/05	\$10.66	\$11.60	\$0.94	\$6,652	\$900	\$7,552	-\$2,049	-21.3%
5	126	\$1,169	\$5,272	\$793	\$7,234	5/31/05	6/26/05	\$9.28	\$10.44	\$1.16	\$5,791	\$900	\$6,691	-\$543	-7.5%
6	279	\$2,974	\$5,372	\$793	\$9,139	9/30/05	5/1/05	\$10.66	\$10.98	\$0.32	\$6,652	\$900	\$7,552	-\$1,587	-17.4%
7	258	\$2,508	\$5,372	\$793	\$8,673	5/31/05	9/27/05	\$9.72	\$10.01	\$0.29	\$6,065	\$900	\$6,965	-\$1,707	-19.7%
8	367	\$5,711	\$5,372	\$793	\$11,875	12/30/05	7/12/04	\$15.56	\$16.38	\$0.82	\$9,709	\$900	\$10,609	-\$1,266	-10.7%
9	276	\$2,942	\$5,372	\$793	\$9,107	11/30/05	9/11/05	\$11.26	\$10.98	\$0.32	\$6,652	\$900	\$7,552	-\$1,555	-17.1%
10	124	\$1,348	\$5,322	\$793	\$7,463	6/30/05	9/27/04	\$10.87	\$11.26	\$0.39	\$6,783	\$900	\$7,683	\$220	2.9%
11	124	\$1,303	\$5,322	\$793	\$7,418	10/31/05	9/18/05	\$10.51	\$10.83	\$0.32	\$6,558	\$900	\$7,458	\$40	0.5%
12	288	\$3,298	\$5,372	\$793	\$9,463	1/31/06	12/11/05	\$11.45	\$11.45	\$0.00	\$7,145	\$900	\$8,045	-\$1,418	-15.0%
13	200	\$1,902	\$5,322	\$793	\$8,017	6/30/05	9/10/11/05	\$9.51	\$9.83	\$0.32	\$5,934	\$900	\$6,834	-\$1,183	-14.8%
14	237	\$2,555	\$5,322	\$793	\$8,670	3/31/06	9/19/05	\$10.78	\$10.87	\$0.09	\$6,727	\$900	\$7,627	-\$1,043	-12.0%
15	312	\$3,685	\$5,322	\$793	\$9,800	6/30/05	1/26/05	\$11.81	\$12.34	\$0.53	\$7,369	\$900	\$8,269	-\$1,550	-15.6%
TOTAL	3,746	\$41,595	\$80,180	\$11,894	\$121,775						\$101,319	\$13,500	\$114,819	-\$18,850	-13.3%
AVERAGE	234	\$2,773	\$5,345	\$793	\$9,661			\$10.82	\$11.21	\$0.39	\$6,755	\$900	\$7,655	-\$1,257	

\*\*\* As of April 2006

\*\*\* As of May 15, 2006

\*\*\* Gaining a GED does not give an employee a pay increase. It allows the employee to receive additional training for a higher paying skilled job. This area will be revealed in upcoming months.

WALS 5/3/06 S/L/S

Calculating Return on Investment Costs									
COURSE									
Books			Instructors						
Candidate	No. of Semesters	\$50/student/ semester	Instructor	Pay per Hour	No. of weeks	No. of Hours per week	No. of Sessions		
1	2	\$ 100	1*	\$27	34	12	5	\$55,080	
2	2	\$ 100	2	\$25	12	15	2	\$9,000	
3	5	\$ 250	3	\$25	12	17.5	1	\$5,250	
4	2	\$ 100	4	\$25	12	22.5	1	\$6,750	
5	1	\$ 50	5	\$25	12	7.5	1	\$2,250	
6	3	\$ 150	<b>Total</b>					<b>\$78,330</b>	
7	3	\$ 150	* Only charged to grant						
8	3	\$ 150							
9	3	\$ 150							
10	2	\$ 100							
11	3	\$ 150							
12	2	\$ 100							
13	2	\$ 100							
14	2	\$ 100							
15	2	\$ 100							
COACHING									
Teachers	GED Fraction*	Salary (per hour)	hours	weeks	Sessions per Year	Class Time	No. of sessions	Total	
Teacher 1	0.063	\$23.85	5.5	52	3	1.5	6	\$11,622	
Teacher 2	0.068	\$23.18	5.5	52	3	1.5	6	\$12,165	
<b>AVG</b>								<b>\$11,894</b>	
* Saw 27 out of 206 students and divided between the two									

### Estimated ROI for Project REACH's GED Candidates

APPLICANT	PROJECT COSTS			WAGES					UHC AVG	HR MINUS	RETURN
	Hours of Instruction in AP**	RELEASE (\$)	COURSE (\$)	DIPLOMA DATE	LAST DATE of pay into before DIPLOMA	PRE *** (\$)	POST **** (\$)	GAIN ***** (\$)			
1	216	\$3,040.00		11/30/05	10/25/04	\$10.51	\$10.83	\$0.32			3%
2	133			1/31/06	12/11/04	\$9.56	\$9.56	\$0.00			0%
3	468			1/31/06	12/11/2005	\$10.83	\$10.83	\$0.00			0%
4	108			4/5/06	12/11/2005	\$10.06	\$10.06	\$0.00			0%
5	327			7/29/05	6/30/05	\$10.66	\$11.60	\$0.94			9%
6	126			5/31/05	6/26/05	\$9.28	\$10.44	\$1.16			13%
7	279			9/30/05	5/1/05	\$10.66	\$10.98	\$0.32			3%
8	258			5/31/05	5/27/05	\$9.72	\$10.01	\$0.29			3%
9	354			12/30/05	7/12/04	\$15.56	\$16.38	\$0.82			5%
10	276	\$9,825.92		11/30/05	9/11/05	\$10.66	\$10.98	\$0.32			3%
11	124			6/30/05	9/27/04	\$10.87	\$11.26	\$0.39			4%
12	207	\$8,744.32		10/31/05	9/18/05	\$10.51	\$10.83	\$0.32			3%
13	288	\$7,912.32		1/31/06	12/11/05	\$11.45	\$11.45	\$0.00			0%
14	200	\$8,744.32		6/30/05	9/10/11/05	\$9.51	\$9.83	\$0.32			3%
15	183			12/30/05	not in system	---	---	---			---
16	237			3/31/06	9/19/05	\$10.78	\$10.87	\$0.09			1%
17	315			6/30/05	1/26/05	\$11.81	\$12.34	\$0.53			4%
TOTAL	4,099	\$38,266.88									
AVERAGE	241	\$2,250.99				\$10.14	\$10.49	\$0.34			3%

\*\*\*\* As of May 15, 2006

\*\*\*\*\* Gaining a GED does not give an employee a pay increase, it allows the employee to receive additional training for a higher-paying skilled job. This area will be revisited in upcoming months.

\* applicant name and number replaced with code for confidentiality.

\*\* As of April 2006

\*\*\* wage before diploma was received (Information obtained from IHH HR Compensation