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PE 101: Origin & Replication
Vermont: Origin of PE
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Focus on High-Risk or Difficult to Place Consumers:

- Little or no work history
- Criminal histories
- Stuck cases (e.g. no progress in some time)
- Client’s stated interest in obtaining work experience
- Soft skills or behavioral issues
“VT DVR’s innovation offers a solution of how to align business-focused services with jobseeker services all the while maintaining a clear focus on persons with the most significant disabilities.” – Foley, Haines, et al, JVR (2018)

Key Findings from Mathematica preliminary impact study (2018):

- “PE increases the likelihood of exiting VR with a job by 21.3 percentage points.”
- “Two quarters after VR exit, we observed a 6.3 percentage point increase in the share of PE recipients who earned more than $2,600.”
Exploring PE Across States

2009
PE emerges in VT DVR

2012
ICI awarded NIDLRR grant to study the PE model

2015
PE model replication begins in OR, NE & ME & forms Learning Collaborative

2016
Maine DVR awarded TWBL grant for PE

2017
ICI's preliminary PE data shows potential impact on employment outcomes

NOW
ICI awarded NIDLRR grant to study PE outcomes until 2020
Emergence of the PE Model

Services to jobseekers

Business relations

Team approach for serving dual-customer

Strategies to mitigate risk

PE Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VR Agency</th>
<th>Team Approach</th>
<th>Business Relations</th>
<th>Low Risk Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vermont DVR</td>
<td>Weekly Jobsville meetings</td>
<td>8 BAMs, some VR some CRP hires.</td>
<td>Set-aside funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska VR</td>
<td>Weekly WIN meetings</td>
<td>4 BAMs represent most populated regions; most services provided directly by VR</td>
<td>Liability coverage for consumers in work experience, and Worker’s Comp covered through state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon CFB</td>
<td>Weekly virtual meetings</td>
<td>Expanded to 2 BAMS; several CRPs providing PE services</td>
<td>Liability coverage and Worker’s Comp covered through staffing company as employer of record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine DVR</td>
<td>Bi-weekly regional meetings</td>
<td>Expanded to 2 BAMS; several CRPs providing PE services</td>
<td>Liability coverage is provided by CRP as part of the contract. Worker’s Comp is available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PE 201: Research & Evaluation
PE Research and Evaluation Agenda

- Process
  - 1. Can the PE model be replicated in state VR agencies outside of Vermont?
  - 2. How do implementation strategies for key model components differ across replication sites?
- Impact
  - Employment outcomes: Successfully closed cases; Wages / Hours Worked
  - “Drop out” rates; case costs
- Fidelity and Long-term outcomes
## Evolution of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2019 - 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR</strong></td>
<td>• Small pilot</td>
<td>• Cohort study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Qualitative study</td>
<td>• Quantitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N=25 adults</td>
<td>• N=71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME</strong></td>
<td>• 2 site office pilot</td>
<td>• 4 sites model demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential impact evaluation with comparison</td>
<td>• Impact eval plus quasi-experimental design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N=100+ youth</td>
<td>• N= 800+ youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE</strong></td>
<td>• Statewide roll-out</td>
<td>• Full-scale adoption statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planned impact evaluation with comparison</td>
<td>• Matched comparison group impact evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• N = no set target</td>
<td>• N=1000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Getting to Fidelity

Identify: Core model components

Document: Implementation strategies

Develop: Scoring Criterion and measures

Implement: Within/across state programs

Incorporate: Scores into impact eval
Model Component: Services to Jobseekers

Criterion

- Array of work-based learning experiences
- Rapid and sustained engagement
- Team members support jobseekers: “Meet you where you are”

Measures

- # of WBL activities
- Focus on “job ready”? 
- # of days/weeks between referral and WBL
Model Component: Business Relations

**Criterion**
- Dedicated business relations staff focused on business outreach
  - Array of WBL activities
  - Coordinate business outreach across team members
  - Rapid follow-up

**Measures**
- # of business relations staff
- # of WBL activities
- Emphasize business needs
- Coordinate outreach
  - Follow up immediately
    (Always / never / sometimes )
Model Component: Mechanisms to Mitigate Risk

**Criterion**
- Funding and mechanisms to compensate WBL participants
- Liability and worker’s compensation
- Focus on WBL experience with potential to hire

**Measures**
- Sufficient funds: adequate and accessible
- Coverage provided for all WBL experiences
- Clarity of written and verbal communication about approach
Model Component: Team Approach to Meeting Dual-Customer Needs

Criterion

- Multiple, cross-functional communication processes
- Communication focus on: successes, referrals, LMI, challenging cases
- Data collected for jobseekers and businesses; able to be linked

Measures

- # of processes / frequency
- Communication participation rate % of team members
- #/% Completion of data elements
- Data linkages across systems (yes/no)
Including Vermont, over 4,300 jobseekers received PE to date.
Number of PE Jobseekers Receiving PE in Replication States 2016-2019

- Nebraska
- Maine
- Oregon
- Total

Year: 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019
Number of PE Jobseekers Closed into Competitive Integrated Employment

- Nebraska
- Maine
- Oregon
- Total

Years: 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019
Compared to what?

- Drawing a valid comparison group: methods and approaches
- Limitations given:
  - “Inclusion criteria” heavily dependent on counselor discretion
  - Many cases are still active / open (majority in Maine)
  - Need to consider all cases closed, including prior to IPE for accurate impact assessment
### Early indicators: Nebraska example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nebraska VR</th>
<th>Adult (N)</th>
<th>Youth (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open case</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Non-PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>2277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful outcome</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Non-PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated Unsuccessful</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Non-PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>690</td>
<td>8508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Successful Closure Rate</strong>*</td>
<td>45.09%</td>
<td>38.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.71%</td>
<td>20.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Successful closure rate = # Successful outcome/ (# Successful outcome+ #Terminated Unsuccessful including prior to IPE). Not convention for reporting successful rehabilitation to RSA as pre-IPE closures are included in analysis.*
Why we are excited about this!

- PE can be extracted from VT and successfully replicated in other state VR agencies
- Preliminary outcomes are promising
- Interest in the field (in EBP, dual-customer approaches) continues to grow

“Evidence-based practices are often implemented poorly and rarely endure beyond initial enthusiasm and grant funding” (Bond et al., 2016, p. 864).

Not the case for PE! 🤭
Next steps for research and analysis

• 2019 – 2020: Finalize impact evaluation for three replication states, with comparison groups drawn in two.
• Incorporate Fidelity of Implementation scores (multiple scores within states / across area offices) into analysis.
• Update information about implementation, including: case cost, dosage, duration of intervention, etc.
PE 301: VR Capacity & Solutions
The New VR

Growth in Business Relations Units, Services, Partnerships, Outcomes
- Rapid expansion of Business Relations in VR
- Cross system performance outcomes
- Innovations like customized training strategies and emphasis on work based learning

Client Population Shifts
- Pre-ETS and High School Students
- Modern Medicine and the likely increase in people with multiple disabilities, new disabilities, and complex medical disabilities
- Encouraging people back into the labor force
- Workforce system interest in populations with high disability but limited work history
Real Time Rapid communication

Mobility

Technological Advances

Labor Market and Talent

AI in the workplace

Small Employers without HR personnel
Why PE

• Focus on rapid communication between business relations and field services and employers, particularly small employers
• Focus on clients who some may view as "not job ready" and who have employment barriers beyond disability
• Risk reduction for client and for business
• “Work based learning for adults” Diane Dalmasse.
Capacities

- Business relations personnel that do not carry a jobseeker caseload
- Rapid communication that minimizes the time between an employer request and a jobseeker in place.
- Strategies for encouraging vendor partnerships rather than competition
- Cross system relationships
The Vendor Question

• Most VR agencies face a few challenges with vendors:
  – Capacities, staff turnover, consistency of quality, geographic coverage, specification versus generalization

• Contracts:
  – Fee for Service
  – Required Activities
  – Measuring process versus outcomes
Solutions?

a) Contracting processes that pay for key components of the model
b) Enhancing internal capacities
c) Juggling process and outcome payment points
d) Counselor budgets
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