



Evaluating the national HPOG grantees: what to expect

Robin Koralek, Abt Associates

Presentation to the HPOG Annual Grantee Meeting

November 30, 2016



The National Evaluation



- Why?
 - HPOG’s authorizing legislation calls for a comprehensive evaluation of these demonstration projects
 - To estimate the impact of the HPOG programs relative to programs otherwise available in the area
 - Builds evidence to support the sustainability of HPOG
 - Growing interest in career pathways programs across the federal government
 - One component of ACF’s multi-faceted research effort to evaluate career pathways programs

The National Evaluation



Who?

- 27 non-tribal grantees
- 38 distinct programs

What?

- Impact evaluation
- Descriptive evaluation (implementation, outcomes, and systems)
- Cost-benefit study

Accomplishments to date



- Evaluation Design and Implementation Plans (EDIPs)
- Random assignment (as of 11/14/16)
 - 7,093 participants
 - 4,735 treatment group members
 - 2,358 control group members

Impact evaluation



- What impact does HPOG have on:
 - Earnings
 - Education/training progress
 - Employment in the healthcare field
 - Readiness to work in healthcare field
 - Job quality

- How will we know?
 - Random assignment of most new applicants (on-going)
 - Compare outcomes of those assigned to receive access to HPOG services (the treatment group) to those who do not (the control group)

Impact evaluation data sources



- What data are we collecting?
 - PAGES data on participant characteristics for all study participants, and on service receipt, etc. for the treatment group
 - Administrative data on earnings and enrollment in school
 - Participant surveys (about 1 and 3 years after enrollment)

Descriptive evaluation



- Implementation study will describe:
 - Design and implementation of the non-tribal HPOG 2.0 Program
 - Local labor markets
 - How grantees spend their grants, unit costs of program activities and services
 - Similar programs and services available to non-HPOG participants
 - Program components that program operators believe increase impact sizes
 - Focus areas of interest to ACF and the field

Descriptive evaluation



- Outcome study will document participants':
 - Characteristics
 - Program experiences
 - Training/education outcomes
 - Employment outcomes

Descriptive evaluation



- Systems study will describe:
 - Local service delivery systems in which programs operate
 - How program implementation influenced local service delivery systems
 - How local service delivery systems influenced HPOG program implementation

Descriptive evaluation data sources



- PAGES
- Telephone discussions with program managers and staff to learn about program implementation and HPOG network and local training system (*planned for early 2017*)
- Site visits to up to six programs to learn about particular areas of interest (*planned for early 2018*):
 - Employer engagement
 - Basic skills instruction
 - Career pathways training opportunities
 - Work-readiness training
 - Program sustainability

Descriptive evaluation data sources



- Site visits to up to five programs to learn about program components and strategies that may increase impacts (*planned for summer-fall 2018*)
- Telephone discussions with program managers and staff to learn about experiences, results to date, successes, and challenges (*planned for early 2019*)

Cost-Benefit Study



- Participant benefits:
 - Differences in favorable outcomes between program participants and control group members (primarily earnings)
- Costs:
 - Costs of delivering training and services, including job readiness, academic, and occupational training as well as support services
 - Costs incurred by participants
 - Comparable costs in the absence of HPOG (i.e., the control group)

How will we build on past and on-going evaluation efforts?



- Work collaboratively with grantees to provide support, minimize burden
- Build community of learning through evaluation TA, sharing reports and resources, capitalizing on PAGES data
- Use common data elements, data collection strategies, programming, etc., to enable synthesis of findings across evaluations
- Build on lessons learned (e.g., data collection improvements, selection of outcomes of interest)
- Maintain close communication among project directors and with ACF

What have we learned from the HPOG 1.0 evaluation?



- Program characteristics and implementation strategies – what makes a difference for programs and for participants?
 - Descriptive Implementation and Outcome Study Report (April 2016)
 - National Implementation Evaluation Final Report (forthcoming)
- Changes to local systems for providing training and employment assistance
 - Systems Change Analysis Report (May 2016)
- TANF recipients' engagement and experiences in HPOG
 - Training TANF Recipients for Careers in Healthcare: The Experience of the Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) Program (September 2015)

www.career-pathways.org

What else to expect from the HPOG 1.0 evaluation?



- Participant Impacts: What are the training, employment and earnings outcomes for HPOG participants compared to non-participants?
 - Impact reports (2017; 2019)
 - PACE site-specific reports (2016-2017)
- More on program characteristics and implementation strategies – what makes a difference for programs and for participants?
 - Impact reports (2017; 2019)
 - PACE site-specific reports (2016-2017)

Contact Information



HPOG National Evaluation Team

Gretchen Locke
Abt Associates
Gretchen_Locke@abtassoc.com

Robin Koralek
Abt Associates
Robin_Koralek@abtassoc.com

ACF Project Officers

Hilary Forster
Hilary.Forster@ACF.hhs.gov

Nicole Constance
Nicole.Constance@ACF.hhs.gov



BOLD
THINKERS
DRIVING
REAL-WORLD
IMPACT

