United States Department of Agriculture

Evaluation of SNAP Employment and Training Pilots: Fiscal Year 2020 Annual Report to Congress

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender

CONTENTS

I. Background 1
A. The pilots 1
B. The evaluation 1
II. Overview of Pilot Characteristics 3
III. Evaluation progress in FY 2020 7
A. Producing interim evaluation reports 7
1. Introduction 7
2. Implementation analysis 7
3. Participation analysis 7
4. Difference in service receipt for the treatment and control groups 8
5. Impacts on employment, earnings, receipt of public assistance, and well-being outcomes 8
6. Analysis of pilot costs 9
7. Conclusion 9
B. Evaluation data collection 9
1. Baseline data collection 9
2. Impact data collection 9
3. Implementation data collection 10
4. Participation data collection 11
5. Cost data collection 11
IV. Evaluation activities in FY 2021 12
A. Impact analysis 12
B. Implementation analysis 12
C. Participation analysis 13
D. Benefit-cost analysis 13
E. Reviewing and reporting study findings 13

EXHIBITS

Exhibit II.1. Characteristics of SNAP E&T Pilots 4

This report provides an overview of the SNAP Employment and Training Pilots Evaluation in fiscal year (FY) 2020. Sections I and II provide background information on the pilots and evaluation. Section III discusses activities that took place in FY 2020, including progress related to the interim evaluation reports and the collection of data on which final evaluation report analyses will be based. Looking forward, Section IV outlines evaluation-related activities scheduled to take place after FY 2020.

I. Background

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is a federally-funded, state-administered food assistance program. SNAP households are eligible for SNAP's Employment and Training (E&T) program, which can provide opportunities for those that are work eligible to enter, re-enter, and remain in the workforce.. SNAP E&T assists SNAP participants with job search support; job skills training; education (basic, occupational); work experience; and workfare. The opportunity for gainful employment is important for the dignity it provides and the opportunity for families to move forward to be better tomorrow than they are today.

Section 4022 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 authorized and funded the SNAP E&T pilots, which enabled the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) and States to expand SNAP E&T programs and test innovative strategies to connect SNAP participants with work, thereby increasing their incomes and reducing the need for nutrition assistance benefits. This is the sixth and final annual report to Congress.

A. The pilots

In March 2015, through a competitive solicitation, USDA awarded grants ranging from $8.9 million to $22.3 million to pilots in 10 States: California, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington. The pilots offered a range of services, as directed by the legislative mandate. Pilot strategies included lighter-touch approaches (such as resume and cover letter writing, interviewing and communication skills, and job search strategies) as well as more intensive services that connect participants with in-demand and emerging industries using strategies that were tested for the first time among SNAP E&T participants. These included career assessment, certified occupational skills training at community colleges and other institutions, and work-based learning opportunities, such as work experience, subsidized employment, or work study. In most of the States, grantees created new partnerships between State agencies that administer SNAP and other entities including workforce agencies, employers, community colleges, and community-based organizations.

SNAP participants who enrolled in the pilots were randomly assigned to a treatment group that was offered an enhanced set of services or a control group that could participate in existing SNAP E&T programs or other workforce development programs in the community.

Pilot staff began enrolling SNAP participants into the pilots in 2016. Pilots completed enrollment between July 2017 and September 2018. Four pilots stopped providing services in December 2018, and six pilots stopped providing services between January and April 2019.

B. The evaluation

The Agricultural Act of 2014 funded a rigorous, longitudinal evaluation of the 10 pilots. USDA contracted with Mathematica who, supported by its subcontractors MDRC, Insight Policy Research, Koné

Consulting, and Decision Information Resources (collectively referred to as the evaluation team), conducted the evaluation.

The evaluation includes four components: (1) an ***impact analysis*** that identifies what works and for whom by examining impacts on employment and earnings, public-assistance receipt, and other outcomes such as food security, health, well-being, and housing status; (2) an ***implementation analysis*** that documents the context and operations of each pilot as well as helps to interpret and understand impacts within and across pilots; (3) a ***participation analysis*** that examines the characteristics and service paths of treatment group members, and whether the presence of the pilots and their services or participation requirements affects whether people apply for SNAP or continue to receive SNAP benefits; and (4) a ***benefit-cost analysis*** that estimates the return on each dollar invested.

The evaluation team collected data from multiple sources to support the evaluation. The primary sources of data on employment, earnings, receipt of public assistance, and service receipt are administrative records obtained from State and local agencies. Other data sources include baseline information collected from individuals at random assignment; data from surveys of individuals enrolled in the pilot, administered 12 and 36 months after random assignment; qualitative data from interviews with agency, partner, and provider staff, and focus groups with individuals enrolled in the pilot and employers; and cost data provided by pilot staff. Most data were collected throughout the pilot period, but in FY2020, the evaluation team continued to collect administrative data on employment, earnings, and receipt of public assistance as well as 36-month survey data.

Using data collected through 2018, the team produced 10 interim pilot-specific evaluation reports and a cross-pilot summary report which described service use and presented short-term impacts over a 12-month period for individuals enrolled in the pilots between January 2016 and December 2017. USDA will publish the 10 interim pilot-specific evaluation reports and a cross-pilot summary report in FY 2021. The final evaluation reports are expected in 2022. Building on interim pilot-specific report findings, the final evaluation reports will examine the experiences of all individuals enrolled in the pilots and will follow individuals' outcomes over a period of up to 36 months after random assignment. The final reports will also examine the benefits of providing treatment group services relative to their costs.

II. Overview of Pilot Characteristics

For all pilots, the State agency that administers SNAP was awarded the grant in March 2015. The SNAP agencies oversaw the pilots but partnered with service providers—such as Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) agencies, community education or training providers, or community colleges—and non-provider partners—such as community-based organizations, leadership councils, or university boards or centers —to help provide services and administer the pilots (Exhibit II.1). For most pilots, the grantee worked with some or all of its partners to plan pilot processes and activities in 2015. States then began enrollment into their pilots between January 2016 and April 2016, depending on the pilot.

When applying for the pilot grants, the States and their partners often saw the pilots as an opportunity to develop and provide more intensive services than were usually available, filling a gap in existing services. This could include offering more intensive case management, additional support services, work-based learning opportunities, or individualized services that were responsive to each person's specific needs. Some States were expanding their SNAP E&T services to align with what they offered in other programs such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or WIOA, while others were creating services that did not exist in the pilot areas.

Participation in the majority of the pilots was voluntary, but three—Georgia, Illinois, and Mississippi—administered mandatory programs in some or all of the pilot counties (Exhibit II.1). Under mandatory E&T programs, individuals enrolled in the pilots had to participate in E&T activities (either pilot activities or activities offered through the existing SNAP E&T program) to retain their SNAP benefits. Those who did not participate—in either the treatment or control group—could be sanctioned for noncompliance, which means they lost their benefits and were ineligible to participate in SNAP (and the pilot) for a State-determined number of months or until they became compliant.

Most of the pilots offered the enhanced services in selected areas of the State, but Delaware and Vermont offered services statewide (Exhibit II.1). States that did not offer services statewide generally targeted regions that were most in need of services, had the largest target populations, or had providers who could readily offer enhanced services. The pilot areas ranged from one county in California to 35 counties in Kansas. Most of the pilots were serving a mix of urban and rural communities, but pilots in Kentucky and Vermont targeted primarily rural areas.

All of the pilots targeted work registrants, but half of the pilots targeted a subset of this population or served additional groups. Georgia and Mississippi targeted able-bodied adults without dependents (ABAWDs), as these individuals were mandatory participants in both States and pilot services could help this group meet their work requirements. Vermont and Washington targeted individuals who had significant barriers to employment such as individuals with long-term unemployment, substance use disorders, mental health disorders, criminal histories, or unstable housing. Finally, in addition to work registrants, Illinois offered services to individuals working 30 or more hours per week but needing skill upgrades.

Exhibit II.1. Characteristics of SNAP E&T Pilots

State/ (Grantee agency)	Key partners and providers	Program type	Location	Target population	Key enhanced pilot services
California (California Department of Social Services and Fresno County Department of Social Services)	Reading and Beyond, Fresno County Economic Development Corporation	Voluntary	9 locations in Fresno county	Work registrants	18 months of intensive case management, basic and postsecondary education, training, subsidized employment, job search assistance, support services, job retention services, financial incentives for skill upgrades, and service retention.
Delaware (Department of Health and Social Services, Division of Social Services)	Eastside Rising, Food Bank of Delaware, Delaware Technical Community College, KraftHeinz, and Career Team	Voluntary	Statewide	New work registrants who are unemployed or underemployed and are low-skilled and/or have limited work experience	Four tracks; three tracks included industry-specific training and employment (construction, culinary, and manufacturing with subsidized employment); the fourth track offered primarily job placement. Job readiness assistance, financial literacy counseling, criminal background remediation, and support services were available.
Georgia (Georgia Division of Family and Children Services)	Georgia Department of Labor, three Local Workforce Investment Agencies: DeKalb Workforce Services, Atlanta Regional Commission, Coastal Workforce Services	Mandatory	9 counties in or near the Atlanta and Savannah metropolitan areas[a]	Originally ABAWDs (ages 18–49) who have been unemployed for at least 12 months but broadened to all ABAWDs in FY 2016	Job search preparation and training, job search assistance, job readiness workshops, occupational skills training, case management, and support services.

Exhibit II.1. Characteristics of SNAP E&T Pilots *(continued)*

Illinois (Illinois Department of Human Services)	Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, Southern Illinois University Center for Workforce Development, and 24 community-based organizations (providers)	Mandatory in 15 counties; voluntary in 18 counties[b]	33 counties across the State (seven LWIAs)	Work registrants who are unemployed or underemployed with low skills or limited work experience, and those working 30 or more hours per week but needing skill upgrades	Assessment and career exploration; case management; adult basic education and GED services; occupational skills training; paid work experience, on-the-job training, and subsidized work; job readiness, job search assistance, and job retention services; and support services.
Kansas (Kansas Department for Children and Families)	University of Kansas, Center for Partnerships in Research	Voluntary	35 counties organized into 4 regions	Work registrants	Intensive case management; job readiness preparation; job search assistance and job development and matching; occupational skills training; soft skills, life skills, and basic education; mental health and substance use disorder counseling; job retention services; and support services.
Kentucky (Department of Community Based Services)	Eastern Kentucky Concentrated Employment Program, Kentucky Adult Education, Kentucky Community and Technical College System, and Jobs for the Future	Voluntary	8 counties in Eastern Kentucky	Work registrants	Coordinated team-based case management, extensive support services, basic adult education, postsecondary education, training, subsidized work-based learning opportunities, coaching while in training or employment settings.
Mississippi (Mississippi Department of Human Services)	Mississippi State University's National Strategic Planning and Analysis Research Center, East Mississippi Community College, Itawamba Community College, Jones County Junior College, Mississippi Delta Community College, Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, and Jobs for Mississippi Graduates	Mandatory	5 community college districts	New and existing ABAWDs	For the Enhanced Community College Services group: a four-week career readiness class; intensive case management; three pathways—academic (basic education or college vocational education), life skills (additional work or behavioral skills), or work (subsidized or unsubsidized employment or internships); and support services. For the Basic Community Colleges Services group: three pathways, support services, and more limited case management.

Exhibit II.1. Characteristics of SNAP E&T Pilots *(continued)*

Vermont (Vermont Agency of Human Services, Economic Services Division)	Vermont Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Vermont Department of Labor, Community Colleges of Vermont, and Community Action Agencies of Vermont	Voluntary	Statewide	Work registrants with barriers such as homelessness, connections to the correctional system, and substance use	Clinical assessment and counseling, ongoing barrier reduction through support services, referral to employment services with a Vocational Rehabilitation counselor or Department of Labor case manager, and referral to classes through Community Colleges of Vermont to obtain a Governor's Career Readiness Certificate.
Virginia (Virginia Department of Social Services)	Virginia Community College System	Voluntary	24 localities in the Tidewater, south central, and far southwest areas of Virginia	Work registrants, including ABAWDs and noncustodial parents	Career counseling, intensive case management, digital literacy and job readiness training, group counseling, adult basic education and GED services, occupational skills training leading to certified credentials, and extensive support services.
Washington (Washington Department of Social and Health Services)	Washington Employment Security Department, Washington Division of Child Support, the State Board of Community and Technical Colleges, local workforce development councils, 21 community-based organizations, and three community and technical colleges	Voluntary	4 counties (King, Pierce, Spokane, and Yakima)	New work registrants with significant barriers to employment: long-term unemployed, homeless, limited English proficiency, veterans, and noncustodial parents with delinquent payment history	Comprehensive case management, extensive wraparound and support services to address barriers, a mandatory six-week life skills course (Strategies for Success), and work-based learning opportunities (on-the-job training, subsidized and regular employment, and internships and externships), in addition to all available existing SNAP E&T services.

[a]There were originally 10 counties, but Georgia stopped offering pilot services to new participants in one county after January 2017.

[b]The pilot did not exclusively serve mandatory participants because existing SNAP E&T services were not offered in 18 of 33 counties included in the study. In the remaining 15 counties where existing SNAP E&T program services were offered, pilot participants who had work requirements were mandated to participate in those activities. In Illinois, the largest percentage of the study sample was drawn from the 15 counties where existing SNAP E&T services were available, and hence the majority of study participants from Illinois were mandatory

ABAWDs = able-bodied adults without dependents; FY = fiscal year; LWIA = local workforce investment area

III. Evaluation progress in FY 2020

Many activities took place in FY 2020. These included producing pilot-specific interim reports, collecting a variety of data to address the evaluation's research objectives, and planning the final report analyses.

A. Producing interim evaluation reports

During FY 2020, the evaluation team produced 10 pilot-specific interim evaluation reports and a cross-pilot summary report. These reports describe how each pilot was implemented; what services individuals received; whether these services led to impacts on individuals' employment, earnings, and other outcomes in the 12-month period following their random assignment into the pilot; and what the total and component costs were associated with planning and operating the pilot through 2017. The reports will be completed in FY2021. The following sections provide a brief overview of the content of each pilot-specific interim report and describe the approaches that the evaluation team used to answer the evaluation's research questions.

1. Introduction

The first chapter of each State-specific report provides an overview of the State's pilot, including its location within the State, key partners and providers, number and characteristics of enrolled individuals, existing SNAP E&T services available to the control group, and enhanced services offered to the treatment group through the pilot.

2. Implementation analysis

The second chapter of each pilot-specific report describes the planning and early implementation of the pilot, covering the period from when the pilot grants were awarded (March 2015) through spring 2017. The evaluation team based findings on data collected through several sources, including: (1) telephone calls and in-person interviews with grantee, partner, and provider staff; (2) focus groups with individuals enrolled in the treatment group and employers affiliated with treatment group services; and (3) case studies of specific individuals' experiences receiving treatment group services.

The chapter provides background on the existing SNAP E&T services that each State agency had in place before the pilot began enrollment, if any existed in the pilot's locations. This information helps explain why the grantee chose to deliver certain types of enhanced services and provides important context for grantees' experiences in planning and implementing the services. The implementation chapter then describes the planning and implementation of the pilot. It describes startup activities, such as hiring staff and contracting with partners and providers, as well as activities that took place after enrollment into the pilots began, such as how individuals were recruited into the pilot, how they were randomly assigned into treatment and control groups, and what types of services each group received. The discussion of each pilot's implementation challenges and successes provide context for understanding patterns in the services treatment group members received.

3. Participation analysis

Chapter three of each pilot-specific report summarizes the participation analysis, which examines the extent to which treatment group members started any pilot services or activities, the types of services or activities individuals started and completed, the typical order of services and activities, and how long

individuals engaged in services and activities. The evaluation team used administrative service use data provided by grantees, partners, and providers to conduct the analysis. Administrative service use data contain detailed information regarding training, education, and employment-related activities, as well as other services provided to treatment group members. For the interim reports, the evaluation team analyzed engagement in treatment group services over the 12 months following random assignment for each individual enrolled in the pilot through December 2017.

The participation analysis chapter begins with an estimate of the treatment group's engagement in services immediately following enrollment into the pilot, such as receiving an initial intake assessment or completing an individualized career plan. Examining engagement in these activities highlights services and activities with high levels of engagement as well as common drop off points that prevented individuals from receiving a meaningful amount of services.

The chapter then presents rates of participation in and completion of employment and training-related activities, such as job search assistance or training, occupational skills training, basic education, and work-based learning. The chapter explores the type of education and training obtained, such as degrees or certifications earned. To understand the full set of pilot services that individuals in the treatment group received, the participation analysis chapter also explores the receipt of support services and case management, identifying what types of support services participants most often received, the average dollar amount of support services received, and the number and mode of contacts participants had with case managers.

Finally, this chapter explores the frequency and reasons why individuals exited the pilot. Exits could occur for a variety reasons, including completing treatment group services, withdrawing from services, or becoming ineligible for SNAP or the pilot. This analysis examines the percentage of individuals exiting overall and when they exited.

4. Difference in service receipt for the treatment and control groups

Chapter four of each pilot-specific report describes the analysis of differences in engagement and service receipt between treatment and control group members which uses 12-month follow-up survey data to describe the employment-related activities and education and training activities in which treatment and control group members participated during the previous year. The data capture any type of service received, regardless of whether it was provided through the enhanced set of services available to the treatment group, the existing SNAP E&T services available to the control group, or the services available in communities to any individuals (such as services available through WIOA, community colleges, nonprofits, or other organizations).

As in the previous chapter, the analysis of differences between treatment and control groups in service receipt in this chapter first presents rates of participation in and completion of services overall, followed by rates of participation in and completion of specific employment and training activities. The analysis of service contrasts also explores treatment-control differences in the receipt of support services and case management contacts.

5. Impacts on employment, earnings, receipt of public assistance, and well-being outcomes

Chapter five of each pilot-specific report examines whether treatment group members' engagement and service receipt translated into short-term impacts over a one-year follow-up period on employment and receipt of public assistance and/or earnings, job characteristics, food security, health, well-being, and

housing status. Analyses use data from three sources: (1) State unemployment insurance (UI) wage records, (2) SNAP administrative data, and (3) 12-month follow-up survey data. UI wage records provide information on quarterly earnings, which are also used to construct measures of quarterly employment status. The first set of analyses estimates the impact of enhanced services on employment-related outcomes, such as the employment rate, quarterly earnings, the number of hours worked, and the characteristics of current jobs, while the second set of analyses estimates the impact of enhanced services on individuals' receipt of public assistance, such as participation in SNAP and TANF, and Medicaid coverage. The analysis also estimates the impact of enhanced services on the receipt of other forms of public assistance, including UI, Social Security Income, and the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children.

6. Analysis of pilot costs

Chapter six of each pilot-specific report describes the overall costs of planning and implementing the enhanced services through calendar year 2017. The evaluation team examined cost data provided by grantees and by partners and providers for this analysis. In addition to collecting data on costs, the evaluation team collected information on how staff spend their time on pilot activities through a web-based survey fielded once in 2016 and again in 2017.

The chapter presents total costs of services, as well as costs covered by the FNS grant or through in-kind funding leveraged from other sources. The chapter also describes costs by category: staff, direct service, supplies and equipment, and overhead and operating costs, providing additional detail on sub costs when applicable. Finally, the analysis presents the time direct service staff reported spending on key activities such as recruiting and enrolling individuals into the pilot, providing case management, and administering assessments.

7. Conclusion

In addition to summarizing key findings from earlier chapters, Chapter seven of each pilot-specific report describes the additional questions that will be answered in the final report.

B. Evaluation data collection

The evaluation requires many types of data to address its research objectives. Some analyses use baseline data collected from individuals before their random assignment to a treatment or control group. The analyses also use participant survey data, administrative records from State and local agencies, qualitative interview data, and cost data (cost workbooks and time use survey data). The evaluation team began collecting baseline data in FY 2016 and collected most types of data in FY 2017 and throughout FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020.

1. Baseline data collection

The evaluation team completed baseline data collection in FY 2018. Additional baseline data were not collected in FY 2019.

2. Impact data collection

The impact analysis examines the effects of the pilots on employment and earnings, public assistance receipt, and other outcomes such as food security, health, well-being, and housing status. It also assesses

how impacts vary for different groups of individuals enrolled in the pilots. The data sources used in these analyses are described below.

SNAP administrative data. The evaluation team regularly collects SNAP administrative data from grantees and continued to do so through FY 2020. The evaluation team continues to ensure the data files are complete and contain the requisite information for all individuals enrolled in the pilots. All grantees have submitted SNAP administrative data through February to July 2020. The ending date depends on the pilot. By March 2021, the evaluation team will have obtained the final set of data from all grantees.

UI wage record data. In FY 2020, the evaluation team obtained UI wage record data containing quarterly earnings records from grantees through Quarter 3 (July to September) of 2020. State UI agencies will continue to regularly provide quarterly earnings records through the end of 2020. For all grantees, the administrative records extend back more than one year before pilot launch and the evaluation team will collect UI wage records through 2020.

Follow-up survey data. The evaluation team began administering the 36-month follow-up survey in two States—California and Kansas—in February 2019 and in remaining States on a rolling basis from February through April 2019. The survey is administered to individuals approximately 36 months after each enrolled in the pilot and collects information about their service receipt, employment, earnings, and well-being measures such as food security, health, and housing status. The 36-month follow-up survey employs a design similar to the 12-month follow-up survey wherein the evaluation team first collects data through telephone interviews and then visits the residential addresses of individuals who could not be located by phone. However, rather than conducting field locating using a subsample of non-respondents across all 10 States, as was done in the 12-month follow-up survey, field locating was conducted in a few key States—Kentucky, Mississippi, and Vermont—with all 36-month survey non-respondents. These States were selected to ensure adequate survey sample sizes for the analysis.

Due to concerns related to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, the evaluation team ceased field locating efforts in March 2020. The decision was made to align with air travel and social distancing guidance and protect the health and safety of both field locating staff and survey respondents. However, the evaluation team used several new procedures to employ in the telephone interview to partially offset any reduction in response rates due to discontinuing field locating. Specifically, efforts were made to increase the number of targeted phone, email, and mail notifications that individuals receive. These strategies appear to be moderately successful in increasing response rates. As a result, the evaluation team implemented these procedures in all States, not just those where field locating was halted.

3. Implementation data collection

The implementation analysis documents the context and operations of each pilot and helps provide context for and interpret the pilots' impacts. The data come from three rounds of site visits, which include in-depth interviews with pilot staff, focus groups with individuals enrolled in the pilot and employers providing training, observation of operational activities, and document reviews. The evaluation team began conducting site visits in FY 2016 and continued work into FY 2019. Additional implementation data collection did not take place in FY 2020.

4. Participation data collection

The participation analysis examines the characteristics and service paths of individuals enrolled in the pilot. For each pilot, provider staff documented the types of training, education, and services they provided to each individual enrolled in the treatment group and, in some cases, individuals enrolled in the control group. These data included entry and exit dates for specific E&T activities. The evaluation team collected participation records for all treatment group members during the service period from 2016 through 2019. Additional participation data collection did not take place in FY 2020.

5. Cost data collection

The benefit-cost analysis estimates the return on each dollar invested in each pilot. All participating pilots provide cost data quarterly and complete annual staff time-use surveys for the analysis.

For the interim reports, the evaluation team processed, assessed the quality of, and analyzed data for all pilots through 2017. In FY 2020, in preparation for the final report analyses, the evaluation team began processing the cost data through pilot closeout. Through preliminary data quality assessments, the evaluation team did not identify any issues with the post-2017 cost data that would prevent the evaluation team from performing the planned benefit-cost analysis for each pilot. The evaluation team also began work on the benefit-cost analysis by gathering data from supplementary sources and consulting experts in the field regarding methodological approaches.

IV. Evaluation activities in FY 2021

The following evaluation activities are planned for FY 2021, organized according to the pilot's four evaluation objectives and the reporting of evaluation findings.

A. Impact analysis

Data collection for the impact analysis component of the evaluation will continue through early 2021 and includes the following components:

- **Follow-up survey data collection.** The evaluation team will continue administering the 36-month follow-up surveys to people who responded to the 12-month follow-up survey. The evaluation team will administer this survey through December 2020 or early January 2021.
- **SNAP, TANF, and Medicaid administrative data collection.** The evaluation team will continue to collect administrative data describing SNAP, TANF, and Medicaid program participation for all grantees through December 2020.
- **UI wage records data collection.** The evaluation team will continue to obtain quarterly UI wage data from State UI agencies for each of the 10 grantees that covers employment through at least the spring of 2020. The team will continue to clean and prepare the UI wage records to use in the final evaluation report impact analysis.

After all data are collected, the evaluation team will construct analytic measures for the final report.

B. Implementation analysis

The evaluation team completed primary data collection and does not plan to collect new data for this component. The evaluation team will analyze information from the third round of implementation data collection site visits and incorporate a discussion of key takeaways into the final evaluation reports. In conducting the implementation analyses for the final evaluation reports, the evaluation team will build upon supplementary analyses of implementation research conducted in FY 2020 that identified five implementation challenges and lessons learned:

- Strategic partnering was important for the pilots but developing and cultivating strong partnerships was a major challenge for some grantees.
- Developing and launching programs or services that did not previously exist was particularly challenging, even when partnering with established providers.
- Take-up rates for education, occupational skills training, and work-based learning activities were often lower than anticipated.
- Rigid service models sometimes inadvertently affected rates of take-up and completion of services.
- Staff in most pilots struggled to recruit individuals, as many organizations did not traditionally recruit for their programs.

C. Participation analysis

The evaluation team completed primary data collection and does not plan to collect new data for this component. The evaluation team will construct analytic measures and perform final report analyses. The data available at the time of the interim evaluation reporting period limited the analyses to examining participation over a 12-month period of most, but not all, individuals enrolled in the pilot. Now that all data have been collected through the end of the pilots, analyses included in the final report will include examining participation over a longer period of time, up to 36 months for some individuals, and will include all individuals randomly assigned into the pilots. They also will include supplemental analyses related to exit rates and support service receipt.

D. Benefit-cost analysis

The evaluation team completed primary data collection and does not plan to collect new data for this component. For the benefit-cost analysis, the evaluation team will analyze the cost and outcome data to compare the costs and benefits of each program.

E. Reviewing and reporting study findings

Technical working group meetings. The evaluation team has conducted two of the three technical working group meetings in Washington, D.C. The first meeting took place in 2015 and focused on study design and considerations. The second meeting took place in 2019 and focused on interim findings. The third meeting will take place in 2021 and will focus on final findings.

Reports. For each pilot, the evaluation team will share study findings through interim and final study reports. The interim reports have been produced and describe service use and present short-term impacts over a 12-month period. The evaluation team is beginning the planning process for the final evaluation reports, which will examine outcomes over a period of up to 36 months after random assignment. Interim and final study reports will synthesize findings across pilots. Each report will discuss all four study components— impact, implementation, participation, and cost analyses. (The interim reports include a cost analysis and the final reports will include the full benefit-cost analysis.). The evaluation team will analyze the data and produce final evaluation reports in FY 2021.