



Analysis of Work Experiences for CaPROMISE youth

prepared by the CaPROMISE Research Team, Interwork Institute,
San Diego State University (July 30, 2018)

Preface

Guiding Principles for CaPROMISE Program Evaluation

Before enumerating the specific evaluation findings, here are guiding principles that the SDSU team uses in their approach to CaPROMISE Program Evaluation (PE):

1. Informs and guides Project activities and assesses outcomes. Every PE inquiry is initiated with the premise that the findings will provide useful guidance for efficiently implementing interventions, providing needed services and informing policies.
2. Insures all PE efforts are classified as either *formative* or *summative*. CaPROMISE *formative* evaluation findings document interventions, services, practices and staff approaches that are '*keeping the train on the tracks*' as well as practices and approaches that appear to be falling short of attaining the intended outcomes. CaPROMISE's *summative* evaluation findings determine the extent to which the goals were met after interventions and services.
3. Insures conformance in accordance with Institutional Review Board guidelines regarding access to youth and family evaluation data. The source of all data is based 100% on what is entered by the CSCs into the Data Management System (DMS). The good news is that this restriction of access preserves the confidentiality and the anonymity of the CaPROMISE youth and their family members. The caution regarding this restriction is that any incomplete and/or delayed data entry by the CSCs yields an underestimate of the volume and breadth of services and interventions as well as CaPROMISE goal attainment.
4. Recognizes the significant burden on CSCs to 'keep up' with the DMS data entries. The DMS was designed to be as 'user friendly' as it could be without sacrificing the 'richness in detail' of the entered data. CaPROMISE is about service delivery, not 'paperwork'. But this 'user friendly' aspect has a potential down side. For example, a checked box for 'Coaching' under the Core Service area of 'Parent/Guardian Training and Information' informs the Project that this specific intervention was provided. Certainly, this is a valuable piece of information that becomes a part of the family's data profile. While it is useful to have that depth and breadth of detail for each intervention, the reporting burden that it places upon the CSCs may be unreasonable. This is why the SDSU Interwork staff conduct a number of on-site interviews – to have conversations that furnish rich, qualitative details about the interventions implemented by the CSCs.

- Documents and disseminates CaPROMISE Evaluation findings to all stakeholders in a clearly presented format and in a timely manner. To facilitate easy digestion of the reports, the descriptions of specific statistical tools and the analysis procedures are not generally included in the reports. These details are available upon request for those readers who express an interest.

Introduction

The following information provides a summary of the most recent PE activity conducted in May, 2018. The PE inquiry focused on work experiences through year 4 (October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017) and their association with several other data elements.

The questions and findings related to the work experience inquiry are described in the next section. As you review the results, *perhaps you might want to reflect on whether the findings were generally what you suspected.*

Findings for PE Analyses of Work Experience Data (paid, unpaid and volunteer)

- What were the number of work experiences ¹logged into the DMS?

Findings: The total number of work experiences logged into the DMS was 2,454. The average number of logged work experiences per youth was 2.21. The number of work experiences per youth ranged from one (376 youth) to 10 (one youth).

- Were there gender differences associated with the number of work experiences?

Findings: No. The average number of work experiences logged for male youth was 2.21 and for females was 2.20. These figures were remarkably similar. This is an example of a situation where we would hope to NOT derive a significant finding from the data. A reasonable interpretation regarding this finding is that there is no systematic bias in the way that male and female CaPROMISE youth are being served regarding this intervention.

- Were there differences in the number of work experiences based on enrollment age?

Findings: Yes. DMS data entered at 'age at enrollment' as either 14, 15 or 16. The youth who were older (16 years) at time of enrollment had a slightly greater number of work experiences than the younger youth (14 years). The average number of work experiences for each of the three age groups is:

14 years – 2.04

15 years – 2.26

16 years – 2.31

¹ Work experience in CaPROMISE requires the youth to be actively engaged in the workplace. Key characteristics that distinguish the CaPROMISE work experience from an educational experience are: (a) work takes place in an integrated setting; (b) youth performs the real work; and (c) youth interacts with supervisors and co-workers.

4. Were there differences in the number of work experiences associated with ‘disability’ as defined by the 13 disability categories used by the US Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)?

Findings: No. the average number of work experiences varied slightly across each of the 13 groups but not to a significant degree. This again is an example of a situation where a non-significant finding is desirable. It suggests a consistent and unbiased approach taken by the CSCs.

5. Were there differences in the number of work experiences associated with ‘disability’ as defined by five areas of ‘function’ developed by SDSU Interwork’s staff²?

Findings: No. The average number of work experiences varied slightly across each of the 5 groups but not to a significant degree, as shown in the table below. The data suggests a consistent and unbiased approach taken by the CSCs.

Function	Total work experiences
Sensory	2.14
Cognitive/Intellectual	2.19
Affective/Emotional	2.21
Mobility/Health	2.30
Multiple	1.98
Total	2.21

6. Were there differences in the number of work experiences associated with the status of parent/guardian employment at the time of CaPROMISE intake?

Findings: Yes. For the CaPROMISE evaluation staff, this finding was somewhat surprising. Youth whose parents were ‘retired’ at the time of enrollment showed a significantly higher average number of work experiences than all other groups, as shown in the table below (shaded area):

Parent employment at intake	Total work experiences
Part-Time	2.35
Full-Time	2.21
Unemployed/looking for work	2.05
Homemaker	2.17
Retired	2.79
Other	2.10
Total	2.21

² SDSU identified a function scale to collectively examine the data. This model was field tested by one of the LEAs. The OSEP classifications were clustered into the five functional categories.

In contrast, youth whose parents were “unemployed/looking for work” at time of enrollment had the lowest average number of work experiences, albeit not a significant difference. This is an example of when the answer to one question suggests the need to ask follow-up questions. The PE team thought that the analysis results would reflect a greater number of work experiences associated with parents who were employed full time. One CSC suggested that this finding might reflect a parent’s strategy to preserve social services benefits. To explore this issue further will involve interviews of CSCs.

7. Were there differences in the number of work experiences associated with the status of parent/guardian’s formal education at time of CaPROMISE intake (highest degree completed)?

Findings: No. The average number of work experiences was consistent across all groups, ranging from parents without a high school diploma to parents with doctoral degrees.

8. Were there differences in the number of work experiences associated with the student’s expressed expectation to attend college upon high school completion?

Findings: Yes. The average number of work experiences for youth who expressed a desire to attend college was 2.31 as compared to an average of 2.05 for those who expressed no interest in attending college. This finding constitutes a significant difference.

9. Were there differences in the number of work experiences associated with the youth’s expressed expectation to seek employment upon high school completion?

Findings: Yes. The average number of work experiences for youth who expressed a desire to seek employment was 2.32 as compared to an average of 2.07 for those who expressed no interest to seek employment. This was a significant difference and paralleled the findings from question 8 above.

10. Were there differences in the number of work experiences associated with the parent/guardian’s expressed expectation for their youth to attend college upon high school completion?

Findings: No. The average number of work experiences for youth whose parents stated expectations for their youth to attend college was 2.25. For parents who did not state that expectation the average number was 2.14. While not a significant difference, the finding parallels the trend seen in findings for questions 8 and 9.

11. Were there differences in the number of work experiences associated with the parent/guardian’s expressed expectation for their youth to seek employment upon high school completion?

Findings: Yes. The average number of work experiences for youth whose parents stated expectations for their youth to seek employment was 2.32. For parents who did not state this expectation, the average number was 2.07, a significant difference.

The findings for questions 8 – 11 suggest a trend that should be further explored. There appears to be a noteworthy association between work experiences and youth/parent/guardian aspirations regarding post-secondary education and employment. Is there a causal relationship between these two measures, or is there possibly a third factor, such as family values regarding achievement or youth's intrinsic level of motivation?

12. Was there an association between the number of work experiences and the number of interventions implemented in the Core Service area of Parent/Guardian Training and Information, (i.e., referral, coaching and Family Resource Center (FRC) Support)?

Findings: Yes. This finding should be interpreted with caution. Of the three interventions that comprise this Core Service area, the strongest association was between the number of work experiences and the number of FRC Support interventions. While not a measurably strong relationship, it was nonetheless, statistically significant. There was no noteworthy relationship with Work Experiences observed for the Referral and Coaching.

Summary

This program evaluation explored the association between CaPROMISE youth's average number of work experiences with selected demographics for youth and parents/guardians and post-high school expectations. Data analysis revealed the number of work experiences for youth were significantly higher for older youth and youth whose parents/guardians were retired. Surprisingly, there were no significant differences in the number of work experiences associated with a youth's disability. This finding contradicts assumptions from the field that students with significant disabilities are less likely or more difficult to place in work experiences. However, the categories used in CaPROMISE to classify youth's disabilities limits the determination for severity of disability. Factors other than significance of youth's disability may be associated with work experiences and thus warrant additional exploration. For example, this program evaluation revealed youth's and parent's/guardian's post-high school expectations were related to number of work experiences. Youth and parents/guardians who reported the expectation that the youth will attend postsecondary education and/or become employed after high school had significantly more work experiences than youth and parents/guardians who did not have these post-high school expectations.

From your perspective as a youth or family member, CSC, job developer, DOR counselor, or FRC provider, might there be other factors associated with youth's work experiences. The SDSU Interwork staff of CaPROMISE welcomes your input. Nobody has a better idea of how these findings might be explained than those of you who are 'in the field'. This includes youth and family members, CSCs, Supervisors, DOR personnel, allied agency personnel, ancillary service providers. We would like to hear from you regarding your ideas about this report as well as ideas for follow-up analyses and future reports.

Please address correspondence about this document to: Mark Tucker, Ph.D., Department of Administration, Rehabilitation and Postsecondary Education, San Diego State University, email: mtucker@sdsu.edu; Mari Guillermo, Ed.D., Interwork Institute, San Diego State University, email: mari_g@interwork.sdsu.edu

Disclaimer: CaPROMISE is funded through a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Grant #H418P130003. The contents of this paper do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.