

Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment (RESEA)

Program Evaluation Report Recommendations to Support National Analyses

State evaluation findings will be useful for program operators and policy makers. For this reason, it's important that your RESEA program evaluation reports are well-documented and contain:

- The interventions being tested;
- The context of the evaluation; and
- Impact and analysis results with well-documented statistical details.

Complete, consistent, and high-quality program evaluation reports can enable various types of evidence syntheses and other secondary data analysis, including meta-analyses, that can empirically synthesize information from across multiple relevant evaluations. These types of syntheses can support RESEA evidence building by enabling a broader understanding of effective interventions, which will improve CLEAR's ability to rate RESEA interventions for states' use. Such analyses can also identify gaps in knowledge where states could stand up new studies and inform program operators and policy makers interested in continuous improvement of the RESEA program.

The Department's ability to facilitate or conduct successful secondary analyses, such as meta-analyses, to benefit states is dependent on states' program evaluation reports including consistent information about the key evaluation components described below. At a minimum, each state must include the following information in their evaluation report, as appropriate to their evaluation design. States are not limited to reporting on the below information and should work with their independent evaluator to ensure reports are reporting appropriate information based on the evaluation design used.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS AND CONTEXT: *What elements of the program, that are being studied, must, if appropriate to the evaluation design, be included to conduct a meta-analysis?*

Intervention and Comparison Conditions:

- ☐ What interventions (program, policy, practice, etc.) does the study evaluate?
- ☐ What specific services or activities did the intervention consist of?
- ☐ Was there any adjustment or adaptation implemented in the study?
- ☐ What services, if any, did the comparison group receive?

Setting:

- ☐ Where did the study take place?
- ☐ What are the key characteristics of the setting (urban, suburban, or rural; state; etc.).
- ☐ In what years did the study take place?

Study Sample:

- ☐ Who participated in the study?
- ☐ How were they selected and recruited?
- ☐ What were the ages of participants?
- ☐ What were the criteria for participation in the program or the intervention?
- ☐ What are their socio-demographic characteristics?

STUDY DESIGN AND ANALYSIS: *The following are the elements that a meta-analysis would need to know about the program, that are being studied, the study's setting, and the sample of study participants.*

Study Design:

- ☐ What was the study's design (e.g., randomized experiment, quasi-experimental design, descriptive)?
- ☐ If an impact evaluation, how were the units (e.g., individuals, groups of individuals) assigned to the program, with a description of the control/comparison condition (e.g., random assignment, matched comparison)?

Measure:

- ☐ Identify the measurement instrument, if any, and data source (self-reports, administrative data) for the measures.
- ☐ Identify the timing of all measurements in the study, including any pre-tests.

Baseline Equivalence:

- ☐ Provide information needed to assess baseline equivalence of program and comparison groups.
 - Evaluators should provide information needed to assess baseline equivalence of program and comparison groups on demographics and on key characteristics that may predict the outcome(s) of interest.
 - For outcomes such as earnings, where pre-intervention measures are available and relevant, equivalence should be shown on those measures.
 - For analysis of employment, evaluators should show equivalence on available measures of employment history and earnings.
 - For analyses of unemployment compensation (UC) duration — equivalence on UC profiling scores is important because that is a measure of expected risk of benefit exhaustion (maximum UC duration).
 - Equivalence on other measures related to pre-claim employment history and prior UC claims may be important as well.

Methods of Data Analysis:

- ☐ Describe the analytical models or methods used to estimate impacts.

- ☐ Specify the variable, if any, that were included as controls in the analysis.
- ☐ Specify the unit of analysis (e.g., cluster, individual), and, if applicable, how clustering was addressed.

Missing Data:

- ☐ How did the analysis account for missing data, if any?
- ☐ Specify the type of data (baseline, outcome, or both) for which missing data methods were used.

IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS: *As appropriate to the evaluation design, the evaluation must report the following for each outcome measure (and each subgroup, as available):*

☐ Sample size for the treatment group.	☐ Unadjusted control/comparison group standard deviation.
☐ Unadjusted treatment group mean outcome.	☐ Impact estimate (with information on how it was computed, if other than raw difference in means) and associated p-value.
☐ Unadjusted treatment group standard deviation.	☐ Standardized difference.
☐ Sample size for the control/comparison group.	☐ Unadjusted control/comparison group mean.
If any information from unadjusted sample sizes, group means, standard deviations, are missing, the following should be documented from a study's report:	
☐ Coefficient from the impact estimation model.	☐ Standard error of the impact (and, if the standard error is unavailable, the specific p-value associated with the impact estimate).

For additional information on communicating and reporting study findings, please see the [Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment \(RESEA\) Toolkit](#) on the RESEA Evaluation and Evidence Resources page on the [WorkforceGPS](#) site, along with other evaluation technical assistance resources.