

SUMMARY OF IMPACT ESTIMATES STATE: *California*

Insert for

California's Individual Self-Sufficiency Planning (ISSP) Project: *Final Evaluation Report of a State Partnership Initiative (SPI) Demonstration Project*

December 31, 2004

Prepared by:

John Shea, *Allen, Shea & Associates*
Steve Ekstrom, *The Results Group*
c/o Allen, Shea & Associates
1780 Third Street
Napa, CA 94559

Ph: 707-258-1326 • Fax: 707-258-8354

Email: allenshea@sbcglobal.net • Website: www.allenshea.com

OVERVIEW OF DESIGN

Question	Answer
1. How was the comparison group selected? What is the justification that this comparison group represents what would have happened to the participants?	Each comparison group member was selected essentially at random (systematic sampling with a random start) from DOR case records, meaning the person had expressed an interest in vocational rehabilitation and employment services, as evidenced by behavior. Each potential comparison group member had to live in a county making up Groups B, C, and D. Each had to have an "open DOR case" in the same year that their matched ISSP project participant entered the project. Each had to be receiving SSA benefits (SSI, SSDI, or both) and have a severe Psychiatric Disability as primary (or first secondary) diagnosis. These two variables – SSA Benefit Status and Major Disability – formed the strata from which comparison

SUMMARY OF IMPACT ESTIMATES, *Insert for ISSP Project: Final Evaluation Report*

	<p>group members were selected. Basic demographic characteristics were quite similar. See full report. We would have liked to have “matched” on work history, but we did not have this information in advance. However, an analysis of the predictors of employment success (26s as a percentage of 26s and 28s) indicated that SSA Benefit Status was not only important in its own right, but receipt of SSDI generally meant recent work history. For reasons explained in the full report, we pay more attention to comparability in services (<i>Mental Health Cooperative program</i> versus service from a <i>DOR Generalist Counselor</i>) than geography. And, in looking at waiver effects, we restrict attention to those receiving SSI either alone or in combination with SSDI.</p>
<p>2. Are impacts regression adjusted (yes/no)? If yes, what characteristics are used as control variables (“X’s”)?</p>	<p>No, we did not take this approach.</p>
<p>3. If impacts are developed using a <i>Difference-in-Difference</i> approach, what time period is used for the pre-enrollment period?</p>	<p>Yes, we have used a Difference-in-Difference approach. The pre-enrollment period for project participants are the three calendar quarters before the quarter in which the person entered the project. For comparison groups, we left open how long the person had been a DOR client in the match with SFY 1 project entrants, because many participants in SFY 1 were already employed. In subsequent years, we specified that all comparison group members had to have been in Status 02 (enrollment in DOR services) in the same fiscal year as their matched participant. The logic is that after the first six months of enrollment in project services, many were replacements for those who had left the project, and probably relatively new to employment services. With respect to SSI waiver effects, because the waivers went into effect in May 2001, we map quarters in relation to April/May/June 2001. Hence, we have many quarters before the waivers went into effect for our difference-in-difference approach.</p>
<p>4. Are any enrollees excluded from the impact estimates? If yes, why?</p>	<p>No, we include all enrollees in the impact estimates for whom we have data. We use all of the entrants reported by the project sites. We have done no <i>trimming</i> because of outliers. We considered doing so, but decided not to, because a few quarters of earnings of \$25,000 or more were probably <i>real</i>.</p>

SUMMARY OF IMPACT ESTIMATES, *Insert for ISSP Project: Final Evaluation Report*

**OVERVIEW OF KEY FINDINGS: Entrants and Comparison Group Members,
SFY 1, 2 & 3 (January 1, 1999 – June 30, 2001)**

	Mean Value			Statistical Signifi- cance	Sample Size	
	Treat Group	Comp Group	Treat minus Comp Difference		Treat Group	Comp Group
One Year Post-Intake						
Employment (% \$ in Q4)	34.6%	31.1%	3.5%	ns	209	859
Percent of time employed (%)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Earnings/whole sample (\$)	\$697/qtr	\$656/qtr	\$41/qtr	ns	209	859
Among SSI and concurrent recipients:						
SSI eligibility (%)	66.5%	65.0%	1.5%	ns	209	859
SSI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Among SSDI and concurrent recipients:						
SSDI eligibility (%)	61.7%	62.7%	-1.0%	ns	209	859
SSDI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Income (Earnings+Benefits) (\$)	unk	unk	--		209	859
18 Months Post-Intake						
Employment (% \$ in Q6)	30.3%	32.0%	-1.7%	ns	209	859
Percent of time employed (%)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Earnings/whole sample (\$)	\$629/qut	\$733/qtr	-\$104/qtr	ns	209	859
Among SSI and concurrent recipients:						
SSI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		209	859
SSI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Among SSDI and concurrent recipients:						
SSDI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		209	859
SSDI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Income (Earnings+Benefits) (\$)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Two Years Post-Intake						
Employment (% \$ in Q8)	32.2%	30.5%	1.7%	ns	209	859
Percent of time employed (%)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Earnings/whole sample (\$)	\$750/qtr	\$776/qtr	-\$26/qtr	ns	209	859
Among SSI and concurrent recipients:						
SSI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		209	859
SSI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Among SSDI and concurrent recipients:						
SSDI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		209	859
SSDI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		209	859
Income (Earnings+Benefits) (\$)	unk	unk	--		209	859

NOTE: SSA Benefit Status only recorded at intake (or pseudo-intake).

Unk = Unknown ns = Not statistically significant at .10 or below (χ^2 for categorical variables; two-tailed *t*-test for continuous variables) * = Statistically significant at .10 level; ** = at .05 level; *** = at .01 level.

NOTE: The small differences for those who entered in SFY 1, 2, or 3 masks the fact that (1) SFY 1 project entrants did more poorly than comparison group members, while (2) SFY 2 & 3 project entrants did much better than comparison group members. Reasons are outlined on pages 64 to 68 of our *Final Report*.

SUMMARY OF IMPACT ESTIMATES, *Insert for ISSP Project: Final Evaluation Report*

**OVERVIEW OF KEY FINDINGS: Entrants and Comparison Group Members,
SFY 1 (July 1, 1998 – June 30, 1999; first enrollment January 1999)**

	Mean Value			Statistical Signifi- cance	Sample Size	
	Treat Group	Comp Group	Treat minus Comp Difference		Treat Group	Comp Group
One Year Post-Intake						
Employment (% \$ in Q4)	35.0%	32.8%	2.2%	ns	120	479
Percent of time employed (%)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Earnings/whole sample (\$)	\$552/qtr	\$673/qtr	-\$121/qtr	ns	120	479
Among SSI and concurrent recipients:						
SSI eligibility (%)	65.0%	64.3%	0.7%	ns	120	479
SSI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Among SSDI and concurrent recipients:						
SSDI eligibility (%)	61.7%	67.0%	-5.3%	ns	120	479
SSDI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Income (Earnings+Benefits) (\$)	unk	unk	--		120	479
18 Months Post-Intake						
Employment (% \$ in Q6)	30.8%	36.5%	-5.7%	ns	120	479
Percent of time employed (%)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Earnings/whole sample (\$)	\$509/qtr	\$850/qtr	-\$341/qtr	**	120	479
Among SSI and concurrent recipients:						
SSI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		120	479
SSI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Among SSDI and concurrent recipients:						
SSDI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		120	479
SSDI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Income (Earnings+Benefits) (\$)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Two Years Post-Intake						
Employment (% \$ in Q8)	32.5%	36.7%	-4.2%	ns	120	479
Percent of time employed (%)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Earnings/whole sample (\$)	\$533/qtr	\$930/qtr	-\$397/qtr	**	120	479
Among SSI and concurrent recipients:						
SSI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		120	479
SSI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Among SSDI and concurrent recipients:						
SSDI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		120	479
SSDI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		120	479
Income (Earnings+Benefits) (\$)	unk	unk	--		120	479

NOTE: SSA Benefit Status only recorded at intake (or pseudo-intake).
 Unk = Unknown ns = Not statistically significant at .10 or below (χ^2 for categorical variables; two-tailed t-test for continuous variables) * = Statistically significant at .10 level; ** = at .05 level; *** = at .01 level.

SUMMARY OF IMPACT ESTIMATES, *Insert for ISSP Project: Final Evaluation Report*

**OVERVIEW OF KEY FINDINGS: Entrants and Comparison Group Members,
SFY 2 & 3 (July 1, 1999 – June 30, 2001)**

	Mean Value			Statistical Signifi- cance	Sample Size	
	Treat Group	Comp Group	Treat minus Comp Difference		Treat Group	Comp Group
One Year Post-Intake						
Employment (% \$ in Q4)	34.1%	28.9%	5.2%	ns	88	388
Percent of time employed (%)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Earnings/whole sample (\$)	\$895/qtr	\$634/qtr	\$261/qtr	ns	88	388
Among SSI and concurrent recipients:						
SSI eligibility (%)	68.5%	65.8%	2.7%	ns	88	388
SSI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Among SSDI and concurrent recipients:						
SSDI eligibility (%)	61.8%	57.4%	4.4%	ns	88	388
SSDI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Income (Earnings+Benefits) (\$)	unk	unk	--		88	388
18 Months Post-Intake						
Employment (% \$ in Q6)	29.5%	26.3%	3.2%	ns	88	388
Percent of time employed (%)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Earnings/whole sample (\$)	\$792/qtr	\$585/qtr	\$207/qtr	ns	88	388
Among SSI and concurrent recipients:						
SSI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		88	388
SSI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Among SSDI and concurrent recipients:						
SSDI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		88	388
SSDI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Income (Earnings+Benefits) (\$)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Two Years Post-Intake						
Employment (% \$ in Q8)	31.8%	22.6%	9.2%	ns	88	388
Percent of time employed (%)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Earnings/whole sample (\$)	\$1,046/qtr	\$582/qtr	\$464/qtr	*	88	388
Among SSI and concurrent recipients:						
SSI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		88	388
SSI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Among SSDI and concurrent recipients:						
SSDI eligibility (%)	unk	unk	--		88	388
SSDI benefit paid (\$)	unk	unk	--		88	388
Income (Earnings+Benefits) (\$)	unk	unk	--		88	388

NOTE: SSA Benefit Status only recorded at intake (or pseudo-intake).
 Unk = Unknown ns = Not statistically significant at .10 or below (χ^2 for categorical variables; two-tailed t-test for continuous variables) * = Statistically significant at .10 level; ** = at .05 level; *** = at .01 level.

FINDINGS FOR SUBGROUPS OF INTEREST (Defined Based on Pre-Intake Characteristics)

1. *Year entered the ISSP project.* – SFY 1 entrants were less successful than comparison group members, in terms of employment and covered UI earnings. SFY 2, 3, & 4 entrants, on the other hand, were much more successful in terms of these outcomes, and for SFY 2 & 3, the gains widened from Q6 to Q9, 1.5 to 2.5 years subsequent to enrollment in the ISSP project.
2. *SSA Benefit Status.* – In terms of mean covered UI earnings (total N as base), there was growth in covered earnings for project participants and comparison group members. With the passage of time, SSI Only recipients had higher earnings than Concurrent and SSDI Only beneficiaries. However, none of the differences post-enrollment were statistically significant, either within the two groups (participants vs. comparison group members) or in looking at differences-in-differences. (See *Interim Report*, pp. 102, 108 & 112.) Nevertheless, in our *Final Report*, it is apparent that the SSI waivers probably increased mean covered UI earnings, when comparing earnings prior to the second quarter of 2001, and earnings in quarters subsequently, among SSI recipients.
3. As we reported in our *Interim Report* (pp. 102, 108, & 112), those with some covered UI earnings in Q-1 were much more likely to have some earnings in subsequent quarters, and their mean earnings (total N as base) were higher. Furthermore, these differences *within* groups (project participants vs. comparison group members) were statistically significant, generally at the 0.01 level (*t*-test for means), but differences in differences were slight and not statistically significant.

ADDITIONAL EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. We have no good measure of percentage of time employed.
2. Our earnings are partial, because they exclude considerable earnings, especially for those from San Mateo County in the treatment group, many of whom have earnings from The Work Center and/or in a number of *temporary, trainee* positions organized through Vocational Rehabilitation Services.
3. We have SSA Benefit Status (SSI, SSDI, or both) only at the time of enrolling in the project (or, when selected from the DOR case files for inclusion in our comparison group).
4. We have no additional SSA benefit data to report. In our *Interim Report* (Shea & Ekstrom, 2004a, pp. 84 to 89) we noted changes between June 1999 and May 2003, for 148 current project participants at that time. Among the 133 who received some SSA benefits in June 1999, we reported the following:

- There was a small net reduction (-1% SSDI and -3% SSI) in the number of project participants receiving these SSA benefits.
- Both SSDI and SSI dollar amounts, in total, rose, but by somewhat less than cost-of-living adjustments.
- Four individuals left the SSDI roles, while eleven had increases in SSDI of 20% or more, with six of the eleven seeing changes of 52% to 85%, nearly all due to quarters of higher earnings replacing quarters of lower earnings.
- Had the \$1 for \$2 rule (on earnings above \$65 or \$85 in the month) still been in effect, SSI outlays for the 133 participants would have declined by an estimated 3%, rather than have risen by 12%.
- Estimated earnings for SSI recipients with *imputed earnings* rose from \$17,683.36 in June 1999 to \$31,620.42 in May 2003.¹
- While ten individuals who received SSI benefits in June 1999 received no such cash benefit in May 2003 (some because of SSDI increases), an additional nine individuals had estimated earnings in that month which would have ended their SSI cash benefit had the old \$1 for \$2 rule applied.
- SSI outlays would have been about \$5,000 lower, in total, in May 2003 than they actually were, had the \$3 for \$4 waiver not been in effect.

¹ Gail Sandberg very kindly provided the SSA data used here. She was not asked to provide earnings data, nor tags for work incentives. Thus, we have no way to estimate earnings for those receiving SSDI only. As for SSI Only and Concurrent (SSI/SSDI) beneficiaries, some received an SSI benefit in excess of \$757; considerably more received exactly \$757. The earnings of both these groups were assumed to be zero. Some may have earned up to \$65 (or, \$85) for the month. Some number of concurrent beneficiaries had SSDI and SSI amounting to \$777. We assumed they also had zero earnings in May 2003.