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Abstract

This report provides a detailed description of a formal evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com, an internet-based employment services system currently operational in Ohio. The U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) awarded the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services (ODJFS) a grant to develop and implement OhioMeansJobs.com. This grant required a random assignment experiment to address several questions related to outcomes associated with the use of the OhioMeansJobs.com employment services system. Analyses yielded several exploratory findings that investigators believed warrant further investigation. These results as well as recommendations for enhancements to the OhioMeansJobs.com system are discussed.
When this evaluation study was designed, Ohio operated 77 separate workforce programs that were spread across 13 different government agencies (Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, email communication, October 20, 2016). Observations suggested that specific services that were provided were useful to customers. However, some customers were required to navigate federal and state programs that lacked standardized processes and consistency in providing services. In looking for an adaptable solution to this problem, the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS) determined that in other jurisdictions, customers were able to “virtually” access workforce development services using state-of-the-art technologies. Through this research, ODJFS also gained insight into how the private sector was using dynamic web-sites to actively engage customers and offer services. This information provided a basis for the development of Ohio’s on-line, employment services system referred to as OhioMeansJobs.com. OhioMeansJobs.com retained many of the services provided historically but offered those services in a virtual, self-serve environment.

Section 2: Selected Review of Literature and Background Information

The internet is revolutionizing the way people live, work and play and government, business and educational institutions are utilizing a variety of internet-based platforms and tools to provide valued consumer services. Pollard and Hillage (2001) define internet-based learning as the delivery and administration of learning opportunities via computer, networked and web-based technology. The general consensus regarding the goals of access to information and services in a virtual environment is to enhance individual and organizational performance and development (Pollard & Hillage, 2001; Ogernon & Goodman, 2011). The goal of this review of the literature is to provide some insight into the factors that are likely to impact successful use of internet-based services and assist in the development of specific evaluation questions that might provide a basis for assessing the efficacy of the OhioMeansJobs.com system.

The Changing Environment

Reece (2006) notes that the internet is producing significant change in government and its processes. It can be argued that the promise of e-government goes beyond centralization of services. Several studies support the relationship between e-government services and increased service delivery, democratic responsiveness and public attitudes (Goodwin, Susar, Neitzio, Snaprud, & Jensen, 2011; O'Leary, Straits & Wandner, 2004; West, 2004, 2005; Wilson & Brown, 2012). The e-business literature also points to a current and growing demand for internet-based tools and products (Welsh, Wanberg, Brown, & Slimmering, 2003; Clark & Mayer, 2008; Lain & Aston, 2004). For example, the 2012 “State of the Industry Report” by the American Society for Training and Development (2012) found that about two-thirds of business related training was delivered through technology in a sample of over 450 companies. Finally, many studies have supported technology as an effective delivery method for educational content, especially when used in conjunction with face-to-face learning (Zhao, Lei, Yan, Lai & Tan, 2005).
The Promise of Internet-Based Service Delivery

Research and theory have identified specific benefits of internet-based learning both for individuals and organizations (Clark & Mayer, 2008; Sambrook, 2003; Attewell, 2002). For example, Sambrook (2003) and Bernthal, Weaver & Wellins, (2002) claim that e-learning 1) provides options for consistent, world-wide training; 2) reduces delivery cycle time; 3) increases learner convenience; 4) reduces learner information overload (e.g., learners can work at their own pace); 5) improves tracking (e-tools automatically record information); and 6) lowers expenses. In an analysis of a convenience sample of 204 senior level executives, almost half stated that e-learning was cost-effective; slightly more than one-third noted use across multiple sites; one-fifth felt that e-learning was an effective way to develop staff skills; and one-fifth noted the advantages of self-pacing (Young, 2002).

One of the most recent meta-analyses and thorough reviews of online learning studies was done by the U.S. Department of Education. The authors (U.S. Department of Education, 2010, p. xiv) concluded that “students in online conditions performed modestly better on average than those learning the same material through traditional, face-to-face instruction.” In addition, a recent meta-analysis of 65 studies by Sitzmann (2011) examined outcomes of participants in computer-based simulations compared to comparison groups. Sitzman concluded that post-training self-efficacy, declarative and procedural learning and retention were higher for virtual learners as compared to comparison participants. Welsh et. al, (2003, p. 251) came to a similar conclusion and stated “that technology delivered instruction is, on average, slightly better than classroom training.”

In another meta-analysis, researchers concluded that e-learners scored higher than those in instructor led courses (Welsh et al., 2003). In the cases cited in this study, many conducted on behalf of the U.S. Army, researchers found that learning outcomes were either better or equal for those in e-learning courses compared to their classroom counterparts. This review also suggested that e-learning has the potential to be less expensive than classroom training if there are large numbers of learners, learners are geographically dispersed and courses are repeated. Finally, Russell, Calvey and Banks (2003) indicated there was no significant difference in learning outcomes between those that learned at a distance and those learning in the traditional classroom manner. Overall, the evidence reviewed here suggested that there were similar or more favorable outcomes for internet-based instruction compared to traditional, face-to-face instruction.

Lessons Learned and Characteristics of Effective Internet-Based Services

Research and theory suggest that if services are not easy to use, citizens may not be served (Goodwin, Susar, Nietzio, Snaprud & Jensen, 2011). Nurdin, Stockdale, and Scheepers (2011) note four organizational barriers that have the potential to impact local adoption and implementation of internet-based government services: 1) adaptability of technology; 2) mission of the organization; 3) participant involvement;
and 4) bureaucracy). They suggest that if these four areas are not addressed, e-government systems will not be used by the citizens for which they are intended. In addition, research conducted by the U.S. Department of Education (2010) suggests that online learning can be enhanced by giving learners control of their interactions with media and prompting learner reflection.

One of the major concerns of the e-education literature is whether learning is as effective for those with lower levels of computer efficacy (Welsh et al., 2003; Bonk & Wisher 2000). Not surprisingly, some studies have found that lower levels of computer efficacy are related to lower rates of learning. Explanation suggests those with higher computer efficacy may feel more in control of their learning and may be more willing to take “risks” from which they might learn (Bonk & Wisher, 2000). Similarly, Durnham, Estrella, Leufgen and Henderson-Frakes (2011) claim that learners in business applications who have higher levels of computer efficacy tend to do best. For example, Brown (2005) followed 78 employees in an e-training course and those with more computer experience did better in e-learning environments.

Computer literacy is an important concern given that many government, business and educational institution are utilizing internet-based systems to provide services. Araque, Maiden, Bravo, Estrada, Evans, Hubchik, Kirby and Reddy (2013) evaluated a program called “Computers for Families.” They found that participants in the Computer for Families program were more likely than non-participants to access the internet and complete and submit job applications on-line. These researchers (Araque, et al., 2013, p. 1400) suggest that what they refer to as the “digital divide phenomenon,” is shifting from an emphasis on access to technology to differences in “in the intensity, frequency and nature of internet use.” Thus it can be argued that individuals seeking employment or other services with low levels of computer literacy must be trained and prompted to use available technology. Such a policy is likely to promote significant long-term individual and community level benefits.

In summary, evidence suggests that government, business and educational institutions are implementing internet-based services in the effort to enhance access to services and information. Several conclusions emerge from the brief review of the literature summarized above:

1. Internet-based services have become the predominant channel for delivery of a vast array of consumer services and all individuals should have equal access to current technological innovations.
2. Internet-based systems are generally thought to be cost effective and produce outcomes consistent with or superior to traditional service delivery mechanisms.
3. Effective internet services must be easy to use, users must have control of their interactions with media and the virtual environment must provide the opportunity for the user to reflect on her/his experiences.
4. Computer literacy is an important factor and must be addressed in any application of internet-based services.
This review of literature clearly supports the case for implementation of OhioMeansJobs.com type systems as an efficient and effective solution to the challenges of providing a variety of consumer services including workforce development. Empirical research focused on the use of the internet in government, business and education provides insights into contextual, systemic and user factors that might inform the development and use of technology-rich learning environments such as OhioMeansJobs.com. It would appear that OhioMeansJobs.com-like platforms are a logical next step in the evolution of workforce development tools. As such, the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com represents an opportunity to understand how such systems perform relative to key workforce development outcomes.

Section 3: Purpose and Scope of Evaluation Study

Intent of OhioMeansJobs.com

The design and implementation of the OhioMeansJobs.com system was a result of Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services’ (ODJFS) efforts to understand the state-of-the-art in delivering internet-based services. The goal of OhioMeansJobs.com was to transform Ohio’s public, workforce services into a cost-effective system by creating a virtual approach using innovative technology consistent with best practices as expressed in the research literature and practical guidelines. This goal fully aligned with the Workforce Innovation Fund’s (WIF) efforts to produce greater efficiency in delivery of quality services through a technology supported, learning environment. The formal intent of the OhioMeansJobs.com system was to provide expanded access to Ohio’s workforce services that was intuitive and self-directed, providing the opportunity to move from one job search activity to another and access information highly relevant to a customer’s employment goals at the customer’s discretion.

A major goal of the evaluation project described below is to understand the impact of OhioMeansJobs.com on users who are compliant with the protocol for using the system. As indicated in the review of the literature, there is much evidence to suggest that internet-based services will be the norm for services delivery in the government, business and educational arenas in the near future. Thus basic questions about how such systems preform are fundamental to efforts to assure that services meet the needs of consumers. The evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com provides the opportunity to address this question relative to the delivery of employment services based on data obtained from a “randomized control trial” (RCT). An RCT is a study design that randomly assigns participants to a treatment group who have access to the intervention under study and a control group who are denied access or provided with access to an alternative intervention.

The nature of the basic questions posed in the OhioMeansJobs.com evaluation study suggested interpreting evaluation results from the vantage-point of an “Intention to Treat” (ITT) perspective (Gupta, 2011; Del Re, Maisel, Blodget, & Finney, 2013; Schulz, Altman, & Moher, 2013). An ITT analysis is based on retaining data for all individuals randomized into a study usually through a formal data imputation procedure to fill in
missing values. However, ITT provides an alternative approach to data analyses. A “per-protocol" analysis can be conducted using only data for study participants who participated in the intervention according to a predefined protocol. In a per-protocol analysis the goal is to understand the impact of an intervention implemented exactly as designed. This approach is not without controversy. However, given the dearth of information about the impact of internet-based employment services systems, evaluators reasoned that valuable information might be obtained in efforts to assess the impact on users of OhioMeansJobs.com given that those customers used services consistent with design specifications. Evaluators judged this approach was most consistent with the goals of the evaluation and provided the most useful approach to interpreting study data.

**Traditional Internet-Based Services**

Traditional employment services provided in Ohio typically involved a variety of activities and opportunities for customers to develop workforce related products. One Stop Centers created under the provisions of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998 were the primary organizations responsible for providing employment services prior to 2013. One Stop Centers historically operated resource rooms where consumers were able to use computers to do job searches, write resumes, complete applications for jobs and/or access labor market information. Resource rooms also provided access to fax machines and printers to print resumes and cover letters. Consumers had to register at a One Stop Center and meet with a case-manager to gain access to other services which were often provided on-line. The case-manager identified options for individual customers based on a variety of factors including education, work experience and/or job expectations. Following an assessment, the case-manager produced a list of services for which the customer was eligible. These services typically included job search assistance, resume writing, basic skills/literacy development, access to workshops, staff assisted job matching, computer training, referral to supportive services and/or referral to other federal, state and/or local programs.

**OhioMeansJobs.com Services**

Changes implemented concurrent with the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com provided new, web-based options for delivering employment services. To access services, customers were required to register on the OhioMeansJobs.com web-site and create an account. With the implementation of OhioMeansJobs.com, most of the services available in One Stop Centers such as job searches, employment training, access to labor market information, resume writing, supportive services and access to workshops could be accessed on-line through a “self-serve” portal. Internet-based services included templates to assist customers in writing different types of resumes and a rating tool that evaluated resumes and suggested changes and enhancements. In addition, customers were able to create “backpacks" to save workforce development products and information such as resumes and cover letters, letters of recommendations and job search data. Such information, stored in a virtual "backpack," allowed access to documents at any time including from a Smart Phone. The actual services provided
through the OhioMeansJobs.com self-serve portal were highly consistent with traditional services provided through Ohio’s One Stop Centers with one notable exception. Access and use of OhioMeansJobs.com services were at the control of the consumer through the OhioMeansJobs.com self-serve portal.

**Legislation Impacting the Implementation of OhioMeansJobs.com**

Several legislative changes directly impacted users of employment services in Ohio during the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com. These legislative changes also had significant impact on the design and conduct of the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com. Ohio House Bill 1 became effective on September 27, 2013. House Bill 1 required local service providers to use the OhioMeansJobs.com web-site as their labor exchange and job placement system and prohibited additional workforce funds to be used for any other labor exchange or job placement system that was duplicative of OhioMeansJobs.com. Ohio House Bill 1 also required local One Stops to be renamed OMJ Centers.

Ohio House Bill 2 became effective April 11, 2014 and required all unemployment claimants with a work search requirement to register with OhioMeansJobs.com. The registration process required posting and maintaining an active, searchable resume to allow employers to easily connect with job seekers looking for suitable employment. In addition, registration allowed the state to immediately make job seekers aware of up to five weekly job leads posted on the OhioMeansJobs.com system. Finally, House Bill 2 required claimants to participate in specific employment activities designed to help job seekers better understand their strengths.

**Overview of the Evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com and Outcomes of Interest**

Thus, OhioMeansJobs.com became the official mechanism for delivering employment services in Ohio with the passage of Ohio House Bills 1 and 2. The evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com was designed based on the notion of pilot-testing OhioMeansJobs.com in several counties in Ohio as a precursor to full implementation. However, passage of House Bills 1 and 2 created a situation where all users of employment services were mandated to use the OhioMeansJobs.com system. Given these legislative changes, permissions were obtained to shield a small group of customers from access to OhioMeansJobs.com, creating the opportunity to compare employment outcomes of customers who used OhioMeansJobs.com services and customers who used traditional internet-based services delivered by OMJ Centers. Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services (ODJFS) officials provided clearance for local employment service providers to provide traditional internet-based services to individuals who were assigned to the control group over the duration of the OhioMeansJobs.com evaluation study.

A formal logic model, representative of the OhioMeansJobs.com system, was developed as part of the evaluation planning process and is reproduced in Attachment A. This logic model provides an overview of what might be referred to as a protocol for
using employment services, regardless of model of delivery. The model implies a sequence of basic services that must be provided to customers to facilitate their career development activities. Career development activities as defined in the project logic model included 1) assessing career interests, 2) exploring careers, 3) exploring labor markets, 4) assessing vocational skills, 5) developing a career plan, 6) securing financial assistance, 7) participating in job readiness training, 8) searching for a job and 9) interviewing and securing a job. Intervention logic is based on the assumption that providing services to support these activities is associated with securing or enhancing employment.

The OhioMeansJobs.com logic model, review of the literature, practical guidelines for the development of internet based services and goals of ODJFS suggested several primary “outcomes” of interest.” Initial attention was directed to questions concerning efficiency of customers’ job search efforts, job placement and job retention. Other outcomes of interest included access to and use of services; the impact of participants’ backgrounds and characteristics on employment outcomes; the extent to which services matched customers’ expectations; and services that were perceived as most helpful.

In summary, the primary service mechanism for assisting job seekers and employers in Ohio has historically been through One Stop or what are now referred to as OMJ Centers administered by ODJFS. In the last several years, Ohio officials implemented an innovative, on-line services delivery system referred to as OhioMeansJobs.com. The focus of the evaluation described in this report was to compare two distinct approaches to delivering employment services: one in which a case-manager provides access to employment services and the other in which access to services occurs on-line via the OhioMeansJobs.com web-site. The information reviewed above and insights described up to this point, lead to the development of formal evaluation questions.

Section 4: Evaluation Questions

Logic in Addressing Evaluation Questions

As indicated in Table I, OhioMeansJobs.com designers and evaluators posed several specific evaluation questions. The primary or “confirmatory” evaluation question focused on whether customers who accessed employment services through the OhioMeansJobs.com self-serve portal were more likely to “start a job” than customers who used traditional, internet-based services provided by case-managers three months after enrollment in the study? Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services (ODJFS) staff indicated that individuals who were unemployed or not satisfied with their current employment situation should be able to resolve their employment issues within a 30 day period.

In addition to the confirmatory question, several exploratory evaluation questions were posed based on the review of the literature (see Table I). Questions 1 and 2 relate directly to the assertion that the internet is the predominant channel for delivery of a vast array of services and that all individuals should have equal access to technological
innovations. Question 2 reflects concerns about the impacts of computer literacy on access to internet-based services. Questions 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are directly related to issues of cost effectiveness and achievement of desired employment outcomes. Questions 8, 9, 10 and 11 are related to ease of use of OhioMeansJobs.com.

Table I. Questions Addressed at Three, Six and 12 Months Post Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do participants using OhioMeansJobs.com and traditional, internet-</td>
<td>Access to Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based services have equal access to employment services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do individual characteristics of study participants including</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer literacy affect their use of employment services and progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in obtaining employment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are customers who use the OhioMeansJobs.com system more likely to</td>
<td>Job Starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>start jobs than customers who use traditional, internet-based services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are customers who use the OhioMeansJobs.com system more likely to</td>
<td>Job Offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be offered jobs than customers who use traditional, internet-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are customers who use the OhioMeansJobs.com system more likely to</td>
<td>Job Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply for jobs than customers who use traditional, internet-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do customers who use the OhioMeansJobs.com system make faster</td>
<td>Job Search Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress in their job search than customers who use traditional,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internet-based services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are customers who use the OhioMeansJobs.com system less likely to</td>
<td>Left a Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave a job than customers who use traditional, internet-based services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do customers who use the OhioMeansJobs.com system use more</td>
<td>Use of Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workforce services than customers who use traditional, internet-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are customers who use the OhioMeansJobs.com system more likely to</td>
<td>Services Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel that services met expectations than customers who use</td>
<td>Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional, internet-based services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is there less need for staff assistance for customers who use the</td>
<td>Need for Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OhioMeansJobs.com system than for customers who use traditional,</td>
<td>Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internet-based services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. What service is viewed as most useful for customers who use the OhioMeansJobs.com system and customers who use traditional, internet-based services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Useful Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions that were not Addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questions summarized above represent Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services (ODJFS) concerns and reflect the current state-of-the-art in the field. In addition, concerns about attrition and other threats to validity such as potential contamination across experimental groups, lead evaluators to focus on employment status at three months post enrollment as the confirmatory question addressed in the OhioMeansJobs.com evaluation study. Time constraints precluded more thorough analysis of data related to the questions posed above for specific sub-groups. For example, future evaluation and research might focus on experiences and outcomes for various age and/or racial groups and/or individuals with various levels of computer literacy.

Section 5: Implementation Study

The “Implementation Study,” initiated in February 2014 and concluded in March of the same year, focused on questions related to the operation of OhioMeansJobs.com. The information generated through the “Implementation Study” was used to assist in the interpretation of data obtained in the formal evaluation project and addressed several key questions. Evaluators were interested in the degree to which OhioMeansJobs.com was operating according to design specifications and pilot-testing the functionality of instrumentation proposed for use in the larger evaluation study. In order to address these concerns the evaluation team initiated four data collection activities: 1) a process designed to identify key services provided to users of employment services; 2) surveys of a small group of users of the OhioMeansJobs.com system; 3) interviews with OhioMeansJobs.com designers; and 4) interviews with OMJ Center staff.

Implementation Study Methodology

Key Employment Services. A worksheet was utilized to identify key services available to users of OhioMeansJobs.com and other customers using employment services in Ohio. Such services were identified during a presentation of the specialized features of the OhioMeansJobs.com system. Relevant information was recorded on the worksheet by a member of the evaluation team during a formal presentation of the OhioMeansJobs.com system provided by a primary OhioMeansJobs.com designer.² Twenty-nine (29) elements of the OhioMeansJobs.com system were noted. At a subsequent planning meeting, these elements were presented to other members of the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS) staff who were involved in the design of OhioMeansJobs.com. This review resulted in the designation of 23 key services. Each of these 23 services was rated by OhioMeansJobs.com designers through a structured group process on a scale from 1 to 3 where 1 meant “low

²This individual was an ODJFS employee and the OhioMeansJobs.com project manager.
significance to employment,” 2 meant “moderate significance to employment,” and 3 meant “high significance to employment.” After this process and further discussion, 11 features were judged to be highly significant to employment and were designated as “key employment services” (see Table II).

**Table II. Key Employment Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Demand Occupations</td>
<td>Specified occupations by education level required for entry, wage and annual openings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of Job Search Activities</td>
<td>Allowed customers to save search parameters and identify jobs that fit their search criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Job Search Planner</td>
<td>Guided customers through steps to better understand skills, interests and job prospects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career or Job-Specific Information</td>
<td>Provided information about training needed and other information for various types of careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume Creator/Resume Rater</td>
<td>Helped create a resume in a professional template.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Availability Notices</td>
<td>Sent job availability notices to customer-designated email addresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Calculator</td>
<td>Provided a target salary to help customers choose an occupation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-Personality Matcher</td>
<td>Provided career suggestions that matched customer’s interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>Provided a list of scholarships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>Measured real-world skills and matched those skills with specific careers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to Other State Agencies</td>
<td>Provided referrals to other state agencies for assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Customer Surveys.** The customer sample included 30 individuals. The survey was administered to customers who had interfaced with the OhioMeansJobs.com system for approximately three to four months. A first wave of invitations was sent to 50 individuals selected randomly from a list of 2,651 customers using services at various OMJ Centers. Invitations were e-mailed on February 1, 2014. A second wave of invitations was sent to 100 individuals selected randomly from the same list minus the first 50 invitees on March 26, 2014. Participants received a $50.00 incentive in the form of a gift card for their participation. The customer survey consisted of more than 50 items (See Attachment B) which took approximately ten to 15 minutes to complete on-line. The customer survey included content identical to the survey that was to be used in the larger evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com and consisted of scales and/or questions.
consistent with the variables noted in Table I. Properties of the various scales and/or questions that were pilot-tested in the Implementation Study are summarized in Table III.

### Table III. Scales/Questions Pilot-Tested In the Implementation Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale/Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Services</td>
<td>Scale consisted of ten statements reflecting access to services such as skill assessments when needed.</td>
<td>Participants responded to each statement on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Applications</td>
<td>Participants were asked how many job applications they had submitted in the last few months.</td>
<td>Response options were 0, 1-2, 3-4 or more than 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Starts</td>
<td>Participants were asked if they had started a job in the last few months.</td>
<td>Response options were 0, 1-2, 3-4 or more than 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Offers</td>
<td>Participants were asked how many job offers they had received in the last few months.</td>
<td>Response options were 0, 1-2, 3-4 or more than 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search Progress</td>
<td>Scale consisted of four statements reflecting a customer's preparation for the job search process.</td>
<td>Participants responded to each statement on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left a Job</td>
<td>Participants were asked whether they had left a job in the last few months.</td>
<td>Response options were 0, 1-2, 3-4 or more than 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Services</td>
<td>Scale consisted of 14 services including key employment services (see Table II) with addition of training, access to information I might need to apply for a job and other.</td>
<td>Participants indicated each service they had used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services met Expectations</td>
<td>Scale consisted of nine services including key employment services (see Table II) with addition of training, access to information I might need to apply for a job and other.</td>
<td>Participants responded to each statement on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need for Staff Assistance Scale consisted of five statements reflecting the need for one-on-one staff assistance. Participants responded to each statement on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Most Useful Service Scale included same items as Use of Services scale Participants were instructed to select the single service that was most useful.

Participants were also asked whether survey questions “were easily understood” and whether the survey was “too long” or “about right” in length. Finally, participants were asked to assess the OhioMeansJobs.com system using ten adjective pairs: Helpful-Not Helpful, Easy-Difficult, Friendly-Unfriendly, High Quality-Low Quality, Personal-Impersonal, Clear-Confusing, Engaging-Not Engaging, User Friendly-Frustrating, Readily Available-Not Available and New-Same Old Thing.

**Designer Interviews.** Four Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS) staff members responsible for the content of OhioMeansJobs.com participated in interviews as part of the Implementation Study. The designer interview consisted of ten (10) questions. Questions included multiple-choice and open-ended response types (see Attachment C). Items on this survey were designed to identify perceptions related to the implementation and use of OhioMeansJobs.com services and included the semantic differential scales used in the customer survey described above. A single member of the evaluation team conducted phone interviews with each of the four designers. Interviews lasted 15 to 30 minutes and were completed in September and October 2014.

**OMJ Center Staff Interviews.** The OMJ Center sample included 15 staff members and managers at OMJ Centers in four Ohio counties (Belmont, Clark, Stark and Lucas). Of those contacted, one staff member and two managers did not respond and were not interviewed. The OMJ Center staff interview consisted of 11 questions and included multiple-choice and open-ended response types (See Attachment D). Interview questions were designed to identify staff members’ perceptions of customers’ experiences with OhioMeansJobs.com and also included the semantic differential scales used in the customer survey and designer interviews described above. A single member of the evaluation team conducted phone interviews with each of the 12 interviewees. Interviews lasted 15 to 30 minutes and were completed between September and October 2014.

**Implementation Study Findings**

Participants who completed surveys reported that the data collection instrument was of an appropriate length and that questions were understandable. Evidence also suggested that the OhioMeansJobs.com web-site functioned as intended. Over 78% of customers agreed that services were accessible with the exception of “assessments.” Assessments were standardized tests related to such things as aptitudes and career interests. At the time of the Implementation Study, the types and procedures available
to administer assessments had not been standardized. Customers also indicated a moderate level of use of most OhioMeansJobs.com services. Furthermore, data from OMJ Center staff interviews indicated that almost all OMJ Center staff (11 out of 12) were “very” or “somewhat” confident that the OhioMeansJobs.com system was working as intended.

In general, designers expected customers to experience OhioMeansJobs.com as helpful, easy, friendly, of high quality, personal, clear, engaging, user friendly, available and new. These adjectives were parts of “semantic differential” scales used to assess the intentions of designers and the experiences of “Implementation Study” participants. Study participants' experiences relative to these dimensions were somewhat lower than how designers anticipated that the OhioMeansJobs.com site would be experienced but approached expectations. In addition, implementation study participants rated two-thirds of OhioMeansJobs.com services as “useful” and over 70% gave OhioMeansJobs.com an overall rating of “very” or “somewhat” useful. OhioMeansJobs.com Center staff observations regarding user experiences were lower than ratings provided by participants and designers. Finally, reliability coefficients for the scales that were to be used in the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com ranged from a low of .77 for the “Job Search Progress Scale” to .98 for the “Computer Literacy Scale.”

The evaluation team concluded that Implementation Study data and findings supported the methodology that evaluators planned to use in the larger evaluation study. In addition, Implementation Study results indicated that OhioMeansJobs.com was functioning according to design specifications. These conclusions justified initiating the larger evaluation study as planned. The evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com provided the opportunity to address the evaluation questions indicated in Table I. The reminder of this report provides a summary of the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com and concludes with a review of selected quality improvement recommendations.

**Section 6: Population, Participants, Sample and Units of Analysis**

Ohio residents who sought employment services in 2013, 2014 and 2015 who resided in one of the 11 study counties are the population of interest for the OhioMeansJobs.com evaluation. Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS) refers to these individuals as “universal customers.” A universal customer is an individual over the age of 18, who receives basic career services provided through Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act or Wagner-Peyser funds (Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, e-mail communication, October 20, 2016). Any resident of Ohio is eligible to use employment services provided by ODJFS. By definition, use of a service results in the designation of universal customer. Thus universal customers might be unemployed and looking for a job; employed but looking for a new job; or satisfied with their current employment situation but using a service. The Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services indicated that there were many thousands of individuals who met the definition of universal customer who used services in the 11 study counties.
Current data for the 11 study counties were reported in 2013 county profiles (Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, 2013). The 11 study counties were nominated by ODJFS and representatives agreed to participate in the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com. These counties were not selected to be representative of all counties in Ohio. Statistical and demographic data for the 11 study counties are summarized in Table IV. Study counties included approximately 28.6% of Ohio’s population. Seven of these counties were classified as urban (Belmont, Brown, Clark, Franklin, Hamilton, Lucas and Stark) and four as rural (Adams, Columbiana, Pike and Scioto) based on the Office of Management and Budget’s Metropolitan Statistical Area Designation policy. A metropolitan statistical area includes one or more counties containing a core area of 50,000 or more population and adjacent counties with a high level of integration with the urban core (Office of Management and Budget, 2010). The column to the far right in Table IV indicates the number of study participants from each county.

Table IV. Study Counties and Selected Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate (2012)</th>
<th>WIA Participants&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>% in Poverty (2011)</th>
<th># of Study Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>11,544,225</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>28,350</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>69,671</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>44,381</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>137,206</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbiana</td>
<td>106,507</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>1,195,537</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>802,038</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>437,998</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>28,480</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scioto</td>
<td>78,477</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>374,868</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Total</td>
<td>3,303,513</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3,487</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2,468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>3</sup> Includes participants in the Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth programs. Individuals in these programs constitute a small subset of universal customers.
Unit of Analysis, Eligibility Criteria and Participant Characteristics

The universal customer using services in one of the 11 pilot counties was the unit of analysis for the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com. Evaluators employed a power analysis (Cohen, 1988) to generate the total sample size and estimate the number of individuals necessary in each condition to test the confirmatory question posed in this study. The power analysis set specific parameters in G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang & Buchner, 2007): alpha = .05, power = .80, effect size (Cohen’s $h$) = .20 and employed a two-tailed test. The resulting sample size estimates were 393 cases per group for a total sample size of 786. Because of possible issues related to attrition, a total sample of approximately 2,400 individuals was recommended for the proposed evaluation. It was assumed that attrition might be as high as 50% at each of the three planned follow-up periods.

Only Ohioans who resided in one of four original study counties (Belmont, Clark, Lucas and Stark Counties) or seven counties that were added to assure adequate numbers of study participants (Adams, Brown, Columbiana, Franklin, Hamilton, Pike and Scioto Counties) were eligible to participate. Additional study inclusion criteria required that study participants be at least 18 years of age; not be veterans; not have received specific services including ability testing, work readiness assessments, skill and aptitude tests, job readiness development, career counseling, job coaching; and/or ongoing support at an OMJ Center in the 30 days prior to enrollment in the study. The final study sample consisted of 2,468 individuals.

Study participants tended to be distributed across age ranges. About one quarter (23.8%) were between the ages of 18 and 29; one quarter (27.4%) between the ages of 30 and 39; one quarter (22.6%) between the ages of 40 and 49 and slightly less than one fifth (19.3%) between the ages of 50 and 59. A small percentage (6.6%) of study participants were 60 years of age or older. The majority of study participants (70.3%) were female. Slightly more than two-thirds (64.2%) were Caucasian, one third (30.4%) were African American and 4.0% self-identified as Hispanic. Only a small percentage (5.4%) of study participants had less than a high school education while many had graduated from a post-secondary education program (49.1%). It is likely that study participants were at least somewhat familiar with internet-based technology and may have started the study with relatively high levels of computer literacy. Finally, more than half (58.7%) of study participants were employed at the time they used services.

Data provided by the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services (2014) summarize demographic characteristics of Ohio Workforce Investment Act (WIA) program participants (see Table V). Similar statistics for universal customers in the 11 study counties were not available. However, review of the data in Table V offer some insight into the degree to which the study sample was equivalent to the larger population of users of employment services in Ohio. Workforce investment Act (WIA) program participants in Ohio were typically between the ages of 18 and 45; were slightly more likely to be male and white; and in general, had a high school diploma or less education. Comparison of the data for the evaluation study sample and WIA program participants
in Ohio suggested that the study sample differed from the population of interest as represented by WIA program participants in terms of race, gender and education. There was a higher percentage of females in the study sample, the study sample was more highly educated and less racially diverse than WIA program participants. However, caution must be exercised in the interpretation of these data as WIA program participants may or may not be representative of universal customers.

### Table V. Demographic Characteristics of 2014 Workforce Investment Act Program Participants in Ohio (N=26,991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Sample&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>14,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-55</td>
<td>8,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 and Older</td>
<td>2,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>14,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity-Hispanic</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>23,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Below HS Diploma</td>
<td>7,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS Diploma</td>
<td>11,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>3,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Secondary Degree</td>
<td>4,589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>4</sup> When actual numbers served were available, percentages were calculated to the first decimal point. In some cases actual numbers served were estimated from percentages provided by ODJFS. In most cases, percentages to the nearest whole number were provided.
Section 7: Evaluation Design

Study Design

A random assignment experiment was employed to test the impact of OhioMeansJobs.com on job starts and other key study variables. The use of a comparison group design was stipulated by the U.S. Department of Labor. Evaluators were not able to implement a true experiment due to the complexity of selecting a random sample. Selecting a random sample of sufficient size would have required implementing the evaluation study across a significantly larger number of counties than the original 11 study counties. Limitations due to time and logistics precluded such an approach. Thus evaluators randomly assign participants who had volunteered to participate in the study to the treatment and control groups.

Fig. 1 provides a graphic representation of the evaluation design. The reference to “Eligible to Participate” in the first box in Fig. 1 refers to the processes of recruitment, screening and obtaining informed consent. “Random Assignment,” noted in the second box, occurred when potential study participants provided informed consent. Participants were randomly assigned to the treatment condition (exposure to OhioMeansJobs.com services) or the control condition (exposure to traditional, internet-based services). Measurement occurred at enrollment in the study ($M_{Baseline}$) and at three months ($M_1$), six months ($M_2$) and 12 months post-enrollment ($M_3$).

Progression through Study and Allocation Sequence

Once individuals expressed interest in participating in the evaluation study, they were referred to a link that took them to additional information and enrollment procedures. In the enrollment process, potential study participants provided information and demographic data that were used to determine eligibility. If a potential participant met eligibility requirements, she/he was assigned to either the treatment condition or the control condition. Because of limitations in the ability to track potential participants and interests in maintaining confidentiality, evaluators were unable to determine the number of individuals who expressed interest in participating in the study who were not eligible to participate.

At this point, participants provided informed consent and completed a short computer
literacy scale (see Attachment E). Shortly after completing informed consent, participants received an e-mail message with instructions for next steps. In the case of the treatment condition, participants were directed to a link to the OhioMeansJobs.com site. In the case of the control condition, participants were directed to a site that provided instructions for using traditional, internet-based services. The primary difference between the two conditions was in the method of accessing services. Individuals in the treatment condition accessed services through a self-serve mechanism while individuals in the control condition accessed services through a case-manager.

During the next period of the study, participants in both conditions accessed appropriate services. Data related to key variables were collected on participants’ three, six and 12 months enrollment anniversaries (see Attachment F). Progression through the study is represented by the CONSORT diagram illustrated in Fig. 2. (Moher, Schultz & Altman, 2001). All universal customers in the 11 study counties constituted potential study participants. Through various recruitment procedures, 2,468 individuals volunteered to participate in the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com. Random assignment procedures resulted in 1,233 study participants being assigned to the treatment condition (exposure to OhioMeansJobs.com) and 1,235 individuals being assigned to the control condition (exposure to traditional, internet-based services).

At the first follow-up, three months post enrollment, data for 87 control group participants and 82 treatment group participants were removed from analyses because these participants indicated that they were satisfied with their employment situation at enrollment. Evaluators reasoned that since the purpose of the study was to investigate the efficacy of on-line employment services and these individuals were not actively looking for employment, it was most appropriate to exclude their responses in subsequent data analyses. In addition, data for 566 individuals in the treatment condition and 649 individuals in the control conditions were excluded from analysis because they did not complete three month measures. Attrition at three months was 49.4% for the treatment group and 56.3% for the control group.

Similarly, during the second follow-up period, six months post enrollment, data for 114 participants in the treatment condition and 93 participants in the control conditions were removed from data analyses because these participants indicated that they were satisfied with their employment situation at the three month follow-up. At the six month follow-up, 621 participants in the treatment condition and 637 participants in the control condition did not complete six month measures. Attrition at six months was over 50.0% for the treatment and control groups.

Finally, during the third follow-up period, 12 months post enrollment, data for 102 participants in the treatment condition and 93 participants in the control condition were removed from data analyses because these individuals indicated that they were satisfied with their employment situation at six the month follow-up. At the 12 month follow-up, 757 participants in the treatment condition and 772 participants in the control condition did not complete 12 month measures. Again, attrition at 12 months was well
over 50% for the treatment and control groups. It is important to note that attrition at all measurement periods exceeded expectations.
Fig. 2. CONSORT flow diagram.
Random Assignment Procedures

Random assignment occurred after recruitment and eligibility screening. A computer generated, random assignment procedure was used to assign participants to the treatment or control groups by blocks. After a customer was enrolled, she/he was added to a roster of study participants. The roster included places for approximately 2,500 study participants. Each slot on the roster was associated with a block group number generated prior to the beginning of the recruitment period. Thus, the name of each study participant was associated with a randomly generated block group number (see column three in Table VI). If the block group number was an odd number, the study participant was assigned to the treatment condition (as illustrated in column four of Table VI). If the block group number was an even number, the study participant was assigned to the control condition.

Table VI. Random Assignment of Study Participants by Blocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Name</th>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Randomly Assigned Block Group Number</th>
<th>Group Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>0001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>0002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>0003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>0004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equivalency of Control and Treatment Groups

Registration. Data collected during the eligibility screening process constituted “baseline” data for the study sample (see Table VII). Data suggested that the treatment and control conditions were composed of participants who were quite similar in terms of age, gender, Caucasian or African American race and educational level. However, data indicated that there were more individuals who identified as “other” for race and as Hispanic in the control group. Approximately seven percent (6.7%) of the control group identified as "Other" for race as compared to 4.1% of the treatment group and five percent (5.1%) of the control group identified as Hispanic as compared to 2.8% of the treatment group. Data reported in Table VII, indicated a significantly larger number of control group participants who reported “Other” for Race and “Hispanic” for ethnicity. Despite these differences, evaluators concluded that randomization procedures were largely effective assuring that the treatment and control groups were equivalent.
Table VII. Comparison of Characteristics of Treatment & Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>k (# of items)</th>
<th>n⁵</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Significant at the .05 level.

Section 8: Evaluation Timeline

Evaluation activities described in this report were initiated and completed between July 2013 and October 2016 (see Table VIII for timeline). Approval from the Ohio State University, Institutional Review Board (IRB) was obtained in January 2014. The Implementation Study was initiated in February and completed in March 2014. Study participants were recruited beginning in April 2014. Data collection occurred on a rolling schedule at three, six and 12 months post-enrollment and was completed in November 2015. Data analysis and production of the final report were completed between November 2015 and November 2016.

Table VIII. Milestones in OhioMeansJobs.com Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed instrumentation and completed study description, invitation and informed consent</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised study design based on House Bill 1 requirements</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Institutional Review Boards (IRB) approval</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated Implementation Study</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Implementation Study</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited study participants, collected baseline data and added additional counties</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵ The totals for Education and Employment do not sum to 2,468 because of missing data.
Revised study design based on House Bill 2 requirements  April 2014
Completed recruiting study participants and collecting baseline data November 2014
Completed intervention and measurement at three, six and 12 months November 2015
Secured secondary data from ODJFS April 2016
Completed data analysis September 2016
Developed policy implications November 2016
Produced final report November 2016

Section 9: Sampling and Recruitment

The individuals who participated in the evaluation study described in this report did not constitute a random sample. Rather, evaluators employed a variety of procedures that resulted in the recruitment of a study sample of 2,468 volunteers. These individuals were recruited from four original counties (Belmont, Clark, Lucas and Stark) from March to November 2014. From late July 2014 until the end of the participant enrollment period, recruitment procedures were initiated in seven additional counties (Adams, Brown, Columbiana, Franklin, Hamilton, Pike and Scioto) to ensure sufficient power to conduct statistical analyses. Study participants received up to $145 in incentives for participating in the evaluation of OhioMeansJobs.com.

More specifically, participants received a $25 gift card at enrollment and $10 gift cards each month as long as they continued to use employment services. Completing follow-up measures was counted as a service but participants were not required to complete measures to receive credit toward a gift card. Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services (ODJFS) staff monitored participation and were responsible for the issuance of gift cards in $20 increments. Recruitment of study participants occurred through two primary channels: on-site and on-line. Recruitment targets suggested that the evaluation team had to recruit and enroll approximately 400 individuals per month across study sites.

Recruitment Procedures

On-Site Recruitment. A monthly schedule was developed each month during the recruiting period. The schedule assured that recruiters from the evaluation team were on-site at each study location approximately once per week although the time and day of the week varied. Prior to the initial on-site recruiting session, recruiters conducted a meeting with Center staff in order to explain the research project. Actual recruitment procedures focused on advertising the proposed study. A color poster (approximately 24” X 36”) was fixed to a wall in a prominent location at each study site (see Attachment G) and a color flyer on 8.5” X 11” paper (see Attachment H) was inserted into an
approved receptacle in close proximity to the poster noted above. Site staff were responsible for filling the receptacle on a daily basis and answering general questions about the study.

The same flyer was placed in materials distributed by site staff to all new customers. In addition, table-tents or web-keys advertising the evaluation study (see Attachment I) were placed near computers that were available to customers. A web-key was an electronic device attached to customer computers that provided direct access to study information and enrollment procedures. Finally, recruiters provided brief presentations at specialized events. All of the recruitment materials referred interested individuals to a URL where they could access additional information about the study and enroll. Enrollment included completion of the “Evaluation Study Registration” and the provision of informed consent. Less than 10% of the sample (220 individuals or 8.9%) joined the study as a result of on-site recruitment procedures.

**On-Line Recruitment.** Each week during the recruitment period, Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services (ODJFS) personnel sent evaluators a list of individuals from the study counties who had used services within the prior seven days. A member of the evaluation team reviewed the list and entered contact information into the Qualtrics survey system, creating a unique ID for each potential enrollee. The Qualtrics system automatically sent an invitation to potential participants inviting them to participate in the study. Potential study participants were directed to a link that allowed them to provide registration information and informed consent. One week after the original e-mail invitation was sent, evaluators sent a reminder e-mail to individuals who had not enrolled in the evaluation study.

### Section 10: Methods and Data Analyses

**Analytic Methods**

Regression, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and chi square tests were the main analytic procedures employed in this study. In addition, two different sets of analyses were performed relative to evaluation questions. Initial analyses were performed utilizing cases with complete data. Follow-up analyses were performed utilizing imputation procedures to fill in missing data for the variable **Starting a Job** at the three month follow-up. Thus, evaluators addressed each evaluation question using cases with complete data and then considered the confirmatory question based on imputed data. Finally, original plans called for the using administrative data as a means to verify self-report data. However, careful inspection of administrative data uncovered significant issues related to the use of these data for research purposes. Inconsistencies in the availability of data, definitions of specific variables and procedures for data entry resulted in significant variation in the characteristics of administrative data across study sites. As a result, evaluators elected not to use administrative data in any form in this study.

---

[6] Qualtrics is an on-line survey system that was used to collect study data.
Section 11: Validity and Threats

There were several threats to validity that presented challenges to OhioMeansJobs.com evaluators: 1) implementation of OhioMeansJobs.com or what is often referred to as the fidelity; 2) overall and differential attrition; 3) missing data; 4) equivalency of the treatment and control groups; and 5) contamination of the control group. Contamination referred to the degree to which individuals in the control group utilized the self-serve portal to access services. These particular threats to validity emerged from discussion among evaluators and other stakeholders and were judged to be the most critical issues related to the interpretation of study results.

Implementation of OhioMeansJobs.com

Initial concerns focused on the degree to which OhioMeansJobs.com services would be as accessible as traditional, internet-based services. Given Ohio’s long and successful history of providing employment services, evaluators were concerned that the OhioMeansJobs.com system would not be accessible to users. A significant difference in Access to Services was observed at the three month follow-up, with participants in the control condition indicating significantly more access to services than participants in the treatment condition. The mean score for Access to Services for participants in the treatment group was 3.79 and 3.90 for participants in the control group ($F=5.29$, $df=1$, $p=.022$).

In contrast to this finding, evidence from the Implementation Study supported the claim that the OhioMeansJobs.com system was accessible to users. Data indicated that over 78% of customers agreed that OhioMeansJobs.com services were accessible. Participants in the Implementation Study also indicated a moderate level of use of most OhioMeansJobs.com services. Furthermore, data from interviews with Center staff indicated that almost all site staff (11 out of 12) were “very” or “somewhat” confident that the OhioMeansJobs.com system was working as intended. Finally, designers of OhioMeansJobs.com expected customers to experience services as generally positive. Data indicated that study participants’ experiences were somewhat lower than envisioned by designers but approached expectations. In addition, Implementation Study participants rated two-thirds of OhioMeansJobs.com services as “useful” and over 70% gave OhioMeansJobs.com an overall rating of “very” or “somewhat” useful.

Attrition and Differential Attrition

Attrition, or loss of participants over time, is a well-known problem in field and longitudinal research. One form is “subject non-response,” often defined as completely missing data (no responses because participants dropped out). Prior to the initiation of the evaluation study, evaluators believed that this type of attrition might be as high as 50% from one measurement period to the next. Thus, several strategies were employed to reduce attrition. First, participants were reminded to complete surveys on a regular schedule. Second, in selected cases, members of the evaluation team called participants and administered surveys via the telephone. Finally, incentives were
offered consistent with data collection periods. As indicated in Table IX, attrition was
more than 50% at the three month follow-up period. Attrition exceeded 50% at the six
and 12 month follow-up periods.

Table IX. Overall Attrition and Differential Attrition at Three Month Follow-Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Randomization</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Data</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data (Not complete data)</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attrition (% missing data)</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall rate of attrition for the three month follow-up period was 52.8%. Overall
attrition was defined by Deke, Sama-Miller and Hershey (2015) as the proportion of
sample members randomly assigned to the treatment and control groups for whom
outcome data are not available. The differential attrition rate at the three month follow-
up was 6.9%. Differential attrition was defined as the difference in the attrition rates
between the treatment and control groups. In order to address attrition in a randomized
control trial (RCT), Deke, Sama-Miller and Hershey established acceptable levels of
overall and differential attrition necessary to address potential bias based on the
composition of the analytic sample. These authors expressed guidelines for overall and
differential attrition in terms of “bounds.” For an RCT with overall attrition ranging from
50% to 55%, differential attrition must be between .3% and 1.0% to be within the
acceptable bound. OhioMeansJobs.com study data exceeded this bound. According to
Deke, Sama-Miller and Hershey (2015) the combination of overall and differential
attrition observed in the OhioMeansJobs.com study data produce “unacceptably high
bias.”

Missing Data

The extent to which users of OhioMeansJobs.com started jobs at rates comparable to
users of traditional internet-based services at the three month follow-up period was the
confirmatory question addressed in the evaluation study. As noted above, there was
substantial attrition and other forms of missing data at each of the evaluation follow-up
periods. At the three month follow-up period, 100% of the variables in the data-set
contained missing values and more than half of cases were missing. Evaluators tested
the differences between cases with missing data and cases with complete data on
selected variables in order to understand the nature of missing data. These tests
indicated that there were systematic differences between the treatment and control
groups suggesting that data were missing at random (MAR). For example, differences
between cases with complete data and cases with missing data for employment status

---

7 This figure was adjusted to exclude individuals who were satisfied with their employment situation.
at registration ($\chi^2=9.417, df=3, p=.024$) are indicated in Table X. Evaluators also found significant differences between the cases with missing data and cases with complete data relative to age ($\chi^2=47.085, df=4, p=.000$) and educational level ($\chi^2=67.520, df=5, p=.000$). Evaluators applied the Blimp application (Enders, 2010) to perform single level imputation to further assess the confirmatory question posed in this study.

Table X. Cases with Missing and Non-Missing Data by Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Non-Missing</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly unemployed</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly employed</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equivalency of Control and Treatment Groups

Data collected during the eligibility screening process constituted “baseline” data for the study sample. Statistics summarized in Table VII indicated that there were no significant differences between the treatment and control condition groups in age, gender, Caucasian or African American racial status and education level. It should also be noted that the average **Computer Literacy** score for the treatment group was 65.5 and 65.7 for the control group indicating a high level of computer literacy. However, data indicated that there were more individuals in the control group who identified as “Other” for race and “Hispanic” for ethnicity. However, evaluation team members concluded that random assignment procedures worked as intended and that the control and comparison groups were largely equivalent at registration.

Contamination of the Control Group

Several mechanisms were used to monitor and address “implementation of assignment.” First, when participants were recruited, they were told they were not to discuss or share access to the OhioMeansJobs.com system. In addition, participants were asked if they had discussed or provided materials to other individuals when they completed measures at the three, six and 12 month follow-up periods. Staff involved in recruiting and monitoring participants were also trained and had written protocols to guide them in their assigned duties in order to guard against contamination of experimental conditions. Self-report questions, at the three, six and 12 month follow-up periods required participants to report the extent to which they had discussed the study with others and whether they had shared their password.

Results indicated that at the three-month follow-up, 3.2% (n=52) reported having
discussed the study “a great deal” and 0.5% (n=8) reported that they had shared their password. At the six month follow-up, the figures were very similar, 3.2% (n=53) of participants reported having discussed the study “a great deal” and 0.4% (n=7) reported sharing their password. At the 12 month follow-up, 59 participants or 4.0% reported having discussed the study “a great deal” while 9 study participants indicated that they had shared their password. At all follow-up periods, data indicated that similar numbers of study participants reported having discussed the study and sharing passwords.

As indicated in Table XI, more than 80% of control condition participants indicated that they “mostly used OhioMeansJobs.com services” in their job search efforts. Only a small proportion of control group participants indicated that they used “in-person services.” The low number of control group participants who indicated that they used in-person services suggests a high level of contamination of the control group.

**Table XI. Percent of Study Participants Using Various Forms of Employment Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
<th>Mostly Used</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OhioMeansJobs.com</td>
<td>In-Person</td>
<td>OhioMeansJobs.com &amp; In-Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Months</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Months</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 12: Data Collection, Variables, Outcome Definitions and Study Findings**

**Outcomes and Definitions**

The impact of use of a self-serve portal on eight outcomes was assessed in the OhioMeansJobs.com evaluation study. Outcome variables included 1) **Started a Job**, 2) **Job Offers**, 3) **Progress in Job Search**, 4) **Use of Services**, 5) **Job Retention**, 6) **Services Met Expectations**, 7) **Need for Staff Assistance** and 8) **Most Helpful Service**. **Started a Job** was assessed through a single forced-choice question: “Did you start a job in the last few months?” The response options for this question were, “Yes” or “No.” Results for **Starting a Job** at the three, six and 12 month follow-up periods are indicated in Table XI. The frequency that participants who used OhioMeansJobs.com services started jobs at the three month follow-up as compared to users of traditional, internet-based services was the confirmatory question in this study. None of the differences in starting jobs were significant at the .05 level (three month-$\chi^2=.099$, $df=1$, $p=.754$; six month-$\chi^2=.139$, $df=1$, $p=.709$; 12 month-$\chi^2=.298$, $df=1$, $p=.585$). Analysis with imputed data confirmed this results ($F=0.839$, $df=1$ and 115, $p=0.362$).
Table XII. Study Participants Who Started Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-Up Period</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) Mos.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six (6) Mos.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mos.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, Job Offers was assessed using a single forced-choice question (see Table XIII). Customers were asked: “How many job offers did you receive since you started using OhioMeansJobs.com services?” There were four response options: “None,” “1-2,” “3-4” or “More than 4.” Results were significant at the three month follow-up indicating that participants who used OhioMeansJobs.com services received four or more job offers more frequently than participants who used traditional, internet-based services ($\chi^2=8.32, df=3, p=.040$). Results at the six ($\chi^2=1.27, df=3, p=.734$) and 12 month ($\chi^2=.696, df=3, p=.874$) follow-up periods were nonsignificant.

Table XIII. Job Offers Received by Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-Up Period</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) Mos.</td>
<td>No Offers</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or More Offers</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six (6) Mos.</td>
<td>No Offers</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or More Offers</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mos.</td>
<td>No Offers</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were asked four (4) questions to determine their **Job Search Progress** scores. These questions were answered on Likert-type scale where 1 meant “Strongly disagree,” 2 meant “Disagree,” 3 meant “Not sure,” 4 meant “Agree” and 5 meant “Strongly agree.” The four questions were, 1) “At this point in time, I know what kind of job I want”; 2) “I am confident that my resume will be well received by possible employers”; 3) “I am well prepared to apply for jobs”; and 4) “In the last two months, my job interviews have gone well.” **Job Search Progress** questions were treated as a scale where values ranged from 1.0 which implied a low level of progress to 5.0 which implied a high degree of progress (see Table IV). Reliability for this scale was .77 in the Implementation Study and .77 at the three month follow-up period. There were no significant differences observed at the three month follow-up ($F=.085$, $df=1$, $p=.770$); six month follow-up ($F=.181$, $df=1$, $p=.671$) or 12 month follow-up ($F=1.28$, $df=1$, $p=.257$) periods.

**Table XIV. Study Participants Job Search Progress Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Follow-Up Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three (3) Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of Services** was assessed by asking participants to indicate whether they used 14 specific services. Response options were “Yes” or “No.” Services included, 1) Being able to see in-demand occupations, 2) Having a record of my job search activities, 3) Creating a career plan, 4) Access to information about specific careers, 5) Resume rating and writing assistance, 6) Receiving information when jobs were available, 7) Access to information about how much income I need, 8) Understanding how various jobs match my personality, 9) Training, 10) Scholarships, 11) Information about jobs in my area, 12) Referral to another state agency for services, 13) Access to information I might need to apply for a job and 14) Other.

A 14 item composite measure was created by summing use of services. The maximum number of services that could have been used was 14 and participants received 1.0 point for each service they used (see Table XV). Results indicated that participants tended to use a few specific services regardless of whether they used OhioMeansJobs.com services or traditional, internet-based services (range 1.9 to 3.0). However, at the three month follow-up period, users of OhioMeansJobs.com services used significantly more services than users of traditional, internet-based services
(F=7.115, df=1, p=.008). Results were nonsignificant at the six month (F=.039, df=1, p=.843) and 12 month (F=.681, df=1, p=.410) follow-up periods.

**Table XV. Study Participants Use of Employment Services Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Follow-Up Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three (3) Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job Retention** was assessed using a single forced choice question: “Did you leave a job in the last few months?” The response options for this question were, “Yes” or “No” (see Table XVI). Results at the three month ($\chi^2=1.56, df=1, p=.693$); six month ($\chi^2=1.4, df=1, p=.237$) and 12 month follow-up periods ($\chi^2=1.82, df=1, p=.177$) were nonsignificant.

**Table XVI. Study Participants Who Left Jobs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-Up Period</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) Mos.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six (6) Mos.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mos.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services Met Expectations** was assessed using nine survey questions. These questions included: 1) “Services were explained to me before I started the program”; 2) “I was able to get the services I needed in a timely fashion”; 3) “The amount of privacy I experienced in using services was about right”; 4) “My services focused on the problems I have in finding a job”; 5) “When I needed personal attention, it was available to me”; 6) “The language used to provide services was understandable”; 7) “I felt respected during my job search”; 8) “I believe the services I received will help me find a
job”; and 9) “Overall, I am very satisfied with the services I received to help me find a job.” A total score was calculated by averaging responses across items. Response options for these questions ranged from 1.0 (“Strongly disagree”) to 5.0 (“Strongly agree”) where higher scores implied a higher level of met expectations. Reliability for this scale was .95 in the Implementation Study and .95 at the three month follow-up. As indicated in Table XVII, there were no significant differences observed at the three month follow-up ($F=2.39$, $df=1$, $p=.122$); six month follow-up ($F=.012$, $df=1$, $p=.914$) or 12 month follow-up ($F=2.66$, $df=1$, $p=.606$) periods.

Table XVII. Study Participants Services Met Expectation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Follow-Up Period</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three (3) Month</td>
<td>Six Month (6)</td>
<td>12 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked five questions to determine their Need for Staff Assistance. This assessment was judged to be important because OhioMeansJobs.com designers were interested in the most efficient allocation of resources to support the provision of high quality employment services. Staff assistance referred to the degree to which participants needed assistance from staff to complete job search tasks. These questions were answered on Likert-type scales where 1 meant “Strongly disagree,” 2 meant “Disagree,” 3 meant “Not sure,” 4 meant “Agree” and 5 meant “Strongly agree.” The five questions were: 1) “I needed help from staff in deciding what kind of job I wanted.”; 2) “I needed help from staff in preparing my resume.”; 3) “I needed help from staff in completing job applications.”; 4) “I needed help from staff in completing job interviews”; and 5) “I needed help in using various employment services.” Need for staff assistance questions were treated as a scale where values ranged from 1.0 which implied a low need for staff assistance to 5.0 which implied a high need for staff assistance. Reliability for this scale was .93 in the Implementation Study and .93 at the three month follow-up. As indicated in Table XVIII, there were no significant differences observed at the three month follow-up ($F=.118$, $df=1$, $p=.731$); six month follow-up ($F=.063$, $df=1$, $p=.802$) or 12 month follow-up ($F=369$, $df=1$, $p=.544$) periods.

Table XVIII. Services Met Expectation Scores for Treatment and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Follow-Up Period</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Month</td>
<td>Six Month</td>
<td>12 Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Helpful Service was assessed using a single forced choice question. Customers in both conditions were asked: “Which service do you think was most helpful in your job search?” Response options included the 14 employment services referred to in Table XIX. Participants were directed to pick a single service. Participants were asked what services they found most useful at the three, six and 12 month follow-up periods. Participants were able to select one service. Users of OhioMeansJobs.com services and traditional, internet-based services selected “information when jobs were available” (20.2% of participants selected this service) and “information about jobs in my area” (23.7% of participants selected this service) at much higher rates than services such as “in-demand occupations” (5.9% of participants selected this service), “creating a career plan” (2.7% of participants selected this service) and “access to information about needed income” (0.1% of participants selected this service). It appeared that participants were most interested in services related to applying for and securing employment. This is not surprising in that study participants all indicated that they were either unemployed or employed but seeking a different job. This information suggests that study participants, regardless of condition, showed low levels of interest in developing long-term career plans.
Table XIX. Participants’ Perceptions of Most Useful Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Three Month Follow-Up</th>
<th>Six Month Follow-Up</th>
<th>12 Month Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Demand Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of Job Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a Career Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. about Specific Careers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume Rating &amp; Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. when Jobs Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. about Needed Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job &amp; Personality Matching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. about Jobs in My Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to Another State Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. Needed to Apply for Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 13: Discussion

Adoption of a “per-protocol” approach to data analyses suggests several conclusions that arise out of the evaluation study described above. A per-protocol analysis provides a foundation for considering the results of randomized control trials (RCT) on individuals who comply with a specific treatment protocol (National Academy of Sciences, 2010). However, it is clear that the most prudent approach to interpretation of data from RCTs is dependent on both per-protocol and ITT approaches to dealing with data. The ITT approach requires that all individuals randomized into the study be retained in data analyses (Gupta, 2011; Del Re et. al, 2013). Multiple imputation is typically recommended as a means for dealing with missing data.

In order to consider results of the OhioMeansJobs.com evaluation study based on a per-protocol framework, the reader must assume that subjects who provided complete data also complied with the protocol for using the OhioMeansJobs.com employment services system. It is important to point out that this protocol applied equally to the delivery of traditional employment services provided by case-managers. The logic model illustrated in Attachment A provides the closest description of activities that might be considered an OhioMeansJobs.com or career development protocol.

This logic model indicates that individuals who use employment services should 1) assess career interests, 2) explore careers, 3) explore labor markets, 4) assess vocational skills, 5) develop a career plan, 6) secure financial assistance, 7) participate in job-readiness training, 8) search for a job and 9) interview and secure a job. Data indicate that regardless of condition, most study participants entered this chain of activities by searching for a job. Thus it can be argued that users of the OhioMeansJobs.com system and traditional employment services were at least partially compliant with the specified career development protocol.

Based on this argument, several exploratory findings appear to be relevant to judgments about the OhioMeansJobs.com system based on evaluation data and other findings. First, the OhioMeansJobs.com system “did no harm.” On almost every outcome indicator, users of OhioMeansJobs.com services fared at least as well as users of traditional internet-based employment services. For example, at the three month follow-up, 37.1% of users of OhioMeansJobs.com services and 36.2% of users of traditional internet-based services had started a job. Similarly, at the three month follow-up, 19.9% of users of OhioMeansJobs.com and 18.9% of users of traditional internet-based services had left a job. In addition, users of OhioMeansJobs.com reported using more services and received four or more job offers more frequently than users of traditional internet-based services.

As part of the evaluation process, the evaluation team and other stakeholders developed recommendations for enhancements to the OhioMeansJobs.com system. The recommendations summarized below are an abbreviated version of recommendations that were developed as part of a planning process facilitated by
members of the evaluation team. The formal recommendations were summarized in a separate document available from the Ohio Department of Jobs and Family Services (ODJFS). Planners felt that the OhioMeansJobs.com system should be retained as a primary feature of Ohio’s employment services system and that selected services currently provided by case-managers should be automated to free case-managers to work with the “most difficult to serve.” In addition, planners believed that enhanced efficiencies might be achieved if case-managers focused their attention on computer literacy training and instruction on how to use the OhioMeansJobs.com site.

In terms of the research reported in this report, it is clear that results must be further investigated in future studies. At a minimum, additional effort should be directed to the Intention to Treat (ITT) perspective with regard to further analysis using imputed data. With respect to the current analyses, there were significant threats to the validity of experimental procedures, attrition was high, substantial data were missing and there appeared to be contamination of the control group. However, even with these qualifications, evaluators believe that study results provide direction for future research, further development of the OhioMeansJobs.com system and important information for teams developing similar internet-based, employment services in other locations. It is clear based on anecdotal reports and observations from the literature that access to services via the internet is a defining characteristic of life in the 21st century. Thus it is no surprise that a variety of governmental agencies are developing and implementing internet-based employment services. Efforts to develop effective and efficient mechanisms for delivering services such as OhioMeansJobs.com should be encouraged in order to meet the needs of consumers and now and into the future.
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Attachment A: OhioMeansJobs.com Logic Model
Attachment B: Implementation Study Customer Survey

The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS) is recruiting people to participate in a research project. Researchers from The Ohio State University will help to determine the effectiveness of on-line services to help people meet their employment goals. This project is designed to help Ohio service providers and service providers across the nation develop and deliver the best possible on-line, employment services. In order to be eligible you must:

- Be 18 or older
- Provide informed consent
- Have used OMJ services for at least 60 days

If you participate you may receive $50.00 in the form of a gift card which you should receive 2 to 3 weeks after you register for the study. The study lasts for 30 days.

You will be asked to complete one survey. You may also be asked to participate in a telephone interview. The survey and the interview will both take approximately 20 minutes to complete for a total of 40 minutes. Your responses will be kept confidential. Your name will never be used in any reporting of data. Again, your participation is completely voluntary and even as a participant, you may choose not to answer any question. All the data from this study will be made available to the U.S. Department of Labor and other researchers.

1. If you are willing to participate, please check the box below.

I agree to participate in this evaluation study described above?

_____ Yes
_____ No

2. What was your reason for choosing to use OMJ services?

3. When was the last time you used an OMJ employment service?

_____ Within the last 7 days
_____ 8 to 21 days ago
_____ 22 to 30 days ago
_____ More than 30 days ago

Please answer the following questions about your knowledge of computers and then tell us whether each question is easy to understand. How much do you Agree or Disagree with each statement? Was the question easily understood?
4. I can switch a computer on.
5. I can restart a computer.
6. I can begin a new document.
7. I can open a previously saved file from any drive/directory.
8. I can use "save as" when appropriate.
9. I can print a document.
10. I can use a browser such as Internet Explorer or Firefox to navigate the internet.
11. I can open a web address directly.
12. I can identify the host server from the web address.
13. I can use "back" and "forward" to move between web pages.
14. I can use search engines such as Google.
15. Overall, I feel very confident about my ability to use the computer.
16. I believe that technology saves me time.
17. I believe that technology is a good tool to help me reach my employment goals.

The next set of questions asks about the services you received. And just like before, please rate whether each question was easily understood. If a question does not apply to you, you should check not applicable.

18. The services I received represented a good faith effort to help me find employment.
19. Assessments were available to me when I needed them.
20. Information about various jobs was available to me when I needed it.
21. I was able to conduct on-line job searches when needed.
22. Job information was available to me when I needed it.
23. I could review my job search materials anytime I wanted.
24. Learning opportunities were available to me if I wanted to participate in them.
25. Appropriate training was available to me if I needed it to get a job.
26. I believe I had access to the resources to help me get a job.
27. I was able to find help to prepare me to get a job.

This section asks about your job search progress. How much do you Agree or Disagree with each statement? Was the question easily understood?

28. I knew what kind of job I wanted when I started receiving services.
29. I was confident that my resume would be well received by possible employers.
30. I was well prepared to apply for jobs.
31. My job interviews went well.

This section asks about your need for staff assistance. How much do you Agree or Disagree with each statement? Was the question easily understood?

32. I needed help from staff in deciding what kind of job I want.
33. I needed help from staff in preparing my resume.
34. I needed help in completing job applications.
35. I needed help in completing job interviews.
36. I needed help in using the on-line system.

This section asks how services met your expectations. Don’t forget to rate whether each question was easily understood. How much do you Agree or Disagree with each statement? Was the question easily understood?

37. I received guidance about the services I received.
38. I was able to get services when I needed them.
39. The amount of privacy I experienced in using services was about right.
40. My services focused on the problems I had in meeting my job goals.
41. When I needed personal attention, it was available to me.
42. The language used to provide services was understandable.
43. I was treated with respect when getting services.
44. I believe the services I received helped me meet my job goals.
45. Overall, I am very satisfied with the services I received.

46. How many job offers did you receive since you started using OMJ services?
   _____ None
   _____ 1-2
   _____ 3-4
   _____ More than 4

47. How many different jobs have you had (both part-time and full-time) since you started using OMJ services?
   _____ None
   _____ 1-2
   _____ 3-4
   _____ More than 4

48. What was the primary reason you left your last job?
   _____ No benefits
   _____ Not enough pay
   _____ Working hours
   _____ Personal reason
   _____ Didn’t have the required skills
   _____ Couldn’t afford transportation
   _____ Didn’t like my boss
   _____ Laid-off
   _____ Fired
   _____ Found a better job
   _____ Other ____________________
49. Again, think about the time period when you were using OMJ services. Which of the following services do you think was most helpful in your job search? (Check ONE service that you think was most useful).

- Being able to see in-demand occupations
- Having a record of my job search activities
- Career/Job planning/Creating a plan
- Access to information about specific careers
- Resume writing assistance/Rating
- Receiving information when jobs were available
- Access to information about how much income I needed
- Understanding how various jobs match my personality
- Training
- Scholarships
- Information about jobs in my area
- Referral to another state agency for services
- Access to information I might need to apply for a job
- Other ____________________

So that researchers can understand who used what services, please answer the following questions based on your experience using OMJ.

50. To what extent have you shared information about your participation in OMJ with friends or acquaintances?

- I have not discussed my participation with anyone.
- I have discussed my participation a little, but just in passing.
- I have discussed some of the details of my participation in this study.
- I have discussed my participation a great deal.

51. Have you shared your OMJ access with anyone else in the last several months?

- Yes
- No

52. Would you say that this survey up to this point was easy to understand or difficult to understand?

- Easy
- Difficult
- Not sure
53. Would you say that this survey up to this point was too long or about right in length?

_____ Too long
_____ About right
_____ Not sure

There are just a few more questions, we would like you to answer. The next section asks you to think about several features that are available through OMJ. First, you will be asked how often you used a special feature then you will be asked how useful you thought the feature was to your job search efforts.

54. Reviewed in-demand occupations
55. Added information to my backpack
56. Accessed information about specific careers/jobs
57. Developed my own career or job search plan
58. Identified specific career/job goals
59. Created a resume
60. Maintained an updated resume
61. Rated my resume
62. Used the chat feature to ask questions or clarify specific issues
63. Would you say that OMJ was very, somewhat or not particularly useful to your job search efforts?

_____ Very useful
_____ Somewhat useful
_____ Not particularly useful

Please think about how you view OMJ as a resource for helping people find a job. The following questions contain word pairs that might be used to describe your experience with OMJ. Please rate OMJ on the following scales by checking the space that most closely matches how you feel. If you are not sure, you should check "neither/nor." In my experience, I found OMJ:

64. Helpful-Not helpful
65. Easy-Difficult
66. Friendly-Unfriendly
67. High quality-Low quality
68. Personal-Impersonal
69. Clear-Confusing
70. Engaging-Not engaging
71. User friendly-Frustrating
72. Readily available-Not available
73. New-Same old thing

74. If necessary, would you be willing to discuss your experiences using OMJ services?
You may be asked to participate in a short telephone interview. The following information will be used to help researchers contact you.

75. What is your current telephone number?
76. What is your current e-mail address?
77. What is your current mailing address

Thank you for the time that you spent completing this survey. You can expect to receive your gift card in 2-3 weeks. Remember, researchers may call you to ask you a few questions about your experience with this survey and OMJ.
Attachment C: Designer Interview Questions

1. How big of a barrier is computer literacy for the average customer using on-line employment assistance services? Would you say computer literacy is a significant barrier, somewhat of a barrier or not a barrier?
2. Do you think most customers will overcome this barrier with time?
3. Would you describe your role in the design of the OMJ system in a few sentences?
4. Now, I want you to think about how OMJ was designed to work. What do you believe are the five most critical features of OMJ? In other words, what parts of OMJ are the most helpful to customers?
5. What do you believe are the three most important goals of OMJ?
6. What do you think are the three most important products that a customer of OMJ will produce?
7. What do you think are the three most important skills that a customer of OMJ will develop?
8. The following adjective pairs might be used to describe OMJ. I am going to read the adjective pairs and I’d like you to tell me on a 1 to 5 scale how you believe the average client experiences OMJ. For these questions, 5 will always be the more positive response and 1 will be the more negative response. For example, if I say 1 is “not helpful” and 5 is “helpful,” how would the average customer rate OMJ?
   - Not helpful-Helpful
   - Difficult-Easy
   - Unfriendly-Friendly
   - Low-quality-High quality
   - Impersonal-Personal
   - Confusing-Clear
   - Not engaging-Engaging
   - Frustrating-User friendly
   - Not available-Available
   - Same old thing-New
9. In general, how do you think most of the clients you serve are reacting to the OMJ system?
10. Is there anything else you want to share about OMJ that I didn’t ask about?
Attachment D: Center Staff Interview Questions

1. How big of a barrier is computer literacy for the average customer using on-line employment assistance services? Would you say computer literacy is a significant barrier, somewhat of a barrier or not a barrier?
2. Do you think most customers will overcome this barrier with time?
3. Now, I want you to think about how OMJ is designed to work. What do you believe are the five most critical features of OMJ? In other words, what parts of OMJ are the most helpful to customers?
4. I’m going to list several features of the OMJ system. Based on your observations, I want you to tell me how routinely customers use the feature based on your observations. This is on a scale from 1 to 4, where 1 means “customers never use the feature,” 2 means “rarely use the feature,” 3 means “somewhat routinely use the feature,” and 4 means they “routinely use the feature.” You can also respond “unsure” if you are not sure.

- See occupations that are in-demand
- Have a record of their job search activities
- Create a career plan
- Access information about specific careers
- Rating resumes/Resume writing assistance
- Receive information about when jobs are available
- Receive information about how much income they need
- Understand how various jobs match their personality
- Training
- Scholarships
- Receive information about jobs in their area
- Referral to another state agency for assistance
- Obtain information they may need to apply for job

5. In general, how confident are you that the OMJ system is working as intended? Would you say you are “very confident,” “somewhat confident” or “not confident at all?”

6. The following questions contain adjective pairs that might be used to describe OMJ. For each one, I want you to tell me using a 1 to 5 scale, first how the average customer or client would rate OMJ, then how you would rate OMJ. For example, if the adjective pair was helpful versus not helpful, and I tell you that 1 is “not helpful” and 5 is “helpful,” how would the average customer rate OMJ? How would you rate OMJ?

- Not helpful-Helpful
- Difficult-Easy
- Unfriendly-Friendly
• Low-quality-High quality
• Impersonal-Personal
• Confusing-Clear
• Not engaging-Engaging
• Frustrating-User friendly
• Not available-Available
• Same old thing-New

7. What do you believe are the three most important goals of OMJ?
8. What do you think are the three most important skills that an OMJ customer will develop?
9. In general, how do you think most of the clients or customers you serve are reacting to the OMJ system?
10. Is there anything else you want to share about OMJ that I didn’t ask about?
The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS) is recruiting people to participate in a research project. Researchers from Ohio State University will help to determine the effectiveness of on-line services to help people meet their employment goals. This project is designed to help Ohio service providers and service providers across the nation develop and deliver the best possible on-line employment services. If you are eligible, you may receive compensation for your time. In order to be eligible you must be 18 or older, acknowledge the rules of participation, provide informed consent and not have received certain services in the last 30 days. In addition, the federal government has specific rules about when veterans can participate in research studies. It is possible that your military service might limit your participation in this study. This study lasts for 365 days or 12 months.

If you join this study, you will be assigned to one of two conditions. You may have access to Ohio’s One-Stop Services or you may have access to a new way of providing these services on the internet. The risk of being harmed or experiencing discomfort as a participant in this research study is minimal. If you participate, you may receive up to $145 over the 12 month participation period. You will receive $25 at enrollment and a $10 credit for every month in which you participate in at least one service. Credits will be paid out in $20 increments. That means that you can receive a $20 gift card every other month if you participate in services each and every month while you are part of the study. It is important that you know that you will not receive a gift card until you receive two $10 credits. You will be asked to complete three surveys over the 12 month research study.

Each survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. You can stop at any time or refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. We will work to make sure no one sees your survey responses without approval. But because we are using the Internet, there is a chance someone could access your on-line responses without permission. In some cases, this information could be used to identify you. All the data from this study will be made available to the U.S. Department of Labor and other researchers. In addition to researchers, others such as representatives of the Office of Responsible Research at Ohio State University may have access to research data. Your name will never be used in reporting of any data.

Do you agree to participate in the evaluation study described above? ___ Yes ___ No

It is important that you understand that you may or may not be eligible, but you can find out by completing a short questionnaire. Please answer the following questions. Your
answers to these questions will help determine if you are eligible to participate in the evaluation project. What is your name (First and last)?

1. Which statement best describes your employment history in the last 12 months?
   _____ I was unemployed during this period
   _____ I was mostly unemployed during this period
   _____ I was mostly employed during this period
   _____ I was employed during this period

2. What is your age?
   _____ 17 or Younger
   _____ 18-29
   _____ 30-39
   _____ 40-49
   _____ 50-59
   _____ Over 60

3. Are you a male or female?
   _____ Female
   _____ Male

4. What is your race?
   _____ White
   _____ African American
   _____ Other

5. Are you of Hispanic decent?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

6. Are you a military veteran?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
7. In what county do you live?
   _____ Adams
   _____ Brown
   _____ Columbiana
   _____ Franklin
   _____ Hamilton
   _____ Pike
   _____ Scioto
   _____ Other

8. What is the highest level of education you completed?
   _____ 6th grade or less
   _____ 7-12th grade
   _____ High school graduate
   _____ Some post-secondary education
   _____ Post secondary degree (2 or 4 year)
   _____ Graduate or professional degree

9. In the past 30 days have you received any of the following services at your local OhioMeansJobs Center?
   _____ Ability testing, work readiness assessments, skill and aptitude tests
   _____ Job readiness development (communication skills, punctuality)
   _____ Career counseling, job coaching or on-going support
   _____ None of the above

If you join this study, you must not discuss your participation with other people who are using employment services or permit others to use any materials related to your participation in this study. You must also provide contact information including phone number, address, e-mail address and phone number, be willing to be contacted on a regular basis, provide notification if your address changes, continue to participate even if you obtain a job or decide not to use employment services, either create a new account on OhioMeansJobs.com or update your existing OhioMeansJobs account. Only one registration per person is allowed.

10. Do you agree to these rules of participation?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

Congratulations! You have been accepted into the OhioMeansJobs study. This means that if you use services at both your local OhioMeansJobs Center and at OhioMeansJobs.com you will receive a free gift card. Periodically, you will be asked to fill out a survey regarding the services you received. There are just a few more questions we would like you to complete.
11. At this point in time, which of the following statements best describes your reason for using ODJFS employment services?

_____ I am currently unemployed and looking for a new job
_____ I am currently employed and looking for a better job
_____ I am satisfied with my current employment situation

12. What is the best phone number to reach you?
13. What is your current email address?
14. What is your current mailing address?

Please answer the following questions about your knowledge of computers where 1 means you strongly disagree (SD), 2 means you disagree (D), 3 means you are not sure (NS), 4 means you agree (A) and 5 means you strongly agree (SA).

15. I can switch a computer on.
16. I can restart a computer.
17. I can begin a new document.
18. I can open a previously saved file from any drive/directory.
19. I can use "save as" when appropriate.
20. I can print a document.
21. I can use a browser such as Internet Explorer or Firefox to navigate the internet.
22. I can open a web address directly.
23. I can identify the host server from the web address.
24. I can use "back" and "forward" to move between web pages.
25. I can use search engines such as Google.
26. Overall, I feel very confident about my ability to use the computer.
27. I believe that technology saves me time.
28. I believe that technology is a good tool to help me reach my employment goals.

Again, congratulations! You have been enrolled into the OhioMeansJobs study. You are eligible to receive services at both your local OhioMeansJobs Center and at OhioMeansJobs.com. In approximately 3 months, we will be following up with you with a survey about your experiences using these services.
Attachment F: Evaluation Participant Survey Questions

Please answer the following questions based on your experiences in the last few months.

1. Which of the following employment services provided by the state of Ohio have you used in the last few months? (Check all services that apply.)

   ____ Being able to see in-demand occupation
   ____ Having a record of my job search activities
   ____ Creating a career plan
   ____ Access to information about specific careers
   ____ Resume rating and writing assistance
   ____ Receiving information when jobs were available
   ____ Access to information about how much income I need
   ____ Understanding how various jobs match my personality
   ____ Training
   ____ Scholarships
   ____ Information about jobs in my area
   ____ Referral to another state agency for services
   ____ Access to information I might need to apply for a job
   ____ Other ____________________
   ____ I have not used any services in this time period

2. Which of the following statements best describe your reason for using employment services?

   ____ I am currently unemployed and looking for a job.
   ____ I am currently employed and looking for a better job.
   ____ I am satisfied with my current employment situation.

3. Which of the following services do you think was MOST useful in your job search in the last few months? (Check ONE service.)

   ____ Being able to see in-demand occupations
   ____ Having a record of my job search activities
   ____ Creating a career plan
   ____ Access to information about specific careers
   ____ Resume rating and writing assistance
   ____ Receiving information when jobs were available
   ____ Access to information about how much income I need
   ____ Understanding how various jobs match my personality
   ____ Training
   ____ Scholarships
   ____ Information about jobs in my area
   ____ Referral to another state agency for services
Access to information I might need to apply for a job
Other ____________________

Please answer these questions based on your experience since you enrolled in this research survey.

4. Were the services you received mostly
   On-line via OMJ
   In-person with an OhioMeansJobs staff member
   About equally in-person and on-line

Please answer the following questions using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means you “strongly disagree,” 2 means you “disagree,” 3 means you are “not sure,” 4 means you “agree” and 5 means you “strongly agree.”

5. The services I received in the last few months represented a good effort to help me find employment.
6. Skill assessments related to my employment goals were available to me when I needed them.
7. Information about various careers was available to me when I needed it.
8. I was able to conduct on-line job searches when needed.
9. Career advice was available to me when I needed it.
10. I could review my job search materials anytime I wanted.
11. Learning opportunities were available to me if I wanted to participate in them.
12. Appropriate training was available to me if I needed it to get a job.
13. I believe I had access to the resources to help me get a job.
14. I was able to find help to prepare me to get a job.

Remember to answer these questions based on your experiences in the last few months.

15. I know what kind of job I want.
16. I am confident that my resume will be well received by possible employers.
17. I am well prepared to apply for jobs.
18. My job interviews have gone well.

In the next several questions, the word "staff" refers to employees of OhioMeansJobs Centers. Just like before, you should think about your experiences in the last few months.

19. I needed help from staff in deciding what kind of job I wanted.
20. I needed help from staff in preparing my resume.
21. I needed help in completing job applications.
22. I needed help in completing job interviews.
23. I needed help in using various employment resources.
24. I received guidance about the services I used.
25. I was able to get services when I needed them.
26. The amount of privacy I experienced in using services was about right.
27. My services addressed the problems I had meeting my job goals.
28. When I needed personal attention, it was available to me.
29. The language used to provide services was understandable to me.
30. I was treated with respect when getting services.
31. I believe the services I received helped me meet my job goals.
32. Overall, I am very satisfied with the services I received.
33. In the last few months, how many job applications have you submitted?
   _____ 0
   _____ 1-2
   _____ 3-4
   _____ More than 4
34. In the last few months, how many job offers have you received?
   _____ 0
   _____ 1-2
   _____ 3-4
   _____ More than 4
35. Did you start a job in the last few months?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
36. Did you leave a job in the last few months?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
37. What was the primary reason you left the last job you had in the last few months?
   (Select One)
   _____ No benefits
   _____ Pay
   _____ Working hours
   _____ Personal reason
   _____ Didn't have the required skills
   _____ Couldn't afford transportation
Didn't like my boss
Let go
Laid off
Relocated to another area
Other ____________________

Please provide the following information, in case researchers have to contact you.

38. What is the best phone number to reach you?
39. What is your current email address?
40. What is your current mailing address?

So that researchers can understand who used what services, please answer the following questions based on your experiences in the last few months.

41. Which of the following best describes your willingness to share information about your participation in this study with friends or acquaintances?

_____ I have not discussed my participation with anyone.
_____ I have discussed my participation a little, but just in passing.
_____ I have discussed some of the details of my participation in this study.
_____ I have discussed my participation a great deal.

42. Have you shared your OMJ access password with anyone else in the last few months?

_____ Yes
_____ No

43. If requested, would you be interested in meeting or talking via telephone to discuss your experiences with your job search?

_____ Yes
_____ No

That concludes the survey. Thank you very much.
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Special Annunciation

You are invited to be a part of our research study while you search for a job.

Help OhioMeansJobs find the best way to serve you.

➢ If you are selected for the study, you’ll get gift cards for using our OhioMeansJobs services.
➢ For more details, pick up a flyer in the stand located in this room.

Your help is greatly appreciated.

In partnership with:

➢ Ohio Department of Job and Family Services
➢ OhioMeansJobs Centers in Belmont, Clark, Lucas, and Stark counties.
➢ Hamilton-Park Consulting LLC
Attachment H: OMJ Flyer

Ohio MEANS Jobs

Department of Job and Family Services

You are invited to be part of the OhioMeansJobs research study.

The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services is evaluating new ways to deliver services. We invite you to help, by using OhioMeansJobs services – either in person at your nearest OhioMeansJobs Center or online at http://ohiomeansjobs.com – and then answering some questions.

You will receive a free gift card if you are selected to participate and if you use OhioMeansJobs services. Your responses will not be made public.

Whether you participate in the study or not, you still can take advantage of all the free employment services at your nearest OhioMeansJobs Center or at http://ohiomeansjobs.com.

You may be selected for the study if you:

✓ Are 18 or older
✓ Have an active email account
✓ Receive services in Belmont, Clark, Lucas or Stark counties
✓ Have not received assistance from a staff person at an OhioMeansJobs Center with such things as help understanding an assessment or help getting job coaching, career counseling or training within the past 30 days

Your help is greatly appreciated. By answering questions about OhioMeansJobs services, you will help us serve you and others better.

For additional details go to: http://ohio-omj.com

This study is being led by Dr. David Julian, a researcher at The Ohio State University. Dr. Julian can be reached at (614) 292-0175 or by writing to the OSU College of Education and Human Ecology, 1900 Kenny Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210.
BE PART OF THE OHIOMEANSJOBS RESEARCH STUDY. IF SELECTED, YOU MAY RECEIVE A FREE GIFT CARD.

For more information go to http://ohio-omj.com