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MEGAN LIZIK: Hello. And welcome to this webinar on REA Impact Study Findings and Implications for RESEA Evaluations, one of the webinars in DOL's RESEA Evaluation Technical Assistance series.

My name is Megan Lizik and I'm a senior evaluations specialist with the US Department of Labor's Chief Evaluation Office, and the project officer for DOL's RESEA Evaluation. I'm joined by Larry Burns, reemployment coordinator for the US Department of Labor's Office of Unemployment Insurance. We are excited to moderate this webinar.

Before we discuss the substance of this webinar, I would like to provide a little background about the independent RESEA evaluation project that this series is a part of. In the fall of 2018, the Department of Labor chief evaluation office contracted with Abt Associates and its partners, the Urban Institute, Capital Research Corporation, and the National Association of State Workforce Agencies, to help states develop strategies that will support new RESEA evidence requirements.

As part of this project, we are assessing the current state of the evidence of RESEA, conducting an implementation study of the RESEA programs, and providing evaluation technical assistance to states to build your technical capacity to meet the new legislative requirements. This webinar is part of the project's evaluation technical assistance. You can learn more about the study by clicking on the link on the slide.

This webinar will share a summary of findings from DOL's recently completed independent evaluation of the Reemployment Eligibility and Assessment, or REA program, and discuss some implications for states administering and evaluating reemployment services and eligibility assessment for RESEA programs. In a few months we'll hold a follow-up webinar to hear from a few states that participated in the study and also take questions from states.

We are joined by Jacob Alex Klerman, senior fellow with Abt Associates. It is a pleasure to give Jacob Klerman a chance to share the results of the REA impact study that he and his team at Abt conducted for DOL. You will see that Jacob's presentation walks us through important findings from this large and complex study, as well as draws on his technical insights from more than just this single evaluation. Jacob and I worked together on several independent DOL evaluations, including the ongoing RESEA project. Beyond that, Jacob has and is currently leading multiple large studies for DOL and for other federal agencies. He also edits Evaluation Review, an academic journal on evaluation theory. We are delighted to have him join us and look forward to a fun and informative talk.

Before turning it over to him, I'm glad to share a bit of background. DOL's independent REA implementation and impact studies were funded by DOL's chief evaluation office to examine the design and operation of the REA program, and measure the impact of the program on key UI and employment outcomes. Abt Associates conducted the evaluation on behalf of DOL. The impact study is one of the largest evaluations of a social program ever successfully conducted involving four states and the random assignment of nearly 300,000 unemployment insurance claimants. It had a multi-armed random assignment design, meaning that UI claimants were randomized until one of four treatment conditions; in other words, not just treatment and control conditions many people think of when they hear random assignment.

With significant findings, which Jacob will discuss more in a moment, this study provides compelling insights into the effectiveness of this program in reducing UI duration and increasing employment and earnings outcomes, more so than any other study conducted to-date.

In light of the RESEA program recently becoming a permanent program with growing funding and new requirements for ongoing evidence building, this study can help inform states' designs of their RESEA programs and give you important insights about what's required to successfully conduct high quality impact evaluations of these types of low intensity programs. For example, this study may be of particular interest because it looked at some of the same types of research questions your state might be considering. It also looked at the effectiveness of REA's three program components, which may offer insights into how you select and bundle components to create your RESEA program design.

For example, components of your RESEA program might include case management, intensive services, more than one meeting, scheduling claimants and meetings, and other activities to support work search compliance, to name a few. Finally, this new REA impact study offers methodological insights that will be helpful to consider as you progress your state's RESEA evaluation plan. Because the REA programs examined in this study are relatively low cost and low intensity, they can be expected to have proportionately modest impacts. However, detecting modest impacts requires extremely large samples. Jacob will go into greater detail about this and other technical insights momentarily.

JACOB KLERMAN: Thank you, Megan. It's a pleasure to be able to share the results of the work of myself and my colleagues on the RESEA impact study, the state staff. More broadly I will share not only insights in the REA impact study, but also from Abt's ongoing work with DOL on the RESEA program, other evaluations, and evaluation literature more broadly.

Everything starts with research questions. What do we want to know? For most evaluations we want to answer these four questions. A, Whole Program: What was the overall impact of each state's existing REA program on UI duration, employment, and earnings: B, Components: What was the role of different components of the program in achieving those impacts? C, Differential Impact: How did those impacts vary with claimant characteristics? And D, Causal Pathways: How does REA achieve its impacts?

These studies have large enough samples to address the last three research questions. Many studies don't even have enough sample to address the first research question. The REA impact study was different. It did have a large enough sample to almost address all four research questions. It'll become apparent that not enough sample is a repeated chorus in this presentation.

Sample sizes and not have enough sample are going to be the repeated chorus of this webinar. Let's start at the beginning. For evaluation in general and for state RESEA evaluations in particular, the goal is to demonstrate impact. But evaluations results are like political polls. The estimates are not exactly right. Instead they have a margin of error. The larger the sample, the smaller the margin of error; and therefore the more likely we are to demonstrate effectiveness. We will see that appropriate sample sizes are a whole lot larger than you might think.

Before we go the body of the webinar, a quick overview of the study is helpful. The study considered all four research questions, whole programs, components, differential impacts, and causal pathways, both for UI weeks, and for employment and earnings. The study used multi-armed random assignment. Everything I'm going to discuss today assumes random assignment. In my opinion and the opinion of a technical expert panel that considered the issues, random assignment is far superior to anything else for evaluating REA or RESEA. And it is feasible. Finally, anything else requires even larger sample sizes.

The study conducted random assignment in four states: Indiana, New York, Washington, and Wisconsin. And the sample size was huge – nearly 250,000 UI claimants were randomized. We will see that even those samples were not large enough for some research questions.

Finally, before I go to the body of the webinar, I want to discuss a few technical terms that you'll hear me use, and that you'll also see described in evaluation studies. You may want to refer back to this slide if helpful as the presentation progresses. The first technical term is statistical significance. Statistical significance indicates that a finding is unlikely to occur by chance. If an impact estimate of a well-conducted study is statistically significant, that indicates confidence that differences in outcomes reflect a real impact rather than a difference that occurred by chance.

The second technical term is "detect" impact. If an intervention has an effect on an outcome, then being able to detect that impact means the study has a large enough sample to produce an estimate of that impact that is statistically significant. For an RESEA intervention to obtain a high or moderate rating of causal effectiveness, studies must have detected statistically significant impacts of that intervention.

My talk has two parts. First I'll talk about the results of the study for the four types of research questions it considered. Second I'll talk about the implications of the study for appropriate sample sizes. Spoiler alert: appropriate sample sizes are large.

For each of the four research questions I'm going to try to answer three questions. Why care – why should we care about the results of this research question? How studied – what methods did we use to address this research question? And findings – what did we learn about this research question?

OK. Let's get started considering each of the four research questions in turn.

For whole programs we care because we want to know if the program works and how big a difference it makes. That's what we call impact. For REA and for RESEA the main outcomes of interest are called out in the RESEA statute – UI weeks Q2 employment and earnings.

To estimate the impact of the whole program, the natural approach is random assignment. For all otherwise eligible UI claimants, flip a coin. Heads you get REA, tails you don't. We don't really flip a coin. You may not want half and half. But we need to use some other random process. Then compare outcomes for those selected for REA to outcomes for those not selected for REA. Those selected and not selected only differ by the result of a coin toss and whether or not they got the program. Therefore, any difference in outcomes must be due to the program or statistical noise. More on that in the second part of the talk. In this, random assignment is much better than any other approach to estimating impact. For any other approach we need to worry that any difference in outcomes might be due to preexisting differences in those selected versus those not selected. Maybe those methods don't really estimate impact that they don't properly control.

Our estimates clearly demonstrate that REA decreases UI weeks. You can see that by the green arrows that point down. It's true for the first row, which is the pooled estimate across all four states, and for the individual states alone, Indiana, New York, Washington, Wisconsin, in the last four rows. Furthermore, these results are statistically significant; that is, the margin of error does not include no impact. We show that the margin of error does not include no impact and the result is statistically significant with the stars and the green arrows. Three or even two stars would be enough for CLEAR to give these estimates a high causal evidence rating. And in fact you'll see that for the pooled estimates at the top and for the estimates for each of the four states, each of those estimates has three stars and that would be enough for a high causal evidence rate.

On the previous slide we argued that REA decreases UI weeks in all four states. But we also showed that the estimates vary widely across the states. In some states the impact is about half a week, and in other states the impact is more than a week and a half. Often even though the estimates vary, the margins of error overlap. In that case we can't really be sure which state has a larger impact. That's not true here. In this case for our study, because the sample is large enough, we can be sure that some of the impacts are larger than others.

It would be nice to know why some states have larger impacts than others. We will see that knowing why would also be really helpful with determining the appropriate sample size. The report includes some non-experimental analyses suggesting that response to non-attendance matters; that is, that impacts are larger for states that adopt suspend until attend. I'm not going to go into that here; see the report.

The previous slides considered impacts on UI weeks. The study also shows that REA increases Q2, that is the second full quarter after initial claim employment, by about 2 percentage points, PP on the slide because I'm running out of space. In words, that means that employment rises from 67.4 percent to 69.4 percent. This is detectable impact, but it's not huge. There are also impacts on earnings in the year after initial claim, a little less than $500, which is about a 2 percent increase in earnings over that year after initial claim. Again that's a detectable impact, but it's not huge. Because these impacts are not huge, detecting them is hard. Even with our large samples, looking at each state alone, we would only have detected impacts in two of the states, but not in the other two. More on that below, but for now just remember: detecting impacts on employment earnings requires even larger samples than detecting impacts on UI weeks.

The report thinks about the impacts on weeks of UI and on earnings together, and infers that roughly half of the decrease in UI weeks is more employment. The other half is people neither working nor receiving UI. I choose the phrasing roughly half deliberately. It's quite rough, but the basic story is right. Far from every week of decreased UI is an increased week of employment.

Research question A considered the overall impact of the program. For a program manager, that's not actionable information. You have to run the program. You want to know how to run it better. Research question B was, what is the impact of a component of a program. Answering that question could provide actual information. We can think of REA or RESEA programs as being made up of components. We might then ask, how would impact change if we added, deleted, or changed some component.

The REA impact study considered one component, multiple REA meetings versus a single REA meeting. I'm going to use it as an example of component. As Megan noted, there are lots of other possible components that you might study. The advantages of random assignment for evaluating whole programs carry over to evaluating components, and the same basic strategy applies. To evaluate a component, among those selected for REA, flip a coin. Heads you get REA with the component; tails you get REA without the component. Outcomes can only differ because of a component and change.

The REA impact study considered multiple versus single REA meetings; that is, the additional component tested was additional meeting. Impacts were mixed. In one state multiple meetings decreased UI weeks, but not in the other state. Non-experimental analysis suggests that the difference is that in one state almost everyone still on UI was called in for a second and even a third REA meeting. In the other state only claimants that case workers thought would benefit were called in. In practice not a lot of them were called in. This finding raised important external validity issues. It will not always be true that a finding in California will also apply in Maine, or choose your favorite pair of states. Also in neither state did we detect an impact of multiple meetings on Q2 employment. We think that's because we didn't have enough sample. If this was a song, "because we didn't have enough sample" might be the repeated chorus. More on that in the second part of the webinar.

Another actionable type of information would be who benefits more. If you knew which UI claimants would have larger impacts, you might choose to serve them. Look to resources where they are most useful.

Again, random assignment is the ideal method. Randomly assigned UI claimants with a range of characteristics, not just the claims for whom you're sure the program had larger impact. See which groups the program really had larger impacts; when the sources are limited, serve them, end of story.

The REA impact study found larger impacts on UI weeks for those with lower earnings and lower UI benefits will serve them. We also looked at the profile score, the probability of exhausting benefits. We did not find that impacts were large for those with higher profile score. This result was potentially important. Many states focus REA and now RESEA on those with high profile scores. These results suggest that that strategy may not have the largest impact. The study did not detect the differential impact on Q2 employment. Again, we think that was because the samples were not large enough – same repeated chorus

At a higher level, if we understood how the program generates its impact, we might be able use those insights for program design.

Understanding how REA generates its impacts was the primary goal of this study. We conceptualized REA as working through a combination of three pathways: assistance, eligibility, and attendance.

We call the first causal pathway assistance, that is conventional job search assistance. Examples would include developing a reemployment plan, workshops, and specific job leads. This is the "reemployment" in the REA program name and the "reemployment services" in the RESEA program names.

We call the second causal pathway eligibility; that is, does REA leads detecting more eligibility issues usually able and available, and insufficiently intensive job search. This is the "eligibility assessment" in the program names.

We call the third causal pathway attendance; that is, a program requires you to attend a meeting. Attendance is the impact of being required to attend the meeting above and beyond the assistance and eligibility provided at the meeting.

Through a range of analyses, the evaluation tried to understand the relative importance of these three causal pathways. Details are in the report. At a high level, we found the following.

Our analysis suggests that more than half of the impact of REA on UI weeks arises from enforcing the requirement to attend the meeting. Selected claimants often don't attend. In some cases their benefits are suspended. The sure, swifter, and more substantial the penalty for non-attendance, the larger will be the impact on UI weeks. Eligibility appears to have a small impact. We compared non-monetary determinations for those selected and not selected, not a lot of difference. The rest is assistance. We infer that it matters, but it is not the main pathway. This is all for UI weeks. Samples were not large enough to learn anything about causal pathways or employment or earnings – again, that repeated chorus.

Summing up, most of the impact is through attendance; some is through assistance; little is through eligibility.

We just finished the first part of the webinar. We reviewed REA study findings. We're now ready to talk about the second part of the webinar, implications for sample sizes. You can guess what's coming. It's been the repeated chorus in the first part of the webinar. All four research questions are important. Answering them requires large samples, especially for employment and earnings.

The REA impact study had very large samples, in each state roughly 20,000 UI claimants for each comparison. For some comparisons we had much larger samples. And we still often did not detect impact. For all four states, we detected whole program impact on UI weeks. For only two of the four states did we detect whole program impacts on Q2 employment. Detection rates were even worse for components in differential impact. Sometimes we detected impacts on UI weeks; we never detected impacts for Q2 employment. We think the issue here is almost always sample size. There really are impacts; it's just the 20,000 UI claimants was not enough to detect them.

I touched on these issues at the beginning of the webinar. For state RESEA evaluation, the goal was to demonstrate impact. In practice that means we need to show statistical significance. No estimated impact is exactly true. As with an election poll there is a margin of error. CLEAR gives an RESEA intervention a high rating if less than 5 percent of the time the result will be due to chance. In table of the results, this is usually signaled with two or three stars. For example, see the arrows in the slides at the beginning of the talk. CLEAR gives an RESEA intervention a moderate rating if less than 10 percent of the time the result will be due to chance. In tables or graphs that is usually signaled with one star. In CLEAR, intervention causal ratings are also represented by the thermometer icon shown here in the slide.

There are two key challenges. First, figure out how many UI claimants you need to randomly assign to detect impacts. Second, finding that many claimants so you can randomize them. The REA impact study provides key insights, what are likely impacts, and how large a sample is needed to detect those impacts.

For RESEA, demonstrating effectiveness requires detecting a statistically significant impact on both UI weeks and Q2 employment. The REA impact study results show that samples to demonstrate effectiveness are smaller for UI weeks and much larger for Q2 employment. In what follows we focus on Q2 employment. If you have enough sample to detect an impact on Q2 employment, you certainly have enough sample for UI weeks.

Smaller projected impacts have larger appropriate samples. Not just a little larger, a lot larger. Cut the projected true impact in half, you quadruple the appropriate sample size. So whenever possible, test things with larger likely impact. Of course we don't know the impact. That's why we're doing the evaluation. The REA impact study helps your evaluator to project plausible impacts. With that information, your evaluator can estimate appropriate sample sizes.

The next few slides give some sample size numbers. It is important to understand that there is no magic or required number. The larger the sample, the more likely you are to detect a statistically significant impact. Conversely, the smaller the sample, the less likely you are to detect an impact. Given that the goal is to demonstrate effectiveness, you probably want to sample even larger than the numbers that follow.

The REA impact study samples were not small. For whole programs the samples ranged from 16,000 to more than 100,000. Those samples were enough to detect impacts on UI weeks in all four states.

The situation was different for the other statutory outcome, Q2 employment. For Q2 employment, the study only detected impact for two of the four states.

More careful study of the results for the four states and more formal analysis suggests the key issue is the size of true impact. Estimated impacts vary by a factor of three, 0.7 percentage points in Washington to 2.6 percentage points in Indiana. The math implies that appropriate sample sizes therefore vary by a factor of nine. That's a problem because we don't know true impact; that's why we're doing the evaluation.

The takeaway from this analysis is that if you have a larger impact, the sample of about 10,000 is probably a larger enough sample. In most states that should be feasible. On the other hand, if you have a smaller impact, a sample of more than 50,000 is probably appropriate. In most states that's likely to be challenging. In net, you probably should not assume that you have larger impact. You probably need to proceed assuming you don't have really small impacts either. Thus you probably need to proceed looking for something near small impacts, perhaps about 50,000 UI claimants to be randomized.

The previous slides considered whole program. That analysis suggests the appropriate sample sizes range from 10,000 to more than 50,000. Appropriate samples for components and differential impacts are several times larger. For components a key issue is impacts relative to whole program impact. In particular, is your component a big part of the overall program or a small part. For these purposes, our multiple meetings component was probably somewhere in between. All in all, the implied sample sizes are not small and sometimes they're huge. Details matter. To work through these issues get help from someone, an evaluator who has done this before, and who has thought deeply about these issues. This isn't rocket science but it's close.

The previous slides have suggested that we need big samples, often huge samples. How might we actually get big enough samples? So this slide includes four possible strategies. The first strategy would be for components to evaluate a big intervention; that is, an intervention which likely has a large impact. Second strategy is to randomize nearly every RESEA eligible UI claimant. Don't limit who you randomize to only part of the state or people who you think will benefit. The more people you randomize, the larger your sample. This is especially true for differential impact. You want to randomize people, even the ones who you think may not have large impacts. If you don't randomize them, you can't figure out what their impacts were. The third strategy is to continue randomization for several years, because every year your sample will get larger. And then finally, the fourth strategy is to pool samples with other states that have similar programs or are interested in evaluating similar components.

Many people find these sample sizes surprising. I know I did the first few times I saw them. People see these sample sizes and say, what do you mean, a few thousand people seems like a huge sample. Our experience with the REA impact study strongly suggests otherwise. There are lots of important research questions which a sample of many tens of thousands or more would be appropriate. Among those research questions is the RESEA statutes research question, what is the impact of the state's RESEA program on Q2 employment. When you attempted to skimp on sample sizes, ask yourself, how will I feel in several years after considerable expense if we do not detect the impact of an intervention that is truly effective simply because we didn't have a large enough sample?

Figuring out appropriate sample sizes is crucial and hard. This webinar is only a start. Get an experienced evaluator, one with experience with this type of study, random assignment evaluation of interventions for UI claimant. Work closely with them, both to figure out what an appropriate sample is and how to get that sample.

Throughout, remember: no one ever thought they had too much sample.

So the first part of this webinar reviewed the findings of the REA impact study for the four research questions, whole programs, components, differential impact, and causal pathways. Chorus of that discussion was probably because not enough sample size. Then the second part of the webinar shared some insights about appropriate sample size. Choosing an appropriate sample size is not rocket science, but it's close. The most important state action is to select and then work closely with an appropriate evaluator; that is, an evaluator with deep experience with similar evaluation, in particular the issues involved in jointly choosing research questions and appropriate sample sizes.

Now, I'll turn things back to Megan.

MEGAN LIZIK: Thank you, Jacob. I'll now take a few minutes to summarize some of the key findings and considerations.

First, this study found that REA programs are effective. With this study's huge sample size and significant findings, it provides compelling evidence that this program's effectiveness in reducing UI duration and increasing employment and earnings outcomes, more so than any other study conducted to date. It also found that while all three of REA's program components contributed to its impact, attending the meeting drove the impact the most. Some of the impact comes from the assistance of job search and referrals to reemployment services provided at the meeting, and little of the impact appears to come from the enforcement of UI's ongoing eligibility requirements.

Finally, as I mentioned earlier, and as discussed in greater detail in the REA impact study's implementation report, the REA interventions examined in this impact study were low-intensity; at most, a few hours of group engagement and a few hours of one-on-one counseling. As such these REA programs had a low direct cost of about $100 per UI claimant and generally would not be expected to generate large impact. Because they were low-cost and low-intensity however, you'd expect them to have modest impacts, and detecting modest impacts requires a very large sample.

The REA impact study discussed today and Jacob's discussion of implications provides insights into the general range of sample sizes needed to detect outcomes, like UI duration, and employment, and earnings, as well as the sample size needed to test the impact of a program component. For those of you conducting impact studies, these insights will be useful to your independent evaluators as they calculate the sample sizes needed to successfully conduct your evaluation. This study also found that while generating large samples was challenging, it was feasible.

Jacob's talk today and the reports from this study suggest several implications for how RESEA evaluations might generate adequate samples such as by conducting whole program evaluations rather than evaluations on program components alone, by pooling sample across multiple states, and by conducting random assignment for more than one year.

Finally, this REA study also implies a few strategies that may improve the future success of similar impact studies such as using random assignment which requires smaller sample sizes and quasi-experimental design; using administrative data to measure outcomes; using a consortia-type model where several states participate in an evaluation that's able to access larger samples by pooling; and finally, providing evaluation technical assistance to participating sites all along the way.

When thinking about your RESEA program and evaluation considerations, there are various factors about this REA study's context that should be taken into account, such as the economy and labor market conditions. This study was conducted from 2014 through 2019, a time when there was a strong labor market and low unemployment. Under those kinds of conditions many people are able to get jobs. Some may not have claimed UI or may not be claiming UI, not because they are employed, but for other reasons. But in a slower labor market, getting a job could be more challenging for those out of work. You may wish to design your RESEA program to focus more or less on certain program components accordingly.

And of course no single study makes it evidence-based. You'll want to be thoughtful to look not just at the results and interventions studied in this REA evaluation, but for multiple studies, when choosing what evidence to inform your program design. You can find studies in the RESEA evidence based summarized and linked to on careers RESEA topic area tab. This also underscores many of the insights and strategies we've been sharing with you over the course of our RESEA Evaluation TA webinar series. As you select evidence to inform the design of your RESEA programs, and as you consider evaluating those programs, you'll want to consider what evidence is available, what it says, what your current context and learning needs are, and where your study can fill gaps in the evidence base.

If you begin an impact study, remember the importance of conducting high quality implementation evaluations alongside your impact studies, so you know how the intervention you're studying was designed and implemented. The REA impact study we discussed today saw impacts vary across states. Implementation studies can help interpret findings like this variation from impact studies, and shed light on promising components or features of programs that could be replicated in future programs and further tested to build evidence of effectiveness.

Finally I'd like to revisit three steps to improve impact study success which you've seen several times throughout our Evaluation TA webinar series. First, use an academically rigorous design like random assignment. Second, take time to do the up front planning necessary to have a clear idea of how big a sample you need to answer your research questions and say something about your program's impacts. You don't want to be in a place where you invest time and resources to do an impact study, and it can't tell if there were impacts because the sample is too small. This could sometimes be misinterpreted as the program not being found effective or not working, when that's absolutely not the case. You won't know unless your sample size is appropriate to answer the research question that you have.

Finally states are encouraged to work with experienced evaluators on your RESEA evaluations. Remember, experienced evaluators conduct complex studies like the ones you may be thinking about all the time. They have specialized experience and expertise in research methods, calculating sample sizes, statistical analysis, data collection, protection of human subjects, and more. Regardless of whether your state is conducting your RESEA evaluation or overseeing a contractor conducting the evaluation, state staff administering your RESEA program, staff involved for the labor market information, and other technical staff, have knowledge and expertise that will be critical to the success of your evaluation.

Now I'll turn things over to Larry to wrap up today's webinar.

LAWRENCE BURNS: Thanks, Megan. DOL's Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research is adding this new REA study, and in fact four new study profile summaries to its database. There'll be one profile summary for each of the four contrasts or types of treatment examined by the study that Megan and Jacob mentioned earlier. Each study contrast has received a high causal evidence rating by CLEAR, meaning this new study provides very credible evidence, and you can have a lot of confidence in its findings. This rating is represented by the gas gauge icon shown on this slide and won't change. For now, the interventions examined by the new REA study will be added to the REA intervention category and assigned a high intervention causal evidence rating, represented by the thermometer icon shown here.

However when CLEAR conducts its next RESEA systematic evidence review, this study and all other new causal evidence will inform possible changes to the existing RESEA intervention categories and ratings. That isn't expected to happen for a few years, but the intervention rating could change at that time. Look for these new study summaries and ratings in CLEAR's RESEA topic area tab.

Additionally we plan to hold a follow up webinar in a few months to hear from a few states about their experiences on this evaluation, and take questions about the REA impact study, and implications for RESEA. Look for this webinar in the summer of 2020. And finally, our evaluation TA team is working on a plan to deliver more evaluation technical assistance over the next several months. If you need immediate assistance, you can contact DOL's RESEA evaluation team at the help line address shown here, RESEA@abtassoc.com.

Now I'll share where you can access resources to learn more.

Here you can find links to all the publicly available reports on DOL's REA implementation and impact studies, which are posted on DOL's chief evaluation office website. We've also shared the link to the WorkforceGPS landing page, where you can find all of the webinars posted as part of the Evaluation TA webinar series. The other links here will take you to resources that provide additional information about the RESEA evidence base, as well as tips for planning and conducting impact evaluations.

We really appreciate all of you listening to this webinar. This slide lists the contact information for the speakers that you heard from, as well as the RESEA evaluation TA help line, RESEA@abtassoc.com.

Thank you again. This concludes this webcast.