

## Appendix A: OPRE's HPOG Research and Evaluation Strategy

Seven related HPOG research and evaluation projects are designed to identify what types of approaches work well in achieving the goals of HPOG, and in what circumstances and for whom they work, so they can be replicated in the future. The projects are as follows:

- **HPOG Implementation, Systems, and Outcome (ISO) Evaluation Design and Performance Reporting.** The HPOG ISO project has two parts. The first developed an evaluation plan for measuring the implementation, systems change, and outcomes of HPOG programs, including enrollment, program retention, training completion, job entry, employment retention and advancement, and earnings. The second built and maintains the HPOG Performance Reporting System (PRS), a management information system, to track grantee progress for program management and accountability and to record participant data for use in the evaluation.
- **HPOG National Implementation Evaluation (NIE).** The HPOG NIE is the execution of the study devised in the ISO evaluation plan (above). The NIE includes an in-depth examination of HPOG grantee program design and implementation, a systems analysis of networks created by HPOG programs (e.g., among grantees, employers, and other partners), and a quantitative descriptive analysis of HPOG program outputs and outcomes. Twenty-seven grantees—excluding the five tribal organizations—are included in this analysis.
- **HPOG Impact study.** The HPOG Impact study uses an experimental design to examine the effect of the HPOG program on participants' educational and economic outcomes. This evaluation aims to identify which components of HPOG programs (e.g., types of support services, program structure, and training areas) contribute to participant success. For some grantees, a multi-arm experimental design will be implemented, creating a control group that will not have access to HPOG, an "HPOG service as usual" treatment group, and an "enhanced HPOG" group that will receive additional supports and services. The 20 grantees that are not part of the Tribal evaluation, University Partnership Research Grants, or PACE evaluation are included in the HPOG Impact study.
- **Evaluation of Tribal HPOG.** A separate evaluation has been designed for the five tribal grantees, given the unique contexts in which these programs operate. This evaluation focuses on the implementation and outcomes for the tribal grantees.
- **Pathways for Advancing Careers and Education (PACE).** The PACE evaluation, formerly known as ISIS, is a nine-program experimental study of promising career pathway programs. Three HPOG grantees are included in the PACE study.
- **University Partnership Research Grants for HPOG.** These studies are being conducted by research partners at universities that have partnered with one or more HPOG programs to answer specific questions about how to improve HPOG services within local contexts.
- **Career Pathways Intermediate Outcomes (CPIO) study.** CPIO is analyzing the outcomes at 36 months after intake of participants in the HPOG Impact study and the PACE project. CPIO extends by almost two years the period in which participants can complete education and training activities and make progress in their careers and includes analysis of the intermediate steps (measured at 15 months) on participant outcomes and the effects of program participation on participants' children.

These research components are being coordinated to avoid duplication of effort, maximize the usefulness of collected data, reduce burden on grantees participating in the federal evaluation activities, meet performance management requirements, and promote cross-project learning.

Abt Associates, in collaboration with the Urban Institute, is conducting the ISO, NIE, Impact, and CPIO studies. NORC at the University of Chicago is conducting the evaluation of tribal HPOG, in partnership with Red Star Innovations and the National Indian Health Board. Abt Associates is conducting the PACE project. Five university research institutions are leading the University Partnership Research Grants: the Institute for Policy Research at Northwestern University, the School of Social Work at Temple University, the Institute on Assets and Social Policy at Brandeis University, the School of Social Work at Loyola University Chicago, and North Dakota State University.

## Appendix B: NIE Data Collection

### Introduction

The NIE Descriptive Implementation and Outcome Studies relied on both primary and secondary data sources. The main sources of primary data for the Descriptive Implementation Study are: 1) a series of surveys of key informants knowledgeable about various aspects of HPOG Program design, implementation, administration and community context; and 2) the HPOG Performance Reporting System (PRS) for data on program services and participant characteristics, program experiences, and outcomes.

The NIE surveys include:<sup>1</sup>

#### Grantee Survey

The Grantee survey was designed to collect comprehensive and comparable data across all grantee programs using primarily closed-form questions. Data gathered included contextual factors, program administration, and program components, including intake and pre-training and training courses or workshops, program activities and support services. The domains covered by the Grantee survey are present in Exhibit B-1.

## Exhibit B-1. Domains Covered by the Grantee Survey

<b>Program Context and Administration</b>
Grantee/site and program information <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Grantee perspective on pre-HPOG healthcare sectoral training opportunities</li><li>Grantee institutional background and experience with similar populations and programs</li><li>Grantee partner networks (including variations by site)</li><li>Target populations for HPOG</li></ul>
Program administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Administrative organization, including staffing structure and backgrounds</li><li>Service delivery structure, including use of other agency services and contracted service providers</li></ul>
<b>Intake and Program Activities and Services</b>
Intake and enrollment activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Outreach and recruitment</li><li>Eligibility and intake</li></ul>
Comprehensive assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Academic assessments</li><li>Non-academic assessments</li></ul>
Core curriculum <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Pre-training offerings<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Basic skills instruction</li><li>Academic prerequisite</li><li>Vocational training</li></ul></li><li>Structure and delivery of core curriculum (career pathways principles)<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Modularization</li><li>Acceleration</li><li>Flexible delivery</li></ul></li></ul>
Academic and non-academic supports <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Case management</li><li>Academic supports and counseling</li><li>Personal supports and counseling</li><li>Social supports</li><li>Financial supports</li><li>Other support services</li></ul>
Employer connections <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Employer involvement in HPOG</li><li>Work-based learning</li><li>Job development strategies</li></ul>

### Management and Staff Survey

Social policy research has long maintained that the perspective of human services workers who interact directly with clients is a major factor in determining the shape and results of policy and program implementation.<sup>2</sup> The Management and Staff survey was focused on HPOG personnel who interact with participants either directly or by supervising those who do. It collected close-ended responses to questions about worker responsibilities, activities, frequency and nature of contact with HPOG participants, and attitudes and beliefs about the goals and efficacy of the HPOG Program and the prospects for its participants. The domains covered by the Management and Staff survey are present in Exhibit B-2.

## Exhibit B-2. Domains Covered by the Management and Staff Survey

<b>Professional Background and Experience</b>
Demographic characteristics Educational and professional background Relevant professional experience and job tenure
<b>Job Quality</b>
Opinions about job quality Professional development opportunities Staff stability/turnover
<b>Program Responsibilities, Activities and Services</b>
Management/supervisory responsibilities Administrative and programmatic responsibilities Recruitment, intake, and enrollment responsibilities Case management and counseling responsibilities Participant involvement and monitoring Frequency of contact with participants
<b>Management and Staff Beliefs and Opinions</b>
Beliefs and opinions about program goals and efficacy Beliefs and opinions about participant prospects

## Stakeholder/Network Survey

A critical element in understanding the social, political, and economic context in which HPOG programs are implemented is their relationship to the network of groups and institutions partnering with HPOG grantees and with an interest in training and hiring low-income workers in the health professions. To understand stakeholder roles in implementing and cooperating with HPOG, the NIE fielded a Stakeholder/Network survey to institutions identified as “partners” or “stakeholders.” Survey respondents included one or more individuals at the partner and stakeholder organizations who are well informed about collaboration among network stakeholders, as well as their respective organization’s experiences and views regarding the HPOG program’s implementation and effectiveness. The major survey domains are listed in Exhibit B-3.

## Exhibit B-3. Domains of the Stakeholder/Network Survey

Organizational characteristics Respondent/HPOG grantee or program relationship HPOG program engagement/involvement Resources accessible by HPOG programs HPOG stakeholder/partner communication HPOG network collaboration
---

## Employer Survey<sup>3</sup>

The success of HPOG grantees ultimately depends on their ability to meet healthcare employers’ needs and hiring standards. As employers are the end users of HPOG services, their perspectives on the programs provide important insights about the extent to which those emerging from training fully meet their expectations. The NIE fielded a survey intended to collect information about relevant local employers’ knowledge of, interactions with, and opinions about the HPOG Program and its participants,

as well as about local hiring needs and standards. The survey targeted two types of employers based on the nature of their involvement with HPOG:

- Employers who are part of the partnership network and may have been involved in HPOG design, development, and implementation.
- Employers not directly involved as partners but active in hiring HPOG graduates or who have been contacted by the program as potential employers of HPOG participants.

The major domains covered in the Employer survey are listed in Exhibit B-4.

**Exhibit B-4. Domains of the Employer Survey**

<p>Employer-specific experiences and practices with respect to hiring healthcare professionals, including:</p> <p>What is the most common healthcare position for which you have hired in the past two years?</p> <p>How have you typically identified the workers you have hired for this position?</p> <p>Would you say it is easy, somewhat challenging, or very challenging to find qualified applicants for this healthcare position at the present time?</p> <p>How important are certificates of training completion when considering hiring someone who has received job related skill training?</p>
<p>Employers' awareness of and involvement with HPOG, including:</p> <p>During the past two years, did your organization hire any healthcare workers referred by [HPOG grantee institution]?</p> <p>Has your organization had previous experience with job applicants referred by [HPOG grantee institution], for instance, through internships, clinical assignments, job shadowing or other training activities that your organization hosted?</p> <p>How would you rate your overall experience working with [HPOG grantee institution] in placing individuals in jobs in your organization?</p>
<p>Employers perceptions of the HPOG training program, including:</p> <p>Is program effectively meeting area healthcare labor needs?</p> <p>Is program effectively producing graduates with the healthcare skills needed?</p> <p>Have people in your organization have been satisfied with the job-readiness of [name of grantee institution] participants?</p>

**HPOG Performance Reporting System (PRS)**

The other primary data source for the NIE Descriptive Implementation and Outcome studies is the HPOG PRS. The PRS was designed to serve two related purposes: 1) a management information system for documenting program activities and accomplishments against program goals and assisting with program management, and 2) a source of data for research purposes.

The PRS is the main data source for the characteristics of program participants as well as a record of their participation in HPOG activities and services and their outputs and outcomes. It has been in operation since September 30, 2011, and therefore does not include all data on all participants from the first year of HPOG program services.<sup>4</sup> A range of participant socioeconomic and demographic characteristics are entered into the PRS at the time of program intake. As individuals enroll in HPOG, engage in program activities, and receive services, grantee staff record participant service receipt, outputs, and outcomes in individual-level records in the PRS.<sup>5</sup> Finally, the PRS records individuals' program completion and employment status at program exit and at six months following exit.<sup>6</sup>

While the PRS is primarily a participant-level database, it also contains some descriptive information about each grantee's organization and service delivery structure, including available services and training courses, service delivery vendors, and specific service delivery sites. A summary listing of the data available from the PRS is included as Exhibit B-5.

## Exhibit B-5. Summary of Data Available from the PRS

<b>Grantee and Program Information</b>
Grantee information (name, location, institutional type)
Local program/service delivery sites
Available education and training services <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Occupation training type (Standard Occupational Code [SOC])</li><li>Vendor/provider of the training or education</li><li>Total hours required (length/duration)</li><li>Educational credential opportunities</li><li>Licensure/certification opportunities</li><li>Semi-annual Program Performance Reports (PPRs) (grant implementation milestones, outputs, and outcomes)</li></ul>
<b>Participant Information</b>
Identifying information (name, date of birth, social security number, contact information)
Administrative information <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Program site</li><li>Case manager</li></ul>
Characteristics at intake/enrollment <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Demographic characteristics (sex, race/ethnicity, marital status, parental status, citizenship, tribal status, veteran status, homeless status, disability status, ex-offender status)</li><li>Socioeconomic characteristics (receipt of public assistance, education level, literacy and numeracy, employment status, employment experience, healthcare employment experience, incumbent worker status, earnings, family income)</li></ul>
Record of basic skills instruction/pre-training activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Courses/workshops enrolled</li><li>Duration and completion status</li><li>Provider</li></ul>
Record of occupational/vocational training activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Occupation by SOC</li><li>Intensity, duration and completion status</li><li>Provider</li></ul>
Record of employment activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Job-readiness workshops</li><li>Internships, apprenticeships, work-study placements</li><li>Duration (including hours completed)</li></ul>
Record of support services <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Training/education-related support services</li><li>Counseling (academic, career, personal)</li><li>Personal/family services (provided or referred)</li><li>Case management</li><li>Cultural programming</li><li>Work-retention services</li></ul>
Record of assessments
Outputs and outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Training/education completed</li><li>Educational credentials/degrees received</li><li>Professional licenses/certifications received</li><li>Employment, earnings, and healthcare occupational status at program exit and six months following exit</li></ul>

## Secondary Data Sources

The NIE Descriptive Implementation and Outcome studies used data from several secondary data sources, including:

- Notes from research site visits conducted for the HPOG Impact Study—In part because the Descriptive Implementation Study findings are based largely on close-ended measures, the study used some qualitative information from the HPOG Impact Study site visits to programs implemented by 20 of the 27 grantees to add nuance to the data and provide concrete examples of program operations and design. The notes are from visits conducted between May and August 2014.
- Quarterly earnings data from the National Directory of New Hires (NDNH)—These data provide uniform and reliable information on participants' employment and earnings. The NDNH is maintained by the ACF Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE). The NDNH provides quarterly earnings from state Unemployment Insurance (UI) records, including data from some employers not included in the UI program (e.g., the federal government).<sup>7</sup>

An advantage of the NDNH data is their accuracy. Relative to self-reports by individuals or program staff found in the PRS, these administrative data come directly from mandatory employer reports as part of the UI system, so they have a high degree of accuracy and coverage and provide data in a consistent format. A disadvantage of the data is that they do not contain information on hourly wages or hours worked, industry or occupation of job, nor information on employer benefits. Despite the lack of these data elements, access to the NDNH data for this evaluation greatly enhances the NIE's ability to answer the research questions on participant outcomes.

- Other federal government data—For contextual information on local HPOG program labor market trends, the studies used the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Occupational Employment Statistics. The NIE used those data to analyze local labor market trends in hiring and wages for healthcare industry workers.

## NIE Survey Sampling Frame Process

In fall 2013, designated liaisons at each of the 49 programs completed a sampling questionnaire in which they listed: all managers and staff who interacted regularly and directly with HPOG participants in the context of service delivery, such as case managers, academic or career counselors, or program managers who meet regularly with participants;<sup>8</sup> all organizations that they considered to be partners or stakeholders in their HPOG program; and area employers that had hired HPOG participants or had been contacted by the program about hiring participants. For every organization reported, HPOG program staff provided a point of contact along with their title and contact information.

To identify all members of the HPOG program network, research staff then conducted telephone follow-up with each formal partner identified by the program operators. Formal partners were asked to identify and provide contact information for any additional organizations that had helped plan or implement their local HPOG program, along with any stakeholders who were not directly involved. These two data collection efforts—the sampling questionnaire and the follow-up protocol—provided the comprehensive list of all partners and stakeholders in each of the 49 program networks.

## NIE Survey Fielding and Results

The Grantee, Management and Staff, Stakeholder/Network, and Employer surveys were fielded in winter 2013-2014. Exhibit B-6 provides a description of each survey, dates they were fielded, the number of surveys fielded and the number of completed surveys by type.

**Exhibit B-6. NIE Surveys: Fielding and Response Rates<sup>9</sup>**

Survey	Description	Fielding Dates	Surveys Fielded	Surveys Completed & Included in Analysis	Response Rates
Grantee Survey	Web-based survey sent to designated informants at 49 program operators.	November 2013 – March 2014	49	49	100%
Management and Staff Survey	Web-based survey sent to managers and staff who interact with participants in 49 programs.	November 2013 – January 2014	358	321	90%
Stakeholder/Network Survey	Web-based survey sent to organizations identified by program operators and their formal partners as involved in or relevant to their HPOG programs*	December 2013 – March 2014	810	472	58%
Employer Survey	Telephone and web-based survey fielded to employers that had been targeted for hiring participants but played no other program role.	February – April 2014	266	132	50%
Stakeholder/Network and Employer Survey	Web survey, a longer version of the Stakeholder/Network Survey that included supplemental questions from the Employer Survey, sent to organizations identified by program operators as both potential employers of participants and program partners.	December 2013 – March 2014	42	16	38%

*Note:* An error in survey fielding required follow up with a portion of survey respondents to ensure that complete surveys were fielded. Survey questions that had been omitted in error from 104 surveys were collected separately in January and February 2014. In 15 cases, the omitted items were unable to be recovered.

## PRS Data and Sample

The primary participant-level data used for the NIE Outcome Study are from the HPOG PRS. All those data were drawn from the PRS on October 1, 2014 for HPOG participants who had given consent to have their unidentified data used for HPOG research. The Outcome Study analyzed multiple PRS subsamples, depending on the specific research question addressed. Most findings are based on a sample of 12,614 participants who enrolled between September 30, 2010 (the beginning of the HPOG Program), and April 1, 2013, for whom 18 months post enrollment can be observed. Depending on the specific research question being addressed, subsamples of this main sample are used as described in Exhibit B-7.

## Exhibit B-7. PRS Samples

PRS Sample	N
<b>Main sample used for analysis</b>	
Individuals enrolled in HPOG with at least 18 months post enrollment as of October 1, 2014.	12,614
<b>Subsamples of total main sample</b>	
Participated in healthcare training	10,660
Completed healthcare training	7,511
Completed healthcare training and exited HPOG	4,126
Completed healthcare training, exited HPOG and employed at exit	2,305
Did not complete healthcare training, exited HPOG	2,613
Did not complete healthcare training, exited HPOG and employed at exit	598

The study uses a PRS sample other than this main sample in two places in the report. The description of characteristics of HPOG program participants in section 3.4 uses the sample of all participants from the beginning of the program on September 30, 2010 through October 1, 2014 (23,633 participants). This sample is used to provide the most accurate picture to date of the composition of HPOG program participants.

The second place an alternate PRS sample is used is in calculating the number of HPOG participants for whom a specific program activity or service was available, reported on in sections 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.4, 6.3, and 6.5. For analyses in each of these sections, the sample is the average monthly number of participants enrolled in HPOG between October 1, 2013 and September 30, 2014 (13,086 participants). This time period corresponds to the period over which grantees reported on program components in the NIE Grantee survey. This sample is also used to calculate HPOG program grant expenditures in section 2.2.3.

### NDNH Data and Sample

The major data source for participant employment and earnings outcomes is the NDNH. The study uses NDNH quarterly earnings data for individuals in the main PRS analysis sample. The sample is 12,521.<sup>10</sup> At the time of the analysis for this study in the fourth quarter of 2014, NDNH quarterly data were available from the fourth quarter of 2009 through the second quarter of 2014. This is due to data lags in posting state UI quarterly earnings data to the NDNH. For all sample participants, we have at least four quarters of data prior to their quarter of enrollment and at least six quarters of data after their quarter of enrollment. Because participants complete (or drop out of) training at different times after enrollment, analyses of employment and earnings by quarter after training completion (or dropping out) average together all participants with data available for each post-training quarter presented.

## Appendix C: Research Questions and Analytic Approach

As a step toward providing a national-level description of HPOG implementation, the Descriptive Implementation and Outcome studies developed a framework of high-level research questions organized by the concepts in the HPOG logic model. These questions include:

- **Contextual Factors**
  - **Program Operator.** What types of institutions administer HPOG grants and operate HPOG programs? What is their experience designing and operating healthcare training programs for low-income populations?
  - **Community Conditions.** What is the nature of the local healthcare markets in which HPOG operates? What local opportunities are there for low-income workers to train for careers in healthcare professions?
- **Program Administration**
  - **Service Delivery Framework.** How do programs use other community providers and resources in implementing HPOG? Who are HPOG Program partners? How is HPOG managed? How is HPOG staffed? What are the attitudes and opinions of HPOG management and staff about their roles and about the HPOG program?
  - **Resources.** How are HPOG grant funds used (e.g., what are grant expenditures per participant)?
- **Program Design and Components**
  - **Marketing and Recruitment.** What are the HPOG Program’s strategies for marketing HPOG and recruiting potential HPOG participants? What are the challenges to recruitment?
  - **Eligibility and Intake.** What are HPOG eligibility requirements? What is the application process for HPOG?
  - **Assessments.** What types of assessments are used by the HPOG program?
  - **Pre-Training Activities and Basic Skills Instruction.** Prior to vocational training, what activities are available to HPOG participants to help prepare them for post-secondary training in healthcare?
  - **Occupational Training.** What are the content, structure and delivery methods of the occupational training courses offered by HPOG grantee programs?
  - **Academic and Non-Academic Supports.** What academic counseling and supports are offered to HPOG participants? What non-academic supports are offered by HPOG? What financial support services for education and training are offered by HPOG? How is case management implemented?
  - **Employment Activities.** How does HPOG support job placement? How does HPOG support job retention?
  - **Fidelity to Career Pathways Principles.** To what degree and in what ways have HPOG grantees implemented programs incorporating the Career Pathways framework?

- **Program Participation**
  - **Participant Characteristics.** What are the relevant demographic characteristics of HPOG Program participants?
  - **Participation Patterns.** What support services do HPOG Program participants use? What are participation patterns in basic skills training and other pre-training activities? What are participation patterns in healthcare training courses? What are participation patterns in employment development activities?
  - **Participant Outputs and Outcomes.** How many participants complete one or more healthcare training courses? How many participants receive degrees, licenses or certificates? How many and which participants find employment? How many participants find employment in healthcare? What are the quarterly earnings and earnings growth of job finders?

## Analytic Approach and Summary Measures

The Descriptive Implementation and Outcome Study Report includes analysis at the national level, presenting data across all HPOG grantees and programs, or for specific subgroups of grantees and programs. To the extent feasible and appropriate, the study summarized and/or combined individual survey responses and other single-variable measures at the highest level needed to support the narrative account of how HPOG was designed and implemented.

## Units of Analysis

### Descriptive Implementation Study

The primary unit of analysis for most constructs and variables in the Descriptive Implementation Study is the program, defined as “a unique set of services, training courses and personnel.” “Program” is the major analytic unit because it is the nexus of policy and practice interfacing directly with program participants.

“Program” is the unit in which all the HPOG participants are offered the same range of services and training activities regardless of physical location. Grantees may have one or more program, depending on their configuration, particularly in regard to the number and nature of their partnerships. For some variables, notably contextual ones, both grantees and programs are the analytic units. Finally, where it is informative to present the distribution of measures within a construct across the HPOG participant population, the study reports those distributions, using the HPOG participant as the analytic unit (e.g., the number and percentage of individuals who have a particular program service, training course or other program component – such as full tuition assistance or tuition support, for example – available to them).

### Outcome Study

The main unit of analysis for the Outcome Study is the HPOG participant. Results are presented aggregating individuals’ characteristics, outputs and outcomes across grantees and programs. In some cases, additional information on the range of average outcomes across programs is presented to further illuminate results.

There may be interesting differences across programs that the aggregate is obscuring. Individual grantees and programs are not identified, but results are presented as the range of program-level results.

## Summary Measures

The Descriptive Implementation Study generally uses one of the three types of summary measures:

- **Means.** Some constructs or variables are summarized as means across all or a subset of grantees or programs. For example, the number of full-time and part-time case managers per program are presented as simple arithmetic means.
- **Frequencies.** When it is important to present the distribution across a range of values, the study reports frequencies. For example, when analyzing data about the number of training courses available in HPOG programs, the study presents the frequency of specific ranges of numbers of different training courses to allow for a clearer understanding of the variation across HPOG programs.
- **Composite Measures or Indices.** For some constructs, the study presents composite measures or indices. For example, when presenting information from survey items using Likert scales, the study exhibits often collapse scores within a given range.

## Appendix D: Additional Tables

**Exhibit D-1. Program Operator Institutional Type**

Institutional Type	Number	Percentage
Community or technical college (includes community college district)	23	47%
Workforce Investment Board (WIB)	10	20
Nonprofit (e.g., community or faith-based) service/training provider	9	18
One-Stop career center	2	4
State government agency	2	4
Other	3	6

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q1.1.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-2. Program Operator Experience with Targeted Groups before HPOG**

Targeted Group	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Individuals without a GED or high school diploma	5	12%	38	88%
Low-income individuals	5	12	38	88
Unemployed individuals	6	14	37	86
LEP individuals	8	19	35	81
TANF recipients	10	24	32	76
Veterans	10	24	31	76
Post-secondary students	12	29	29	71
Single parents	12	29	29	71
SNAP recipients	12	29	29	71
Incumbent workers (i.e., currently employed)	13	33	27	68
Individuals with disabilities	12	32	26	68
Non-custodial parents	20	49	21	51
Victims of domestic violence	20	50	20	50
Ex-offenders	21	54	18	46
Homeless individuals	23	55	19	45
Youth transitioning out of foster care	24	60	16	40
Other target group (Please specify)	9	56	7	44

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q1.3.

N=49

Missing: 6–11 programs

**Exhibit D-3. HPOG Programs' Targeted Groups before HPOG**

Targeted Group	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Low-income individuals	0	0%	49	100%
TANF recipients	0	0	49	100
Unemployed individuals	2	4	46	96
SNAP recipients	7	16	36	84
Single parents	12	29	30	71
Post-secondary students	13	31	29	69
Incumbent workers (i.e., currently employed)	17	43	23	58
Veterans	21	51	20	49
LEP individuals	21	54	18	46
Individuals without a GED or high school diploma	24	55	20	45
Non-custodial parents	23	56	18	44
Victims of domestic violence	24	62	15	38
Youth transitioning out of foster care	26	68	12	32
Homeless individuals	28	70	12	30
Individuals with disabilities	28	72	11	28
Ex-offenders	37	95	2	5
Other target group (Please specify)	13	65	7	35

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q3.3.

N=49

Missing: 0–11 programs

**Exhibit D-4. HPOG Programs' Experience with Sectoral Training before HPOG**

Program Experience	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Before HPOG, my organization had operated sectoral training in healthcare – it was not new to sectoral training in healthcare.	9	21%	34	79%
Currently, my organization is also operating a sectoral training program in a field other than healthcare.	10	23	33	77
Before HPOG, my organization had operated a sectoral training program in a field other than healthcare.	13	30	30	70
Before HPOG, my organization had never operated any type of sectoral training program – it was completely new to sectoral training.	37	88	5	12

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q1.2.

N=49

Missing: 6–7 programs

**Exhibit D-5. HPOG Programs' Service Areas**

Area	Number	Percentage
Urban, suburban, rural	12	24%
Urban only	11	22
Urban, suburban	9	18
Suburban only	8	16
Suburban, rural	5	10
Rural only	3	6
Urban, rural	1	2

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q2.1.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-6. HPOG Programs' Catchment Area**

Size	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Multiple cities, towns, or villages	26	53%	23	47%
Multiple counties	26	53	23	47
A single county	31	63	18	37
Single local workforce development area as defined under WIA	35	71	14	29
More than one local workforce development area as defined under WIA	37	76	12	24
Informally defined based on participant access	45	92	4	8
Entire state	46	94	3	6
A single city, town, or village	47	96	2	4
Other (Please specify)	47	96	2	4

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q2.2.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-7. Availability of Healthcare Training before HPOG Implementation**

Opportunity	Not at All Available		2		3		4		Readily Available	
	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age
Opportunities that emphasize career pathways	9	18%	6	12%	16	33%	5	10%	13	27%
Opportunities that target individuals with significant skill, education, and work experience deficits	7	14	13	27	15	31	3	6	11	22
Opportunities that are designed to accommodate non-traditional student populations	7	14	14	29	10	20	8	16	10	20
Curricula that accommodate multiple learning modes and capabilities	7	14	13	27	17	35	4	8	8	16
Opportunities to orient and acclimate non-traditional student populations to health professions	4	8	18	37	15	31	5	10	7	14

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q4.2.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-8. Availability of Healthcare Training after HPOG Implementation**

Opportunity	Not at All Available		2		3		4		Readily Available	
	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age
Opportunities that emphasize career pathways	1	2%	6	12%	11	22%	9	18%	22	45%
Opportunities that are designed to accommodate non-traditional student populations	1	2	13	27	11	22	10	20	14	29
Opportunities that target individuals with significant skill, education, and work experience deficits	1	2	8	16	17	35	9	18	14	29
Curricula that accommodate multiple learning modes and capabilities	4	8	7	14	17	35	9	18	12	24
Opportunities to orient and acclimate non-traditional student populations to health professions	2	4	10	20	16	33	10	20	11	22

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q4.1.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-9. Secondary Responsibilities of Staff**

Responsibility	No	Yes
Academic advising	26%	74%
Employment assistance	32	68
Intake and enrollment	32	68
Non-academic advising	34	66
Recruitment	36	64
Career advising	50	50
Other	14	86

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q12.

N=234 staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-10. Primary Responsibility of HPOG Managers**

Responsibility	Percentage
Supervising case managers/advisors	46%
Program design/enhancements	10
Supervising instructional staff	4
Supervising other types of staff (e.g., recruitment, study intake, enrollment)	4
Program reporting	3
Hiring staff	1
Other (Please specify)	32

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q11.

N=86 managers across 38 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Appendix Exhibit D-11. HPOG Staff Demographic Characteristics**

Race	No	Yes
White	33%	67%
Black or African American	77	24
American Indian or Alaska Native	97	3
Asian	97	3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	100	0

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q6.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-12. HPOG Staff Demographic Characteristics**

Origin	Percentage
No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	87%
Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano	9
Yes, Puerto Rican	1
Yes, Cuban	0
Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	4

*Source:* HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q5.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

*Missing:* 1 program

**Exhibit D-13. Sustainability of Relationships with Other Organizations after HPOG Ends**

Activity	1 Strongly Disagree		2		3		4		5 Strongly Agree		Don't Know	
	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age
	Existing HPOG partners will continue to work with my organization to provide healthcare training to low-income individuals in the community	2	4%	1	2%	7	15%	10	21%	25	52%	3
Existing HPOG partners will continue to work with my organization to provide support services for sectoral training programs	3	6	2	4	7	15	10	21	21	44	5	10

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q5.12.

N=48

Missing: 1 program

**Appendix Exhibit D-14. Potential Challenges to the Sustainability of Relationships with Existing HPOG Partners**

Challenge	Not a Challenge		2		3		4		A Serious Challenge	
	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age
	Lack of resources in partner organizations (e.g., budget, staff, equipment, space)	1	2%	2	4%	7	14%	18	37%	21
Unfavorable economic conditions	5	10	3	6	15	31	14	29	12	24
Lack of shared goals	14	29	12	24	8	16	9	18	6	12
Leadership changes in partner organizations	10	20	10	20	14	29	12	24	3	6

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q5.13.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-15. Modes of Marketing and Recruitment**

Strategy	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Word of mouth	1	2%	48	98%
Distribution of print materials	2	4	47	96
Referrals from TANF agencies	3	6	46	94
Referrals from Workforce Investment Board or One-Stop career centers	3	6	46	94
In-person presentations in the community	10	20	39	80
Referrals from community/faith-based organizations	12	24	37	76
Use of grantee/partner websites	14	29	35	71
Referrals from post-secondary institutions	15	31	34	69
Partnerships with or referrals from employers	17	35	32	65
Facebook, Twitter, other social media	21	43	28	57
Referrals from secondary schools/school districts	26	53	23	47
Partnerships with or referrals from professional and industry organizations	30	61	19	39
TV or radio public service announcements	32	65	17	35
Direct mail campaigns	36	73	13	27
Toll-free informational hotlines	44	90	5	10
Door-to-door outreach	46	94	3	6
Other	38	78	11	22

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q6.1.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-16. Recruitment Challenges**

Challenge	Not a Challenge		2		3		4		A Serious Challenge	
	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age
Low or inadequate basic skill levels of applicants	5	10%	6	13%	11	23%	15	31%	11	23%
Prospective applicant's need to work, which limits feasibility of enrolling in training	1	2	11	23	13	27	14	29	9	19
Insufficient referrals from TANF agency	8	17	11	23	10	21	11	23	8	17
Inadequate child care options	12	25	10	21	12	25	8	17	6	13
Problems with transportation or location	8	17	7	15	13	28	13	28	6	13
Availability of other training options besides HPOG	17	36	12	26	7	15	6	13	5	11
Difficulty in finding eligible participants	15	31	14	29	9	19	6	13	4	8
Insufficient referrals from partner community-based organizations	14	29	10	21	15	31	7	15	2	4
Insufficient referrals from partner(s) in the workforce system	15	32	13	28	11	23	6	13	2	4
Problems with class schedules or off-hours availability of services	14	29	14	29	11	23	7	15	2	4
Difficulty in finding candidates with interest in health professions	19	40	10	21	11	23	7	15	1	2
Insufficient referrals from partner employers/employer organizations	12	25	9	19	16	33	10	21	1	2
Insufficient resources devoted to outreach and recruitment	19	40	8	17	16	33	5	10	0	0
Other	1	20	0	0	1	20	1	20	2	40

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q6.3.

N=49

Missing: 1–2 programs

**Exhibit D-17. Financial Eligibility Measures**

Financial Eligibility Measure	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Eligible for TANF	9	18%	40	82%
Federal poverty level	9	18	40	82
Household income	18	37	31	63
Eligible for SNAP	20	41	29	59
Individual income	34	69	15	31
Individual earnings	35	71	14	29
Other	38	78	11	22

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.8a.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-18. Established Thresholds to Determine Eligibility**

	Mean	Std	Median	Min	Max
Percent of the federal poverty level	194	17	200	150	250
Household income	†	†	†	†	†
Individual income	\$22,160	\$15,089	\$22,160	\$11,490	\$32,829
Individual earnings	\$32,829	‡	\$32,829	\$32,829	\$32,829

† None of the survey respondents provided eligibility thresholds based on household income.

‡ Only one respondent provided individual earnings, so standard deviation could not be calculated.

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.8b.

N=49

Missing: 4–31 programs

**Exhibit D-19. Minimum Reading Grade-Level Eligibility Requirement**

	Number	Percentage
4th grade or equivalent	1	3%
5th grade or equivalent	2	5
6th grade or equivalent	4	11
7th grade or equivalent	3	8
8th grade or equivalent	12	32
9th grade or equivalent	9	24
10th grade or higher	6	16

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.7b.

N=38

Missing: 1 program

**Exhibit D-20. Minimum Math Grade-Level Eligibility Requirement**

	Number	Percentage
4th grade or equivalent	1	3%
5th grade or equivalent	1	3
6th grade or equivalent	8	24
7th grade or equivalent	3	9
8th grade or equivalent	7	21
9th grade or equivalent	7	21
10th grade or higher	6	18

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.7c.

N=34

Missing: 1 program

**Exhibit D-21. Applicant Screenings**

Screening Used at Application	None		Some Applicants		All Applicants	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Background check for felonies	13	27%	10	21%	25	52%
Background check for misdemeanors	15	32	10	21	22	47
Drug screening	23	48	11	23	14	29
Physical or other medical exam	25	52	15	31	8	17
Other	7	37	4	21	8	42

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.4.

N=49

Missing: 1–2 programs

**Exhibit D-22. Percentage of Eligible Applicants Found to be Unsuitable for the Program**

Among applicants who meet the eligibility criteria for HPOG program, approximately what percentage are found to be not “suitable” for the program?	Number	Percentage
Less than 5 percent	22	48%
5–10 percent	13	28
11–20 percent	2	4
21–30 percent	4	9
More than 30 percent	5	11

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.13d.

N=46

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-23. Where HPOG Applications Were Available**

Places	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
One Stop Career Centers	22	47%	25	53%
Community colleges	23	50	23	50
TANF offices	26	57	20	43
Online (including email from staff)	33	77	10	23
SNAP offices	34	79	9	21
Community action agencies	36	80	9	20
Unemployment Insurance offices	36	80	9	20
Secondary schools	37	82	8	18
Agencies serving immigrants	37	84	7	16
Public housing authority/office	37	84	7	16
Agencies serving the homeless	38	86	6	14
Health clinics	38	86	6	14
Head Start program locations	39	87	6	13
Proprietary training schools	39	89	5	11
Hospitals	40	93	3	7

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.2.

N=49

Missing: 2–6 programs

**Exhibit D-24. Application Submission Methods**

Method	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
In-person (e.g., at orientation, during intake, or at a program office)	1	2%	48	98%
Fax	35	83	7	17
U.S. Mail	34	83	7	17
Email	38	88	5	12
Online (via website or submission portal)	39	93	3	7
Telephone	40	98	1	2

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.3.

N=49

Missing: 0–8 programs

**Exhibit D-25. Average Length of Time for Application Process (Days)**

	Mean	Std	Median	Min	Max
On average, how many days does it take to complete the application/intake process?	22	19	21	1	121

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.17.

N=49

Missing: 2 programs

**Exhibit D-26. Number of Required Meetings Which Are In-Person Meetings**

How many of the required meetings are in-person meetings?	Number	Percentage
1	7	14%
2–3	36	73
4 or more	6	12

*Note:* Numbers do not align with Exhibit 3-10 because the report exhibit excludes two programs that did not provide the average length of their application process.

*Source:* HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.16b.

N=49

*Missing:* 0 programs

**Exhibit D-27. Applicant Competencies Assessed During Intake**

Skills or Needs Areas	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Basic academic skills	4	8%	45	92%
Support service needs	5	11	42	89
Career interests	12	26	34	74
Motivation	12	27	32	73
Job-readiness or “soft skills”	18	39	28	61
English language proficiency	19	42	26	58
Life skills (e.g., time management, personal hygiene)	19	43	25	57
Social skills (e.g., interpersonal skills)	21	49	22	51
Coping skills	28	65	15	35
Career aptitudes	31	69	14	31
Learning styles	35	78	10	22
Other	8	57	6	43

*Source:* HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.11.

N=49

*Missing:* 0–6 programs

**Exhibit D-28. Demographic Characteristics of HPOG Participants at Intake**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	1,455	12
Female	11,159	88
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
White Non-Hispanic	4,942	40
Black Non-Hispanic	4,669	37
Hispanic/Latino, any race	2,087	17
Asian or Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	341	3
Native American or Alaska Native	100	1
Two or more races, non-Hispanic	319	3
Missing	156	
<b>Age</b>		
< 20	1,055	8
20–29	5,738	46
30–39	2,967	24
40–49	1,733	14
50+	1,028	8
Missing	40	
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	2,017	17
Never married	7,367	62
Divorced, widowed, or separated	2,538	21
Missing	692	
<b>Dependent children</b>		
Yes	7,782	66
No	4,074	34
Missing	758	
<b>Highest educational attainment</b>		
Less than 12th grade	726	6
High school equivalency or GED	1,612	13
High school graduate	5,076	42
1-3 years of college/technical school	4,076	33
4 years or more of college	710	6
Missing	414	
<b>Literacy at 8th grade or higher</b>		
Yes	8,402	85
No	1,455	15
Missing	2,757	
<b>Numeracy at 8th grade or higher</b>		
Yes	6,961	73
No	2,530	27
Missing	3,123	

Characteristic	Number	Percentage
<b>Currently in school</b>		
Yes	4,179	36
No	7,283	64
Missing	1,152	
<b>Currently employed</b>		
Yes	4,845	39
No	7,606	61
Missing	163	

*Note:* Sample is 12,614 HPOG participants in the PRS with at least 18 months post-enrollment data as of October 1, 2014. Percentages are of nonmissing responses at intake. Percentages missing range from 1 to 9 percent. Literacy and numeracy are missing for 22 and 25 percent which includes those for whom these skills were not tested at intake.

Source: PRS, 2014.

**Exhibit D-29. Pre-Training Activities Offered**

Pre-Training Activities	Not Offered		Offered	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Introduction to healthcare careers	3	10%	26	90%
Soft skills training	7	15	41	85
College skills training	7	33	14	67
Prerequisite subject courses	17	53	15	47
Computer/technological skills training	28	58	20	42
Financial literacy workshop	29	60	19	40
Other	2	25	6	75

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.1.

N=49

Missing: 0–1 programs

**Exhibit D-30. Pre-Training Activities Created or Adapted for HPOG**

Pre-Training Activity	Created for HPOG		Adapted or Modified		"Off the Shelf"	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Introduction to healthcare careers	16	64%	6	24%	3	12%
Soft skills training	16	43	15	41	6	16
Financial literacy workshop	5	28	7	39	6	33
College skills training	4	29	7	50	3	21
Prerequisite subject courses	3	21	3	21	8	57
Computer/technological skills training	3	16	9	47	7	37
Other	4	67	0	0	2	33

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.1.1.

N=49

Missing: 0–4 programs

**Exhibit D-31. Basic Skills Education Offered**

Basic Skills Education	Created for HPOG		Adapted or Modified		"Off the Shelf"	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Adult Basic Education (N=21)	3	16%	3	16%	13	68%
Pre-GED classes (N=7)	1	14	3	43	3	43
English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction (N=9)	1	11	3	33	5	56
General Equivalency Degree (GED) classes (N=19)	0	0	4	24	13	76
Other (N=32)	3	60	1	20	1	20

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.3.

N=49

Missing: 0–2 programs

**Exhibit D-32. Methods for Delivery of Basic Skills Instruction**

Method	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Basic skills instruction is provided as stand-alone components taken independently of health and vocational education/training activities	10	31%	22	69%
Basic skills instruction is integrated into the occupational training instruction	22	69	10	31
Integration of basic skills instruction and health and vocational education/training activities varies by provider	23	72	9	28

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.6.

N=32

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-33. Role of Program in Providing Healthcare Training**

Role	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Provides Training Space	18	37%	31	63%
Provides Faculty or Instructors	20	41	29	59
Provides Training Equipment	20	41	29	59
Provides Healthcare Trainings	21	43	28	57
Provides Work-Based Learning Opportunities (e.g. clinicals, internships, on the job training)	23	47	26	53
Provides Learning Technologies (e.g., learning management system, online tutoring software, online discussion board, wikis, course blogs)	25	51	24	49

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.14.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-34. Characteristics of Healthcare Training Courses Supporting Career Pathways**

Characteristics of Training Courses Offered	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Training options provide credentials that are “stackable”	7	14%	42	86%
Set of training options support multiple career pathways	17	35	32	65
Set of training options support a single career pathway	18	37	31	63
Program offers a range of training activities that can be pursued independently	24	49	25	51
Other	47	96	2	4

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.7.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-35. Health or Vocational Education/Training Activities: Available During the Work Day**

Training Activity	No		Yes	
	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age
11-9111 Medical and health services managers (N=5)	2	40%	3	60%
11-9121 Clinical research coordinator (N=1)	0	0	1	100
19-1042 Toxicologists (N=1)	0	0	1	100
21-1010 Counselors (N=1)	0	0	1	100
21-1011 Substance abuse and behavioral disorder counselors (N=4)	2	50	2	50
21-1014 Mental health counselors (N=0)	0	0	0	0
21-1090 Miscellaneous community and social service specialists (N=3)	0	0	3	100
21-1091 Health educators (N=1)	0	0	1	100
21-1094 Community health workers (N=4)	0	0	4	100
21-1798 Social and human service assistants (N=0)	0	0	0	0
27-3091 Interpreters and translators (N=3)	0	0	3	100
29-1031 Nutritionists (N=1)	0	0	1	100
29-1050 Pharmacists (N=2)	0	0	2	100
29-1125 Recreational therapists (N=1)	0	0	1	100
29-1126 Respiratory therapists (N=2)	0	0	2	100
29-1127 Speech pathologists (N=1)	0	0	1	100
29-1128 Kinesiotherapists (N=1)	0	0	1	100
29-1140 Registered nurses (N=29)	0	0	29	100
29-1170 Nurse practitioners (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-1171 Nurse practitioners (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-1190 Miscellaneous health diagnosing and treating practitioners (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1199 Health diagnosing and treating practitioners, all others (N=1)	0	0	1	100
29-2010 Clinical laboratory technologists and technicians (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-2011 Medical and clinical laboratory technologists (N=5)	0	0	5	100
29-2012 Medical and clinical laboratory technicians (N=11)	0	0	11	100
29-2021 Dental hygienists (N=7)	0	0	7	100
29-2030 Diagnostic related technologists and technicians (N=5)	1	20	4	80
29-2031 Cardiovascular technologists and technicians (N=18)	5	28	13	72
29-2032 Diagnostic medical sonographers (N=3)	0	0	3	100
29-2033 Nuclear medicine technologists (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-2034 Radiologic technologists (N=14)	1	7	13	93
29-2035 Magnetic resonance imaging technologists (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-2040 Emergency medical technicians and paramedics (N=4)	1	25	3	75
29-2041 Emergency medical technicians (N=25)	2	8	23	92
29-2042 Paramedics (N=8)	2	25	6	75
29-2050 Health practitioner support technologists and technicians (N=6)	0	0	6	100
29-2051 Dietetic technicians (N=2)	1	50	1	50
29-2052 Pharmacy technicians (N=36)	7	19	29	81
29-2053 Psychiatric technicians (N=0)	0	0	0	0

Training Activity	No		Yes	
	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age
29-2054 Respiratory therapy technicians (N=13)	0	0	13	100
29-2055 Surgical technologists (N=18)	1	6	17	94
29-2060 Licensed and vocational nurse (N=30)	1	3	29	97
29-2070 Medical records and health information technicians (N=35)	6	17	29	83
29-2071 Medical records and health information technicians (N=12)	0	0	12	100
29-2090 Miscellaneous health technologists and technicians (N=3)	0	0	3	100
29-2099 Health technologists and technicians, all other (N=14)	4	29	10	71
31-1010 Nursing, psychiatric and home health aides (N=11)	0	0	11	100
31-1011 Home health aides (N=13)	1	8	12	92
31-1012 Nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants (N=29)	4	14	25	86
31-1014 Nursing assistants (N=38)	1	3	37	97
31-1015 Orderlies (N=1)	0	0	1	100
31-1016 Patient care technician (N=11)	2	18	9	82
31-2010 Occupational therapy assistants and aides (N=1)	0	0	1	100
31-2011 Occupational therapy assistants (N=9)	0	0	9	100
31-2012 Occupational therapy aides (N=3)	0	0	3	100
31-2020 Physical therapist assistants and aides (N=2)	1	50	1	50
31-2021 Physical therapist assistants (N=14)	0	0	14	100
31-2022 Physical therapist aides (N=6)	3	50	3	50
31-9010 Massage therapists (N=4)	1	25	3	75
31-9090 Miscellaneous healthcare support occupations (N=8)	0	0	8	100
31-9091 Dental assistants (N=20)	2	10	18	90
31-9092 Medical assistants (N=38)	3	8	35	92
31-9093 Medical equipment preparers (N=4)	1	25	3	75
31-9094 Medical transcriptionists (N=6)	0	0	6	100
31-9095 Pharmacy aides (N=2)	0	0	2	100
31-9097 Phlebotomists (N=28)	6	21	22	79
31-9099 Healthcare support workers, all others (N=11)	1	9	10	91
31-9999 Child care advocate (N=1)	0	0	1	100
39-9011 Childcare workers (N=0)	0	0	0	0
43-4051 Customer member services & call center (N=0)	0	0	0	0
43-4171 Receptionists and information clerks (N=4)	0	0	4	100
43-5031 Police, fire, and ambulance dispatchers (N=1)	0	0	1	100
43-6013 Medical office clerk/secretary/specialist (N=16)	0	0	16	100
51-9081 Dental lab technician (N=1)	0	0	1	100
99-9999 Other (N=15)	10	67	5	33
99-9999 Other (N=8)	4	50	4	50

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.9.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-36. Health or Vocational Education/Training Activities: Available in the Evening**

Training Activity	No		Yes	
	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age
11-9111 Medical and health services managers (N=5)	3	60%	2	40%
11-9121 Clinical research coordinator (N=1)	1	100	0	0
19-1042 Toxicologists (N=1)	1	100	0	0
21-1010 Counselors (N=1)	0	0	1	100
21-1011 Substance abuse and behavioral disorder counselors (N=4)	2	50	2	50
21-1014 Mental health counselors (N=0)	0	0	0	0
21-1090 Miscellaneous community and social service specialists (N=3)	1	33	2	67
21-1091 Health educators (N=1)	0	0	1	100
21-1094 Community health workers (N=4)	2	50	2	50
21-1798 Social and human service assistants (N=0)	0	0	0	0
27-3091 Interpreters and translators (N=3)	1	33	2	67
29-1031 Nutritionists (N=1)	0	0	1	100
29-1050 Pharmacists (N=2)	2	100	0	0
29-1125 Recreational therapists (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1126 Respiratory therapists (N=2)	2	100	0	0
29-1127 Speech pathologists (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1128 Kinesiotherapists (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1140 Registered nurses (N=29)	12	41	17	59
29-1170 Nurse practitioners (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-1171 Nurse practitioners (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-1190 Miscellaneous health diagnosing and treating practitioners (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1199 Health diagnosing and treating practitioners, all others (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-2010 Clinical laboratory technologists and technicians (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-2011 Medical and clinical laboratory technologists (N=5)	4	80	1	20
29-2012 Medical and clinical laboratory technicians (N=11)	7	64	4	36
29-2021 Dental hygienists (N=7)	5	71	2	29
29-2030 Diagnostic related technologists and technicians (N=5)	4	80	1	20
29-2031 Cardiovascular technologists and technicians (N=18)	10	56	8	44
29-2032 Diagnostic medical sonographers (N=3)	3	100	0	0
29-2033 Nuclear medicine technologists (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-2034 Radiologic technologists (N=14)	10	71	4	29
29-2035 Magnetic resonance imaging technologists (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-2040 Emergency medical technicians and paramedics (N=4)	1	25	3	75
29-2041 Emergency medical technicians (N=25)	10	40	15	60
29-2042 Paramedics (N=8)	3	38	5	63
29-2050 Health practitioner support technologists and technicians (N=6)	2	33	4	67
29-2051 Dietetic technicians (N=2)	2	100	0	0
29-2052 Pharmacy technicians (N=36)	15	42	21	58
29-2053 Psychiatric technicians (N=0)	0	0	0	0

Training Activity	No		Yes	
	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age
29-2054 Respiratory therapy technicians (N=13)	9	69	4	31
29-2055 Surgical technologists (N=18)	14	78	4	22
29-2060 Licensed and vocational nurse (N=30)	15	50	15	50
29-2070 Medical records and health information technicians (N=35)	16	46	19	54
29-2071 Medical records and health information technicians (N=12)	8	67	4	33
29-2090 Miscellaneous health technologists and technicians (N=3)	0	0	3	100
29-2099 Health technologists and technicians, all other (N=14)	5	36	9	64
31-1010 Nursing, psychiatric and home health aides (N=11)	6	55	5	45
31-1011 Home health aides (N=13)	6	46	7	54
31-1012 Nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants (N=29)	8	28	21	72
31-1014 Nursing assistants (N=38)	15	39	23	61
31-1015 Orderlies (N=1)	0	0	1	100
31-1016 Patient care technician (N=11)	5	45	6	55
31-2010 Occupational therapy assistants and aides (N=1)	1	100	0	0
31-2011 Occupational therapy assistants (N=9)	7	78	2	22
31-2012 Occupational therapy aides (N=3)	2	67	1	33
31-2020 Physical therapist assistants and aides (N=2)	1	50	1	50
31-2021 Physical therapist assistants (N=14)	8	57	6	43
31-2022 Physical therapist aides (N=6)	2	33	4	67
31-9010 Massage therapists (N=4)	0	0	4	100
31-9090 Miscellaneous healthcare support occupations (N=8)	4	50	4	50
31-9091 Dental assistants (N=20)	11	55	9	45
31-9092 Medical assistants (N=38)	23	61	15	39
31-9093 Medical equipment preparers (N=4)	2	50	2	50
31-9094 Medical transcriptionists (N=6)	4	67	2	33
31-9095 Pharmacy aides (N=2)	1	50	1	50
31-9097 Phlebotomists (N=28)	11	39	17	61
31-9099 Healthcare support workers, all others (N=11)	5	45	6	55
31-9999 Child care advocate (N=1)	1	100	0	0
39-9011 Childcare workers (N=0)	0	0	0	0
43-4051 Customer member services & call center (N=0)	0	0	0	0
43-4171 Receptionists and information clerks (N=4)	3	75	1	25
43-5031 Police, fire, and ambulance dispatchers (N=1)	1	100	0	0
43-6013 Medical office clerk/secretary/specialist (N=16)	10	63	6	38
51-9081 Dental lab technician (N=1)	1	100	0	0
99-9999 Other (N=15)	14	93	1	7
99-9999 Other (N=8)	6	75	2	25

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.9.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-37. Health or Vocational Education/Training Activities: Available on Weekends**

Training Activity	No		Yes	
	Number	Percent- age	Number	Percent- age
11-9111 Medical and health services managers (N=5)	4	80%	1	20%
11-9121 Clinical research coordinator (N=1)	1	100	0	0
19-1042 Toxicologists (N=1)	1	100	0	0
21-1010 Counselors (N=1)	1	100	0	0
21-1011 Substance abuse and behavioral disorder counselors (N=4)	2	50	2	50
21-1014 Mental health counselors (N=0)	0	0	0	0
21-1090 Miscellaneous community and social service specialists (N=3)	3	100	0	0
21-1091 Health educators (N=1)	1	100	0	0
21-1094 Community health workers (N=4)	3	75	1	25
21-1798 Social and human service assistants (N=0)	0	0	0	0
27-3091 Interpreters and translators (N=3)	2	67	1	33
29-1031 Nutritionists (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1050 Pharmacists (N=2)	2	100	0	0
29-1125 Recreational therapists (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1126 Respiratory therapists (N=2)	2	100	0	0
29-1127 Speech pathologists (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1128 Kinesiotherapists (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1140 Registered nurses (N=29)	22	76	7	24
29-1170 Nurse practitioners (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-1171 Nurse practitioners (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-1190 Miscellaneous health diagnosing and treating practitioners (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-1199 Health diagnosing and treating practitioners, all others (N=1)	1	100	0	0
29-2010 Clinical laboratory technologists and technicians (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-2011 Medical and clinical laboratory technologists (N=5)	5	100	0	0
29-2012 Medical and clinical laboratory technicians (N=11)	11	100	0	0
29-2021 Dental hygienists (N=7)	6	86	1	14
29-2030 Diagnostic related technologists and technicians (N=5)	5	100	0	0
29-2031 Cardiovascular technologists and technicians (N=18)	18	100	0	0
29-2032 Diagnostic medical sonographers (N=3)	3	100	0	0
29-2033 Nuclear medicine technologists (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-2034 Radiologic technologists (N=14)	14	100	0	0
29-2035 Magnetic resonance imaging technologists (N=0)	0	0	0	0
29-2040 Emergency medical technicians and paramedics (N=4)	4	100	0	0
29-2041 Emergency medical technicians (N=25)	18	72	7	28
29-2042 Paramedics (N=8)	6	75	2	25
29-2050 Health practitioner support technologists and technicians (N=6)	5	83	1	17
29-2051 Dietetic technicians (N=2)	2	100	0	0
29-2052 Pharmacy technicians (N=36)	30	83	6	17
29-2053 Psychiatric technicians (N=0)	0	0	0	0

Training Activity	No		Yes	
	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age
29-2054 Respiratory therapy technicians (N=13)	11	85	2	15
29-2055 Surgical technologists (N=18)	18	100	0	0
29-2060 Licensed and vocational nurse (N=30)	23	77	7	23
29-2070 Medical records and health information technicians (N=35)	31	89	4	11
29-2071 Medical records and health information technicians (N=12)	11	92	1	8
29-2090 Miscellaneous health technologists and technicians (N=3)	2	67	1	33
29-2099 Health technologists and technicians, all other (N=14)	13	93	1	7
31-1010 Nursing, psychiatric and home health aides (N=11)	11	100	0	0
31-1011 Home health aides (N=13)	11	85	2	15
31-1012 Nursing aides, orderlies, and attendants (N=29)	21	72	8	28
31-1014 Nursing assistants (N=38)	31	82	7	18
31-1015 Orderlies (N=1)	1	100	0	0
31-1016 Patient care technician (N=11)	11	100	0	0
31-2010 Occupational therapy assistants and aides (N=1)	1	100	0	0
31-2011 Occupational therapy assistants (N=9)	9	100	0	0
31-2012 Occupational therapy aides (N=3)	3	100	0	0
31-2020 Physical therapist assistants and aides (N=2)	2	100	0	0
31-2021 Physical therapist assistants (N=14)	13	93	1	7
31-2022 Physical therapist aides (N=6)	6	100	0	0
31-9010 Massage therapists (N=4)	3	75	1	25
31-9090 Miscellaneous healthcare support occupations (N=8)	7	88	1	13
31-9091 Dental assistants (N=20)	16	80	4	20
31-9092 Medical assistants (N=38)	34	89	4	11
31-9093 Medical equipment preparers (N=4)	4	100	0	0
31-9094 Medical transcriptionists (N=6)	6	100	0	0
31-9095 Pharmacy aides (N=2)	2	100	0	0
31-9097 Phlebotomists (N=28)	23	82	5	18
31-9099 Healthcare support workers, all others (N=11)	9	82	2	18
31-9999 Child care advocate (N=1)	1	100	0	0
39-9011 Childcare workers (N=0)	0	0	0	0
43-4051 Customer member services & call center (N=0)	0	0	0	0
43-4171 Receptionists and information clerks (N=4)	4	100	0	0
43-5031 Police, fire, and ambulance dispatchers (N=1)	1	100	0	0
43-6013 Medical office clerk/secretary/specialist (N=16)	15	94	1	6
51-9081 Dental lab technician (N=1)	1	100	0	0
99-9999 Other (N=15)	15	100	0	0
99-9999 Other (N=8)	8	100	0	0

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.9.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-38. Average Number of Health or Vocational Education/Training Activities Designed for Accelerated Completion**

	Mean	Std	Median	Min	Max
Number of health or vocational education/training activities designed for accelerated completion	3	2	3	1	9

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.11.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-39. Methods of Healthcare Training Course Delivery**

Method of Course Delivery	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Large Group Instruction (8 or more students at one time)	0	0%	49	100%
Labs or Other "Hands-on" Exercises	9	18	40	82
Small Group Instruction (fewer than 8 students at one time)	31	63	18	37
Online Courses/Tutorials	33	67	16	33
Individualized (One-on-One) Instruction	45	92	4	8
Self-Paced Instruction	47	96	2	4

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.12.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-40. Average Number of Courses Offering Different Methods of Healthcare Training Course Delivery**

	Mean	Std	Median	Min	Max
Large Group Instruction (8 or more students at one time)	11	8	9	1	36
Labs or Other "Hands-on" Exercises	8	7	7	1	36
Small Group Instruction (fewer than 8 students at one time)	7	8	5	1	27
Online Courses/Tutorials	3	2	3	1	7
Self-Paced Instruction	2	1	2	1	3
Individualized (One-on-One) Instruction	1	0	1	1	1

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.12.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-41. Completion Status at 18 months by Subgroups, Among Participants Who Began Training**

	Successfully Completed		Still in Training		Dropped Out	
	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age
Age <25 (N=3,649)	2,599	71%	393	11%	652	18%
Age 25+ (N=6,951)	4,870	70	1,062	15	1,011	15
Less than 12th Grade (N=530)	397	75	33	6	100	19
High School Equivalency or GED (N=1,324)	992	75	114	9	216	16
High School Graduate (N=4,260)	3,091	73	498	12	666	16
1-3 Years of College/ Technical School (N=3,582)	2,370	66	650	18	558	16
4 Years or More of College (N=637)	437	69	127	20	71	11
Employed at intake (N=4,152)	2,854	69	721	17	569	14
Not Employed at intake (N=6,362)	4,549	72	732	12	1,076	17
Receiving TANF (N=1,516)	1,127	74	112	7	276	18
Not Receiving TANF (N=8,289)	5,784	70	1,249	15	1,246	15
Currently in school (N=3,886)	2,293	59	861	22	725	19
Ever trained in a healthcare profession (N=4,181)	2,813	67	700	17	665	16
Ever worked in a healthcare profession (N=3,999)	2,744	69	643	16	608	15

*Note:* Sample is 10,660 HPOG participants in the PRS with at least 18 months post-enrollment data as of October 1, 2014 and participated in healthcare training. Percentages are of participants in subgroup who began health care training and are not missing completion status.

*Source:* PRS, 2014.

**Exhibit D-42. Average Number of Case Managers per Program**

	n	Mean	Std	Median	Min	Max
Full-time case managers (N=48)	43	4	3	3	1	15
Part-time case managers (N=45)	21	2	1	1	1	6

*Source:* HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.3.

*Missing:* 5–24 programs

**Exhibit D-43. Case Managers' Average Caseloads**

	Mean	Std	Median	Min	Max
Full-time case managers (N=48)	64	35	57	20	150
Part-time case managers (N=45)	34	17	35	10	75

*Source:* HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.3.

*Missing:* 14–31 programs

**Exhibit D-44. Type of Assistance Provided by Staff**

Service	None of My Time	2	3	4	5	6	Most of My Time
Providing career information and advice to participants	12%	15%	4%	9%	11%	17%	31%
Identifying job openings for participants	24	17	8	4	10	8	29
Assisting participants with developing skills needed for success at school, work, and other areas of life	15	11	13	9	9	16	27
Helping participants develop career goals	14	11	11	10	17	11	27
Referring participants to job search/placement services	24	20	5	6	8	15	21
Helping participants prepare resumes	28	16	7	9	9	12	20
Advising participants on personal issues and needs	15	18	13	9	12	15	17
Advising participants on admissions requirements or pre-requisites	19	20	10	13	12	11	15
Assisting participants with internships/externships/clinical placements	40	18	8	7	9	5	14
Monitoring participants' day-to-day academic progress	29	15	12	11	7	12	14
Conducting mock interviews	40	14	13	3	10	8	13
Advising participants on course selection	31	19	14	6	10	7	13
Obtaining and reviewing participants' academic assessment results	24	13	15	15	10	9	13
Referring or connecting participants to support services	22	22	12	12	9	10	13
Assisting participants with enrollment in classes	34	19	7	8	10	11	11
Advising or assisting participants with financial aid or scholarships	38	20	10	9	6	7	9
Arranging instructional support such as tutoring or study groups for participants	40	14	16	9	5	6	9
Recruiting participants for the program	18	28	11	14	14	6	9
Other1	38	0	5	4	9	13	32
Other2	57	0	0	7	5	14	18

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q18-S.

N=234 staff across 49 programs

Missing: 1–2 programs

**Exhibit D-45. Case Managers' Responsibilities**

Responsibility	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Participant monitoring (e.g., assessing participants' progress in training or needs for program supports)	1	2%	47	98%
Counseling to identify personal and supportive service needs	2	4	46	96
Career counseling (e.g., reviewing careers or career pathways)	9	19	39	81
Job search/placement assistance	20	42	28	58
Academic counseling (e.g., course advising)	22	46	26	54
Financial counseling (e.g., helping with financial aid or related income support or budget matters)	22	46	26	54
Job retention services	23	48	25	52
Other	44	92	4	8

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.2.

N=48

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-46. Frequency of Participant Contact Through Various Methods (**

Contact Method	Never	A Few Times per Year	About Once a Month	2 to 3 Times a Month	Once a Week or More
In person, individual session	2%	14%	26%	19%	38%
In person, group session	14	19	18	27	22
Over the phone	1	10	18	24	46
By email or other electronic communication	3	10	13	23	51
Other	0	20	20	40	20

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q20.

N=234 staff across 49 programs

Missing: 1 program

**Exhibit D-47. Individual Who Initiates the Majority of Participant Meetings**

Individual	Percentage
I do	41%
It varies case to case	27
Equally me or another person (program staff or participant)	18
Another program staff member does	10
The participant does	4

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q21.

N=232 staff across 49 programs

Missing: 1 program

**Exhibit D-48. Provision of Social Support Services**

Service	Provide Directly		Make Referrals		Both	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Peer support activities (N=34)	23	68%	3	9%	8	24%
Mentoring activities (N=23)	13	57	3	13	7	30
Cultural programming (N=12)	8	67	1	8	3	25
Other (N=2)	1	50	1	50	0	0

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.8.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-49. Participation in Academic Counseling and Advising Services Offered by HPOG Program**

Service	Required for All		Required for Some		Voluntary for All	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Academic/career counseling (N=45)	36	82%	1	2%	7	16%
Tutoring (N=38)	2	5	10	27	25	68
Other 1 (N=11)	5	45	0	0	6	55
Other 2 (N=3)	1	33	0	0	2	67
Other 3 (N=1)	0	0	0	0	1	100

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.16.

Missing: 0–1 programs

**Exhibit D-50. Staff Responsible for Academic Counseling and Advising Services Offered by HPOG Program**

Service	HPOG Staff		Partner Staff		Other Staff	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Academic/career counseling (N=45)	35	78%	7	16%	3	7%
Tutoring (N=37)	23	62	12	32	2	5
Other 1 (N=10)	8	80	0	0	2	20
Other 2 (N=3)	1	33	1	33	1	33
Other 3 (N=1)	0	0	1	100	0	0

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.18.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-51. Staff Responsible for Academic Counseling and Advising Services Offered by HPOG Program**

	Dedicated Staff		Nondedicated Staff	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Academic/career counseling (N=35)	24	69%	11	31%
Tutoring (N=23)	20	91	2	9
Other 1 (N=8)	6	75	2	25
Other 2 (N=1)	0	0	1	100
Other 3 (N=0)	0	0	0	0

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.18b.

Missing: 0–1 programs

**Exhibit D-52. Staff Responsible for Academic Counseling and Advising Services Offered by HPOG Program**

Service	Health or Vocational Partners		Basic Skills Instruction Partners		Both	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Academic/career counseling (N=7)	3	43%	0	0%	4	57%
Tutoring (N=12)	3	25	0	0	9	75
Other 1 (N=0)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other 2 (N=1)	0	0	0	0	1	100
Other 3 (N=1)	0	0	0	0	1	100

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.18c.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-53. Social Support Service Requirement**

Service	Not Required		Required	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Peer support activities (N=34)	27	79%	7	21%
Cultural programming (N=12)	10	83	2	17
Mentoring activities (N=23)	20	87	3	13
Other (N=2)	2	100	0	0

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.9.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-54. Most Common Ways HPOG Participants Receive Academic Support**

Academic Support	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Attend group study or "help" sessions	15	31%	34	69%
Spend extra one-on-one time with the instructor	22	45	27	55
Provided additional "self-study" resources	30	61	19	39
Assigned a tutor by our organization	32	65	17	35
Referred by instructor to an academic counselor or case manager to determine the best next steps	32	65	17	35
Referred by instructor to an academic "help" center at the training institution	35	71	14	29
Assigned a tutor by the training institution	37	76	12	24
Other	47	96	2	4

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.19.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-55. Training and Work-Related Financial Assistance Provided by HPOG**

Policy	No		Yes	
	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age
HPOG funding covers 100% of program tuition	25	51%	24	49%
HPOG funding covers whatever amount of program tuition that is not covered by Pell Grant, employer contributions, WIA Individual Training Accounts (ITA), or other sources	25	51	24	49
HPOG funding covers up to a certain amount of program tuition (i.e., there is a cap)	32	65	17	35
HPOG funding covers 100% of program tuition for some training activities	39	80	10	20
HPOG funding does not cover any program tuition	47	96	2	4
Other	40	82	9	18

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.14.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-56. Other Sources of Financial Assistance for Participants**

Funding Source	No		Yes	
	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age
Pell Grants	9	18%	40	82%
WIA Individual Training Accounts (ITA)	20	42	28	58
Employer contributions, including on-the-job training (OJT)	36	80	9	20
Other	4	33	8	67

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.15.

N=49

Missing: 0–4 programs

**Exhibit D-57. Applicants Required to Apply for a Pell Grant**

	Number	Percentage
No	29	60%
Yes	19	40

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.10a.

N=49

Missing: 1 program

**Exhibit D-58. Assistance to Applicants to Complete the FAFSA**

	Number	Percentage
No	2	11%
Yes	17	89

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q7.10b.

N=19

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-59. Financial Support Services: Support Available**

Service	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Book costs	0	0%	49	100%
Exam/exam preparation fees	0	0	49	100
Licensing and certification fees	0	0	49	100
Work/training uniforms, supplies, tools	0	0	48	100
Computer/technology equipment	26	54	22	46
Other	5	63	3	38

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.17.

N=49

Missing: 0–1 programs

**Exhibit D-60. Financial Support Services: Provided Upon Request (Subject to Funding Availability)**

Service	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Work/training uniforms, supplies, tools (N=48)	27	56%	21	44%
Computer/technology equipment (N=22)	13	59	9	41
Exam/exam preparation fees (N=49)	29	59	20	41
Licensing and certification fees (N=49)	29	59	20	41
Book costs (N=49)	33	67	16	33
Other (N=3)	1	33	2	67

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.18.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-61. Financial Support Services: Provided to All Participants without Request**

Service	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Book costs (N=49)	24	49%	25	51%
Licensing and certification fees (N=49)	27	55	22	45
Exam/exam preparation fees (N=49)	28	57	21	43
Work/training uniforms, supplies, tools (N=48)	31	65	17	35
Computer/technology equipment (N=22)	15	68	7	32
Other (N=3)	3	100	0	0

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.18.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-62. Financial Support Services: Provided for Select Training Courses**

Service	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Computer/technology equipment (N=22)	19	86%	3	14%
Book costs (N=49)	43	88	6	12
Licensing and certification fees (N=49)	43	88	6	12
Exam/exam preparation fees (N=49)	44	90	5	10
Work/training uniforms, supplies, tools (N=48)	43	90	5	10
Other (N=3)	3	100	0	0

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.17.

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-63. Participants' Receipt of Personal and Family Supports and Services**

Service	Number	Percentage
<b>Transportation Services</b>	<b>6,859</b>	<b>54</b>
General transportation assistance	6,160	49
Driver's license assistance	117	1
Car repair costs	421	3
Car insurance costs	161	1
<b>Housing Services</b>	<b>1,517</b>	<b>12</b>
Security deposit	53	<1
First month's rent	162	1
Funds for housing program	45	<1
Short-term/temporary housing program	139	1
Home heating assistance	154	1
Utilities assistance	594	5
Other housing support services	370	3
<b>Other Personal and Family Supports</b>	<b>3,924</b>	<b>31</b>
Child/dependent care assistance	1,178	9
Food assistance (non-SNAP)	499	4
Addiction and substance abuse services	31	<1
Family preservation services	173	1
Family engagement services	197	2
Legal assistance	61	0
Primary/medical care	1,117	9
Food and shelter	394	3
Other emergency assistance	274	2
<b>Any Personal or Family Support</b>	<b>7,325</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>No Personal or Family Support</b>	<b>5,289</b>	<b>42</b>

Note: This sample includes all enrolled HPOG participants in the PRS with at least 18 months post-enrollment data as of October 1, 2014. Participants receiving multiple types of services are included in multiple rows.

N=12,614

Source: PRS, 2014.

**Exhibit D-64. Types of Personal and Family Support Services: Provide Directly**

Service	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Transportation assistance	4	8%	45	92%
Child care assistance	16	33	33	67
Driver's license assistance	37	76	12	24
Food assistance (other than SNAP)	38	78	11	22
Short-term/temporary housing	41	84	8	16
Cultural programming	44	90	5	10
Primary or medical care	44	90	5	10
Family engagement services	46	94	3	6
Family preservation services	46	94	3	6
Addiction or substance abuse services	47	96	2	4
Legal assistance	48	98	1	2
Other	44	90	5	10

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.11.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-65. Types of Personal and Family Support Services: Make Referrals**

Service	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Legal assistance	16	33%	33	67%
Primary or medical care	16	33	33	67
Addiction or substance abuse services	17	35	32	65
Short-term/temporary housing	18	37	31	63
Food assistance (other than SNAP)	20	41	29	59
Family preservation services	22	45	27	55
Family engagement services	26	53	23	47
Child care assistance	28	57	21	43
Cultural programming	30	61	19	39
Driver's license assistance	35	71	14	29
Transportation assistance	39	80	10	20
Other	48	98	1	2

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.11.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-66. Types of Personal and Family Support Services: Not Offered**

Service	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Driver's license assistance	24	49%	25	51%
Family engagement services	25	51	24	49
Family preservation services	28	57	21	43
Cultural programming	31	63	18	37
Addiction or substance abuse services	33	67	16	33
Legal assistance	34	69	15	31
Food assistance (other than SNAP)	36	73	13	27
Primary or medical care	36	73	13	27
Short-term/temporary housing	36	73	13	27
Child care assistance	45	92	4	8
Transportation assistance	48	98	1	2
Other	37	76	12	24

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.11.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-67. Limits on the Amount of Support Services Provided to Participants**

Limit	Number	Percentage
Yes, there is a limit on program funds spent per participant	18	37%
Yes, there is a limit on program funds spent on any one service for any one participant	9	18
Yes, there is a limit on program funds spent on any one service across all participants	8	16
No, there are no spending limits per participant or per services	11	22
Other	3	6

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.13a.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-68. Job Development, Placement, and Retention Services Provided by Dedicated Staff or Staff with Other Primary Responsibilities**

Service	Dedicated Staff		Staff with Other Primary Responsibilities	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Job-readiness workshops (N=45)	33	77%	10	23%
Job search skills workshops (N=47)	33	73	12	27
Identifying job openings for program graduates (N=47)	36	78	10	22
Meeting with employers to identify job openings for graduates (N=47)	37	80	9	20
One-on-one job search assistance (N=49)	35	74	12	26
Advising on career and job choices (N=49)	35	73	13	27
Operating or referrals to job fairs (N=46)	32	74	11	26
Providing participants with job listings (N=49)	34	74	12	26
Job screening (i.e., screen for suitability for a job) (N=39)	28	78	8	22
Other (from 9.21) (N=5)	4	80	1	20
Post-placement services (e.g., in-person meetings, phone check-ins) (N=46)	27	63	16	37
Other (from 9.22) (N=4)	2	50	2	50

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.25.

Missing: 0–3 programs

**Exhibit D-69. Post-Placement and Retention Services**

Service	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Phone check-ins with participant	5	10%	44	90%
Email check-ins with participant	6	13	42	88
In-person meetings with participant	9	19	39	81
Social media (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn)	23	51	22	49
Phone calls or meetings with participant's supervisor	28	60	19	40
Other	4	50	4	50

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q9.22.

N=49

Missing: 0–4 programs

**Exhibit D-70. Most Important Goal of Program Based on Program Practices**

Most Important Goal	Percentage
Employment	10%
2	12
3	6
Both Equally	59
5	5
6	6
Education	3

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q27.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-71. What Most Important Goal of Program Should Be in Your Opinion**

Most Important Goal	Percentage
Employment	8%
2	6
3	6
Both Equally	60
5	7
6	4
Education	8

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q28.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-72. Staff Support of Participants**

	1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 Strongly Agree
Staff in this program make an effort to get to know the participants well	0%	1%	4%	12%	83%
Staff in this program make an effort to learn about participants' career and employment goals	0	0	5	11	83
Staff in this program closely monitor the academic progress of its participants	0	1	7	19	72
Staff in this program make an effort to learn about participants' personal and family situations	1	2	8	19	70

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q23.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-73. If People in My Job Do Good Work, We Can Really Improve the Lives of Participants**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	1%
2	1
3	7
4	13
5 Strongly agree	78

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q24.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-74. Some Staff Members Seem Confused About the Main Goals for Your Program**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	37%
2	39
3	12
4	9
5 Strongly agree	3

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q68.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-75. Your Duties Are Clearly Related to the Goals for Your Program**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	0%
2	0
3	8
4	38
5 Strongly agree	54

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q69.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-76. Staff Members at Your Program Understand How Program Goals Fit as Part of the Workforce Development System in Your Community**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly Disagree	0%
2	2
3	9
4	49
5 Strongly Agree	40

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q71.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-77. Staff Members at Your Program Work Together as a Team**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly Disagree	1%
2	5
3	2
4	38
5 Strongly Agree	55

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q73.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-78. Helpfulness of Typical Program Services for Participants in Getting a Job in Respective Field**

Rating	Percentage
1 Little help	0%
2	0
3	1
4	7
5	12
6	25
7 Considerable help	56

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q29.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-79. Staff in Your Program Are Able to Spend the Time Needed With Participants**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	1%
2	5
3	11
4	40
5 Strongly agree	42

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q32.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-80. Your Program Has Enough Staff to Meet Current Participant Needs**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	8%
2	20
3	23
4	34
5 Strongly agree	15

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q34.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-81. A Larger Support Staff Is Needed to Help Meet Needs at Your Program**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	7%
2	29
3	22
4	28
5 Strongly agree	14

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q36.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-82. The Heavy Staff Workload Reduces the Effectiveness of Your Program**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	17%
2	41
3	19
4	17
5 Strongly agree	6

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q89.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-83. Frequent Staff Turnover Is a Problem**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	29%
2	37
3	13
4	14
5 Strongly agree	7

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q31.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-84. You Have the Skills Needed to Be Effective in Your Job**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	0%
2	0
3	1
4	40
5 Strongly agree	59

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q56.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-85. You Have the Skills Needed to Effectively Advise/Case Manage Participants**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	2%
2	1
3	4
4	39
5 Strongly agree	54

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q53.

N=234 staff across 49 programs

Missing: 1 program

**Exhibit D-86. You Are Satisfied with Your Present Job**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	0%
2	4
3	5
4	34
5 Strongly agree	57

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q62.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-87. Staff in Your Program Are Given Broad Authority in Carrying Out Their Responsibilities**

Scale	Percentage
1 Strongly disagree	0%
2	5
3	10
4	53
5 Strongly agree	32

Source: HPOG Management and Staff survey, 2014, Q80.

N=320 managers and staff across 49 programs

Missing: 0 programs

**Exhibit D-88. Health or Vocational Education/Training Activities Offered by HPOG Programs**

Training Activity	No		Yes	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Clinical section that is part of a course	4	8%	45	92%
Internships	22	45	27	55
Volunteer positions	41	84	8	16

Source: HPOG Grantee survey, 2014, Q8.13.

N=49

Missing: 0 programs

- <sup>1</sup> The following is excerpted from Alan Werner, Robin Koralek, Ann Collins, Glen Schneider, Pamela Loprest, Shelli Rossman, and Lauren Eyster, *Design Report: National Implementation Evaluation of the Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) to Serve TANF Recipients and Other Low-Income Individuals* (OPRE Report # 2014-02) (Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2014).
- <sup>2</sup> Michael Lipsky, *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1980). See also Evelyn Brodtkin, “Inside the Welfare Contract: Discretion and Accountability in State Welfare Administration,” *Social Service Review* 71 (1997): 1–33.
- <sup>3</sup> Note that data from the Employer survey are used in Hamutal Bernstein, Lauren Eyster, Jennifer Yahner, Stephanie Owen, and Pamela Loprest, *Systems Change Analysis Report: National Implementation Evaluation of the Health Profession Opportunity Grants (HPOG) to Serve TANF Recipients and Other Low-Income Individuals* (Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Forthcoming) and not in this report.
- <sup>4</sup> HPOG programs were required to enter data for participants that enrolled prior to October 2011 and remained active in HPOG after October 1, 2011, but were not required to seek informed consent of first year participants. Of all first-year participants in the PRS, 19 percent gave informed consent and are included in this report. Informed consent from participants enrolled after October 1, 2011 is 95 percent.
- <sup>5</sup> The PRS automatically dates “enrollment” as beginning on the day an individual first receives a service or engages in a substantive activity, including pre-training, healthcare training, or employment development activities.
- <sup>6</sup> “Exit” may be indicated in a PRS record either when a participant completes the HPOG program as defined by that grantee, staff become aware that an individual has left the program, or 90 days after an individual last engaged in an activity or was provided a service.
- <sup>7</sup> For more information on the NDNH see [http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cse/newhire/library/ndnh/background\\_guide.htm](http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cse/newhire/library/ndnh/background_guide.htm). The W-4 and quarterly wage files were accessed to measure outcomes on employment and earnings for this evaluation.
- <sup>8</sup> Thirty-eight program operators identified managers who interacted regularly and directly with participants. Forty-nine program operators identified staff that interacted regularly and directly with participants.
- <sup>9</sup> The *Systems Change Analysis Report* (Bernstein et al.) also reports on findings from an additional version of the Stakeholder/Network Survey sent to four organizations that were the grantees over multi-site HPOG programs
- <sup>10</sup> This sample is 93 less than the PRS sample due to errors in matching PRS and NDNH files.