

Report

Promoting Readiness of Minors in Supplemental Security Income (PROMISE): Technical Appendix to the Interim Services and Impact Report

July 3, 2019

Arif Mamun, Ankita Patnaik, Michael Levere, Gina Livermore, Todd Honeycutt, Jacqueline Kauff, Karen Katz, AnnaMaria McCutcheon, Joseph Mastrianni, and Brittney Gionfriddo

Submitted to:

Social Security Administration
Office of Research, Demonstration, and Employment Support
6401 Security Blvd., 4303 Annex Building
Baltimore, MD 21235
Project Officer: Jeffrey Hemmeter
Contract Number: SS00-13-60044

Submitted by:

Mathematica
1100 1st Street, NE, 12th Floor
Washington, DC 20002-4221
Telephone: (202) 484-9220
Facsimile: (202) 863-1763
Project Director: Gina Livermore
Reference Number: 40304.5AH

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. DATA SOURCES AND SIZES OF ANALYSIS SAMPLES.....	3
A. Data sources.....	3
B. Sizes of analysis samples	7
III. BASELINE EQUIVALENCE OF PARENT SURVEY RESPONDENT SAMPLE AND FULL RESEARCH SAMPLE.....	9
IV. OUTCOME MEASURES.....	35
A. Youth outcomes.....	35
B. Parent and family outcomes	45
V. SURVEY NONRESPONSE AND SURVEY WEIGHTS.....	51
A. Response rates	51
B. Differences between survey respondents and nonrespondents	51
C. Survey nonresponse weights	65
D. Impact estimates with and without survey nonrespondents.....	66
VI. MISSING DATA	81
A. Missing baseline characteristic data.....	81
B. Missing survey outcome data.....	81
VII. ESTIMATION METHODS AND IMPACT ESTIMATES	89
VIII. IMPACT ESTIMATES FOR SUBGROUPS	189
IX. IMPACTS ON SERVICE HOURS BY SCHOOL AND NONSCHOOL PROVIDERS	229
X. COST ANALYSIS METHODS AND ESTIMATES	233

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

TABLES

A.1	Schedule for 18-month survey.....	4
A.2	Administrative data sources by state.....	4
A.3	Ability to construct key analytic outcomes using Medicaid data.....	6
A.4	Ability to construct key analytic outcomes using VR data	7
A.5a	Arkansas PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted).....	10
A.5b	ASPIRE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	12
A.5c	CaPROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	14
A.5d	MD PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	16
A.5e	NYS PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	18
A.5f	WI PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	20
A.6a	Arkansas PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted).....	22
A.6b	ASPIRE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	24
A.6c	CaPROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	26
A.6d	MD PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	28
A.6e	NYS PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	30
A.6f	WI PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	32
A.7	PROMISE 18-month survey respondent sample size and response rate, by program	51
A.8a.1	Arkansas PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	53
A.8a.2	Arkansas PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	54
A.8b.1	ASPIRE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)	55

A.8b.2	ASPIRE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)	56
A.8c.1	CaPROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	57
A.8c.2	CaPROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	58
A.8d.1	MD PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	59
A.8d.2	MD PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	60
A.8e.1	NYS PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	61
A.8e.2	NYS PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	62
A.8f.1	WI PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	63
A.8f.2	WI PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	64
A.9a	Arkansas PROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	68
A.9b	ASPIRE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	70
A.9c	CaPROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted).....	72
A.9d	MD PROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted).....	74
A.9e	NYS PROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted).....	76
A.9f	WI PROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted).....	78
A.10a	Arkansas PROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	83
A.10b	ASPIRE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	84
A.10c	CaPROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	85

A.10d	MD PROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	86
A.10e	NYS PROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	87
A.10f	WI PROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)	88
A.11	Control variables for regression-adjusted analysis of impacts	90
A.12a.1	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	92
A.12a.2	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted)	94
A.12a.3	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	96
A.12a.4	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	97
A.12a.5	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	99
A.12a.6	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted)	101
A.12a.7	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)	102
A.12a.8	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on family's receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted)	103
A.12a.9	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)	105
A.12a.10	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	106
A.12a.11	Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)	107
A.12b.1	ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)	108
A.12b.2	ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted)	110
A.12b.3	ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	112
A.12b.4	ASPIRE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)	113
A.12b.5	ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)	115

A.12b.6	ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted)	117
A.12b.7	ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	118
A.12b.8	ASPIRE: Impacts on family's receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted)	119
A.12b.9	ASPIRE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	121
A.12b.10	ASPIRE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)	122
A.12b.11	ASPIRE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	123
A.12c.1	CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)	124
A.12c.2	CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	126
A.12c.3	CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)	128
A.12c.4	CaPROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)	129
A.12c.5	CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)	131
A.12c.6	CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	133
A.12c.7	CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	134
A.12c.8	CaPROMISE: Impacts on family's receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	135
A.12c.9	CaPROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)	137
A.12c.10	CaPROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)	138
A.12c.11	CaPROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)	139
A.12d.1	MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)	140
A.12d.2	MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	142
A.12d.3	MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)	144

A.12d.4	MD PROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)	145
A.12d.5	MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)	147
A.12d.6	MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	149
A.12d.7	MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)	150
A.12d.8	MD PROMISE: Impacts on family's receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	151
A.12d.9	MD PROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)	153
A.12d.10	MD PROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)	154
A.12d.11	MD PROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)	155
A.12e.1	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)	156
A.12e.2	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	158
A.12e.3	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)	160
A.12e.4	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)	161
A.12e.5	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)	163
A.12e.6	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth's use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	165
A.12e.7	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)	166
A.12e.8	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on family's receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	167
A.12e.9	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)	169
A.12e.10	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)	170
A.12e.11	NYS PROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)	171
A.12f.1	WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)	172

A.12f.2	WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	174
A.12f.3	WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)	176
A.12f.4	WI PROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)	177
A.12f.5	WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)	179
A.12f.6	WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	181
A.12f.7	WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	182
A.12f.8	WI PROMISE: Impacts on family's receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted).....	183
A.12f.9	WI PROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)	185
A.12f.10	WI PROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)	186
A.12f.11	WI PROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)	187
A.13a	Arkansas PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age	190
A.13b	ASPIRE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age	192
A.13c	CaPROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age	194
A.13d	MD PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age	196
A.13e	NYS PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age.....	198
A.13f	WI PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age.....	200
A.14a	Arkansas PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender.....	202
A.14b	ASPIRE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender	204
A.14c	CaPROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender	206
A.14d	MD PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender	208
A.14e	NYS PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender	210
A.14f	WI PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender	212
A.15a	Arkansas PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment	214
A.15b	ASPIRE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment	216
A.15c	CaPROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment	218

A.15d	MD PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment	220
A.15e	NYS PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment.....	222
A.15f	WI PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment.....	224
A.16	ASPIRE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by ASPIRE region	226
A.17	Impact on youth's and parents' receipt of key services from school- and nonschool- based providers	231
A.18	PROMISE program cost analytic framework.....	234
A.19	Input cost category definitions	235
A.20	Program component definitions.....	235
A.21	Program cost period and activity log completion dates with sample sizes	236
A.22a	Arkansas PROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component	237
A.22b	ASPIRE cost analysis by input category and program component.....	238
A.22c	CaPROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component.....	239
A.22d	MD PROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component.....	240
A.22e	NYS PROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component.....	241
A.22f	WI PROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component.....	242

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADL	Activity of daily living
ASPIRE	Achieving Success by Promoting Readiness for Education and Employment
CaPROMISE	California PROMISE
CMS	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
ED	U.S. Department of Education
GED	General Equivalency Diploma
IADL	Instrumental activity of daily living
IPE	Individualized Plan for Employment
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
MD	Maryland
N	No
N/A	Not applicable
n.a.	Not available
n.d.	No data available
NYS	New York State
OASDI	Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance
P	Partial
PROMISE	Promoting Readiness of Minors in Supplemental Security Income
RA	Random assignment
SSA	Social Security Administration
SSI	Supplemental Security Income
SSN	Social Security number
SSR	Supplemental Security Record
VR	Vocational rehabilitation
WI	Wisconsin
Y	Yes

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

I. INTRODUCTION

The PROMISE initiative—Promoting Readiness of Minors in Supplemental Security Income (SSI)—was a joint initiative of the U.S. Department of Education (ED), the Social Security Administration (SSA), the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and the U.S. Department of Labor to support youth with disabilities by funding and evaluating programs designed to promote positive change in the lives of youth who were receiving SSI and their families. Under cooperative agreements with ED, six entities across 11 states implemented demonstration programs for SSI youth who were age 14 to 16. The programs were intended to (1) provide educational, vocational, and other services to the youth and (2) make better use of existing resources by improving service coordination between state and local agencies. ED announced the PROMISE cooperative agreements in September 2013, and the programs began enrolling youth between April 2014 and October 2014. Enrollment continued through April 2016. All programs will deliver PROMISE services through early 2019; some will deliver services through September 2019. Under contract to SSA, Mathematica Policy Research is conducting the national evaluation of (1) how the programs were implemented and operated, (2) their impacts on SSI payments and the education and employment outcomes for the youth and their families, and (3) their cost-effectiveness.

The interim services and impact report presented the estimated impacts of each of the six PROMISE programs on outcomes related to service receipt, education, employment, expectations, health insurance coverage, income, and youth self-determination, as well as on participation in SSA and other public assistance programs for youth and their families. The interim impact analysis, which covered the period of 18 months after the youth enrolled in the evaluation, relied on an experimental design under which eligible youth who applied to the programs were randomly assigned to either a treatment group with an opportunity to receive PROMISE services or to a control group with access to the usual services available in the community other than those provided by PROMISE. The report also presented findings from an analysis of the costs of PROMISE program services and summarized findings from the implementation analysis.

In this appendix, we provide additional detail about the data and methods used for the interim impact analysis. In Chapter II, we describe the data sources and why the sizes of the analysis samples varied by data source. In Chapter III, we present the baseline characteristics and treatment-control equivalence tests for the parent survey respondent sample and the full research sample. In Chapter IV, we describe how we constructed each outcome used in the interim impact analysis. We show the response rates to the 18-month parent and youth surveys and how we addressed potential issues arising from survey nonresponse in Chapter V, followed by a discussion of our treatment of missing data in Chapter VI. In Chapter VII, we discuss our impact estimation methods and present additional inference statistics from the regression-adjusted impact estimates along with unadjusted impact estimates. In Chapter VIII, we present estimated impacts on primary outcomes for subgroups of youth enrolled in the evaluation. We discuss a sensitivity analysis related to our measures of the intensity of services received by youth and their family in Chapter IX. In the final chapter of the appendix, we discuss the data and analytic approach used for the cost analysis.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

II. DATA SOURCES AND SIZES OF ANALYSIS SAMPLES

This chapter provides additional information about the different sources of data used in the interim impact analysis and explains why the size of the analysis samples varied by data source. The data sources for the interim impact analysis included the parent and youth 18-month surveys, the Achieving Success by Promoting Readiness for Education and Employment (ASPIRE) program’s baseline survey, and administrative data. Section A below includes information on the timing of the surveys and the time period covered by the administrative data. Section B explains why the analysis samples can be smaller than the full research sample and how the size varies by data source.

A. Data sources

1. Parent and youth 18-month survey

Mathematica conducted separate follow-up surveys of the youth and their parents 18 months after they enrolled in PROMISE. The surveys were typically administered by telephone: 72 percent of youth survey respondents and 79 percent of parent survey respondents completed the survey by telephone. The remaining youth and parent survey respondents were located and interviewed by field staff.¹ The median length of the survey interview was 66 minutes for the parent survey and 32 minutes for the youth survey. Enrollment in the evaluation occurred over 25 months, beginning in April 2014 and ending in April 2016. To simplify the survey management process, we aggregated the youth into cohorts that corresponded to their month of enrollment. In each month from November 2015 to November 2017, we released one more cohort to be surveyed. Over five and a half months (a 24-week period), we attempted to conduct interviews with all members of each cohort.² Table A.1 shows the survey fielding start and end dates for each cohort and the PROMISE programs represented in each cohort.

2. ASPIRE baseline survey

ASPIRE conducted baseline youth and parent surveys. We used data from those surveys pertaining to youth self-determination. The program conducted the surveys from October 2014 to April 2016. For our analysis, we used data only from baseline interviews that ASPIRE conducted either before or within two weeks of enrollment in the evaluation. We did not use the baseline survey data for 10 cases (1 percent) because ASPIRE staff had conducted those surveys more than two weeks after enrollment.

¹ For a small number of cases in the ASPIRE program—33 youth and 30 parent survey respondents—the survey was self-administered. Because it was cost-prohibitive to deploy field staff due to the remote location of the households, we mailed abbreviated questionnaires designed to be self-administered and the families returned the completed questionnaires to us by mail.

² For enrollees in five of the six programs, we limited the survey field period to 24 weeks. For ASPIRE enrollees, we stopped outreach (mailings, field effort, calls) at week 20 to avoid overlap with the program’s own formative evaluation survey efforts.

Table A.1. Schedule for 18-month survey

Cohort #	Enrollment month	Survey fielding start month	Survey fielding end month	PROMISE programs included in cohort					
				Arkansas PROMISE	ASPIRE	CaPROMISE	MD PROMISE	NYS PROMISE	WI PROMISE
1	4/14	11/15	4/16				X		X
2	5/14	12/15	4/16				X		X
3	6/14	1/16	6/16				X		X
4	7/14	2/16	7/16				X		X
5	8/14	3/16	8/16			X	X		X
6	9/14	4/16	9/16	X		X	X		X
7	10/14	5/16	10/16	X	X	X	X	X	X
8	11/14	6/16	11/16	X	X	X	X	X	X
9	12/14	7/16	11/16	X	X	X	X	X	X
10	1/15	8/16	1/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
11	2/15	9/16	2/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
12	3/15	10/16	3/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
13	4/15	11/16	4/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
14	5/15	12/16	5/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
15	6/15	1/17	6/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
16	7/15	2/17	7/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
17	8/15	3/17	8/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
18	9/15	4/17	9/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
19	10/15	5/17	10/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
20	11/15	6/17	11/17	X	X	X	X	X	X
21	12/15	7/17	1/18	X	X	X	X	X	X
22	1/16	8/17	2/18	X	X	X	X	X	X
23	2/16	9/17	3/18	X	X	X	X	X	X
24	3/16	10/17	3/18	X	X	X		X	X
25	4/16	11/17	3/18	X	X	X		X	X

CaPROMISE = California PROMISE, MD = Maryland, NYS = New York State, WI = Wisconsin.

3. Administrative data

This section discusses the four sources of administrative data used to conduct the interim impact analysis (supplementing the information provided in Chapter II): (1) the PROMISE random assignment system, (2) SSA records, (3) state Medicaid agency records, and (4) state vocational rehabilitation (VR) agency records. First, as an overview, Table A.2 shows the states for which each source of administrative data was available.

Table A.2. Administrative data sources by state

Data source	PROMISE states with youth data	PROMISE states with parent data
Random assignment system	All	All
SSA	All	All
Medicaid	All except New York	All except Arizona and New York
VR	All	All

Note: The 11 states in which PROMISE programs were implemented are Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Maryland, Montana, New York, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin.

a. Random assignment system data

The random assignment system was a web-based system that Mathematica designed and maintained to enroll youth in PROMISE and assign them either to a treatment or control group. Program staff at each program entered data about an enrolling youth and the enrolling parent into the random assignment system at the time of enrollment (from April 2014 through April 2016). Data from this system are available for each PROMISE program and all randomly assigned youth and the parent who enrolled them.

The random assignment system captured the treatment status used in all of our analyses. Because treatment services were provided at the household level, we attempted to purposively assign all siblings of PROMISE-enrolled youth to the same research group (treatment or control) as their sibling. In some cases, we were unable to identify that two youth were siblings until after random assignment. Siblings could be missed if the information provided by the parent at the time of random assignment was inconsistent across siblings; for example, two different parents could have enrolled the two youth, or the parent may have listed a different birth date for him or herself. In these cases, upon learning of the sibling status, we later re-classified youth to ensure only one youth in a family was in the research sample. If siblings were assigned to different groups, then if receipt of services had already begun we removed the control group youth from the research sample. If the youth were assigned to the same study group or receipt of services had not yet begun, the youth who was randomly assigned later was removed from the research sample. Only a small handful of cases were removed from the research sample after having been randomly assigned – 6 in Arkansas, 1 in ASPIRE, 8 in Maryland, 6 in New York, and 3 in Wisconsin.

b. SSA data

We obtained data on the youth's and parents' SSA disability payments and annual earnings.³ We used the disability program benefit data from April 2013 to October 2017, which covered the 12 months prior to random assignment through the 18 months following PROMISE enrollment for all youth enrollees and their parents. The annual earnings data covered 2013 through 2017, which encompassed the calendar years before and after the year of enrollment for all enrollees. Data on SSI receipt, including dates of application and monthly payment amounts, came from the Supplemental Security Record (SSR). SSA data on Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (OASDI) program payments came from the Payment History Update System for all months through 2016 and from the Master Beneficiary Record for all months in 2017. In addition to data on outcomes related to benefits, we obtained data on several key baseline characteristics from the SSR, including length of SSI payment receipt at random assignment, age at first SSI application, and the primary impairment that was the basis for the youth's SSI eligibility.

c. State Medicaid data

We received data from the Medicaid agencies of all states participating in PROMISE except New York.⁴ The Medicaid data we obtained covered the 18-month period following the first and

³ Mathematica did not have direct access to the Master Earnings File. The evaluation team worked with SSA staff to analyze these data.

⁴ Early in the evaluation we considered obtaining Medicaid data from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) rather than from each PROMISE state, but because of the time lag in the availability of the CMS

last enrollment in each PROMISE program. For some states, we did not have adequate information to construct all Medicaid outcomes planned for the interim impact analysis. Table A.3 shows the primary and supplementary outcome measures we constructed by using Medicaid data for youth. Each entry indicates whether the state provided sufficient data to allow us to construct the outcome. For example, there were no comprehensive Medicaid managed care plans in Arkansas, so this measure was not applicable. Several states did not provide information about Capitated Behavioral Health Plan enrollment. In addition, only partial data were available for ASPIRE enrollees because not all states provided the data. For example, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota did not offer comprehensive managed care plans to youth, so this information was missing in those states. Importantly, all Medicaid outcomes for parents in Arizona were missing because about 70 percent of the cases we received from the state were missing information. Because of the large amount of missing data, we did not use these data in the analysis.⁵

Table A.3. Ability to construct key analytic outcomes using Medicaid data

Outcome	Arkansas PROMISE	ASPIRE	CaPROMISE	MD PROMISE	WI PROMISE
Number of months enrolled in Medicaid	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Total Medicaid expenditures	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Enrolled in Medicaid managed care	N/A	P ^{1,2}	Y	Y	Y
Enrolled in Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	N/A	P ²	Y	Y	Y
Enrolled in Medicaid capitated behavioral health plan	N/A	P ^{2,3}	N	N	Y
Fee-for-service payments	Y	P ²	Y	Y	Y
Capitated payments	N/A	P ^{1,2}	Y	Y	Y

N/A = not applicable, N = no, P = partial, and Y = yes.

¹ Comprehensive managed care plans are not available in Montana and South Dakota or for youth in North Dakota, so enrollment and capitated payments are not available in these states.

² Colorado only provided information to calculate the primary Medicaid outcomes of number of months enrolled in Medicaid and total Medicaid expenditures. All other variables are missing for Colorado.

³ Capitated behavioral health plans are not available in South Dakota, so enrollment is not available. Information on capitated behavioral health is not reported in North Dakota.

d. State VR agency data

We received state VR agency data for all programs. As shown in Table A.4, the Arkansas and Montana VR agencies did not provide complete information on service receipt for all participants. These states changed how they reported data in 2016, based on new Rehabilitation Services Administration reporting requirements. The changes resulted in an incomplete service receipt history for VR participants whose cases were open at the time the data reporting structure changed. Because this affected a large share of cases, potentially over many months, we did not use the VR data from these states in the analysis.

data, we opted to request the data directly from the states. SSA and the New York Medicaid agency were not able to establish a data use agreement, so we did not obtain Medicaid data from New York.

⁵ The data were missing in Arizona because of issues the Medicaid agency had with the original consent form signed by the parents. The state only provided data for parents who provided consent on a revised form that was implemented in 2016, after most families had enrolled in the program.

Table A.4. Ability to construct key analytic outcomes using VR data

Outcomes	Arkansas			MD	NYS	WI
	PROMISE	ASPIRE	CaPROMISE	PROMISE	PROMISE	PROMISE
Applied for VR services	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Duration from RA to VR application	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Received VR services	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Types of VR services received	N	P ¹	Y	Y	Y	Y

RA = random assignment

¹ VR data in Montana did not include the types of VR services received.

B. Sizes of analysis samples

The sizes of the full research sample and analysis samples by treatment status and program are shown in Chapter II, Table II.1 of the interim services and impact report. The analysis sample sizes can be smaller than the research sample sizes, but the reason for the difference varies by data source (18-month survey, SSA data, Medicaid data, and VR data).

For the 18-month survey data, the analysis samples were smaller than the research sample because of sampling, survey nonresponse, and the deaths of enrollees. We sampled 2,000 of the 3,097 CaPROMISE research cases in order to meet the contractual requirement to interview no more than 2,000 youth in each program. We did not have survey data on the youth and parents who did not respond to the survey or who died before completing the survey.

For the SSA data, all PROMISE youth in the research sample were included in the analysis sample, as were most parents. Because of the eligibility criteria associated with enrollment in PROMISE, all youth needed to provide a valid Social Security number (SSN) to enroll in the program. Therefore, SSA had information on all youth in the research sample. Parents could be identified in SSA records in two different ways:

1. Using information in the SSR, SSA identified a youth's parents (if available) as of the month of PROMISE enrollment. If the enrolling parent was either the youth's mother or father, the analysis sample included any parents identified in the SSR.
2. If the enrolling parent was not a mother or father or there were no parents identified on the SSR, the analysis sample included the enrolling parent only if he or she provided a valid SSN.

For Medicaid and VR data, the analysis sample excluded those parents who did not have a valid SSN and therefore could not be accurately matched to the state data. This included parents who did not provide an SSN as well as instances in which the state agency had an SSN but SSA could not verify that the SSN was correct. Without a valid SSN, we were unable to determine whether a lack of data was due to the SSN being incorrect or due to the individual not participating in Medicaid or VR. In addition, some states excluded from the data extract some or all of the youth and their parents who had withdrawn from the evaluation or died (Arkansas and the ASPIRE states), while other states included data on those individuals (California, Maryland, and Wisconsin). In Wisconsin, the data did not reflect the period after the date of an enrollee's withdrawal, so the outcome variables we constructed were incomplete for those enrollees. Because there were few of these cases, their inclusion should not bias the estimates. In other states, if enrollees withdrew because they moved out of state, for example, the data would also

indicate that they were no longer enrolled in Medicaid or participating in VR because they would no longer be enrolled in that state. We did not exclude these cases from the analysis.

III. BASELINE EQUIVALENCE OF PARENT SURVEY RESPONDENT SAMPLE AND FULL RESEARCH SAMPLE

This chapter presents the baseline characteristics and comparisons of baseline characteristics between the treatment and control groups for additional analysis samples in each PROMISE program. In Chapters III to VIII of the report, we presented the baseline characteristics of the youth survey respondent sample for each program and assessed the equivalence of the treatment and control groups in that sample. Here, we present the baseline characteristics and equivalence tests for the parent survey respondent sample (Tables A.5a to A.5f) and the full research sample (Tables A.6a to A.6f) for each PROMISE program.

We found that for both samples, on average, most of the baseline characteristics were similar for the treatment and control group in each program. In other words, results for both the parent survey respondent sample and the full research sample suggested that random assignment created treatment and control groups in each program that were equivalent in their baseline characteristics. This provided further confirmation that the regression-adjusted impact analysis yielded unbiased estimates of program impacts for all of the analysis samples. In the few cases where we found statistically significant differences between the treatment and control groups at baseline, we believe the results can still be interpreted as the causal impacts of PROMISE. Because we conducted random assignment in a way that ensured compliance, including removing any cases that were purposively assigned to one group or the other, we are confident that the treatment and control groups are not systematically different from one another. Though some individual characteristics may show statistically significant differences, these are likely to be due to statistical chance; with a significance level of 10 percent, we expect to reject the null hypothesis that the groups are equivalent for 1 out of every 10 characteristics by chance alone, even when the two groups in fact have no underlying differences. Therefore, significant differences for a few characteristics, out of the 25 we considered, are not concerning. To further mitigate any concerns, our regression models included any baseline characteristics that were significantly different at baseline as covariates in our regression-adjusted impact analysis, allowing us to control for the observed differences.

Table A.5a. Arkansas PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	33.3	33.3	33.3	-0.0	0.98
Youth age at RA					
14 years	38.7	38.3	39.2	-0.9	0.66
15 years	27.4	26.8	28.0	-1.3	
16 years	33.9	35.0	32.8	2.2	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.4	0.0	0.50
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	97.3	97.4	97.2	0.2	0.80
English is preferred spoken language	97.2	97.2	97.2	0.1	0.92
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	86.2	85.5	87.1	-1.6	0.54
Own household or alone	12.7	13.3	12.1	1.1	
Another household and receiving support	1.0	1.3	0.8	0.5	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	21.0	20.5	21.6	-1.1	0.75
Non-Hispanic black	55.1	55.8	54.3	1.5	
Hispanic	7.7	7.2	8.2	-1.0	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.9	0.8	1.1	-0.3	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	7.8	8.6	7.0	1.6	
Missing	7.5	7.2	7.8	-0.6	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	42.3	42.2	42.4	-0.2	0.62
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	26.3	25.8	26.8	-1.0	0.66
Non-Hispanic black	58.6	59.3	57.9	1.4	
Hispanic	6.1	6.0	6.1	-0.1	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.9	0.6	1.2	-0.6	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	5.8	6.4	5.3	1.1	
Missing	2.3	1.9	2.7	-0.8	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	41.8	42.5	41.1	1.4	0.87
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.1	
Physical disability	9.4	8.8	10.1	-1.2	
Other mental impairment	44.7	44.4	45.2	-0.8	
Other or unknown disability	2.9	3.1	2.7	0.5	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	93.6	92.2	95.1	-3.0	0.02**
Received OASDI	15.2	15.1	15.2	-0.1	0.98
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.7	8.7	8.8	-0.1	0.77
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.1	7.1	7.0	0.1	0.67
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,205	7,180	7,230	-49	0.67
OASDI	452	452	452	0	0.99
Total SSI and OASDI	7,657	7,633	7,681	-49	0.61
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	27.8	26.9	28.7	-1.8	0.43
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	90.7	90.2	91.2	-1.1	0.48
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	1.8	2.1	1.5	0.7	0.24
One parent	64.0	62.1	65.9	-3.7	
Two parents	34.2	35.7	32.7	3.0	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	10.2	9.8	10.6	-0.8	0.85
Any parent received OASDI only	11.8	11.8	11.8	-0.0	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	7.6	7.8	7.3	0.5	
No parent received any SSA payments	68.7	68.5	68.8	-0.3	
No parent was included in the SSA data analyses	1.8	2.1	1.5	0.7	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.72
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	9	5	14	-10	0.25
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	70.3	70.6	70	0.6	0.80
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	14,547	15,060	14,018	1,042	0.22
Number of parents	1,544	786	758		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parents who completed the PROMISE 18-month parent survey. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.5b. ASPIRE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.6	33.0	32.3	0.7	0.78
Youth age at RA					
14 years	37.8	37.5	38.0	-0.5	0.94
15 years	31.5	31.3	31.7	-0.3	
16 years	30.7	31.2	30.3	0.8	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.4	0.0	0.88
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	91.6	91.6	91.7	-0.2	0.91
English is preferred spoken language	91.3	91.2	91.4	-0.2	0.90
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	83.1	83.3	82.9	0.4	0.15
Own household or alone	14.0	14.6	13.4	1.2	
Another household and receiving support	2.9	2.1	3.7	-1.6	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	32.9	33.5	32.3	1.2	0.69
Non-Hispanic black	10.5	9.3	11.8	-2.5	
Hispanic	33.8	34.7	33.0	1.7	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	6.6	6.4	6.7	-0.3	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	7.2	7.2	7.1	0.1	
Missing	9.0	9.0	9.1	-0.1	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.0	43.9	44.1	-0.2	0.66
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	42.3	43.0	41.7	1.2	0.75
Non-Hispanic black	11.1	10.6	11.7	-1.1	
Hispanic	31.3	31.9	30.7	1.3	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	6.3	6.5	6.0	0.5	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	5.6	5.0	6.2	-1.2	
Missing	3.4	3.0	3.7	-0.7	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	44.8	46.3	43.3	3.0	0.26
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	2.5	2.3	2.7	-0.4	
Physical disability	19.3	20.0	18.6	1.5	
Other mental impairment	28.6	26.2	31.0	-4.8	
Other or unknown disability	4.7	5.1	4.3	0.8	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	91.7	91.7	91.7	0.0	1.00
Received OASDI	10.5	11.8	9.1	2.6	0.08*
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.8	8.9	8.7	0.2	0.43
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.2	7.0	7.3	-0.3	0.14
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,136	7,082	7,192	-111	0.33
OASDI	307	311	303	9	0.88
Total SSI and OASDI	7,443	7,393	7,495	-102	0.34
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	17.8	18.5	17.1	1.4	0.46
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	71.3	71.9	70.7	1.2	0.59
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	8.7	8.1	9.3	-1.2	0.67
One parent	49.3	49.5	49.2	0.3	
Two parents	42.0	42.4	41.5	0.9	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	8.9	8.5	9.3	-0.8	0.72
Any parent received OASDI only	9.9	10.7	9.1	1.6	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	4.2	4.3	4.2	0.1	
No parent received any SSA payments	68.3	68.5	68.2	0.3	
No parent was included in the SSA data analyses	8.7	8.1	9.3	-1.2	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	1.6	1.8	1.3	0.5	0.43
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	12	15	10	5	0.46
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	71.2	70.1	72.4	-2.2	0.34
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	18,564	18,915	18,200	714	0.54
Number of parents	1,614	817	797		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parents who completed the PROMISE 18-month parent survey. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.5c. CaPROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.3	30.9	33.7	-2.8	0.22
Youth age at RA					
14 years	35.1	36.6	33.6	3.0	0.32
15 years	30.6	30.7	30.6	0.1	
16 years	34.2	32.7	35.8	-3.1	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.5	-0.1	0.26
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	64.2	64.7	63.8	0.9	0.69
English is preferred spoken language	64.2	64.5	63.8	0.7	0.76
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	77.1	75.5	78.8	-3.2	0.28
Own household or alone	20.3	21.7	18.8	2.9	
Another household and receiving support	2.6	2.7	2.4	0.3	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	6.5	7.3	5.6	1.8	0.70
Non-Hispanic black	17.5	16.7	18.2	-1.5	
Hispanic	62.7	62.4	63.1	-0.8	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.8	0.7	0.8	-0.1	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	7.6	8.0	7.2	0.8	
Missing	5.0	4.9	5.1	-0.2	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.1	44.3	44.0	0.3	0.46
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	8.8	9.3	8.2	1.1	0.77
Non-Hispanic black	19.6	19.7	19.5	0.2	
Hispanic	62.0	61.2	62.9	-1.7	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.4	0.2	0.6	-0.4	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	7.0	7.2	6.9	0.4	
Missing	2.2	2.4	1.9	0.5	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	47.5	46.6	48.4	-1.8	0.37
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	2.8	2.8	2.8	-0.0	
Physical disability	18.6	17.5	19.8	-2.3	
Other mental impairment	24.0	25.2	22.8	2.3	
Other or unknown disability	7.0	7.9	6.2	1.8	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	94.3	93.4	95.3	-1.9	0.11
Received OASDI	7.0	8.0	6.0	2.0	0.11
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	9.1	8.8	9.3	-0.6	0.01***
Youth age at most recent SSI application	6.8	7.0	6.7	0.3	0.17
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,396	7,295	7,502	-207	0.05*
OASDI	211	264	156	108	0.02**
Total SSI and OASDI	7,607	7,559	7,658	-99	0.32
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	14.0	14.1	13.9	0.1	0.93
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	62.2	61.7	62.7	-1.0	0.62
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	14.5	14.8	14.1	0.7	0.18
One parent	50.3	52.1	48.5	3.6	
Two parents	35.2	33.1	37.4	-4.3	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	6.9	6.8	7.0	-0.2	0.91
Any parent received OASDI only	6.7	7.1	6.3	0.8	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	3.1	3.3	2.9	0.4	
No parent received any SSA payments	68.9	68.0	69.8	-1.8	
No parent was included in the SSA data	14.5	14.8	14.1	0.7	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	2.3	2.9	1.8	1.1	0.15
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	38	43	33	10	0.74
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	74.5	73.3	75.8	-2.5	0.27
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	17,511	17,267	17,763	-496	0.62
Number of parents	1,682	855	827		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parents who completed the PROMISE 18-month parent survey. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.5d. MD PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	34.9	32.8	37.1	-4.3	0.08*
Youth age at RA					
14 years	26.4	24.7	28.2	-3.5	0.28
15 years	25.6	25.8	25.4	0.5	
16 years	48.0	49.5	46.5	3.0	
Average age	15.8	15.8	15.7	0.1	0.14
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	96.5	96.3	96.8	-0.5	0.62
English is preferred spoken language	96.2	96.1	96.4	-0.3	0.73
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	86.3	85.8	86.7	-0.9	0.75
Own household or alone	10.5	11.0	9.9	1.1	
Another household and receiving support	3.3	3.2	3.4	-0.2	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	17.7	17.7	17.6	0.2	0.66
Non-Hispanic black	57.7	56.5	58.8	-2.3	
Hispanic	8.1	9.2	7.0	2.1	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	1.7	1.5	1.9	-0.4	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	7.3	7.6	6.9	0.7	
Missing	7.6	7.4	7.7	-0.3	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	43.3	43.3	43.3	-0.0	0.98
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	23.2	22.5	24.0	-1.5	0.61
Non-Hispanic black	60.6	59.6	61.5	-1.9	
Hispanic	6.9	7.5	6.3	1.2	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	1.2	1.3	1.1	0.1	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	5.2	5.7	4.6	1.1	
Missing	3.0	3.4	2.5	0.9	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	37.0	36.9	37.1	-0.3	0.94
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.5	1.7	1.4	0.3	
Physical disability	10.8	10.3	11.3	-1.0	
Other mental impairment	47.9	48.5	47.2	1.2	
Other or unknown disability	2.8	2.7	2.9	-0.2	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	95.0	95.4	94.5	0.9	0.43
Received OASDI	11.3	12.1	10.5	1.5	0.34
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.3	8.3	8.4	-0.1	0.51
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.9	8.1	7.8	0.3	0.13
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,274	7,366	7,180	186	0.12
OASDI	355	366	345	22	0.73
Total SSI and OASDI	7,629	7,732	7,525	207	0.05*
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	16.8	16.9	16.8	0.1	0.96
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	59.4	59.9	58.9	1.0	0.70
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	5.8	5.5	6.0	-0.4	0.47
One parent	69.8	68.7	70.9	-2.2	
Two parents	24.5	25.8	23.1	2.6	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	7.8	8.3	7.3	1.0	0.12
Any parent received OASDI only	8.2	9.6	6.8	2.7	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	5.0	5.7	4.2	1.5	
No parent received any SSA payments	73.3	70.9	75.7	-4.8	
No parent was included in the SSA data analyses	5.8	5.5	6.0	-0.4	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	4.6	4.9	4.4	0.5	0.62
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	39	43	36	7	0.51
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	67.2	68.1	66.3	1.8	0.46
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	14,991	14,812	15,173	-361	0.73
Number of parents	1,576	795	781		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parents who completed the PROMISE 18-month parent survey. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.5e. NYS PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.7	31.8	33.6	-1.8	0.42
Youth age at RA					
14 years	38.0	39.2	36.8	2.5	0.56
15 years	31.2	30.4	32.0	-1.5	
16 years	30.8	30.3	31.3	-1.0	
Average age	15.4	15.3	15.4	-0.0	0.34
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	85.2	84.7	85.7	-1.1	0.52
English is preferred spoken language	84.9	84.9	85.0	-0.1	0.96
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	85.3	88.1	82.4	5.7	0.00***
Own household or alone	12.9	10.5	15.2	-4.7	
Another household and receiving support	1.8	1.3	2.3	-1.0	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	7.5	7.4	7.5	-0.2	0.21
Non-Hispanic black	38.6	36.9	40.4	-3.6	
Hispanic	37.1	40.1	34.1	6.0	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.8	0.7	0.9	-0.2	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	8.7	8.0	9.4	-1.4	
Missing	7.2	7.0	7.5	-0.6	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.2	44.1	44.2	-0.1	0.75
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	11.6	12.2	11.0	1.2	0.20
Non-Hispanic black	42.0	41.6	42.5	-0.9	
Hispanic	35.1	35.4	34.9	0.5	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.9	0.3	1.4	-1.1	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	7.8	8.3	7.3	1.1	
Missing	2.5	2.1	2.9	-0.8	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	57.2	57.3	57.2	0.1	0.50
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.2	0.8	1.7	-0.9	
Physical disability	12.1	12.0	12.1	-0.2	
Other mental impairment	25.4	26.1	24.7	1.4	
Other or unknown disability	4.1	3.9	4.3	-0.4	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	96.0	95.7	96.4	-0.7	0.44
Received OASDI	9.7	8.7	10.7	-2.0	0.15
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	9.7	9.8	9.5	0.2	0.24
Youth age at most recent SSI application	6.1	6.0	6.3	-0.3	0.10*
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,561	7,607	7,515	91	0.38
OASDI	285	231	340	-109	0.04**
Total SSI and OASDI	7,847	7,838	7,855	-17	0.85
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	18.7	18.3	19.2	-0.9	0.62
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	85.2	86.4	83.9	2.5	0.14
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	5.5	3.5	7.5	-3.9	0.00***
One parent	67.6	68.8	66.4	2.4	
Two parents	26.9	27.7	26.2	1.5	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	11.5	11.5	11.4	0.1	0.00***
Any parent received OASDI only	8.6	7.9	9.4	-1.5	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	5.9	5.8	6.0	-0.2	
No parent received any SSA payments	68.5	71.3	65.7	5.6	
No parent was included in the SSA data	5.5	3.5	7.5	-3.9	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	6.7	6.3	7.1	-0.8	0.53
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	54	51	57	-6	0.53
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	62.5	62.1	63.0	-0.8	0.73
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	13,644	14,185	13,072	1,114	0.21
Number of parents	1,763	887	876		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parents who completed the PROMISE 18-month parent survey. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.5f. WI PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the parent survey respondent sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	33.5	33.1	33.9	-0.8	0.73
Youth age at RA					
14 years	38.9	39.0	38.8	0.2	0.57
15 years	27.0	28.0	26.0	2.0	
16 years	34.1	33.0	35.2	-2.2	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.4	-0.0	0.63
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	95.2	94.8	95.7	-0.9	0.40
English is preferred spoken language	95.1	94.8	95.4	-0.6	0.58
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	87.9	87.6	88.3	-0.7	0.17
Own household or alone	11.4	11.3	11.5	-0.1	
Another household and receiving support	0.7	1.1	0.3	0.8	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	30.7	31.4	29.9	1.5	0.48
Non-Hispanic black	37.6	36.3	38.8	-2.5	
Hispanic	13.3	14.1	12.4	1.7	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.1	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	8.1	7.2	9.2	-2.0	
Missing	7.9	8.6	7.3	1.3	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	41.6	41.7	41.5	0.2	0.58
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	41.1	41.7	40.4	1.3	0.02**
Non-Hispanic black	38.4	37.8	39.1	-1.2	
Hispanic	9.8	10.5	9.0	1.5	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	2.0	2.5	1.6	0.9	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	6.1	4.3	8.0	-3.7	
Missing	2.6	3.2	1.8	1.4	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	37.8	38.5	37.1	1.4	0.47
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.3	1.5	1.1	0.5	
Physical disability	12.2	12.6	11.9	0.6	
Other mental impairment	44.5	42.7	46.4	-3.7	
Other or unknown disability	4.1	4.7	3.5	1.2	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	95.6	95.5	95.8	-0.3	0.78
Received OASDI	12.2	12.0	12.4	-0.5	0.78
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.4	8.5	8.4	0.1	0.58
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.4	7.4	7.5	-0.1	0.68
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,287	7,251	7,325	-73	0.51
OASDI	316	300	333	-33	0.55
Total SSI and OASDI	7,603	7,551	7,658	-107	0.29
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	22.3	22.0	22.6	-0.6	0.78
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	91.3	90.8	91.9	-1.0	0.48
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	3.6	3.7	3.4	0.3	0.95
One parent	59.8	59.6	60.0	-0.4	
Two parents	36.6	36.7	36.5	0.1	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	12.3	11.3	13.4	-2.1	0.64
Any parent received OASDI only	8.5	7.9	9.1	-1.2	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	8.0	8.1	7.9	0.2	
No parent received any SSA payments	67.6	69.0	66.2	2.8	
No parent was included in the SSA data	3.6	3.7	3.4	0.3	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	3.7	3.9	3.6	0.4	0.70
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	32	36	27	9	0.48
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	70.9	71.1	70.8	0.3	0.90
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	13,770	13,995	13,536	458	0.58
Number of parents	1,570	803	767		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parents who completed the PROMISE 18-month parent survey. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.6a. Arkansas PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	33.6	33.2	34.0	-0.8	0.73
Youth age at RA					
14 years	38.3	37.8	38.8	-1.0	0.51
15 years	27.5	26.8	28.3	-1.5	
16 years	34.1	35.4	32.9	2.5	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.4	0.0	0.38
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	97.5	97.7	97.3	0.3	0.64
English is preferred spoken language	97.5	97.6	97.3	0.2	0.76
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	86.7	85.6	87.8	-2.2	0.38
Own household or alone	12.1	13.1	11.2	1.8	
Another household and receiving support	1.2	1.3	1.0	0.3	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	18.1	17.9	18.3	-0.4	0.33
Non-Hispanic black	47.4	48.8	45.9	2.8	
Hispanic	6.6	6.3	7.0	-0.7	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.8	0.7	0.9	-0.2	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	6.8	7.6	5.9	1.8	
Missing	20.3	18.7	22.0	-3.3	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	41.9	41.9	41.9	-0.0	0.98
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	22.6	22.6	22.6	-0.1	0.30
Non-Hispanic black	50.0	51.4	48.6	2.8	
Hispanic	5.2	5.2	5.2	-0.0	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.8	0.6	1.0	-0.4	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	5.0	5.5	4.4	1.1	
Missing	16.4	14.7	18.1	-3.4	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	41.9	42.5	41.4	1.1	0.92
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.1	1.0	1.1	-0.1	
Physical disability	9.4	9.0	9.9	-0.9	
Other mental impairment	44.7	44.5	45.0	-0.5	
Other or unknown disability	2.9	3.1	2.7	0.4	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	94.0	92.6	95.5	-2.9	0.01**
Received OASDI	14.7	15.2	14.2	0.9	0.57
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.7	8.7	8.7	0.0	0.84
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.1	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.98
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,217	7,193	7,241	-48	0.65
OASDI	414	433	396	37	0.54
Total SSI and OASDI	7,632	7,626	7,637	-11	0.90
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	28.0	27.4	28.6	-1.2	0.57
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	90.4	89.6	91.2	-1.6	0.24
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	1.8	2.3	1.2	1.1	0.08*
One parent	63.4	61.5	65.4	-3.9	
Two parents	34.8	36.2	33.4	2.8	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	9.8	9.8	9.8	0.1	0.51
Any parent received OASDI only	11.5	11.6	11.3	0.3	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	7.6	7.7	7.4	0.3	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.4	68.5	70.3	-1.8	
No parent was included in the SSA data	1.8	2.3	1.2	1.1	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.1	0.80
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	13	6	20	-15	0.14
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	70.9	71	70.8	0.2	0.92
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	14,481	14,809	14,156	653	0.40
Number of research sample members	1,805	904	901		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.6b. ASPIRE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.8	33.7	31.8	2.0	0.36
Youth age at RA					
14 years	37.2	37.5	36.8	0.7	0.92
15 years	32.0	31.6	32.4	-0.8	
16 years	30.8	30.9	30.8	0.1	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.4	-0.0	0.67
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	92.0	92.3	91.7	0.6	0.60
English is preferred spoken language	91.7	92.0	91.3	0.7	0.55
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	83.6	83.9	83.2	0.8	0.16
Own household or alone	13.6	13.9	13.2	0.7	
Another household and receiving support	2.9	2.1	3.6	-1.4	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	27.1	27.7	26.5	1.3	0.56
Non-Hispanic black	8.9	7.9	9.9	-2.1	
Hispanic	28.5	29.6	27.4	2.2	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	5.2	5.2	5.2	-0.0	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	5.9	6.0	5.8	0.2	
Missing	24.4	23.6	25.1	-1.5	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	43.9	43.7	44.1	-0.3	0.47
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	34.7	35.5	33.9	1.5	0.62
Non-Hispanic black	9.4	9.1	9.6	-0.5	
Hispanic	26.2	27.1	25.3	1.8	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	5.0	5.2	4.7	0.5	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	4.7	4.2	5.1	-0.9	
Missing	20.1	18.9	21.2	-2.3	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	44.7	46.1	43.3	2.8	0.29
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	2.5	2.1	2.8	-0.6	
Physical disability	19.1	19.7	18.5	1.3	
Other mental impairment	28.9	26.9	30.9	-4.0	
Other or unknown disability	4.9	5.1	4.6	0.5	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	91.6	91.8	91.3	0.5	0.67
Received OASDI	10.4	11.9	8.9	2.9	0.03**
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.8	8.8	8.7	0.1	0.53
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.2	7.1	7.3	-0.2	0.30
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,117	7,088	7,146	-58	0.58
OASDI	296	307	286	22	0.66
Total SSI and OASDI	7,414	7,396	7,432	-36	0.71
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	17.7	18.2	17.2	1.0	0.57
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	71.2	71.6	70.8	0.8	0.69
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	8.5	8.1	8.9	-0.8	0.72
One parent	49.8	49.6	50.1	-0.5	
Two parents	41.7	42.3	41.0	1.3	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	8.7	8.4	9.0	-0.6	0.82
Any parent received OASDI only	9.6	10.2	8.9	1.3	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	4.0	4.1	4.0	0.1	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.2	69.2	69.1	0.1	
No parent was included in the SSA data	8.5	8.1	8.9	-0.8	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	1.4	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.99
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	11	11	10	2	0.75
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	72.2	71.3	73.2	-1.9	0.36
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	18,691	18,817	18,563	254	0.81
Number of research sample members	1,953	978	975		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.6c. CaPROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.6	32.0	33.3	-1.3	0.43
Youth age at RA					
14 years	34.6	35.7	33.4	2.3	0.36
15 years	30.7	30.5	30.9	-0.4	
16 years	34.7	33.8	35.7	-1.9	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.5	-0.0	0.23
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	64.6	64.1	65.1	-0.9	0.56
English is preferred spoken language	64.7	64.0	65.3	-1.3	0.41
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	76.0	75.6	76.4	-0.9	0.69
Own household or alone	21.5	22.0	20.9	1.1	
Another household and receiving support	2.5	2.4	2.6	-0.3	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	3.5	4.0	3.0	1.0	0.50
Non-Hispanic black	9.3	9.2	9.4	-0.1	
Hispanic	34.7	34.9	34.5	0.4	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.0	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	4.0	4.4	3.6	0.8	
Missing	48.1	47.1	49.2	-2.1	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.1	44.2	43.9	0.3	0.27
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	4.6	5.0	4.3	0.7	0.77
Non-Hispanic black	10.3	10.6	10.0	0.6	
Hispanic	34.4	34.3	34.4	-0.1	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.2	0.1	0.3	-0.1	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	3.7	3.9	3.5	0.4	
Missing	46.8	46.1	47.6	-1.5	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	47.8	47.7	47.8	-0.2	0.83
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	2.8	3.0	2.6	0.4	
Physical disability	18.9	18.2	19.5	-1.3	
Other mental impairment	23.7	24.2	23.1	1.1	
Other or unknown disability	6.9	6.8	6.9	-0.1	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	93.7	93.3	94.0	-0.7	0.46
Received OASDI	7.0	7.4	6.6	0.8	0.39
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	9.0	8.9	9.2	-0.4	0.02**
Youth age at most recent SSI application	6.9	7.0	6.8	0.2	0.18
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,404	7,382	7,426	-45	0.56
OASDI	218	234	201	33	0.33
Total SSI and OASDI	7,622	7,616	7,628	-12	0.87
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	14.3	14.0	14.6	-0.6	0.62
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	61.3	60.3	62.4	-2.1	0.17
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	15.1	15.3	14.9	0.4	0.46
One parent	50.4	51.3	49.6	1.7	
Two parents	34.5	33.4	35.5	-2.1	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	6.6	6.5	6.8	-0.4	0.66
Any parent received OASDI only	5.8	6.1	5.6	0.5	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	2.9	3.3	2.5	0.8	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.5	68.9	70.2	-1.3	
No parent was included in the SSA data	15.1	15.3	14.9	0.4	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	2.4	2.6	2.1	0.6	0.28
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	33	29	37	-8	0.70
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	74.4	73.2	75.6	-2.5	0.14
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	18,137	17,731	18,539	-808	0.28
Number of research sample members	3,097	1,548	1,549		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.6d. MD PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	34.7	32.8	36.6	-3.8	0.09*
Youth age at RA					
14 years	26.0	24.8	27.2	-2.4	0.44
15 years	25.9	25.9	25.9	-0.1	
16 years	48.1	49.4	46.9	2.5	
Average age	15.8	15.8	15.7	0.1	0.19
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	96.8	96.8	96.9	-0.1	0.91
English is preferred spoken language	96.6	96.6	96.6	0.0	0.98
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	86.7	86.4	86.9	-0.5	0.96
Own household or alone	10.2	10.4	10.0	0.4	
Another household and receiving support	3.2	3.2	3.1	0.1	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	15.1	15.2	14.9	0.2	0.57
Non-Hispanic black	49.0	48.3	49.8	-1.5	
Hispanic	6.9	7.9	5.9	2.0	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	1.4	1.3	1.6	-0.3	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	6.2	6.5	5.8	0.7	
Missing	21.4	20.8	21.9	-1.1	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	43.0	43.0	43.1	-0.1	0.78
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	19.6	19.0	20.1	-1.1	0.79
Non-Hispanic black	51.2	50.7	51.6	-0.9	
Hispanic	5.8	6.4	5.3	1.1	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.1	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	4.3	4.8	3.9	0.9	
Missing	18.1	17.9	18.2	-0.2	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	36.5	36.5	36.6	-0.0	0.90
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.4	1.5	1.4	0.1	
Physical disability	11.3	11.3	11.3	0.0	
Other mental impairment	48.0	48.3	47.6	0.7	
Other or unknown disability	2.7	2.3	3.1	-0.8	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	94.6	95.0	94.3	0.7	0.52
Received OASDI	11.0	11.8	10.2	1.5	0.29
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.3	8.2	8.4	-0.1	0.56
Youth age at most recent SSI application	8.0	8.1	7.8	0.3	0.17
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,248	7,316	7,178	138	0.20
OASDI	339	347	330	18	0.75
Total SSI and OASDI	7,586	7,664	7,508	156	0.11
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	17.2	16.9	17.4	-0.4	0.81
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	58.5	59.2	57.8	1.3	0.56
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	6.1	5.7	6.5	-0.8	0.25
One parent	69.2	68.1	70.4	-2.4	
Two parents	24.7	26.3	23.1	3.2	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	7.6	8.4	6.7	1.8	0.09*
Any parent received OASDI only	8.0	9.2	6.9	2.3	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	4.4	5.0	3.9	1.1	
No parent received any SSA payments	73.9	71.7	76.1	-4.4	
No parent was included in the SSA data analyses	6.1	5.7	6.5	-0.8	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	4.4	4.5	4.3	0.2	0.84
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	38	41	34	7	0.47
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	67.9	69.0	66.9	2.1	0.35
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	15,353	15,190	15,519	-329	0.73
Number of research sample members	1,866	936	930		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.6e. NYS PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.2	31.6	32.7	-1.1	0.61
Youth age at RA					
14 years	37.6	38.5	36.7	1.8	0.67
15 years	31.7	31.5	31.9	-0.4	
16 years	30.7	29.9	31.4	-1.5	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.4	-0.0	0.41
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	85.2	84.7	85.7	-1.0	0.51
English is preferred spoken language	85.0	84.9	85.0	-0.1	0.94
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	85.6	88.1	83.0	5.2	0.00***
Own household or alone	12.7	10.5	14.8	-4.2	
Another household and receiving support	1.8	1.3	2.2	-0.9	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	6.5	6.5	6.5	-0.0	0.26
Non-Hispanic black	34.7	33.3	36.2	-2.9	
Hispanic	33.9	36.4	31.3	5.1	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.7	0.6	0.8	-0.2	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	7.8	7.1	8.5	-1.4	
Missing	16.4	16.1	16.7	-0.6	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.1	44.1	44.1	-0.0	0.95
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	10.0	10.6	9.4	1.3	0.19
Non-Hispanic black	37.6	37.4	37.7	-0.3	
Hispanic	32.0	32.3	31.7	0.5	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	0.8	0.3	1.3	-1.0	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	7.0	7.4	6.5	0.9	
Missing	12.7	12.0	13.4	-1.4	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	57.6	57.4	57.8	-0.4	0.65
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.3	0.9	1.6	-0.7	
Physical disability	11.6	11.9	11.4	0.4	
Other mental impairment	25.6	26.2	25.1	1.1	
Other or unknown disability	3.9	3.7	4.1	-0.4	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	96.1	95.7	96.4	-0.7	0.43
Received OASDI	9.7	8.9	10.4	-1.5	0.27
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	9.7	9.8	9.5	0.3	0.11
Youth age at most recent SSI application	6.1	5.9	6.3	-0.4	0.04**
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,570	7,589	7,550	39	0.69
OASDI	277	239	314	-76	0.13
Total SSI and OASDI	7,846	7,828	7,864	-36	0.68
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	18.8	18.4	19.1	-0.7	0.69
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	85.2	86.4	83.9	2.5	0.12
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	5.4	3.6	7.2	-3.7	0.00***
One parent	67.6	68.8	66.5	2.3	
Two parents	27.0	27.7	26.3	1.4	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	11.8	11.7	11.9	-0.3	0.01***
Any parent received OASDI only	8.6	8.2	9.1	-0.9	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	5.8	5.8	5.9	-0.1	
No parent received any SSA payments	68.3	70.8	65.9	4.9	
No parent was included in the SSA data	5.4	3.6	7.2	-3.7	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	6.6	6.5	6.6	-0.1	0.90
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	51	49	53	-4	0.69
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	63.2	62.5	64.0	-1.5	0.50
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	13,711	14,192	13,209	983	0.24
Number of research sample members	1,967	986	981		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/****Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.6f. WI PROMISE: Baseline characteristics of the research sample (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Treatment (B)	Control (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	33.2	33.1	33.3	-0.2	0.91
Youth age at RA					
14 years	39.6	39.9	39.3	0.6	0.80
15 years	26.3	26.7	25.9	0.8	
16 years	34.1	33.4	34.8	-1.4	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.4	-0.0	0.57
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	95.4	94.8	95.9	-1.0	0.28
English is preferred spoken language	95.2	94.7	95.7	-0.9	0.34
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	88.3	88.1	88.6	-0.5	0.19
Own household or alone	11.0	10.8	11.1	-0.3	
Another household and receiving support	0.7	1.1	0.3	0.7	
Youth race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	24.8	25.8	23.8	2.0	0.51
Non-Hispanic black	32.0	31.7	32.3	-0.7	
Hispanic	11.1	12.0	10.1	1.9	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	2.0	2.0	1.9	0.1	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	6.6	6.0	7.3	-1.3	
Missing	23.5	22.5	24.5	-2.0	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	41.2	41.2	41.2	-0.0	0.98
Parent race/ethnicity (from the 18-month survey)					
Non-Hispanic white	33.2	34.3	32.0	2.3	0.03**
Non-Hispanic black	32.8	33.1	32.5	0.6	
Hispanic	8.1	8.8	7.4	1.4	
Non-Hispanic American Indian	1.6	2.0	1.3	0.7	
Non-Hispanic other or mixed race	5.0	3.6	6.4	-2.9	
Missing	19.3	18.2	20.4	-2.2	
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	38.3	38.5	38.1	0.5	0.72
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.2	1.3	1.1	0.2	
Physical disability	12.6	13.2	11.9	1.2	
Other mental impairment	44.0	42.7	45.3	-2.6	
Other or unknown disability	4.0	4.3	3.6	0.7	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	95.5	95.6	95.3	0.2	0.81
Received OASDI	11.9	11.4	12.5	-1.1	0.46
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.4	8.4	8.4	0.0	0.90
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.4	7.4	7.4	0.0	0.95
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,238	7,246	7,229	16	0.87
OASDI	306	295	316	-21	0.67
Total SSI and OASDI	7,543	7,541	7,546	-5	0.96
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	21.9	20.7	23.1	-2.4	0.21
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	91.3	90.8	91.8	-0.9	0.48
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	3.4	3.5	3.4	0.1	0.92
One parent	59.7	60.1	59.3	0.8	
Two parents	36.9	36.4	37.3	-0.9	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	11.9	11.2	12.6	-1.4	0.62
Any parent received OASDI only	8.1	7.4	8.9	-1.5	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	7.6	7.7	7.5	0.2	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.0	70.3	67.7	2.7	
No parent was included in the SSA data	3.4	3.5	3.4	0.1	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	3.9	4.0	3.7	0.3	0.73
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	34	37	31	6	0.59
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	71.9	72.0	71.9	0.1	0.97
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	14,173	14,143	14,203	-59	0.94
Number of research sample members	1,896	950	946		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

IV. OUTCOME MEASURES

This chapter describes how we constructed each outcome used in the interim impact analysis. We organized the outcome descriptions by the youth and family outcome domains and noted the data source for each outcome in parentheses.

A. Youth outcomes

1. Youth's receipt of transition services

The outcomes in this domain include the following:

- **Received any transition services since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth received any of the following transition services during the 18 months after random assignment: case management, school transition planning, employment-promoting services, benefits counseling, financial education, self-advocacy or self-determination training, help accessing education or training, life skills training, help accessing or using assistive technology, or any other services to help prepare the youth for work, school, or living independently.
- **Types of services received since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This series of binary measures indicates whether the youth received each of the following services during the 18 months after random assignment:
 - Case management
 - School transition planning
 - Employment-promoting services
 - Benefits counseling
 - Financial education
 - Self-advocacy or self-determination training
 - Help accessing education or training
 - Life skills training
 - Help with assistive technology
 - Other transition services
- **Received any key transition services since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth received any key transition services (case management, employment-promoting services, benefits counseling, or financial education) during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Hours of key transition services received since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the number of hours of key transition services that the youth received from various providers during the 18 months after random assignment. For each provider of a key transition service, the parent survey respondent reported (1) the number of months, (2) the number of days per month, and (3) the number of hours per day that the youth saw the provider. For each provider, we calculated the hours that the youth

saw the provider. We then calculated this outcome by adding the hours across all the providers of key transition services. If the youth received any key transition services but had missing hours information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing hours information when constructing this measure.

- **Number of key transition service providers since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the count of unique providers of the key transition services that the youth received during the 18 months after random assignment. If the youth received any key transition services but had missing provider information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing provider information when constructing this measure.
- **Usefulness of key transition services received since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This categorical measure takes a value of 1 if the youth received no key transition services during the 18 months after random assignment, a value of 2 if the youth received at least one key transition service but rated no service “somewhat useful” or “very useful,” and a value of 3 if the youth received at least one key transition service and rated at least one service “somewhat useful” or “very useful.” If the youth received any key transition services but had missing usefulness information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing usefulness information when constructing this measure.
- **Any unmet needs for services or supports since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth needed but did not receive any of the following services or supports during the 18 months after random assignment: case management, employment-promoting services, benefits counseling, financial education, self-advocacy or self-determination training, education or training supports, referral services, transportation, health services, accommodations, other skills training, or other services.
- **Number of unmet service or support needs since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the number of unique types of services that the youth needed but did not receive during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Types of unmet service or support needs since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This series of binary measures indicates whether the youth had an unmet need for services or supports during the 18 months after random assignment for each of the following types of services:
 - Case management
 - Employment-promoting services
 - Benefits counseling
 - Financial education
 - Self-advocacy or self-determination training
 - Education or training supports
 - Referral services
 - Transportation
 - Health services

- Accommodations
- Other skills training
- Other services
- **Applied for VR services since random assignment (VR data).** This binary measure indicates whether a youth submitted an application for VR services in the 18 months after random assignment. This measure omitted youth who received Pre-Employment Transition Services from a VR agency because they were eligible or potentially eligible for VR services but did not submit a VR application.
- **Duration from random assignment to VR application (VR data).** This categorical measure groups people by the number of months between the date of random assignment and the date of application for VR services. Groups include those submitting an application within the first six months after random assignment, seven to twelve months, thirteen to eighteen months, and a final group for those who did not submit a VR application since random assignment.
- **Received VR services since random assignment (VR data).** This binary measure indicates whether a youth received VR services, as measured by having a signed Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE), during the 18 months since random assignment.
- **Types of VR services received since random assignment (VR data).** This series of binary measures indicates whether the youth received each of the following services from the VR agency during the 18 months after random assignment:
 - Education and training
 - Career
 - Other

2. Youth's education and job-related training

The outcomes in this domain include the following:

- **Enrolled in school at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth was enrolled in school at the time of the survey.
- **Ever enrolled in school since random assignment (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth was enrolled in school at any time during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Received special education or had an Individualized Education Program (IEP) since RA (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth received special education services or had an IEP during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Had a Section 504 plan since RA (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth had a Section 504 plan during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Received General Equivalency Diploma (GED), certificate of completion, or high school diploma since random assignment (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure

indicates whether the youth received a GED, high school diploma, or certificate of completion during the 18 months after random assignment.

- **Received any job-related training since random assignment (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth received job-related training during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Received any job-related training credential since random assignment (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth received a job-related training diploma, certificate, or license during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Type of school attended since random assignment (youth 18-month survey).** This categorical measure indicates whether the youth attended a regular middle school, high school, or college; a specialized school for students with disabilities; a home school; another type of school; or no school during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Highest grade completed at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This categorical measure indicates whether the youth had completed 8th grade or lower; 9th to 11th grade; 12th grade; some post-secondary education; or was in an ungraded program, home-school, or another type of grade at the time of the 18-month survey.
- **Youth received educational accommodations (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth reported receiving accommodations in how they take tests or handle class assignments, adaptations in their classrooms, any person assigned to help them like a tutor, an interpreter, or someone who takes notes for them in class, or any other accommodations at school during the last year.
- **Youth had unmet need for educational accommodations (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth reported that they needed, but did not receive, accommodations in how they take tests or handle class assignments, adaptations in their classrooms, any person assigned to help them like a tutor, an interpreter, or someone who takes notes for them in class, or any other accommodations at school during the last year.

3. Youth's employment and earnings

The outcomes in this domain includes the following:

- **Ever employed in a paid job since random assignment (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicated whether the youth held a paid job during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Ever employed in a paid or unpaid job since random assignment (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth held a paid or unpaid job during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Any paid employment in the year before the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth held a paid job in the year before the 18-month survey. If the youth held a paid job during the 18 months after random assignment but had missing employment in the year before the survey, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing employment information when constructing this measure.

- **Weekly hours worked in paid jobs in the year before the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the youth's average hours worked per week across all paid jobs in the year before the 18-month survey. If the youth held a paid job in the year before the 18-month survey but had missing hours information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing hours information when constructing this measure.
- **Total earnings from all jobs in the year before the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the youth's total earnings from all paid jobs in the year before the 18-month survey. If the youth held a paid job in the year before the 18-month survey but had missing earnings information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing earnings information when constructing this measure.
- **Employment at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth held a paid job at the time of the 18-month survey. If the youth held a paid job in the year before the 18-month survey but had missing employment information at the time of the survey, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing employment information when constructing this measure.
- **Weekly hours worked at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the youth's average hours worked per week across all paid jobs held at the time of the 18-month survey. If the youth held a paid job at the time of the 18-month survey but had missing hours information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing hours information when constructing this measure.
- **Weekly earnings at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the youth's total weekly earnings from all paid jobs held at the time of the 18-month survey. If the youth held a paid job at the time of the 18-month survey but had missing earnings information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing earnings information when constructing this measure.
- **Employment in the calendar year after random assignment (SSA data).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth had any earnings reported to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) in the calendar year after random assignment (as captured in SSA's Master Earnings File).
- **Earnings in the calendar year after random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure shows the total earnings of the youth reported to the IRS in the calendar year after random assignment.⁶

4. Youth's self-determination and expectations

The outcomes in this domain includes the following:

- **Self-determination score (0 to 100 scale) at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This composite score is based on the youth's responses to 20 questions designed to capture the extent to which the youth acted autonomously, initiated and responded to events

⁶ We top coded youth earnings and income above the 99th percentile of earnings to the 99th percentile value for each program to test the sensitivity of our results to outliers. Because the top coding did not meaningfully affect the impact estimates in terms of their magnitudes or precision, we do not report the results of this sensitivity analysis.

in a “psychologically empowered” manner, and acted in a self-realizing manner at the time of the 18-month survey. We based the questions on the ARC Self-Determination Scale (Wehmeyer 1996). The youth had to answer at least five of the seven questions on autonomy, four of the six questions on psychological empowerment, and five of the seven questions on self-realization to receive a score.⁷

- **Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth expected at the time of the 18-month survey that their highest level of schooling would be at least a high school diploma or GED.
- **Autonomy score (0 to 300 scale) at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This composite score reflects the average of the youth’s responses to seven questions designed to capture the extent to which the youth acted autonomously at the time of the 18-month survey. We based the questions on the ARC Self-Determination Scale (Wehmeyer 1996). The youth had to answer at least five of the seven questions to receive a score.
- **Psychological empowerment score (0 to 100 scale) at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This composite score reflects the average of the youth’s responses to six questions designed to capture the extent to which the youth initiated and responded to events in a “psychologically empowered” manner at the time of the 18-month survey. We based the questions on the ARC Self-Determination Scale (Wehmeyer 1996). The youth had to answer at least four of the six questions to receive a score.
- **Self-realization score (0 to 100 scale) at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This composite score reflects the average of the youth’s responses to seven questions designed to capture the extent to which the youth acted in a self-realizing manner at the time of the 18-month survey. We based the questions on the ARC Self-Determination scale (Wehmeyer 1996). The youth had to answer at least five of the seven questions to receive a score.
- **Youth expected to get post-secondary education at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth expected at the time of the 18-month survey that their highest level of schooling would be greater than a high school diploma or GED.
- **Youth expected to live independently at age 25 at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth expected at the time of the 18-month survey to live on his or her own or with a partner at the age of 25.
- **Youth expected to be financially independent at age 25 at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth probably or definitely

⁷ Because the PROMISE 18-month youth survey only covered three of the four sub-scales of self-determination—autonomy, psychological empowerment, and self-realization (with self-regulation as the excluded sub-scale)—our composite self-determination measure does not conform to any validated scale of self-determination. Although, comparisons between treatment and control groups based on the composite self-determination scale created from the three sub-scales we measured are valid, we cannot draw conclusions about the applicability of this composite measure to a broader population, or compare the composite scale to the validated scales of self-determination used in other research.

expected at the time of the 18-month survey to be able to support himself or herself without help from family or government benefit programs at the age of 25.

- **Youth expected to be employed at age 25 at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth probably or definitely expected at the time of the 18-month survey to be employed in a paid job at the age of 25.
- **Youth's reasons for expecting nonemployment at age 25 at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This series of binary measures indicates that the youth probably or definitely expected at the time of the 18-month survey to not be employed at age 25 due to the following reasons:
 - Disability or health reasons
 - Unreliable transportation
 - Inability to find a job
 - School or training enrollment
 - Inaccessible workplaces
 - Risk of losing benefits
 - Not wanting to work
 - Others not believing he or she can work
 - Other reasons
- **Parent expected youth to get post-secondary education at the time of the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the parent expected at the time of the 18-month survey that the youth would continue schooling beyond high school.
- **Parent expected youth to live independently at age 25 at the time of the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the parent expected at the time of the 18-month survey that the youth would live on his or her own or with a partner at the age of 25.
- **Parent expected youth to be financially independent at age 25 at the time of the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the parent probably or definitely expected at the time of the 18-month survey that the youth would be able to support himself or herself without help from family or government benefit programs at the age of 25.
- **Parent expected youth to be employed in a paid job at age 25 at the time of the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the parent probably or definitely expected at the time of the 18-month survey that the youth would be employed in a paid job at the age of 25.
- **Parent believed it important for youth to become independent in some way at the time of the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the parent believed it somewhat or very important at the time of the 18-month survey that the youth would live independently, be financially independent, or be employed in a paid job.

- **Parent usually or always expects youth to do chores at the time of the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the parent usually or always expected at the time of the 18-month survey that the youth would do any of the following chores: fix own breakfast or lunch, do own laundry, straighten up room or living area, or buy a few things at the store.

5. Youth's health and health insurance

The outcomes in this domain include the following:

- **Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey (parent or youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth had any kind of health insurance at the time of the 18-month survey. We derived this measure from the parent 18-month survey for youth who resided with a parent and from the youth 18-month survey for independent youth. Most youth resided with a parent at the time of the 18-month survey.
- **Health insurance type at the time of the survey: Public (parent or youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth had health insurance through Medicaid, Medicare, or the Children's Health Insurance Program at the time of the 18-month survey. We derived this measure from the parent 18-month survey for youth who resided with a parent and from the youth 18-month survey for independent youth. Most youth resided with a parent at the time of the 18-month survey.
- **Health insurance type at the time of the survey: Private (parent or youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth had private health insurance at the time of the 18-month survey. We derived this measure from the parent 18-month survey for youth who resided with a parent and from the youth 18-month survey for independent youth. Most youth resided with a parent at the time of the 18-month survey.
- **Health insurance type at the time of the survey: Private purchased through an Affordable Care Act health exchange (parent or youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth had private health insurance purchased through an Affordable Care Act health exchange. We derived this measure from the parent 18-month survey for youth who resided with a parent and from the youth 18-month survey for independent youth. Most youth resided with a parent at the time of the 18-month survey.
- **General health status at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This categorical measure indicates whether the youth reported his or her health to be poor, fair, good, very good, or excellent.
- **Activity of daily living (ADL) difficulties at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This series of binary measures indicates whether the youth had difficulty with each of the following ADLs at the time of the 18-month survey:
 - Walking, standing, or climbing stairs
 - Personal care and getting around inside the home
 - Speaking or communicating with others
 - Hearing normal conversations
 - Seeing, even with the use of prescription glasses

- None of the above
- **Needed help with or equipment for at least one ADL at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth required special equipment or help from another person to do any of the following ADLs at the time of the 18-month survey: walking, standing, or climbing stairs; personal care and getting around inside the home; speaking or communicating with others; hearing normal conversations; or seeing, even with the use of prescription glasses.
- **Instrumental activity of daily living (IADL) difficulties at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This series of binary measures indicates whether the youth had difficulty with each of the following IADLs at the time of the 18-month survey:
 - Planning and carrying out activities to achieve a goal
 - Learning, remembering, or concentrating
 - Getting around outside of the home
 - None of the above
- **Needed help with or equipment for at least one IADL at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth required special equipment or help from another person to do any of the following IADLs at the time of the 18-month survey: planning and carrying out activities to achieve a goal; learning, remembering, or concentrating; or getting around outside of the home.
- **Substance use in the 30 days before the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This series of binary measures indicates whether the youth had used each of the following substances in the 30 days before the 18-month survey:
 - Tobacco
 - Alcohol
 - Marijuana
 - Other illicit drug

6. Youth's use of Medicaid

The outcomes in this domain include the following:

- **Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid (Medicaid data).** This continuous measure shows the percentage of months (out of the 18 months after random assignment) that the youth was enrolled in Medicaid coverage.
- **Total Medicaid expenditures (Medicaid data).** This continuous measure shows the total dollar amount paid by Medicaid for claims on services that occurred during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Enrollment in Medicaid managed care (Medicaid data).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth was enrolled in a comprehensive Medicaid managed care plan during the 18 months after random assignment.

- **Enrollment in Medicaid 1915(c) waiver (Medicaid data).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth was enrolled in a 1915(c) waiver during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Enrollment in Medicaid capitated behavioral health (Medicaid data).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth was enrolled in a capitated behavioral health plan during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Any Medicaid payments (Medicaid data).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth had any positive amount of Medicaid claims in the 18 months following random assignment.
- **Average monthly Medicaid payments (Medicaid data).** This continuous measure shows the average monthly dollar amount paid by Medicaid for claims on services that occurred during the 18 months after random assignment (regardless of the number of months enrolled).
- **Average monthly fee-for-service payments (Medicaid data).** This continuous measure shows the average monthly dollar amount paid by Medicaid on fee-for-service claims that occurred during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Average monthly capitated payments (Medicaid data).** This continuous measure shows the average monthly dollar amount paid by Medicaid on monthly capitated payment amounts that occurred during the 18 months after random assignment.

7. Youth's economic well-being

The outcomes in this domain include the following:

- **Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (youth 18-month survey and SSA data).** This continuous measure shows the sum of the youth's earnings and SSA disability payments in the year before the 18-month survey. We derived the youth's earnings from the youth 18-month survey and the youth's SSA disability payments from SSA data. If the youth held a paid job in the year before the survey but had missing earnings information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing earnings information when constructing this measure.
- **Received any SSA disability payments since random assignment (SSA data).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth received any SSA disability payments during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Total SSA disability payments since random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure shows the total amount of SSA disability payments (SSI plus OASDI) that the youth received during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **SSI payments since random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure shows the amount of SSI payments that the youth received during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **OASDI payments since random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure shows the amount of OASDI benefits that the youth received during the 18 months after random assignment.

- **Type of SSA disability payments received since random assignment (SSA data).** This categorical variable indicates the type of SSA disability payments received during the 18 months after random assignment: SSI only, SSI and OASDI, OASDI only, or no disability payments.
- **Income in the calendar year after random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure reflects the sum of the youth's earnings and SSA disability payments in the first calendar year following random assignment. We derived the youth's earnings and the youth's SSA disability payments from SSA data.
- **Youth resides with parent at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether the youth resided with a parent or guardian at the time of the 18-month survey.
- **Household income in the calendar year before the survey (parent or youth 18-month survey).** This categorical measure reflects whether the annual income of the youth's household was less than \$10,000; \$10,000 to \$19,999; \$20,000 to \$29,999; or \$30,000 or more. We derived this measure from the parent 18-month survey for youth who resided with a parent and from the youth 18-month survey for independent youth. Most youth resided with a parent at the time of the 18-month survey.
- **Any household member participated in non-SSA public assistance programs at the time of the survey (youth 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether any member of the youth's household participated in a non-SSA public assistance program, such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or government housing assistance.

B. Parent and family outcomes

1. Family receipt of services

The outcomes in this domain include the following:

- **Received any family support services since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether family members other than the youth received any of the following transition services during the 18 months after random assignment: case management, education or training supports, employment-promoting services, benefits counseling, financial education, parent training and information about youth's disability, or parent networking support.
- **Types of family support services received since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This series of binary measures indicates whether family members other than the youth received each of the following services during the 18 months after random assignment:
 - Case management
 - Education or training supports
 - Employment-promoting services
 - Benefits counseling

- Financial education
- Parent training and information about youth's disability
- Parent networking support
- **Any key support services received since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether family members other than the youth received any key support services (case management, employment-promoting services, benefits counseling, or financial education) during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Hours of key support services received since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the number of hours of key support services that family members other than the youth received from various providers during the 18 months after random assignment. For each provider of a key support service, the parent survey respondent reported (1) the number of months, (2) the number of days per month, and (3) the number of hours per day that family members other than the youth saw the provider. For each provider, we calculated the hours that family members other than the youth saw the provider. We then calculated this outcome by adding the hours across all the providers of key transition services. If family members other than the youth received any key support services but had missing hours information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing hours information when constructing this measure.
- **Number of key support service providers since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the count of unique providers of the key support services that family members other than the youth received during the 18 months after random assignment. If family members other than the youth received any key transition services but had missing provider information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing provider information when constructing this measure.
- **Usefulness of key services received since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This categorical measure has a value of 1 if family members other than the youth received no key transition services during the 18 months after random assignment, a value of 2 if family members other than the youth received at least one key transition service but rated no service "somewhat useful" or "very useful," and a value of 3 if family members other than the youth received at least one key transition service and rated at least one service "somewhat useful" or "very useful." If family members other than the youth received any key support services but had missing usefulness information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing usefulness information when constructing this measure.
- **Any unmet service needs since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether family members other than the youth needed but did not receive any of the following services during the 18 months after random assignment: case management, education or training supports, employment-promoting services, benefits counseling, financial education, referral services, transportation, health services, or other services.
- **Number of unmet service or support needs since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This continuous measure shows the number of unique types of services that family members other than the youth needed but did not receive during the 18 months after random assignment.

- **Types of unmet service or support needs since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This series of binary measures indicates whether family members other than the youth had an unmet need during the 18 months after random assignment for each of the following types of services:
 - Case management
 - Education or training supports
 - Employment-promoting services
 - Benefits counseling
 - Financial education
 - Referral services
 - Transportation
 - Health services
 - Other services
- **Parent applied for VR services since random assignment (VR data).** This binary measure indicates whether a parent submitted an application for VR services during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Parent received VR services since random assignment (VR data).** This binary measure indicates whether a parent received VR services, as measured by having a signed IPE, during the 18 months after random assignment.

2. Parents' education and training

The outcomes in this domain include the following:

- **Received any education or job skills training since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether either the parent or the parent's spouse had gone to school; taken classes to improve job skills; or received any diploma, GED, certificate, or professional license during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Highest educational attainment by either parent at the time of the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This categorical measure indicates the highest educational attainment that either the parent or the parent's spouse had attained at the time of the 18-month survey, according to the following categories: not a high school graduate; high school diploma or GED; some post-secondary education; college degree; some post-graduate degree; or missing.
- **Either parent was enrolled in education or job skills training at the time of the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether either the parent or the parent's spouse was enrolled in school or taking classes to improve job skills at the time of the 18-month survey.
- **Either parent received a diploma, GED, certificate of completion, or professional license since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure

indicates whether either the parent or the parent's spouse received a diploma, GED, certificate, or professional license during the 18 months after random assignment.

3. Parents' employment and earnings

The outcomes in this domain includes the following:

- **Either parent was employed since random assignment (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether either the parent or the parent's spouse held a paid job during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Either parent was employed in the month before the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether either the parent or the parent's spouse held a paid job in the month before the 18-month survey.
- **Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This continuous measure reflects the total earnings of the parent and the parent's spouse from all paid jobs in the month before the 18-month survey. If either parent held a paid job in the month before the 18-month survey but had missing earnings information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing earnings information when constructing this measure.
- **Parents' earnings in the calendar year after random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure reflects the total earnings that the parent and the parent's spouse reported to the IRS in the calendar year after random assignment.⁸
- **Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether either the parent or the parent's spouse had access to health insurance through a job held in the month before the 18-month survey. If either parent held a paid job in the month before the 18-month survey but had missing health insurance information, we used multiple imputation to fill in the missing health insurance information when constructing this measure.

4. Parents' economic well-being

The outcomes in this domain includes the following:

- **Parents' total income in the calendar year after random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure reflects the sum of the earnings and the SSA disability payments of the parent and the parent's spouse in the calendar year after random assignment. We derived the parents' earnings and SSA disability payments from SSA data.
- **Received any SSA disability payments since random assignment (SSA data).** This binary measure indicates whether either the parent or the parent's spouse received any SSA disability payments during the 18 months after random assignment.

⁸ We top coded parent earnings and income above the 99th percentile of earnings at the 99th percentile value for each program to test the sensitivity of our results to outliers. Because the top coding did not meaningfully affect the impact estimates in terms of their magnitudes or precision, we do not report the results of this sensitivity analysis.

- **Total payments since random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure reflects the total SSA disability payments (SSI plus OASDI) received by the parent and the parent's spouse during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **SSI payments since random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure reflects the total SSI payments received by the parent and the parent's spouse during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **OASDI payments since random assignment (SSA data).** This continuous measure reflects the total OASDI payments received by the parent and the parent's spouse during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Type of SSA disability payments received since random assignment (SSA data).** This categorical variable indicates the type of SSA disability payments received by the parent and the parent's spouse during the 18 months after random assignment: SSI only, SSI and OASDI, OASDI only, or no disability payments.
- **Either parent had health insurance at the time of the survey (parent 18-month survey).** This binary measure indicates whether either the parent or the parent's spouse had any kind of health insurance at the time of the 18-month survey.
- **Enrolled in Medicaid since random assignment (Medicaid data).** This binary measure indicates whether the parent was enrolled in Medicaid coverage during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Enrolled in Medicaid managed care since random assignment (Medicaid data).** This binary measure indicates whether the parent was enrolled in a comprehensive Medicaid managed care plan during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Enrolled in Medicaid 1915(c) waiver since random assignment (Medicaid data).** This binary measure indicates whether the parent was enrolled in a 1915(c) waiver during the 18 months after random assignment.
- **Total Medicaid payments since random assignment (Medicaid data).** This continuous measure reflects the parent's total Medicaid payments for claims on services during the 18 months after random assignment.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

V. SURVEY NONRESPONSE AND SURVEY WEIGHTS

This chapter discusses the response rates to the 18-month parent and youth surveys and describes how we addressed potential issues arising from survey nonresponse.

A. Response rates

The PROMISE 18-month parent and youth survey response rates were high. They averaged over 80 percent for all programs except WI PROMISE, which had a 78 percent response rate for the youth survey (Table A.7).⁹ Response rates for the parent survey were typically higher than those for the youth survey. The differences in response rates between treatment and control group samples members were small, never exceeding 3.5 percentage points in any program.

Table A.7. PROMISE 18-month survey respondent sample size and response rate, by program

Analysis sample	Arkansas PROMISE	ASPIRE	CaPROMISE	MD PROMISE	NYS PROMISE	WI PROMISE
Youth survey (Survey response rate)						
Treatment	750 (83%)	784 (81%)	834 (84%)	759 (81%)	853 (87%)	746 (79%)
Control	719 (80%)	776 (80%)	800 (80%)	742 (80%)	838 (86%)	729 (77%)
Total	1,469 (82%)	1,560 (80%)	1,634 (82%)	1,501 (81%)	1,691 (86%)	1,475 (78%)
Parent survey (Survey response rate)						
Treatment	786 (87%)	817 (84%)	855 (86%)	795 (85%)	887 (90%)	803 (85%)
Control	758 (84%)	797 (82%)	827 (83%)	781 (84%)	876 (89%)	767 (81%)
Total	1,544 (86%)	1,614 (83%)	1,682 (84%)	1,576 (85%)	1,763 (90%)	1,570 (83%)

B. Differences between survey respondents and nonrespondents

As with any survey with less than a 100 percent response rate, there is the potential that those who responded to the survey differed systematically from those who did not. Among survey respondents, if the treatment and control groups were no longer equivalent at baseline, survey nonresponse may introduce bias in our impact estimates. In addition, if there were numerous and large differences in the baseline characteristics of survey respondents and nonrespondents, this would render the impact estimates based on survey data less representative of the full sample of evaluation enrollees. To assess the extent to which survey nonresponse may be limiting generalizability of the impact findings to all evaluation enrollees, we used SSA data to assess the differences between survey respondents and nonrespondents. Further, we used

⁹ Response rates were calculated as a proportion of the cases eligible for a given survey. In five of the six PROMISE programs, all evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned were eligible to be interviewed for the 18-month survey unless they had died before completing the survey. For CaPROMISE, not all evaluation enrollees were eligible for the survey; we sampled 2,000 of the 3,097 evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned.

survey nonresponse weights to make the survey respondent sample more representative of the full research sample and to minimize potential for bias in the estimated impacts.

Comparison of baseline characteristics (that is, characteristics at the time of PROMISE enrollment) between youth survey respondents and nonrespondents showed some modest differences (see Tables A.8a to A.8f). We compared both youth and parent survey respondents with nonrespondents across 19 baseline characteristics. For the parent survey, we found no more than four baseline characteristics with statistically significant differences in four programs. There were more characteristics with statistically significant differences in Arkansas PROMISE and MD PROMISE. For the youth survey, we found no more than six baseline characteristics with statistically significant differences in four programs; again, Arkansas PROMISE and MD PROMISE were the exceptions. Examples of differences we found included whether English was the preferred written and spoken language, whether the youth received SSA payments, the age of the parents who enrolled their child, and the number of parents used in the SSA data analysis. Overall, even when the differences were statistically significant, they were generally small. The extent and magnitude of the differences suggested that the respondents were not markedly different from the nonrespondents. Nonetheless, our use of survey nonresponse weights allowed us to derive estimates that were representative of the full research sample and minimized the potential for bias.

Table A.8a.1. Arkansas PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	33.6	33.2	36.0	-2.9	0.37
Youth age at RA					
14 years	38.3	38.7	36.4	2.3	0.78
15 years	27.5	27.4	28.4	-1.0	
16 years	34.1	33.9	35.2	-1.3	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.4	-0.1	0.30
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	97.5	97.2	99.2	-2.0	0.00***
English is preferred spoken language	97.5	97.2	99.2	-2.1	0.00***
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	86.7	86.0	90.8	-4.8	0.02**
Own household or alone	12.1	13.0	7.3	5.7	
Another household and receiving support	1.2	1.0	1.9	-0.9	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	41.9	42.3	39.5	2.8	0.00***
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	41.9	42.9	36.0	6.9	0.20
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.1	1.1	0.8	0.3	
Physical disability	9.4	9.1	11.5	-2.4	
Other mental impairment	44.7	43.9	49.4	-5.5	
Other or unknown disability	2.9	3.0	2.3	0.7	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	94.0	93.7	95.8	-2.1	0.14
Received OASDI	14.7	15.0	13.0	1.9	0.39
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.7	8.8	8.3	0.5	0.09*
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.1	7.1	7.7	-0.6	0.03**
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,217	7,229	7,149	80	0.59
OASDI	414	443	245	198	0.00***
Total SSI and OASDI	7,632	7,672	7,394	278	0.05**
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	27.9	26.7	34.6	-7.9	0.01**
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	90.4	90.7	88.5	2.2	0.29
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	1.8	1.8	1.5	0.3	0.59
One parent	63.4	63.9	60.9	2.9	
Two parents	34.8	34.3	37.5	-3.2	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	9.8	10.2	7.3	3.0	0.50
Any parent received OASDI only	11.5	11.7	10.0	1.8	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	7.6	7.5	8.0	-0.5	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.4	68.7	73.2	-4.5	
No parent was included in the SSA data	1.8	1.8	1.5	0.3	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	0.8	0.7	1.5	-0.8	0.30
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	13	10	32	-23	0.33
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	70.9	70.3	74.3	-4.0	0.18
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	14,481	14,542	14,120	423	0.68
Number of parents	1,805	1,544	261		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parent evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/***Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8a.2. Arkansas PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	33.6	33.2	35.4	-2.3	0.43
Youth age at RA					
14 years	38.3	39.3	33.9	5.4	0.12
15 years	27.5	27.5	27.7	-0.2	
16 years	34.1	33.2	38.4	-5.2	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.5	-0.1	0.02**
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	97.5	97.2	98.8	-1.6	0.03**
English is preferred spoken language	97.5	97.1	98.8	-1.7	0.02**
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	86.7	86.0	89.6	-3.5	0.12
Own household or alone	12.1	12.9	8.9	3.9	
Another household and receiving support	1.2	1.1	1.5	-0.4	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	41.9	42.3	40.3	2.0	0.00***
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	41.9	43.5	35.1	8.4	0.03**
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.1	1.0	1.2	-0.2	
Physical disability	9.4	9.1	11.0	-2.0	
Other mental impairment	44.7	43.3	50.9	-7.6	
Other or unknown disability	2.9	3.1	1.8	1.3	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	94.0	93.8	94.9	-1.1	0.40
Received OASDI	14.7	15.2	12.2	3.0	0.13
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.7	8.8	8.2	0.6	0.03**
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.1	7.0	7.8	-0.7	0.00***
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,217	7,218	7,212	7	0.96
OASDI	414	449	264	185	0.00***
Total SSI and OASDI	7,632	7,667	7,476	192	0.11
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	27.9	26.9	32.2	-5.3	0.06*
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	90.4	90.7	89.0	1.8	0.35
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	1.8	1.8	1.8	-0.0	0.59
One parent	63.4	64.0	61.0	3.0	
Two parents	34.8	34.2	37.2	-3.0	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	9.8	10.4	7.1	3.3	0.12
Any parent received OASDI only	11.5	12.0	9.2	2.8	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	7.6	7.8	6.5	1.3	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.4	68.0	75.3	-7.3	
No parent was included in the SSA data analyses	1.8	1.8	1.8	-0.0	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	0.8	0.6	1.8	-1.2	0.12
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	13	8	35	-27	0.17
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	70.9	69.9	75.5	-5.6	0.04**
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	14,481	14,517	14,325	191	0.84
Number of youth	1,805	1,469	336		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all youth evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/**Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8b.1. ASPIRE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.5	32.8	31.0	1.8	0.52
Youth age at RA					
14 years	37.4	38.5	32.2	6.3	0.10*
15 years	31.5	30.9	34.5	-3.6	
16 years	31.1	30.6	33.3	-2.7	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.5	-0.1	0.06*
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	92.7	92.2	94.7	-2.5	0.10*
English is preferred spoken language	92.3	91.8	94.4	-2.5	0.09*
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	83.4	82.8	86.1	-3.4	0.31
Own household or alone	13.7	14.3	11.2	3.1	
Another household and receiving support	2.9	2.9	2.7	0.3	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.0	44.1	43.5	0.6	0.34
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	44.2	44.3	43.7	0.6	0.77
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	2.5	2.6	2.1	0.5	
Physical disability	19.3	19.6	17.7	1.9	
Other mental impairment	29.3	28.8	31.9	-3.1	
Other or unknown disability	4.7	4.7	4.7	-0.1	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	91.5	91.9	89.7	2.3	0.21
Received OASDI	10.2	10.3	9.7	0.6	0.76
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.8	8.9	8.5	0.4	0.13
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.2	7.1	7.6	-0.5	0.06*
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,113	7,140	6,981	159	0.27
OASDI	293	303	244	59	0.33
Total SSI and OASDI	7,406	7,443	7,225	218	0.11
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	17.3	17.3	17.2	0.1	0.95
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	72.6	73.4	68.7	4.7	0.09*
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	8.0	8.1	7.4	0.7	0.33
One parent	49.4	48.6	53.1	-4.5	
Two parents	42.6	43.3	39.5	3.7	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	8.8	9.0	7.7	1.4	0.46
Any parent received OASDI only	9.5	9.8	7.7	2.2	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	4.2	4.4	3.5	0.8	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.5	68.6	73.7	-5.1	
No parent was included in the SSA data	8.0	8.1	7.4	0.7	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	1.4	1.5	1.2	0.3	0.64
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	11	12	6	6	0.22
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	72.2	71.2	77.1	-5.9	0.03**
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	18,699	18,598	19,182	-584	0.63
Number of parents	1,953	1,614	339		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parent evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/***/****Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8b.2. ASPIRE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.5	33.1	30.3	2.8	0.29
Youth age at RA					
14 years	37.4	38.8	31.6	7.3	0.02**
15 years	31.5	30.4	35.6	-5.2	
16 years	31.1	30.7	32.8	-2.1	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.5	-0.1	0.04**
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	92.6	92.1	94.7	-2.5	0.07*
English is preferred spoken language	92.3	91.7	94.4	-2.7	0.06*
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	83.4	82.8	85.8	-3.0	0.36
Own household or alone	13.8	14.3	11.7	2.6	
Another household and receiving support	2.9	3.0	2.5	0.4	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.0	44.1	43.8	0.3	0.64
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	44.2	44.5	43.3	1.2	0.37
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	2.5	2.6	2.0	0.6	
Physical disability	19.3	19.9	16.8	3.1	
Other mental impairment	29.3	28.5	32.6	-4.1	
Other or unknown disability	4.7	4.5	5.3	-0.8	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	91.5	91.7	90.8	0.9	0.60
Received OASDI	10.2	10.3	9.9	0.3	0.85
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.8	8.9	8.4	0.5	0.04**
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.2	7.1	7.6	-0.5	0.03**
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,113	7,123	7,074	50	0.71
OASDI	292	298	268	30	0.62
Total SSI and OASDI	7,405	7,422	7,341	80	0.54
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	17.3	17.5	16.6	0.9	0.66
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	72.5	73.2	69.7	3.5	0.18
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	8.0	8.2	7.4	0.8	0.41
One parent	49.4	48.7	52.4	-3.8	
Two parents	42.6	43.2	40.2	3.0	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	8.8	9.3	6.9	2.4	0.28
Any parent received OASDI only	9.4	9.7	8.1	1.6	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	4.2	4.4	3.6	0.8	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.5	68.4	74.0	-5.7	
No parent was included in the SSA data	8.0	8.2	7.4	0.8	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	1.4	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.38
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	11	12	5	7	0.11
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	72.2	71.1	76.6	-5.5	0.03**
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	18,699	18,592	19,123	-531	0.65
Number of youth	1,953	1,560	393		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all youth evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/****Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8c.1. CaPROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.5	32.0	33.1	-1.2	0.49
Youth age at RA					
14 years	34.4	34.4	34.3	0.1	0.99
15 years	30.8	30.9	30.7	0.2	
16 years	34.8	34.7	34.9	-0.2	
Average age	15.4	15.5	15.4	0.0	0.89
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	64.7	62.4	67.5	-5.1	0.00***
English is preferred spoken language	64.8	62.4	67.6	-5.3	0.00***
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	75.9	76.0	75.8	0.3	0.91
Own household or alone	21.5	21.3	21.8	-0.4	
Another household and receiving support	2.6	2.6	2.5	0.2	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.1	44.2	43.9	0.3	0.34
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	47.6	47.3	48.0	-0.7	0.95
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	2.8	2.8	2.8	0.0	
Physical disability	18.7	18.6	18.9	-0.4	
Other mental impairment	23.9	24.0	23.7	0.4	
Other or unknown disability	6.9	7.3	6.6	0.7	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	93.6	94.4	92.7	1.7	0.05*
Received OASDI	7.0	7.0	7.1	-0.1	0.93
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	9.0	9.1	9.0	0.1	0.62
Youth age at most recent SSI application	6.9	6.8	6.9	-0.1	0.50
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,403	7,417	7,386	31	0.69
OASDI	220	211	230	-20	0.57
Total SSI and OASDI	7,622	7,627	7,616	11	0.88
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	14.3	13.8	14.9	-1.1	0.41
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	61.0	61.1	60.8	0.2	0.88
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	15.2	15.4	14.9	0.5	0.66
One parent	50.6	49.9	51.5	-1.6	
Two parents	34.2	34.8	33.6	1.2	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	6.8	7.0	6.6	0.4	0.18
Any parent received OASDI only	5.9	6.8	4.9	1.9	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	2.9	3.1	2.8	0.3	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.2	67.8	70.9	-3.1	
No parent was included in the SSA data	15.2	15.4	14.9	0.5	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	2.4	2.3	2.4	-0.1	0.88
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	33	37	27	10	0.66
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	74.4	74.5	74.3	0.3	0.87
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	18,123	17,521	18,838	-1,317	0.09*
Number of parents	3,097	1,682	1,415		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parent evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/****Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8c.2. CaPROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.5	32.6	32.4	0.2	0.92
Youth age at RA					
14 years	34.4	34.6	34.1	0.5	0.77
15 years	30.9	31.2	30.5	0.7	
16 years	34.8	34.2	35.4	-1.2	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.5	-0.0	0.67
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	64.9	62.2	67.8	-5.6	0.00***
English is preferred spoken language	64.9	62.2	67.9	-5.7	0.00***
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	75.9	75.9	75.9	-0.0	0.79
Own household or alone	21.5	21.3	21.7	-0.4	
Another household and receiving support	2.6	2.8	2.4	0.4	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.1	44.2	43.9	0.3	0.28
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	47.5	47.7	47.4	0.3	0.99
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	2.8	2.9	2.8	0.1	
Physical disability	18.7	18.7	18.8	-0.1	
Other mental impairment	23.9	23.6	24.3	-0.6	
Other or unknown disability	7.0	7.1	6.8	0.4	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	93.6	94.4	92.7	1.7	0.06*
Received OASDI	7.1	7.0	7.1	-0.1	0.91
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	9.0	9.1	9.0	0.1	0.51
Youth age at most recent SSI application	6.9	6.8	6.9	-0.1	0.36
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,399	7,403	7,394	9	0.90
OASDI	221	214	228	-15	0.66
Total SSI and OASDI	7,619	7,617	7,622	-5	0.94
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	14.3	13.9	14.6	-0.7	0.59
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	61.2	61.3	61.0	0.2	0.88
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	15.1	15.4	14.8	0.6	0.62
One parent	50.7	49.9	51.6	-1.7	
Two parents	34.2	34.7	33.6	1.1	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	6.8	7.0	6.7	0.3	0.29
Any parent received OASDI only	5.9	6.7	5.1	1.7	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	2.9	3.1	2.8	0.3	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.2	67.8	70.7	-2.8	
No parent was included in the SSA data	15.1	15.4	14.8	0.6	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	2.4	2.3	2.4	-0.1	0.90
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	33	38	27	12	0.59
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	74.4	74.3	74.5	-0.2	0.91
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	18,122	17,536	18,776	-1,240	0.10
Number of youth	3,097	1,634	1,463		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all youth evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/****Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8d.1. MD PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	34.7	35.2	32.1	3.1	0.30
Youth age at RA					
14 years	26.0	26.3	24.1	2.2	0.60
15 years	25.9	25.5	27.9	-2.4	
16 years	48.1	48.2	47.9	0.2	
Average age	15.8	15.8	15.8	-0.0	0.64
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	96.8	96.6	98.3	-1.7	0.06*
English is preferred spoken language	96.6	96.3	98.3	-2.0	0.03**
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	86.7	86.1	89.7	-3.6	0.24
Own household or alone	10.2	10.5	8.3	2.3	
Another household and receiving support	3.2	3.4	2.1	1.3	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	43.0	43.3	41.6	1.7	0.00***
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	36.5	37.5	31.4	6.1	0.16
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.4	1.5	1.0	0.5	
Physical disability	11.3	10.8	14.1	-3.4	
Other mental impairment	48.0	47.3	51.4	-4.0	
Other or unknown disability	2.7	2.9	2.1	0.8	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	94.6	95.0	92.8	2.2	0.17
Received OASDI	11.0	11.4	9.0	2.4	0.20
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.3	8.4	7.8	0.6	0.03**
Youth age at most recent SSI application	8.0	7.9	8.7	-0.8	0.00***
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,248	7,266	7,149	117	0.44
OASDI	339	357	241	115	0.09*
Total SSI and OASDI	7,586	7,622	7,390	232	0.10*
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	17.4	16.9	20.0	-3.1	0.23
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	58.5	59.3	54.1	5.2	0.10
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	6.1	5.8	7.2	-1.4	0.20
One parent	69.2	70.1	64.8	5.2	
Two parents	24.7	24.1	27.9	-3.8	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	7.6	7.8	6.2	1.6	0.09*
Any parent received OASDI only	8.0	8.2	6.9	1.4	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	4.4	4.9	1.7	3.2	
No parent received any SSA payments	73.9	73.2	77.9	-4.8	
No parent was included in the SSA data	6.1	5.8	7.2	-1.4	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	4.4	4.6	3.1	1.5	0.18
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	38	39	27	12	0.33
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	68.0	67.1	72.5	-5.4	0.07*
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	15,359	14,913	17,779	-2,866	0.03**
Number of parents	1,866	1,576	290		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parent evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/** Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8d.2. MD PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	34.7	35.4	31.8	3.6	0.19
Youth age at RA					
14 years	26.0	26.8	22.7	4.0	0.17
15 years	25.9	25.1	29.0	-3.9	
16 years	48.1	48.1	48.2	-0.1	
Average age	15.8	15.8	15.8	-0.0	0.50
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	96.8	96.7	97.5	-0.9	0.35
English is preferred spoken language	96.6	96.3	97.5	-1.2	0.21
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	86.7	85.7	90.7	-5.0	0.03**
Own household or alone	10.2	10.8	7.7	3.1	
Another household and receiving support	3.2	3.5	1.6	1.9	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	43.0	43.3	41.8	1.6	0.00***
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	36.5	38.0	30.4	7.6	0.04**
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.4	1.5	1.1	0.4	
Physical disability	11.3	10.7	14.0	-3.3	
Other mental impairment	48.0	46.9	52.3	-5.4	
Other or unknown disability	2.7	2.9	2.2	0.7	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	94.6	94.9	93.7	1.2	0.40
Received OASDI	11.0	11.4	9.3	2.1	0.23
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.3	8.4	7.8	0.6	0.01**
Youth age at most recent SSI application	8.0	7.8	8.6	-0.8	0.00***
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,248	7,249	7,241	8	0.95
OASDI	339	361	247	114	0.08*
Total SSI and OASDI	7,586	7,610	7,489	122	0.33
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	17.2	16.6	19.5	-2.9	0.21
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	58.5	59.4	54.8	4.6	0.11
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	6.1	6.1	5.8	0.4	0.86
One parent	69.2	69.4	68.5	0.9	
Two parents	24.7	24.4	25.8	-1.3	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	7.6	8.1	5.5	2.6	0.02**
Any parent received OASDI only	8.0	8.5	6.3	2.2	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	4.4	5.0	2.2	2.8	
No parent received any SSA payments	73.9	72.4	80.3	-7.9	
No parent was included in the SSA data	6.1	6.1	5.8	0.4	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	4.4	4.5	3.8	0.7	0.54
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	38	39	33	6	0.65
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	67.9	67.0	71.8	-4.8	0.08*
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	15,352	14,843	17,442	-2,599	0.03**
Number of youth	1,866	1,501	365		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all youth evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/***/****Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8e.1. NYS PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.2	32.7	27.9	4.7	0.16
Youth age at RA					
14 years	37.6	37.8	36.3	1.5	0.50
15 years	31.7	31.3	35.3	-4.0	
16 years	30.7	30.9	28.4	2.5	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.3	0.0	0.55
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	85.2	84.9	87.7	-2.8	0.25
English is preferred spoken language	85.0	84.6	87.7	-3.1	0.20
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	85.6	85.1	89.2	-4.1	0.27
Own household or alone	12.7	13.0	9.8	3.2	
Another household and receiving support	1.8	1.9	1.0	0.9	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.1	44.2	42.8	1.4	0.02**
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	57.6	57.3	60.3	-3.0	0.02**
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.3	1.2	1.5	-0.2	
Physical disability	11.6	12.3	5.9	6.4	
Other mental impairment	25.6	25.0	30.9	-5.9	
Other or unknown disability	3.9	4.1	1.5	2.7	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	96.1	96.1	96.1	0.0	1.00
Received OASDI	9.7	9.7	9.3	0.4	0.86
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	9.7	9.7	9.2	0.6	0.06*
Youth age at most recent SSI application	6.1	6.1	6.5	-0.4	0.16
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,570	7,555	7,695	-140	0.36
OASDI	277	285	201	84	0.20
Total SSI and OASDI	7,846	7,840	7,897	-56	0.68
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	19.0	18.9	19.6	-0.7	0.82
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	85.2	84.9	87.7	-2.9	0.24
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	5.4	5.7	2.9	2.7	0.28
One parent	67.6	67.4	69.1	-1.7	
Two parents	27.0	26.9	27.9	-1.1	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	11.8	11.3	15.7	-4.3	0.23
Any parent received OASDI only	8.6	8.6	8.8	-0.2	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	5.8	5.8	6.4	-0.6	
No parent received any SSA payments	68.3	68.6	66.2	2.4	
No parent was included in the SSA data	5.4	5.7	2.9	2.7	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	6.6	6.7	5.4	1.3	0.44
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	51	54	31	23	0.04**
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA					
RA	63.2	62.6	68.2	-5.6	0.11
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	13,711	13,699	13,808	-109	0.94
Number of parents	1,967	1,763	204		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parent evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/****Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8e.2. NYS PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	32.2	32.2	32.2	-0.1	0.98
Youth age at RA					
14 years	37.6	37.6	38.0	-0.5	0.99
15 years	31.7	31.8	31.5	0.2	
16 years	30.7	30.7	30.4	0.3	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.3	0.1	0.29
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	85.2	84.7	88.4	-3.7	0.08*
English is preferred spoken language	85.0	84.4	88.0	-3.6	0.09*
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	85.6	85.0	88.8	-3.7	0.27
Own household or alone	12.7	13.1	9.8	3.3	
Another household and receiving support	1.8	1.8	1.4	0.4	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	44.1	44.4	42.5	1.9	0.00***
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	57.6	57.5	58.0	-0.4	0.00***
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.3	1.1	2.5	-1.5	
Physical disability	11.6	12.7	5.4	7.2	
Other mental impairment	25.6	24.6	31.9	-7.3	
Other or unknown disability	3.9	4.1	2.2	2.0	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	96.1	96.1	96.0	0.1	0.95
Received OASDI	9.7	9.8	8.7	1.1	0.54
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	9.7	9.8	8.9	0.9	0.00***
Youth age at most recent SSI application	6.1	6.0	6.7	-0.7	0.01**
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,570	7,554	7,667	-113	0.40
OASDI	277	287	212	75	0.23
Total SSI and OASDI	7,846	7,841	7,879	-38	0.75
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	19.0	18.5	22.1	-3.6	0.18
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	85.2	84.6	88.4	-3.8	0.07*
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	5.4	5.9	2.5	3.3	0.07*
One parent	67.6	67.0	71.4	-4.4	
Two parents	27.0	27.1	26.1	1.1	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	11.8	11.4	14.1	-2.7	0.16
Any parent received OASDI only	8.6	8.6	8.7	-0.1	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	5.8	5.7	6.9	-1.2	
No parent received any SSA payments	68.3	68.4	67.8	0.7	
No parent was included in the SSA data	5.4	5.9	2.5	3.3	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	6.6	6.7	5.4	1.3	0.38
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	51	54	33	21	0.04**
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	63.2	62.8	65.8	-3.0	0.33
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	13,711	13,727	13,616	110	0.92
Number of youth	1,967	1,691	276		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all youth evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/***/****Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8f.1. WI PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, parent survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	33.2	33.4	31.9	1.5	0.59
Youth age at RA					
14 years	39.6	38.9	42.9	-4.0	0.22
15 years	26.3	27.1	22.7	4.4	
16 years	34.1	34.0	34.4	-0.3	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.3	0.1	0.36
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	95.4	95.2	96.3	-1.2	0.32
English is preferred spoken language	95.2	95.0	96.0	-1.0	0.42
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	88.3	87.7	91.4	-3.7	0.16
Own household or alone	11.0	11.6	8.0	3.6	
Another household and receiving support	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.1	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	41.2	41.6	39.6	2.0	0.00***
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	38.3	39.0	34.7	4.4	0.25
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.2	1.3	0.6	0.7	
Physical disability	12.6	12.0	15.3	-3.4	
Other mental impairment	44.0	43.6	46.0	-2.4	
Other or unknown disability	4.0	4.1	3.4	0.7	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	95.5	95.7	94.2	1.6	0.26
Received OASDI	11.9	12.0	11.4	0.7	0.72
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.4	8.5	8.1	0.3	0.21
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.4	7.4	7.6	-0.3	0.32
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,238	7,304	6,919	385	0.01***
OASDI	306	311	277	34	0.58
Total SSI and OASDI	7,543	7,615	7,196	419	0.00***
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	21.7	22.3	18.8	3.4	0.16
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	91.3	91.5	90.2	1.3	0.45
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	3.4	3.5	3.1	0.4	0.39
One parent	59.7	60.3	56.7	3.6	
Two parents	36.9	36.2	40.2	-4.0	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	11.9	12.5	8.9	3.6	0.05*
Any parent received OASDI only	8.1	8.5	6.4	2.0	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	7.6	8.0	5.5	2.5	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.0	67.5	76.1	-8.6	
No parent was included in the SSA data	3.4	3.5	3.1	0.4	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	3.9	3.6	4.9	-1.3	0.32
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	34	30	52	-22	0.24
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	71.9	70.8	77.5	-6.8	0.01***
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	14,171	13,699	16,444	-2,745	0.01**
Number of parents	1,896	1,570	326		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all parent evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/***Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.8f.2. WI PROMISE: Comparison of baseline characteristics, youth survey respondents versus nonrespondents (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	All (A)	Respondent (B)	Non- respondent (C)	Difference (B-C)	p-value
Demographic characteristics					
Youth sex is female	33.2	34.0	30.4	3.6	0.16
Youth age at RA					
14 years	39.6	38.9	42.0	-3.1	0.08*
15 years	26.3	27.5	22.1	5.4	
16 years	34.1	33.6	35.9	-2.3	
Average age	15.4	15.4	15.4	0.0	0.59
Youth language preference at SSI application					
English is preferred written language	95.4	95.3	95.7	-0.5	0.68
English is preferred spoken language	95.2	95.1	95.5	-0.4	0.75
Youth living arrangement at SSI application					
In parents' household	88.3	87.5	91.4	-4.0	0.08*
Own household or alone	11.0	11.8	8.1	3.7	
Another household and receiving support	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.3	
Enrolling parent age at RA (from the RA system)	41.2	41.6	39.9	1.7	0.00***
Disability					
Youth primary impairment					
Intellectual or developmental disability	38.3	39.6	33.7	5.9	0.07*
Speech, hearing, or visual impairment	1.2	1.3	0.7	0.6	
Physical disability	12.6	11.9	15.0	-3.1	
Other mental impairment	44.0	43.1	47.5	-4.5	
Other or unknown disability	4.0	4.2	3.1	1.1	
SSA program participation					
Youth SSA payment status at RA					
Received SSI	95.5	95.7	94.8	0.9	0.46
Received OASDI	11.9	11.3	14.3	-3.0	0.11
Years since youth's earliest SSI eligibility at RA	8.4	8.5	8.1	0.4	0.09*
Youth age at most recent SSI application	7.4	7.4	7.7	-0.4	0.12
Youth payments in the year before RA (\$)					
SSI	7,238	7,308	6,990	318	0.02**
OASDI	306	300	324	-24	0.69
Total SSI and OASDI	7,543	7,609	7,314	294	0.02**
Household had multiple SSI-eligible children	21.8	22.3	20.1	2.2	0.32
Enrolling parent provided a valid SSN at RA	91.3	91.7	90.0	1.6	0.31
Parents included in the SSA data analyses					
None	3.4	3.5	3.3	0.1	0.60
One parent	59.7	60.3	57.7	2.6	
Two parents	36.9	36.3	39.0	-2.7	
Parent SSA payment status at RA					
Any parent received SSI only	11.9	12.6	9.3	3.3	0.27
Any parent received OASDI only	8.1	8.1	8.3	-0.2	
Any parent received both SSI and OASDI	7.6	7.9	6.4	1.5	
No parent received any SSA payments	69.0	67.9	72.7	-4.8	
No parent was included in the SSA data	3.4	3.5	3.3	0.1	
Earnings					
Youth had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	3.9	3.5	5.0	-1.5	0.21
Youth earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	34	28	55	-27	0.12
Parent had any earnings in the calendar year before RA	71.9	70.3	77.6	-7.3	0.00***
Parent earnings in the calendar year before RA (\$)	14,172	13,613	16,133	-2,520	0.01**
Number of youth	1,896	1,475	421		

Source: SSA administrative data unless otherwise noted.

Note: The sample includes all youth evaluation enrollees who were randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. Youth living arrangements recorded as "living in own household or alone" in the SSA data include living in a residential facility, foster care, another relative's household but paying a fair share of expenses, and in one's own household. The primary impairment categories correspond to SSA's Listing of Impairments. Other mental impairments include conditions such as chronic brain syndrome; schizophrenia; borderline intellectual functioning; and affective, anxiety, personality, substance addiction, somatoform, eating, conduct, oppositional/defiant, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorders.

*/**/***Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test or a chi-square test.

C. Survey nonresponse weights

To account for survey nonresponse, we calculated and used survey nonresponse weights in all regression models to estimate impacts on the survey-based outcome measures. We calculated the survey nonresponse weights as the product of the estimated probability of locating a sample member for a survey (the location adjustment) and the estimated probability that the sample member, once located, responded to the survey (the cooperation adjustment). For all programs except CaPROMISE, we attempted to interview all randomly assigned enrollees who were alive during the relevant 18-month survey field period. The survey nonresponse weights served as the analysis weights. In the case of CaPROMISE, the analysis weight also accounted for the probability that an enrollee was sampled for the survey. Thus, for CaPROMISE, the analysis weight was a product of the sampling weight and the survey nonresponse weight.

For CaPROMISE, our survey sampled 2,000 youth of the 3,097 randomly assigned enrollees. We used stratified random sampling, where strata were defined by the local educational agency and treatment status. Because CaPROMISE's enrollment was completed over a 21-month period, the 18-month survey effort began before all enrollments were completed. As a result, we sampled in two phases: first from the group that was enrolled by the time the 18-month survey effort began and then from the remainder of the enrollees (Matulewicz et al. 2018). We calculated sampling weights as the inverse of the probability of being selected for the sample. Because this was a stratified random sample in each phase, the sampling weights were simply the population size in each stratum divided by the sample size. Because the sample was proportionately allocated to each stratum, the sampling weights were approximately equal to 1.50 for all strata in the first phase and approximately equal to 1.89 for all strata in the second phase.¹⁰

We used two steps in calculating the survey nonresponse weights. First, we developed a "location model" to estimate the probability of locating a sample member. Second, we developed a "response model" to estimate the probability of survey response among the located sample members. We used logistic regression models to estimate the two probabilities, with youth and parent baseline characteristics and geographic location information as covariates. The location model for CaPROMISE used the sampling weight normalized to the sample size. The response models for all programs used the normalized location-adjusted weight. The set of covariates under consideration for the models differed by program. We identified potential interactions by using Chi-square Automatic Interaction Detector.¹¹ All available main and interaction effects identified with Chi-square Automatic Interaction Detector were included as covariates in forward and backward stepwise logistic regression models (using the STEPWISE option of the SAS LOGISTIC procedure). We excluded any covariate or interaction that was unlikely to be related to locating the respondent or to response propensity. Because the stepwise logistic regression procedures in SAS do not fully account for the sample design in the variance estimates, we

¹⁰ These values were obtained by dividing the population size by the sample size within each stratum. The population sizes were 2,604 in phase 1 and 493 in phase 2 across strata. The sample sizes were 1,739 in phase 1 and 261 in phase 2 across strata. We obtained 1.50 by dividing 2,604 by 1,739, and 1.89 by dividing 493 by 261. The actual weights will vary from stratum to stratum but will not differ very much from 1.50 and 1.89 because we used proportional allocation to the strata.

¹¹ Chi-square Automatic Interaction Detector decision trees were calculated by using PROC HSPLIT in SAS.

developed the final weighted models by using a command that accounted for the complex sample design (the SURVEYLOGISTIC procedure in SAS).

Next, we carefully evaluated a series of models. We compared the following measures of predictive ability and goodness of fit: the R-squared statistic, the percentage of concordant and discordant pairs, and the Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test. Model-fitting also involved reviewing the statistical significance of the coefficients of the covariates in the model and avoiding any unusually large adjustment factors. We created five weighting classes for both the location models and the response models based on the quintiles of the estimated propensities, and calculated the adjustments at each step as the inverse of the weighted response rate within each weighting class. We calculated the survey nonresponse weights as the product of the location adjustment and the response adjustment. As noted above, the survey nonresponse weights served as the analysis weights for all programs but CaPROMISE. For CaPROMISE, the analysis weight was the product of the sampling weight and the survey nonresponse weight. We assessed the distribution of the weights for unusually high values because widely varying weights make estimates less precise and risk bias if a few cases with high weights had an undue influence on the estimates. However, we did not observe major outliers. In the final step, we ratio-adjusted the marginal weighted sums so that they matched the total number of eligible treatment and control enrollees within each program.

We developed separate analysis weights for parent and youth survey nonresponse. Because parent and youth surveys were administered separately, survey nonresponse could vary between the two surveys. Thus, for each PROMISE program, we developed two sets of analysis weights—one for the parent survey and another for the youth survey.

D. Impact estimates with and without survey nonrespondents

To assess the extent to which the lack of survey data for nonrespondents would influence our estimates of program impacts, we compared how the estimated impacts varied when nonrespondents were included and excluded from analyses of the administrative data outcomes. If our analysis weights adequately addressed potential nonresponse bias, the impacts on outcomes based on administrative data for the weighted survey sample should be similar to those for the full research sample. The administrative data allowed us to estimate impacts that included those who did not respond to the survey and compare those estimates to those obtained by limiting the sample to survey respondents only and applying the analysis weights. We conducted statistical tests to assess whether the impacts estimated with each sample differed significantly from one another.

The findings suggested that use of the analysis weights minimized the potential for nonresponse bias (Tables A.9a to A.9f). They showed that for the most part the estimated impacts for the survey respondent sample were comparable to those for the full research sample. Across the six PROMISE programs, we compared results between the two estimation samples for a total of 103 outcomes. We found significantly different impact estimates for only six of these outcomes, which was what would be expected by statistical chance alone. In addition, in the few instances in which the estimated impacts differed between the two samples, the differences were small in magnitude and would not substantially change the interpretation. Four of the six observed differences in impacts were in CaPROMISE. However, these differences in

impacts between the survey respondent sample and the full research sample in CaPROMISE are not substantively important, with the possible exception of parental earnings and income (which are highly correlated to one another). These findings provided us with greater confidence that the estimated impacts on outcomes based on survey data (in which information was not available for survey nonrespondents) were unbiased and representative of all PROMISE enrollees.

Table A.9a. Arkansas PROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	<i>Administrative analysis samples</i>			<i>Administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)</i>			
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value for difference
Youth outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	4.2	3.2	0.00***	3.8	4.7	0.00***	0.20
Received VR services since RA	1.1	0.0	0.95	1.0	0.2	0.70	0.73
Employment and earnings							
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA	15.4	40.6	0.00***	13.7	44.0	0.00***	0.31
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (\$)	361	592	0.00***	319	658	0.00***	0.31
Economic well-being							
SSA disability payments							
Received any SSA disability payments since RA	97.2	0.3	0.68	97.5	-0.2	0.78	0.49
Total SSA disability payment amount since RA (\$)	10,930	-259	0.05**	11,031	-246	0.08*	0.93
Income in calendar year after RA (\$)	7,370	402	0.00***	7,414	439	0.00***	0.31
Medicaid							
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.2	0.1	0.88	96.6	0.1	0.89	0.99
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	11,307	1,124	0.20	11,491	1,513	0.12	0.67
Medicaid payments since RA							
Average monthly fee for service payments (\$)	628	62	0.20	638	84	0.12	0.67
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	n.d.						
Family outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	2.4	0.1	0.94	2.4	0.1	0.92	0.97
Received VR services since RA	1.6	-0.0	1.00	1.7	-0.1	0.92	0.91
Employment and earnings							
Parents' earnings in calendar year after RA (\$)	16,083	222	0.66	15,621	447	0.40	0.75
Economic well-being							
Combined disability payments							
Any disability payments since RA	31.2	0.7	0.75	32.7	0.0	1.00	0.77
Total disability payment amount since RA (\$)	4,566	199	0.58	4,881	65	0.87	0.72
Parents' total income in calendar year after RA (\$)	19,094	359	0.49	18,841	530	0.33	0.75
Medicaid							
Ever enrolled in Medicaid benefits since RA	79.7	1.2	0.52	80.8	1.0	0.63	0.89
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	5,617	-188	0.61	5,880	-274	0.50	0.82

Source: PROMISE 18-month follow-up survey; state VR agency data; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. The “administrative analysis samples” results match the results reported in the main text, and use all people for whom data are available. The “administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)” results use the corresponding survey weights for the relevant population to assess the comparability of results using the survey sample.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test

Table A.9b. ASPIRE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	<i>Administrative analysis samples</i>			<i>Administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)</i>			<i>p-value for difference</i>
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p-value</i>	Control mean	Impact	<i>p-value</i>	
Youth outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	7.8	15.1	0.00***	7.3	17.6	0.00***	0.13
Received VR services since RA	4.7	9.4	0.00***	4.3	10.9	0.00***	0.29
Employment and earnings							
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA	14.2	2.8	0.07*	13.9	3.3	0.06*	0.40
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (\$)	324	23	0.68	295	71	0.23	0.40
Economic well-being							
SSA disability benefits (from SSA data)							
Received any SSA disability benefits since RA	95.5	-0.3	0.71	95.5	-0.2	0.84	0.90
Total SSA disability benefit amount since RA (\$)	10,132	-21	0.89	10,165	91	0.58	0.47
Income in calendar year after RA (\$)	6,550	50	0.66	6,561	186	0.14	0.40
Medicaid							
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	92.1	2.1	0.04**	92.5	1.8	0.11	0.77
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	24,798	1,548	0.24	24,161	1,906	0.18	0.79
Medicaid payments since RA							
Average monthly fee for service payments (\$)	354	107	0.07*	323	91	0.14	0.80
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	1,313	14	0.82	1,307	31	0.64	0.79
Family outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	1.2	1.1	0.12	0.9	1.2	0.11	0.81
Received VR services since RA	0.6	0.7	0.19	0.6	0.6	0.29	0.83
Employment and earnings							
Parents' earnings in calendar year after RA (\$)	21,783	-197	0.77	21,672	-706	0.34	0.48
Economic well-being							
Combined disability benefits							
Any disability benefits since RA	26.0	-1.3	0.48	26.9	-1.2	0.57	0.95
Total disability benefit amount since RA (\$)	3,755	-125	0.68	3,892	-146	0.66	0.95
Parents' total income in calendar year after RA (\$)	24,203	-373	0.58	24,185	-864	0.24	0.48
Medicaid							
Ever enrolled in Medicaid benefits since RA	63.9	0.8	0.81	63.8	1.2	0.73	0.89
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	6,322	849	0.31	6,519	647	0.50	0.82

Source: PROMISE 18-month follow-up survey; state VR agency data; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. The “administrative analysis samples” results match the results reported in the main text, and use all people for whom data are available. The “administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)” results use the corresponding survey weights for the relevant population to assess the comparability of results using the survey sample.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test

Table A.9c. CaPROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	<i>Administrative analysis samples</i>			<i>Administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)</i>			
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value for difference
Youth outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	3.8	21.3	0.00***	3.8	21.8	0.00***	0.71
Received VR services since RA	2.5	13.4	0.00***	2.6	13.9	0.00***	0.68
Employment and earnings							
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA	13.0	19.7	0.00***	12.0	21.4	0.00***	0.71
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (\$)	227	102	0.01***	174	119	0.05**	0.71
Economic well-being							
SSA disability payments							
Received any SSA disability payments since RA	96.8	-1.0	0.10*	97.6	-1.3	0.11	0.62
Total SSA disability payment amount since RA (\$)	10,732	-26	0.81	10,893	-95	0.53	0.58
Income in calendar year after RA (\$)	7,114	72	0.40	7,163	60	0.61	0.71
Medicaid							
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	98.7	0.3	0.31	98.9	0.3	0.50	0.91
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	22,294	158	0.85	22,189	849	0.47	0.47
Medicaid payments since RA							
Average monthly fee for service payments (\$)	601	9	0.84	582	64	0.32	0.30
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	638	-0	0.96	651	-17	0.17	0.10*
Family outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	0.6	0.0	0.95	1.0	-0.7	0.36	0.18
Received VR services since RA	0.5	0.0	0.96	0.8	-0.7	0.17	0.08*
Employment and earnings							
Parents' earnings in calendar year after RA (\$)	22,380	467	0.38	21,147	1,735	0.02**	0.04**
Economic well-being							
Combined disability payments							
Any disability payments since RA	19.0	-0.1	0.96	20.1	-0.4	0.83	0.84
Total disability payment amount since RA (\$)	2,705	66	0.78	2,947	-58	0.86	0.65
Parents' total income in calendar year after RA (\$)	24,160	463	0.38	23,067	1,707	0.02**	0.04**
Medicaid							
Ever enrolled in Medicaid benefits since RA	83.9	0.6	0.70	85.7	-3.7	0.09*	0.02**
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	5,581	-303	0.28	5,841	-580	0.14	0.39

Source: PROMISE 18-month follow-up survey; state VR agency data; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. The “administrative analysis samples” results match the results reported in the main text, and use all people for whom data are available. The “administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)” results use the corresponding survey weights for the relevant population to assess the comparability of results using the survey sample.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test

Table A.9d. MD PROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	<i>Administrative analysis samples</i>			<i>Administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)</i>			<i>p-value for difference</i>
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p-value</i>	Control mean	Impact	<i>p-value</i>	
Youth outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	5.9	0.7	0.54	6.8	0.4	0.77	0.80
Received VR services since RA	5.6	0.6	0.55	6.4	0.3	0.80	0.77
Employment and earnings							
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA	21.3	12.8	0.00***	21.8	14.3	0.00***	0.96
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (\$)	431	221	0.00***	428	225	0.00***	0.96
Economic well-being							
SSA disability payments							
Received any SSA disability payments since RA	96.8	0.7	0.32	96.7	0.5	0.48	0.83
Total SSA disability payment amount since RA (\$)	10,688	115	0.38	10,738	246	0.08*	0.33
Income in calendar year after RA (\$)	7,393	307	0.01***	7,433	397	0.00***	0.96
Medicaid							
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	97.3	0.7	0.21	98.3	0.2	0.76	0.32
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	24,900	2,509	0.14	25,323	1,983	0.28	0.77
Medicaid payments since RA							
Average monthly fee for service payments (\$)	809	137	0.15	810	117	0.25	0.84
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	574	3	0.91	597	-7	0.78	0.69
Family outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	1.5	0.4	0.59	1.7	0.5	0.56	0.90
Received VR services since RA	1.1	0.5	0.48	1.3	0.7	0.42	0.88
Employment and earnings							
Parents' earnings in calendar year after RA (\$)	18,465	-1,005	0.05**	17,909	-1,022	0.06*	0.86
Economic well-being							
Combined disability payments							
Any disability payments since RA	21.3	4.0	0.04**	22.1	4.2	0.05*	0.91
Total disability payment amount since RA (\$)	3,090	641	0.04**	3,206	784	0.02**	0.66
Parents' total income in calendar year after RA (\$)	20,498	-546	0.31	19,998	-446	0.43	0.86
Medicaid							
Ever enrolled in Medicaid benefits since RA	82.8	2.9	0.16	82.7	2.8	0.21	0.96
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	9,105	342	0.59	9,402	213	0.76	0.85

Source: PROMISE 18-month follow-up survey; state VR agency data; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of MDJ PROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. The “administrative analysis samples” results match the results reported in the main text, and use all people for whom data are available. The “administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)” results use the corresponding survey weights for the relevant population to assess the comparability of results using the survey sample.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test

Table A.9e. NYS PROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	<i>Administrative analysis samples</i>			<i>Administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)</i>			
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value for difference
Youth outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	1.7	-0.1	0.82	2.0	-0.4	0.56	0.70
Received VR services since RA	0.9	-0.1	0.84	1.1	-0.5	0.32	0.42
Employment and earnings							
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA	20.2	3.7	0.04**	21.1	3.4	0.09*	0.90
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (\$)	338	41	0.38	355	48	0.37	0.90
Economic well-being							
SSA disability payments							
Received any SSA disability payments since RA	97.9	-0.6	0.34	97.8	-0.6	0.37	1.00
Total SSA disability payment amount since RA (\$)	11,292	-10	0.93	11,249	78	0.52	0.46
Income in calendar year after RA (\$)	7,460	47	0.63	7,436	117	0.25	0.90
Medicaid							
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	n.d.						
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	n.d.						
Medicaid payments since RA							
Average monthly fee for service payments (\$)	n.d.						
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	n.d.						
Family outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	0.1	1.1	0.01***	0.1	1.2	0.01**	0.96
Received VR services since RA	0.5	0.4	0.34	0.5	0.3	0.54	0.74
Employment and earnings							
Parents' earnings in calendar year after RA (\$)	15,326	463	0.33	15,337	331	0.51	0.85
Economic well-being							
Combined disability payments							
Any disability payments since RA	31.0	-0.5	0.68	30.8	-0.4	0.76	0.94
Total disability payment amount since RA (\$)	4,196	35	0.81	4,233	78	0.62	0.78
Parents' total income in calendar year after RA (\$)	17,986	511	0.29	18,024	415	0.41	0.85
Medicaid							
Ever enrolled in Medicaid benefits since RA	n.d.						
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	n.d.						

Source: PROMISE 18-month follow-up survey; state VR agency data; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. The “administrative analysis samples” results match the results reported in the main text, and use all people for whom data are available. The “administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)” results use the corresponding survey weights for the relevant population to assess the comparability of results using the survey sample.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test

Table A.9f. WI PROMISE: Impact on outcomes measured using administrative data, including and excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	<i>Administrative analysis samples</i>			<i>Administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)</i>			
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Control mean	Impact	p-value	p-value for difference
Youth outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	14.0	82.9	0.00***	14.6	82.5	0.00***	0.78
Received VR services since RA	8.8	71.3	0.00***	9.4	74.2	0.00***	0.08*
Employment and earnings							
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA	28.9	15.1	0.00***	28.3	15.9	0.00***	0.47
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (\$)	555	105	0.09*	505	152	0.03**	0.47
Economic well-being							
SSA disability payments							
Received any SSA disability payments since RA	97.1	0.1	0.88	97.5	0.2	0.84	0.93
Total SSA disability payment amount since RA (\$)	10,861	129	0.32	10,962	111	0.45	0.90
Income in calendar year after RA (\$)	7,375	214	0.05**	7,405	226	0.07*	0.47
Medicaid							
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.2	0.1	0.84	96.4	1.0	0.18	0.22
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	10,648	284	0.72	10,531	796	0.37	0.54
Medicaid payments since RA							
Average monthly fee for service payments (\$)	502	10	0.79	492	40	0.36	0.46
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	90	6	0.70	93	4	0.78	0.94
Family outcomes							
VR services							
Applied for VR services since RA	2.5	0.5	0.50	3.0	0.2	0.87	0.65
Received VR services since RA	1.2	1.0	0.10	1.3	0.8	0.22	0.79
Employment and earnings							
Parents' earnings in calendar year after RA (\$)	17,350	65	0.90	16,347	322	0.56	0.62
Economic well-being							
Combined disability payments							
Any disability payments since RA	31.6	-2.0	0.35	33.1	-2.1	0.37	0.94
Total disability payment amount since RA (\$)	4,447	-201	0.55	4,727	-216	0.57	0.96
Parents' total income in calendar year after RA (\$)	20,160	-73	0.89	19,340	196	0.73	0.62
Medicaid							
Ever enrolled in Medicaid benefits since RA	86.9	0.5	0.76	87.3	-0.1	0.96	0.73
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	7,724	270	0.61	7,962	243	0.69	0.96

Source: PROMISE 18-month follow-up survey; state VR agency data; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. The “administrative analysis samples” results match the results reported in the main text, and use all people for whom data are available. The “administrative analysis samples, excluding 18-month survey nonrespondents (weighted)” results use the corresponding survey weights for the relevant population to assess the comparability of results using the survey sample.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

VI. MISSING DATA

Data might be missing for reasons other than survey nonresponse. In the survey data, information could be missing because respondents refused to answer or did not know the answer to a question. Even in the administrative data, data for some variables were missing because some enrollees or their parents could not be identified in the administrative records. In this chapter, we describe how we dealt with missing data.

A. Missing baseline characteristic data

Because data on the baseline characteristics of enrollees came primarily from administrative data, missing data on baseline characteristics (including those used as covariates in the regression-adjusted impact analysis) affected only a small share of cases (no more than 5 percent) in each PROMISE program. To avoid excluding cases because of missing baseline data, we imputed values for sample members for whom the data were missing. For a continuous or dichotomous baseline variable, we replaced the missing observations with the program-specific mean value of the variable computed for the nonmissing observations. For a categorical variable, we added a category to indicate missing data.¹²

B. Missing survey outcome data

Data for some of the survey-based outcomes were missing because of item nonresponse. In a small number of cases, data for certain outcomes were missing because the youth or parent responded to a short, self-administered version of the 18-month survey that had only a limited set of questions. Typically, observations with missing data were excluded from analyses of those outcomes. The exception was when an outcome had missing value that was conditional on the value of another variable; exclusion of such cases with missing observations could result in biased estimates. To minimize the risk of bias from this source, we used a multiple imputation procedure that allowed us to retain these cases with conditionally missing data. For example, if youth reported that they worked for pay in the year preceding the 18-month survey but did not provide information on their earnings for this work, we used multiple imputation to estimate their earnings. People who did not report working for pay are considered as having zero earnings.

The imputation procedure utilized multivariate imputation by chained equations (Raghunathan et al. 2001; Van Buuren 2007) and predictive mean matching (Rubin 1986; Little 1988).¹³ This approach used an iterative process to estimate regression models for each outcome measure with missing data. First, for all cases in the analytic sample, we developed predicted values for an outcome by using the relevant multivariate regression models and random disturbance terms. The sets of covariates used in each of these models were tailored to include the covariates most relevant to the variable being imputed. Using predictive mean matching, each case with missing data on a particular outcome was then matched to the 10 cases (with

¹² For two covariates used in the regression-adjusted impact analysis that were derived from survey data—namely, parents' and youth's race and ethnicity information—we created one category to indicate missing information due to either survey or item nonresponse.

¹³ We used the Stata command “mi impute chained” to perform multiple imputation and the command “mi estimate” to analyze these outcomes.

nonmissing data for that outcome) that had the closest predicted values. Next, one of the 10 matched cases was chosen at random and its observed value for the outcome was assigned to the case with missing data. Using this imputation procedure, we estimated 10 plausible replacement values for each missing value of the outcome. We conducted all analyses separately on each of the 10 imputed data sets and then the results were combined by using a standard approach first developed by Rubin (1987), which accounts for the uncertainty associated with missing data imputations. Accounting for imputation uncertainty is a key advantage of the multiple imputation approach. Common single imputation methods such as mean-replacement imputation or hot decking do not account for this uncertainty. As a result, standard errors from data based on single imputation methods may be understated, affecting inferences drawn from the data.

We present findings from the analysis of the multiply imputed data in the body of the report. We also estimated impacts on the same outcomes without the imputation (Tables A.10a to A.10f). In general, the estimates were similar to those from the imputed version of the outcome. Nevertheless, we considered analyzing the multiply imputed version of the outcomes as more appropriate and presented results from their analysis as part of our main findings.

Table A.10a. Arkansas PROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Impact	p-value
Youth's receipt of key services			
Hours of key transition services received since RA	231.8	41.4	0.16
Number of key transition service providers since RA	0.7	0.8	0.00***
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA			
No key service reported	51.8	-36.3	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	1.6	-0.3	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	46.6	36.6	
Youth's employment			
Employment in the year before the survey			
Any paid employment	16.1	30.7	0.00***
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.4	2.6	0.00***
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	588	1,092	0.00***
Employment at the time of the survey			
Any paid employment	8.4	5.1	0.00***
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	2.2	3.2	0.00***
Weekly earnings (\$)	18	26	0.00***
Youth's economic well-being			
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,678	824	0.00***
Family's receipt of key services			
Hours of key support services received since RA	13.6	12.0	0.08*
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.4	0.3	0.00***
Usefulness of key support services received since RA			
No key service reported	77.0	-26.0	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	0.4	0.2	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	22.5	25.8	
Parents' employment			
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	733	106	0.05*
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	28.6	3.2	0.16

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/***Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.10b. ASPIRE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Impact	p-value
Youth's receipt of key services			
Hours of key transition services received since RA	372.2	20.7	0.57
Number of key transition service providers since RA	0.9	0.7	0.00***
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA			
No key service reported	39.3	-21.4	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	3.3	-1.0	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	57.4	22.4	
Youth's employment			
Employment in the year before the survey			
Any paid employment	16.8	4.2	0.03**
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.3	0.1	0.67
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	444	147	0.18
Employment at the time of the survey			
Any paid employment	9.3	2.2	0.14
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	2.1	0.0	0.95
Weekly earnings (\$)	16	4	0.36
Youth's economic well-being			
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	6,929	219	0.19
Family's receipt of key services			
Hours of key support services received since RA	17.6	12.1	0.21
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.4	0.4	0.00***
Usefulness of key support services received since RA			
No key service reported	73.3	-19.0	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	0.9	0.1	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	25.7	18.9	
Parents' employment			
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	1,299	-63	0.41
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	32.0	-0.5	0.82

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/****Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.10c. CaPROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Impact	p-value
Youth's receipt of key services			
Hours of key transition services received since RA	260.0	63.3	0.05*
Number of key transition service providers since RA	0.7	0.6	0.00***
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA			
No key service reported	50.4	-29.1	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	2.0	-0.4	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	47.6	29.5	
Youth's employment			
Employment in the year before the survey			
Any paid employment	9.3	20.9	0.00***
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	0.7	0.5	0.01**
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	403	207	0.12
Employment at the time of the survey			
Any paid employment	4.6	5.9	0.00***
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.0	0.9	0.02**
Weekly earnings (\$)	11	4	0.24
Youth's economic well-being			
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,350	209	0.21
Family's receipt of key services			
Hours of key support services received since RA	13.0	-0.1	0.99
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.3	0.2	0.00***
Usefulness of key support services received since RA			
No key service reported	79.2	-13.5	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	0.9	-0.3	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	19.9	13.9	
Parents' employment			
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	1,091	100	0.14
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	25.8	0.7	0.73

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/***Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.10d. MD PROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Impact	p-value
Youth's receipt of key services			
Hours of key transition services received since RA	406.1	-62.9	0.09*
Number of key transition service providers since RA	1.0	0.5	0.00***
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA			
No key service reported	35.9	-18.4	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	2.6	0.9	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	61.5	17.5	
Youth's employment			
Employment in the year before the survey			
Any paid employment	17.6	16.7	0.00***
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.5	1.2	0.00***
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	674	393	0.03**
Employment at the time of the survey			
Any paid employment	9.3	3.5	0.03**
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	2.4	1.6	0.02**
Weekly earnings (\$)	22	7	0.24
Youth's economic well-being			
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,732	519	0.01**
Family's receipt of key services			
Hours of key support services received since RA	26.4	-3.8	0.65
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.5	0.3	0.00***
Usefulness of key support services received since RA			
No key service reported	70.1	-25.2	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	0.8	2.1	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	29.1	23.1	
Parents' employment			
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	850	48	0.44
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	27.7	-0.3	0.89

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test

Table A.10e. NYS PROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Impact	p-value
Youth's receipt of key services			
Hours of key transition services received since RA	354.9	-12.6	0.72
Number of key transition service providers since RA	0.9	0.3	0.00***
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA			
No key service reported	42.7	-16.3	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	2.2	-0.1	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	55.1	16.4	
Youth's employment			
Employment in the year before the survey			
Any paid employment	16.6	4.3	0.02**
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.0	0.2	0.25
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	439	15	0.86
Employment at the time of the survey			
Any paid employment	7.5	1.6	0.25
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.5	0.2	0.51
Weekly earnings (\$)	14	-1	0.84
Youth's economic well-being			
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,726	39	0.76
Family's receipt of key services			
Hours of key support services received since RA	15.0	-3.7	0.46
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.4	0.2	0.00***
Usefulness of key support services received since RA			
No key service reported	73.8	-10.9	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	1.1	0.2	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	25.1	10.7	
Parents' employment			
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	676	2	0.96
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	22.8	-1.7	0.36

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/***Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test or a chi-square test.

Table A.10f. WI PROMISE: Impact estimates on outcome measures without imputation for conditional item nonresponse (percentage, unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Impact	p-value
Youth's receipt of key services			
Hours of key transition services received since RA	315.4	9.3	0.79
Number of key transition service providers since RA	1.1	0.6	0.00***
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA			
No key service reported	37.4	-20.7	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	3.1	-0.2	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	59.5	21.0	
Youth's employment			
Employment in the year before the survey			
Any paid employment	26.0	13.7	0.00***
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.8	1.0	0.00***
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	685	395	0.00***
Employment at the time of the survey			
Any paid employment	15.1	3.4	0.08*
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	3.8	0.7	0.33
Weekly earnings (\$)	28	7	0.25
Youth's economic well-being			
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,687	472	0.01***
Family's receipt of key services			
Hours of key support services received since RA	19.9	-1.4	0.82
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.4	0.3	0.00***
Usefulness of key support services received since RA			
No key service reported	72.5	-23.6	0.00***
No service rated somewhat or very useful	0.8	1.3	
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	26.6	22.3	
Parents' employment			
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	881	233	0.00***
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	26.2	-0.2	0.93

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/***Difference is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test or a chi-square test.

VII. ESTIMATION METHODS AND IMPACT ESTIMATES

In theory, random assignment should result in groups of youth who are, on average, similar in their characteristics at the time they enrolled in the PROMISE evaluation. Therefore, by design, a simple comparison of mean values of outcomes between the treatment and control groups would provide an unbiased estimate of program impacts. We checked the baseline characteristics of treatment and control group youth in each PROMISE program and found few differences (Tables III.1, IV.1, V.1, VI.1, VII.1, VIII.1, A.5a to A.5f, and A.6a to A.6f). The results suggested that random assignment was well executed in each PROMISE program. Accordingly, a simple comparison of the outcomes 18 months after enrollment would provide an unbiased estimate of the impacts, on average.

To improve the statistical precision of our impact estimates and account for chance differences in baseline characteristics between treatment and control group members, we computed regression-adjusted impact estimates by using multivariate regression models. All regression models included a core set of covariates across all programs. Moreover, for each program, we identified a select set of additional covariates that were included in the model. If we found any statistically significant differences in baseline characteristics at a particular program, we used that characteristic as a covariate in all regressions for that program.¹⁴ When analyzing selected impacts of ASPIRE, we also included covariates derived from the ASPIRE baseline survey conducted by the program staff. In the case of ASPIRE and CaPROMISE, all regressions also included region-fixed effects to account for the fact that we used stratified random assignment at these sites.¹⁵ Table A.11 lists the covariates used in regression-adjusted impact analyses for all PROMISE programs. In all tables with results from the impact analysis in the main report, the means for the treatment group reflected regression-adjusted means.

¹⁴ Exceptions occurred in some regressions with categorical outcome variables. In some programs, if one category of the outcome variable had a small number of observations, then some covariates were collinear and could perfectly predict the outcome. In these cases, the covariates were dropped from the regression model.

¹⁵ Due to the small number of observations in some states, we included a single fixed effect to indicate observations from Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

Table A.11. Control variables for regression-adjusted analysis of impacts

Program	Regression covariates
All PROMISE programs	Youth race/ethnicity (categories; non-Hispanic white is the omitted category); ^a Whether youth is female; Youth duration of SSI payments at random assignment; Whether youth household has multiple SSI-eligible children; Youth total disability payment amount in the 12 months before the month of random assignment; Youth primary impairment (categories; physical disability is the omitted category); Youth's earnings in the calendar year prior to random assignment (only for analysis of Master Earnings File earnings outcomes) ^b
Arkansas PROMISE	Whether youth had SSI payment in the month of random assignment
ASPIRE	Whether youth had OASDI payment in the month of random assignment; Whether youth works or volunteers at baseline; Whether youth talked with parent/teacher/caseworker about post-secondary education at baseline; Whether youth talked with parent/teacher/caseworker about post-school employment at baseline; Whether parent expected youth to pursue post-secondary education at baseline; Whether parent expected youth to be employed in the future at baseline. Whether youth has difficulty with at least one activity of daily living at baseline; Whether youth has difficulty with at least one instrumental activity of daily living at baseline; Parent's self-assessment of financial knowledge at baseline; Region fixed effects
CaPROMISE	Youth OASDI payments in the 12 months before the month of random assignment; Region fixed effects
MD PROMISE	Youth SSI payments in the 12 months before the month of random assignment
NYS PROMISE	Youth's living arrangements at the time of random assignment (categories; living with parents is the omitted category); Youth OASDI payments in the 12 months before the month of random assignment; Number of parents used in SSA data analysis (categories; one parent is the omitted category); Parent SSA beneficiary status (categories; no parent receiving any payments is the omitted category)
WI PROMISE	

Note: Control variables shown for each program were added to the set of control variable shown for all programs.

^aFor parent outcomes, we controlled for parents' race and ethnicity instead.

^bFor parent outcomes, we controlled for parents' earnings in the calendar year prior to random assignment in the analysis of Master Earnings File earnings outcomes.

To estimate the adjusted program impacts at each program, we estimated a regression model of the following form:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta Treatment_i + \lambda X_i + \epsilon_i,$$

where i denotes the individual observation, $Treatment_i$ denotes the indicator for assignment to the treatment group, X_i denotes the vector of covariates and ϵ_i denotes the error term. The coefficient β denotes the parameter of primary interest. When the outcome was continuous, we estimated this regression using ordinary least squares method and β denoted the estimated program impact. When the outcome was binary, we estimated the regression by using logistic regression models, then estimated the program impact by calculating the average marginal effect implied by our estimate of β . For continuous and binary outcomes, we used two-sided t -tests to determine whether the estimated program impact was statistically significantly different from zero. When the outcome was categorical, we estimated the regression by using multinomial logistic regression models, then estimated the program impact on each category by calculating the average marginal effect on each category implied by our estimate of β . We then used two-sided chi-square tests to determine whether the distribution of estimated program impacts was statistically significantly different from zero.

We used Stata's "svy" commands, which were designed to fit statistical models for complex survey data. When examining survey-based outcomes, we specified probability weights in the form of either the parent or youth analysis weight, depending upon the source of the outcome data. When examining administrative outcomes, we did not use any analysis weights. For our examination of the CaPROMISE program, we specified that the survey sampling had been stratified by local educational agency.

We addressed the possibility of heteroskedasticity of unknown form by using the method proposed by White (1980) to produce heteroskedasticity consistent standard errors.¹⁶

Tables A.12a to A.12f provide additional inference statistics for the regression-adjusted impacts, namely standard error of impacts and effect size estimates. For effect sizes for continuous outcome measures, we reported the standardized mean difference known as Hedges' g , estimated by dividing the estimated impact by the pooled standard deviation of the outcome measure. For binary and multinomial categorical outcome measures, we reported adjusted impact estimates in the form of average marginal effects. Effect sizes were calculated by dividing the log odds ratio by 1.65, providing a statistic that reflects the difference in the probability of the occurrence of an event between the two groups (Cox 1970).

We also tested the sensitivity of our impact estimates to the inclusion of covariates (Tables A.12a to A.12f) and found that covariate adjustments did not lead to substantive differences. The impact estimates without covariates supported the broad conclusions of our main analyses that used covariate adjustments.

¹⁶ Heteroskedasticity refers to the circumstance in which the variability of an outcome is unequal across a range of values of a control variable used in the regression model.

Table A.12a.1. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any transition services since RA	82.3	13.4***	1.6	0.940	0.00	13.3***	1.6	782	751
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	27.2	45.6***	2.3	1.193	0.00	45.3***	2.3	778	750
School transition planning	61.1	7.1***	2.4	0.189	0.00	7.1***	2.4	775	752
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	37.4	38.2***	2.3	0.997	0.00	38.4***	2.3	778	751
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	4.5	19.7***	1.7	1.159	0.00	19.7***	1.7	774	746
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	21.2	26.8***	2.3	0.746	0.00	26.8***	2.3	784	751
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	34.5	18.9***	2.5	0.472	0.00	19.1***	2.5	770	744
Help accessing education or training	30.3	16.9***	2.4	0.437	0.00	17.5***	2.5	780	745
Life skills training	41.5	18.3***	2.5	0.449	0.00	18.0***	2.5	779	747
Help with assistive technology	19.8	9.5***	2.2	0.315	0.00	9.5***	2.2	756	743
Other services	6.5	9.9***	1.6	0.627	0.00	9.9***	1.6	782	755
Received any key transition services since RA	50.2	34.7***	2.2	1.041	0.00	34.6***	2.2	776	749
Hours of key transition services received since RA	261.8	23.8	30.0	0.042	0.43	22.7	30.3	761	741
Number of key transition service providers since RA	0.8	0.8***	0.1	0.755	0.00	0.8***	0.1	775	747
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA									
No key service reported	49.8	-34.7***	2.2	-0.001	0.00	-34.6***	2.2	775	746
No service rated somewhat or very useful	1.6	-0.3	0.7	-0.005		-0.2	0.6	775	746
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	48.6	34.9	2.3	0.013		34.9	2.3	775	746
Unmet needs for services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	30.3	-11.3***	2.2	-0.373	0.00	-11.2***	2.2	771	749
Number of unmet service or support needs	1.1	-0.6***	0.1	-0.304	0.00	-0.6***	0.1	771	749
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	6.1	-4.0***	1.0	-0.676	0.00	-3.9***	1.0	771	749
Employment-promoting services	19.0	-9.8***	1.8	-0.505	0.00	-9.8***	1.8	771	749

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Benefits counseling	7.4	-5.1***	1.1	-0.725	0.00	-5.1***	1.1	771	749
Financial education	11.0	-7.0***	1.3	-0.664	0.00	-7.1***	1.3	771	749
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	7.5	-4.5***	1.1	-0.586	0.00	-4.5***	1.1	771	749
Education or training supports	17.2	-7.5***	1.7	-0.398	0.00	-7.4***	1.8	771	749
Referral services	5.2	-3.1***	1.0	-0.577	0.00	-3.1***	1.0	771	749
Transportation	7.0	-4.4***	1.1	-0.623	0.00	-4.3***	1.1	771	749
Health	7.6	-4.4***	1.2	-0.561	0.00	-4.4***	1.2	771	749
Accommodations	5.8	-3.3***	1.0	-0.528	0.00	-3.2***	1.0	771	749
Other skills training	18.9	-10.4***	1.7	-0.561	0.00	-10.5***	1.7	771	749
Any other services	1.7	0.1	0.7	0.025	0.91	0.1	0.7	771	749
VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	4.2	3.2***	1.1	0.361	0.00	3.2***	1.1	867	886
Duration from RA to VR application									
Within the first 6 months	0.9	0.3**	0.5	0.159	0.01	0.3**	0.5	867	886
7 to 12 months	1.1	2.0	0.7	0.637		2.1	0.7	867	886
13 to 18 months	2.1	0.9	0.8	0.209		0.9	0.8	867	886
Did not apply within 18 months of RA	95.8	-3.2	1.1	-0.362		-3.2	1.1	867	886
Received VR services since RA	1.1	0.0	0.5	0.018	0.95	0.0	0.5	867	886
Types of VR services received since RA									
Education and training	n.d.								
Career	n.d.								
Other	n.d.								

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aWe identified these services as key transition services because PROMISE programs were required to offer them. The PROMISE 18-month survey included more detailed questions about providers of these services than about providers of other services.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12a.2. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Enrolled in school at the time of the survey	90.8	-1.7	1.6	-0.112	0.29	-1.5	1.6	749	718
Supplementary outcomes									
Ever enrolled in school since RA	98.6	-0.4	0.6	-0.136	0.59	-0.3	0.7	749	719
Received special education or had an IEP since RA	73.7	1.7	2.2	0.055	0.43	1.3	2.3	772	746
Had a Section 504 plan since RA	50.2	5.5**	2.7	0.134	0.04	5.9**	2.7	676	654
Received GED, certificate of completion, or high school diploma since RA	8.5	1.3	1.5	0.096	0.38	1.3	1.5	747	718
Job-related training since RA									
Received any job-related training	14.7	32.3***	2.3	0.992	0.00	32.4***	2.3	744	718
Received any job-related training credential	3.2	9.6***	1.4	0.902	0.00	9.6***	1.4	742	718
Type of school attended since RA									
None	1.4	0.3	0.7	0.124	0.95	0.3	0.7	748	718
Regular middle or high school or college	89.9	-0.6	1.6	-0.041		-0.3	1.6	748	718
Specialized school for students with disabilities	3.6	0.3	1.0	0.049		0.1	1.0	748	718
Home-schooled	2.1	-0.4	0.7	-0.116		-0.5	0.7	748	718
Other	3.0	0.4	0.9	0.074		0.3	0.9	748	718
Highest grade completed at the time of the survey									
8th grade or lower	10.0	0.2*	1.6	0.011	0.06	0.1	1.6	743	719
9th to 11th grade	81.1	-3.3	2.1	-0.123		-3.2	2.1	743	719
12th grade	8.1	3.1	1.5	0.219		3.0	1.5	743	719
Some post-secondary education	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.990		0.6	0.3	743	719
Ungraded program/home-schooled/other	0.7	-0.5	0.3	-0.920		-0.5	0.3	743	719
Educational accommodations since RA									
Received educational accommodations	82.0	-0.6	2.0	-0.026	0.75	-0.8	2.0	747	713
Any unmet need for educational accommodations	31.2	-3.6	2.4	-0.105	0.14	-3.4	2.4	731	691

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p -value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t -test. The p -value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12a.3. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Ever employed in a paid job since RA	19.6	36.0***	2.3	0.992	0.00	36.0***	2.3	749	719
Supplementary outcomes									
Employed in a paid or unpaid job since RA	29.6	33.1***	2.4	0.839	0.00	32.9***	2.5	750	719
Employment in the year before the survey									
Any paid employment	16.2	30.6***	2.3	0.932	0.00	30.8***	2.3	749	718
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.6	2.7***	0.4	0.392	0.00	2.8***	0.4	745	716
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	747	1,213***	181	0.357	0.00	1,225***	182	744	715
Employment at the time of survey									
Any paid employment	8.4	5.2***	1.6	0.330	0.00	5.5***	1.6	749	718
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	2.3	3.1***	0.7	0.223	0.00	3.2***	0.7	749	718
Weekly earnings (\$)	19	27***	6	0.218	0.00	27***	6	748	717
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	15.4	40.6***	2.0	1.178	0.00	40.3***	2.0	903	901
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	361	592***	62	0.437	0.00	584***	64	903	901

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12a.4. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	49.6	0.4	0.5	0.051	0.36	0.5	0.5	646	604
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.5	-0.7	0.5	-0.564	0.16	-0.8	0.5	642	593
Supplementary outcomes									
Scores on subdomains of self-determination at the time of the survey									
Autonomy (scale: 0 to 300)	153.3	3.8	3.2	0.066	0.24	4.4	3.2	648	604
Psychological empowerment (scale: 0 to 100)	88.9	0.5	1.0	0.026	0.64	0.5	1.0	647	604
Self-realization (scale: 0 to 100)	8.7	-0.4	0.9	-0.028	0.63	-0.5	0.9	646	604
At the time of the survey, youth expected to:									
Get post-secondary education	63.9	3.5	2.7	0.094	0.19	3.7	2.7	642	593
Live independently at age 25	76.9	2.6	2.3	0.094	0.26	3.3	2.4	629	584
Be financially independent at age 25	84.6	0.8	2.0	0.038	0.70	0.9	2.0	639	595
Be employed at age 25	94.0	0.6	1.3	0.066	0.66	0.5	1.3	647	598
Be prevented from working at age 25 because of:									
Disability or health reasons	17.6	-1.9	2.1	-0.084	0.36	-2.1	2.1	643	592
Unreliable transportation	15.6	-3.1	2.0	-0.156	0.12	-3.1	2.0	642	591
Inability to find a job	19.8	-2.7	2.2	-0.111	0.21	-3.0	2.2	641	591
School or training enrollment	15.1	-0.9	2.0	-0.046	0.64	-1.2	2.0	637	594
Inaccessible workplaces	14.5	-0.6	2.0	-0.030	0.76	-0.7	2.0	638	584
Risk of losing benefits	10.0	-1.7	1.6	-0.125	0.30	-1.7	1.6	639	586
Not wanting to work	7.0	0.5	1.5	0.049	0.71	0.5	1.5	644	591
Others not believing he or she can work	11.7	-1.5	1.8	-0.094	0.40	-1.6	1.8	644	589
Other reasons	1.3	-0.8	0.5	-0.561	0.14	-0.8	0.5	644	592
At the time of the survey, parent expected youth to:									
Get post-secondary education	43.2	9.9***	2.6	0.240	0.00	10.2***	2.6	758	733
Live independently at age 25	58.1	3.7	2.5	0.093	0.15	4.3	2.6	715	694
Be financially independent at age 25	69.6	4.4**	2.3	0.133	0.05	5.1**	2.3	752	730
Be employed in a paid job at age 25	86.3	3.1*	1.7	0.180	0.06	3.5**	1.7	758	730
Parent believed it important for youth to become independent in some way at the time of the survey									
	97.2	0.3	0.8	0.061	0.75	0.3	0.8	774	744

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Parent usually or always expected youth to do chores at the time of the survey	6.3	2.3*	1.4	0.205	0.09	2.4*	1.3	771	744

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12a.5. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	95.5	-1.4	1.1	-0.178	0.21	-1.4	1.1	773	740
Supplementary outcomes									
Health insurance type at the time of the survey									
Public	94.1	-0.6	1.3	-0.066	0.62	-0.9	1.3	746	722
Private	6.5	0.5	1.3	0.046	0.72	0.7	1.3	760	728
Private purchased through an Affordable Care Act health exchange	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		n.a.	n.a.	765	727
General health status at the time of the survey									
Poor	2.5	-0.0	0.8	-0.005	0.96	-0.1	0.8	748	715
Fair	16.6	0.6	1.9	0.027		0.4	2.0	748	715
Good	30.4	1.4	2.4	0.041		1.1	2.4	748	715
Very good	26.0	-1.1	2.3	-0.034		-0.8	2.3	748	715
Excellent	24.5	-1.0	2.2	-0.033		-0.6	2.2	748	715
ADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Walking, standing, or climbing stairs	11.4	1.4	1.6	0.078	0.40	0.8	1.7	748	717
Personal care and getting around inside the home	9.7	-0.4	1.4	-0.031	0.76	-0.8	1.5	748	717
Speaking, communicating with others	46.1	-4.7*	2.5	-0.115	0.07	-4.9*	2.6	747	717
Hearing normal conversations	14.4	2.2	1.9	0.102	0.24	2.4	1.9	748	716
Seeing, even with the use of prescription glasses	18.5	-1.3	2.0	-0.053	0.51	-1.4	2.0	746	717
None of the above	39.4	4.3*	2.5	0.108	0.09	4.8*	2.6	746	717
Needed help with or equipment for at least one ADL at the time of the survey	23.1	0.8	2.1	0.028	0.70	0.6	2.2	745	710
IADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Planning and carrying out activities to achieve a goal	32.7	-7.1***	2.3	-0.210	0.00	-7.5***	2.4	742	711
Learning, remembering, or concentrating	59.8	-3.6	2.5	-0.090	0.16	-3.6	2.6	745	713
Getting around outside of the home	11.7	-3.0**	1.5	-0.203	0.05	-3.4**	1.6	748	714
None of the above	35.5	3.0	2.5	0.078	0.23	3.1	2.5	747	713
Needed help with or equipment for at least one IADL at the time of the survey	45.3	-7.3***	2.5	-0.182	0.00	-7.4***	2.6	742	708

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Substance use in the 30 days before the survey									
Smoking	5.6	1.3	1.2	0.130	0.31	1.1	1.3	745	715
Alcohol	3.6	-0.5	0.9	-0.085	0.62	-0.5	1.0	745	717
Marijuana	3.4	0.8	1.0	0.128	0.43	0.7	1.0	744	717
Other illicit drug	0.9	-0.3	0.5	-0.273	0.50	-0.3	0.4	746	716

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

n.a. = not available.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12a.6. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.2	0.1	0.8	0.007	0.88	-0.3	0.8	867	886
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	11,307	1,124	886	0.059	0.20	863	918	867	886
Supplementary outcomes									
Enrollment since RA									
Medicaid managed care	n.d.								
Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	n.d.								
Medicaid capitated behavioral health	n.d.								
Medicaid payments since RA									
Any Medicaid payments	99.0	0.4	0.4	0.336	0.32	0.3	0.4	867	886
Average monthly Medicaid payments (\$)	628	62	49	0.059	0.20	48	51	867	886
Average monthly fee-for-service payments (\$)	628	62	49	0.059	0.20	48	51	867	886
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	n.d.								

Source: State Medicaid program data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges’ g for continuous outcomes and Cox’s Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/**Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12a.7. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,803	993***	212	0.236	0.00	880***	222	745	716
Supplementary outcomes									
SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	97.2	0.3	0.6	0.061	0.68	-1.3	0.9	904	901
Total SSA payments (\$)	10,930	-259**	132	-0.071	0.05	-403**	171	904	901
SSI payments (\$)	10,189	-268*	158	-0.066	0.09	-447**	192	904	901
OASDI payments (\$)	741	9	102	0.004	0.93	45	102	904	901
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	80.1	0.1	1.8	0.005	0.99	-1.5	1.9	904	901
SSI and OASDI	16.1	0.1	1.7	0.004		-0.3	1.7	904	901
OASDI only	1.0	-0.0	0.5	-0.020		0.4	0.5	904	901
None	2.8	-0.2	0.6	-0.045		1.3	0.9	904	901
Income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	7,370	402***	113	0.142	0.00	304**	133	903	901
Youth resided with parent at the time of the survey	97.6	-0.4	0.8	-0.103	0.59	-0.5	0.8	775	750
Household income in the calendar year before the survey									
Less than \$10,000	33.3	0.5*	2.5	0.015	0.09	0.8*	2.5	721	702
\$10,000 to \$19,999	36.1	-4.8	2.5	-0.131		-4.7	2.5	721	702
\$20,000 to \$29,999	20.1	0.6	2.1	0.022		0.2	2.1	721	702
\$30,000 or more	10.6	3.7	1.7	0.207		3.8	1.8	721	702
Any household member participated in non-SSA public assistance programs at the time of the survey	56.8	-2.6	2.5	-0.065	0.30	-2.3	2.6	767	735

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12a.8. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on family’s receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any family support services since RA	40.9	24.4***	2.5	0.607	0.00	24.3***	2.5	777	747
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of family support services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	11.7	15.9***	2.0	0.643	0.00	15.9***	2.0	782	750
Education or training supports	8.4	3.6**	1.5	0.242	0.02	3.7**	1.5	785	753
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	8.9	2.9*	1.5	0.189	0.06	2.7*	1.5	780	754
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	11.9	23.8***	2.1	0.857	0.00	23.6***	2.1	780	749
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	9.4	16.9***	1.9	0.746	0.00	16.8***	1.9	782	750
Parent training and information on youth’s disability ^a	22.2	19.1***	2.3	0.547	0.00	19.0***	2.3	778	751
Parent networking support	14.5	19.9***	2.1	0.683	0.00	20.0***	2.1	781	752
Any key support services received since RA	26.4	24.7***	2.4	0.648	0.00	24.5***	2.4	779	746
Hours of key support services received since RA	40.8	9.7	11.4	0.050	0.40	11.5	11.7	762	733
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.4	0.3***	0.0	0.373	0.00	0.3***	0.0	778	745
Usefulness of key services received since RA									
No key service reported	73.6	-24.5***	2.4	0.000	0.00	-24.5***	2.4	776	743
No service rated somewhat or very useful	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.000		0.2	0.4	776	743
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	26.0	24.3	2.4	0.000		24.3	2.4	776	743
Unmet needs for family services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	17.3	-6.0***	1.8	-0.298	0.00	-5.9***	1.8	778	748
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.5	-0.2***	0.1	-0.187	0.00	-0.2***	0.1	778	748
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	3.3	-1.1	0.8	-0.250	0.18	-1.2	0.8	778	748
Education or training supports	5.5	-1.3	1.1	-0.176	0.22	-1.3	1.1	778	748
Employment-promoting services	7.9	-3.2**	1.2	-0.333	0.01	-3.0**	1.3	778	748
Benefits counseling	5.1	-3.4***	0.9	-0.682	0.00	-3.3***	0.9	778	748
Financial education	5.2	-3.6***	0.9	-0.745	0.00	-3.6***	0.9	778	748
Referral services	3.8	-2.1***	0.8	-0.503	0.01	-2.3***	0.8	778	748
Transportation	4.1	-2.1**	0.9	-0.463	0.01	-2.2**	0.9	778	748
Health	6.3	-3.1***	1.1	-0.432	0.00	-3.1***	1.1	778	748
Any other services	5.2	-2.4**	1.0	-0.390	0.02	-2.5**	1.0	778	748

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Enrolling parent's engagement with VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	2.4	0.1	0.8	0.014	0.94	0.1	0.8	768	799
Received VR services since RA	1.6	-0.0	0.6	-0.000	1.00	-0.1	0.6	768	799

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless noted otherwise.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aThese services were required of the PROMISE programs. With the exception of parent training and information on youth's disability, we asked more detailed questions about providers of these services in the PROMISE 18-month survey than providers of other support services. The outcome measures related to key support services presented in this table reflect all required services except parent training and information on youth's disability.

*/**/***|Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12a.9. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	20.8	1.6	2.1	0.056	0.46	1.8	2.1	777	749
Supplementary outcomes									
Highest educational attainment by either parent at the time of the survey									
Not a high school graduate	24.3	-1.7	2.1	-0.057	0.52	-1.6	2.2	786	758
High school diploma or GED	36.6	2.2	2.5	0.057		2.2	2.5	786	758
Some post-secondary education	20.1	-1.0	2.0	-0.038		-1.0	2.0	786	758
College degree	16.2	0.6	1.9	0.028		0.8	1.9	786	758
Some post-graduate degree	1.7	-0.7	0.5	-0.352		-0.9	0.6	786	758
Missing	1.1	0.6	0.5	0.260		0.5	0.6	786	758
Either parent was enrolled in education or job skills training at the time of the survey	5.6	1.1	1.2	0.114	0.37	1.2	1.2	777	750
Either parent received a diploma, GED, certificate of completion, or professional license since RA	8.9	-1.3	1.4	-0.103	0.36	-1.3	1.4	777	750

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12a.10. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent was employed since RA	56.6	-0.5	2.5	-0.013	0.84	-0.1	2.5	778	751
Supplementary outcomes									
Either parent was employed in the month before the survey	49.6	2.6	2.5	0.062	0.31	2.8	2.6	776	749
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	768	110**	54	0.103	0.04	112**	56	773	746
Parents' earnings in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	16,083	222	500	0.012	0.66	793	879	883	890
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	28.8	3.2	2.3	0.096	0.17	3.6	2.4	776	749

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12a.11. Arkansas PROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	19,094	359	515	0.021	0.49	913	826	883	890
Supplementary outcomes									
Parents' SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	31.2	0.7	2.2	0.019	0.75	1.0	2.2	883	890
Total payments (\$)	4,566	199	357	0.026	0.58	274	360	883	890
SSI payments (\$)	1,606	238	205	0.055	0.25	273	205	883	890
OASDI payments (\$)	2,960	-40	298	-0.006	0.89	1	301	883	890
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	10.0	1.1	1.5	0.070	0.84	1.2	1.5	883	890
SSI and OASDI	7.8	0.4	1.3	0.035		0.5	1.3	883	890
OASDI only	13.5	-0.8	1.6	-0.042		-0.7	1.6	883	890
None	68.8	-0.7	2.2	-0.020		-1.0	2.2	883	890
Either parent had health insurance at the time of the survey	90.9	0.2	1.5	0.018	0.87	0.3	1.5	756	730
Medicaid enrollment and payments since RA (from state Medicaid program data)									
Enrolled in Medicaid	79.7	1.2	1.9	0.047	0.52	1.0	2.0	768	799
Enrolled in Medicaid comprehensive managed care	n.d.								
Enrolled in Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	n.d.								
Total Medicaid payments (\$)	5,617	-188	363	-0.026	0.61	-157	363	768	799

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12b.1. ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any transition services since RA	88.5	8.3***	1.3	0.826	0.00	7.9***	1.3	812	783
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	41.1	30.5***	2.4	0.780	0.00	30.1***	2.4	802	791
School transition planning	62.9	7.1***	2.4	0.194	0.00	6.2***	2.4	791	771
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	46.0	11.7***	2.5	0.285	0.00	10.7***	2.5	798	783
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	4.7	14.3***	1.6	0.943	0.00	14.1***	1.6	802	790
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	20.2	8.2***	2.1	0.271	0.00	7.3***	2.1	806	788
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	38.3	8.6***	2.5	0.214	0.00	7.5***	2.5	795	777
Help accessing education or training	26.2	13.5***	2.3	0.375	0.00	12.9***	2.3	805	779
Life skills training	52.7	12.8***	2.4	0.324	0.00	12.2***	2.4	809	789
Help with assistive technology	23.3	7.4***	2.2	0.229	0.00	6.7***	2.2	799	777
Other services	8.5	5.3***	1.6	0.331	0.00	4.6***	1.6	798	776
Received any key transition services since RA	62.1	20.8***	2.2	0.658	0.00	20.5***	2.2	802	786
Hours of key transition services received since RA	411.3	-10.1	36.6	-0.015	0.78	-20.2	36.3	786	778
Number of key transition service providers since RA	0.9	0.7***	0.1	0.635	0.00	0.7***	0.1	800	784
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA									
No key service reported	37.9	-20.8***	2.2	0.016	0.00	-20.5***	2.2	799	784
No service rated somewhat or very useful	3.5	-1.0	0.9	0.023		-0.9	0.9	799	784
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	58.6	21.8	2.3	0.026		21.4	2.2	799	784
Unmet needs for services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	23.2	-1.5	2.1	-0.052	0.47	-1.8	2.1	780	769
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.6	-0.1	0.1	-0.067	0.20	-0.1	0.1	780	769
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	2.2	-0.8	0.7	-0.276	0.26	-0.8	0.7	780	769
Employment-promoting services	13.2	-2.9*	1.6	-0.168	0.08	-2.8*	1.6	780	769

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Benefits counseling	2.8	-1.7**	0.7	-0.566	0.02	-1.7**	0.7	780	769
Financial education	5.0	-1.5	1.0	-0.224	0.14	-1.5	1.0	780	769
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	2.3	-0.5	0.7	-0.164	0.47	-0.4	0.7	780	769
Education or training supports	11.1	-3.0**	1.5	-0.215	0.04	-3.1**	1.5	780	769
Referral services	1.9	-0.2	0.7	-0.070	0.77	-0.0	0.7	780	769
Transportation	2.1	0.9	0.8	0.221	0.29	1.0	0.8	780	769
Health	4.1	1.3	1.1	0.176	0.23	1.0	1.1	780	769
Accommodations	2.1	0.1	0.8	0.039	0.86	0.1	0.7	780	769
Other skills training	10.5	-2.2	1.5	-0.160	0.13	-2.3	1.5	780	769
Any other services	1.6	1.1	0.8	0.319	0.16	0.8	0.7	780	769
VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	7.8	15.1***	1.6	0.762	0.00	15.3***	1.6	896	966
Duration from RA to VR application									
Within the first 6 months	2.0	5.7***	1.0	0.858	0.00	5.6***	1.0	896	966
7 to 12 months	2.0	6.7	1.0	0.940		6.9	1.0	896	966
13 to 18 months	3.8	2.7	1.0	0.341		2.8	1.0	896	966
Did not apply within 18 months of RA	92.2	-15.0	1.6	-0.761		-15.3	1.6	896	966
Received VR services since RA	4.7	9.4***	1.3	0.732	0.00	9.3***	1.3	896	966
Types of VR services received since RA									
Education and training	1.2	2.2***	0.7	0.630	0.00	2.0***	0.7	835	903
Career	2.2	4.5***	0.9	0.702	0.00	4.6***	0.9	835	903
Other	0.7	1.7***	0.6	0.791	0.00	1.7***	0.6	835	903

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aWe identified these services as key transition services because PROMISE programs were required to offer them. The PROMISE 18-month survey included more detailed questions about providers of these services than about providers of other services.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12b.2. ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Enrolled in school at the time of the survey	91.9	-3.0*	1.5	-0.210	0.05	-3.1**	1.5	783	776
Supplementary outcomes									
Ever enrolled in school since RA	99.0	-0.6	0.6	-0.295	0.29	-0.6	0.6	781	774
Received special education or had an IEP since RA	87.6	-0.6	1.6	-0.031	0.73	-1.2	1.7	816	794
Had a Section 504 plan since RA	34.0	2.9	2.5	0.076	0.25	3.0	2.5	723	697
Received GED, certificate of completion, or high school diploma since RA	6.4	1.4	1.4	0.128	0.30	1.6	1.3	764	756
Job-related training since RA									
Received any job-related training	14.0	6.9***	1.9	0.295	0.00	6.5***	1.9	778	774
Received any job-related training credential	1.4	1.9**	0.8	0.520	0.02	1.9**	0.8	777	771
Type of school attended since RA									
None	1.1	0.6	0.6	0.291	0.73	0.6	0.6	766	756
Regular middle or high school or college	85.8	-0.8	1.8	-0.040		-0.3	1.8	766	756
Specialized school for students with disabilities	7.7	0.6	1.4	0.047		0.3	1.4	766	756
Home-schooled	2.1	-0.6	0.7	-0.198		-0.6	0.7	766	756
Other	3.3	0.2	0.9	0.038		0.0	0.9	766	756
Highest grade completed at the time of the survey									
8th grade or lower	7.7	0.3	1.3	0.029	0.44	0.4	1.4	778	764
9th to 11th grade	82.6	-1.8	2.0	-0.073		-1.7	2.0	778	764
12th grade	8.1	1.8	1.5	0.135		1.7	1.5	778	764
Some post-secondary education	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.231		0.2	0.4	778	764
Ungraded program/home-schooled/other	1.1	-0.6	0.4	-0.464		-0.7	0.5	778	764
Educational accommodations since RA									
Received educational accommodations	88.5	-1.0	1.6	-0.055	0.56	-0.9	1.7	776	769
Any unmet need for educational accommodations	22.3	1.7	2.2	0.058	0.44	1.8	2.2	730	722

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p -value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t -test. The p -value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12b.3. ASPIRE: Impacts on youth’s employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Ever employed in a paid job since RA	18.3	4.8**	2.0	0.177	0.02	4.4**	2.0	782	773
Supplementary outcomes									
Employed in a paid or unpaid job since RA	32.2	8.3***	2.3	0.219	0.00	7.7***	2.4	782	774
Employment in the year before the survey									
Any paid employment	17.1	4.3**	1.9	0.190	0.03	3.6*	2.0	782	773
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.7	0.1	0.3	0.011	0.85	0.1	0.3	780	771
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	781	33	157	0.012	0.83	21	153	778	769
Employment at the time of survey									
Any paid employment	9.4	2.3	1.6	0.159	0.14	1.8	1.6	782	773
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	2.2	0.0	0.5	0.001	0.98	0.0	0.5	782	773
Weekly earnings (\$)	18	4	5	0.046	0.37	4	5	780	772
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	14.2	2.8*	1.5	0.128	0.07	2.1	1.6	978	974
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	324	23	55	0.018	0.68	14	56	978	974

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges’ g for continuous outcomes and Cox’s Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12b.4. ASPIRE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	50.6	-0.6	0.5	-0.075	0.20	-0.7	0.5	591	589
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.4	-0.4	0.8	-0.151	0.56	-0.3	0.8	570	566
Supplementary outcomes									
Scores on subdomains of self-determination at the time of the survey									
Autonomy (scale: 0 to 300)	155.5	-3.8	3.3	-0.067	0.25	-4.7	3.3	597	591
Psychological empowerment (scale: 0 to 100)	90.1	-1.8*	1.0	-0.105	0.07	-1.5	1.0	596	590
Self-realization (scale: 0 to 100)	9.8	0.9	1.0	0.057	0.34	1.0	1.0	593	589
At the time of the survey, youth expected to:									
Get post-secondary education	59.8	-2.6	2.8	-0.064	0.36	-1.8	2.9	570	566
Live independently at age 25	62.3	0.8	2.8	0.022	0.76	0.4	2.9	568	569
Be financially independent at age 25	75.4	3.9	2.4	0.137	0.10	4.6*	2.4	579	581
Be employed at age 25	92.7	-0.1	1.5	-0.010	0.94	0.4	1.5	589	588
Be prevented from working at age 25 because of:									
Disability or health reasons	26.3	-4.1*	2.4	-0.137	0.08	-5.4**	2.5	580	584
Unreliable transportation	19.2	-2.3	2.2	-0.094	0.31	-2.6	2.3	573	584
Inability to find a job	21.1	1.0	2.4	0.036	0.67	0.6	2.4	582	586
School or training enrollment	21.0	-1.3	2.4	-0.047	0.59	-1.9	2.3	576	583
Inaccessible workplaces	15.2	2.0	2.1	0.088	0.36	0.9	2.1	573	575
Risk of losing benefits	18.4	-2.4	2.2	-0.101	0.28	-2.9	2.2	568	573
Not wanting to work	8.2	0.8	1.7	0.064	0.62	0.7	1.6	582	579
Others not believing he or she can work	14.4	1.5	2.1	0.068	0.48	1.0	2.1	586	579
Other reasons	1.9	-0.0	0.7	-0.002	0.99	-0.2	0.8	579	582
At the time of the survey, parent expected youth to:									
Get post-secondary education	45.4	1.9	2.3	0.047	0.41	2.6	2.5	787	755
Live independently at age 25	40.2	-0.9	2.4	-0.022	0.71	-1.5	2.6	743	719
Be financially independent at age 25	56.2	1.9	2.3	0.046	0.42	2.6	2.5	772	746
Be employed in a paid job at age 25	84.5	1.1	1.6	0.053	0.49	1.3	1.8	779	758
Parent believed it important for youth to become independent in some way at the time of the survey									
	93.6	-0.4	1.1	-0.037	0.74	0.1	1.2	794	770

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Parent usually or always expected youth to do chores at the time of the survey	6.5	1.2	1.3	0.113	0.34	0.7	1.3	795	771

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test.

*/**/** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12b.5. ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.7	-0.2	0.6	-0.074	0.78	-0.3	0.6	793	771
Supplementary outcomes									
Health insurance type at the time of the survey									
Public	92.8	0.9	1.2	0.088	0.46	0.6	1.3	775	758
Private	15.2	0.2	1.7	0.012	0.89	0.3	1.8	779	760
Private purchased through an Affordable Care Act health exchange	0.4	-0.2	0.3	-0.590	0.40	-0.3	0.3	772	752
General health status at the time of the survey									
Poor	3.8	-0.7	0.9	-0.133	0.20	-0.7	0.9	763	758
Fair	12.5	3.2	1.8	0.160		3.8	1.8	763	758
Good	34.1	-4.3	2.4	-0.119		-4.4	2.4	763	758
Very good	27.3	-0.2	2.3	-0.005		-0.2	2.3	763	758
Excellent	22.4	2.0	2.1	0.066		1.6	2.2	763	758
ADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Walking, standing, or climbing stairs	18.2	-0.3	1.7	-0.011	0.88	-0.7	2.0	765	759
Personal care and getting around inside the home	18.1	2.0	1.7	0.080	0.23	0.9	2.0	766	759
Speaking, communicating with others	50.1	1.2	2.4	0.030	0.61	1.3	2.6	762	755
Hearing normal conversations	17.9	-0.5	1.9	-0.019	0.81	-0.2	2.0	763	758
Seeing, even with the use of prescription glasses	16.5	0.3	1.9	0.012	0.88	0.4	1.9	764	757
None of the above	34.4	-0.9	2.3	-0.024	0.70	-1.4	2.4	761	756
Needed help with or equipment for at least one ADL at the time of the survey	35.9	1.5	2.2	0.040	0.49	1.1	2.5	758	751
IADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Planning and carrying out activities to achieve a goal	38.5	5.9**	2.4	0.148	0.01	5.7**	2.5	762	757
Learning, remembering, or concentrating	64.0	1.1	2.4	0.028	0.66	1.1	2.5	765	758
Getting around outside of the home	19.6	2.4	1.9	0.089	0.19	2.1	2.1	763	758
None of the above	29.2	-0.2	2.3	-0.007	0.91	-0.6	2.3	764	758
Needed help with or equipment for at least one IADL at the time of the survey	50.1	1.6	2.4	0.039	0.51	1.5	2.6	760	754

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Substance use in the 30 days before the survey									
Smoking	4.3	-0.7	1.0	-0.113	0.47	-0.8	1.0	765	757
Alcohol	2.2	0.7	0.9	0.176	0.40	0.9	0.8	766	755
Marijuana	2.9	0.8	0.9	0.161	0.34	0.7	0.9	763	754
Other illicit drug	0.8	0.0	0.4	0.007	0.98	0.0	0.5	764	754

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12b.6. ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	92.1	2.1**	1.0	0.093	0.04	2.3**	1.0	893	963
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	24,798	1,548	1,314	0.051	0.24	1,736	1,409	893	963
Supplementary outcomes									
Enrollment since RA									
Medicaid managed care	91.8	1.5	1.5	0.135	0.30	1.1	1.5	552	598
Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	4.4	1.9**	1.0	0.235	0.05	1.7	1.1	695	752
Medicaid capitated behavioral health	55.2	2.5	5.0	0.062	0.61	4.7	5.2	177	192
Medicaid payments since RA									
Any Medicaid payments	97.0	0.9	0.7	0.212	0.21	0.9	0.7	893	963
Average monthly Medicaid payments (\$)	1,378	86	73	0.051	0.24	96	78	893	963
Average monthly fee-for-service payments (\$)	354	107*	60	0.087	0.07	96	60	695	752
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	1,313	14	63	0.012	0.82	29	67	552	598

Source: State Medicaid program data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12b.7. ASPIRE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,233	71	194	0.018	0.72	-9	208	780	772
Supplementary outcomes									
SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	95.5	-0.3	0.9	-0.043	0.71	-0.9	1.0	978	975
Total SSA payments (\$)	10,132	-21	146	-0.005	0.89	-73	191	978	975
SSI payments (\$)	9,604	17	155	0.004	0.91	-159	200	978	975
OASDI payments (\$)	528	-38	60	-0.019	0.53	86	88	978	975
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	84.8	-1.2	1.1	-0.055	0.20	-3.8**	1.7	978	975
SSI and OASDI	9.1	0.9	0.7	0.065		3.7	1.4	978	975
OASDI only	1.5	-0.8	0.5	-0.491		-0.7	0.5	978	975
None	4.5	1.1	1.0	0.143		0.9	1.0	978	975
Income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	6,550	50	114	0.016	0.66	2	137	978	974
Youth resided with parent at the time of the survey	97.4	-1.1	0.8	-0.224	0.18	-1.0	0.9	800	781
Household income in the calendar year before the survey									
Less than \$10,000	26.8	-1.2	2.3	-0.038	0.72	-1.0	2.3	753	733
\$10,000 to \$19,999	26.8	1.4	2.3	0.043		1.9	2.3	753	733
\$20,000 to \$29,999	19.8	1.5	2.1	0.055		1.6	2.1	753	733
\$30,000 or more	26.6	-1.7	2.1	-0.054		-2.5	2.2	753	733
Any household member participated in non-SSA public assistance programs at the time of the survey	55.9	-0.6	2.4	-0.016	0.79	-0.4	2.5	789	762

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

//****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12b.8. ASPIRE: Impacts on family’s receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any family support services since RA	45.3	19.3***	2.4	0.480	0.00	18.8***	2.4	808	785
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of family support services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	16.9	9.8***	2.0	0.354	0.00	9.8***	2.1	811	789
Education or training supports	11.1	3.0*	1.6	0.164	0.07	3.0*	1.7	813	787
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	12.3	-1.2	1.6	-0.068	0.47	-1.4	1.6	812	790
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	12.1	20.3***	2.0	0.756	0.00	20.0***	2.0	809	789
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	10.3	7.6***	1.8	0.388	0.00	7.4***	1.7	813	790
Parent training and information on youth’s disability ^a	26.3	16.0***	2.4	0.435	0.00	15.8***	2.3	809	785
Parent networking support	13.2	11.2***	1.9	0.455	0.00	11.6***	1.9	814	789
Any key support services received since RA	29.3	18.7***	2.4	0.485	0.00	18.0***	2.4	810	788
Hours of key support services received since RA	40.7	10.1	12.2	0.052	0.41	8.9	12.0	791	774
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.4	0.4***	0.0	0.412	0.00	0.4***	0.0	808	786
Usefulness of key services received since RA									
No key service reported	70.7	-18.3***	2.4	0.000	0.00	-18.0***	2.4	807	785
No service rated somewhat or very useful	1.0	-0.0	0.6	0.000		0.0	0.5	807	785
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	28.3	18.3	2.4	0.000		18.0	2.4	807	785
Unmet needs for family services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	15.6	-0.5	1.8	-0.023	0.78	-0.1	1.8	794	769
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.3	-0.0	0.0	-0.042	0.41	-0.0	0.0	794	769
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	3.0	-1.6**	0.8	-0.465	0.04	-1.5*	0.8	794	769
Education or training supports	3.7	-0.4	0.9	-0.073	0.66	-0.2	0.9	794	769
Employment-promoting services	7.0	-1.6	1.2	-0.161	0.20	-1.4	1.2	794	769
Benefits counseling	3.1	-0.6	0.8	-0.143	0.44	-0.7	0.8	794	769
Financial education	3.3	-0.3	0.9	-0.052	0.76	-0.3	0.9	794	769
Referral services	2.8	0.1	0.8	0.016	0.93	0.0	0.8	794	769
Transportation	1.9	0.3	0.7	0.091	0.67	0.4	0.7	794	769
Health	4.2	0.2	1.0	0.025	0.87	-0.0	1.0	794	769
Any other services	3.0	0.2	0.9	0.036	0.85	0.3	0.9	794	769

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Enrolling parent's engagement with VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	1.2	1.1	0.7	0.418	0.12	1.0	0.7	631	676
Received VR services since RA	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.492	0.19	0.5	0.5	631	676

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless noted otherwise.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aThese services were required of the PROMISE programs. With the exception of parent training and information on youth's disability, we asked more detailed questions about providers of these services in the PROMISE 18-month survey than providers of other support services. The outcome measures related to key support services presented in this table reflect all required services except parent training and information on youth's disability.

*/**/***|Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12b.9. ASPIRE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	24.0	2.5	2.2	0.079	0.26	1.8	2.2	798	773
Supplementary outcomes									
Highest educational attainment by either parent at the time of the survey									
Not a high school graduate	20.1	-0.4	1.9	-0.016	0.63	0.4	2.0	817	797
High school diploma or GED	31.0	-3.2	2.3	-0.093		-3.1	2.3	817	797
Some post-secondary education	22.6	1.1	2.1	0.037		0.8	2.1	817	797
College degree	21.7	1.2	2.0	0.042		1.0	2.1	817	797
Some post-graduate degree	2.8	0.9	0.9	0.172		0.9	0.9	817	797
Missing	1.9	0.4	0.6	0.129		-0.1	0.7	817	797
Either parent was enrolled in education or job skills training at the time of the survey	9.8	-1.1	1.5	-0.079	0.46	-1.2	1.5	798	773
Either parent received a diploma, GED, certificate of completion, or professional license since RA	8.9	1.4	1.5	0.095	0.36	1.2	1.5	800	774

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12b.10. ASPIRE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent was employed since RA	58.5	-0.1	2.4	-0.001	0.98	-0.3	2.5	810	791
Supplementary outcomes									
Either parent was employed in the month before the survey	59.0	0.5	2.4	0.014	0.82	-0.0	2.5	805	790
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	1,339	-43	77	-0.027	0.58	-53	81	801	786
Parents' earnings in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	21,783	-197	674	-0.008	0.77	-110	1142	899	888
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	32.3	-0.6	2.3	-0.017	0.81	-0.7	2.4	804	789

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12b.11. ASPIRE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	24,203	-373	673	-0.016	0.58	-154	1091	899	888
Supplementary outcomes									
Parents' SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	26.0	-1.3	1.9	-0.042	0.48	0.2	2.1	899	888
Total SSA payments (\$)	3,755	-125	301	-0.017	0.68	127	339	899	888
SSI payments (\$)	1,531	-147	184	-0.037	0.42	-151	186	899	888
OASDI payments (\$)	2,224	22	240	0.004	0.93	278	284	899	888
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	10.5	-1.2	1.4	-0.079	0.85	-1.3	1.4	899	888
SSI and OASDI	4.7	-0.1	1.0	-0.019		0.2	1.0	899	888
OASDI only	10.8	-0.1	1.3	-0.007		1.4	1.5	899	888
None	74.0	1.4	1.9	0.046		-0.2	2.1	899	888
Either parent had health insurance at the time of the survey	90.2	0.2	1.5	0.016	0.88	0.1	1.5	768	757
Medicaid enrollment and payments since RA (from state Medicaid program data)									
Enrolled in Medicaid	63.9	0.8	3.2	0.021	0.81	1.4	3.4	354	380
Enrolled in Medicaid comprehensive managed care	38.5	3.5	6.2	0.089	0.57	-0.1	7.1	91	96
Enrolled in Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		n.a.	n.a.	208	223
Total Medicaid payments (\$)	6,322	849	841	0.075	0.31	936	842	354	380

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

n.a. = not available.

*/**/**Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12c.1. CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any transition services since RA	91.3	4.3***	1.2	0.437	0.00	4.5***	1.2	851	821
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	31.0	31.1***	2.3	0.784	0.00	31.6***	2.3	847	814
School transition planning	76.0	4.4**	2.0	0.157	0.03	4.9**	2.0	843	822
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	36.0	29.9***	2.3	0.749	0.00	30.4***	2.3	845	800
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	6.5	11.1***	1.6	0.678	0.00	11.4***	1.6	839	816
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	14.8	12.4***	2.0	0.466	0.00	12.8***	2.0	841	824
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	36.2	9.9***	2.4	0.248	0.00	9.9***	2.4	832	806
Help accessing education or training	28.2	18.2***	2.3	0.479	0.00	18.2***	2.3	838	813
Life skills training	47.0	13.5***	2.4	0.331	0.00	13.7***	2.4	847	815
Help with assistive technology	24.3	7.5***	2.2	0.225	0.00	7.6***	2.2	822	814
Other services	4.3	4.4***	1.2	0.452	0.00	4.5***	1.2	846	818
Received any key transition services since RA	50.8	28.4***	2.3	0.792	0.00	28.9***	2.2	845	799
Hours of key transition services received since RA	282.2	48.7	31.4	0.080	0.12	52.4*	31.1	829	792
Number of key transition service providers since RA	0.7	0.6***	0.0	0.619	0.00	0.6***	0.0	844	798
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA									
No key service reported	49.2	-28.4***	2.3	-0.015	0.00	-28.9***	2.2	843	797
No service rated somewhat or very useful	2.0	-0.4	0.7	0.003		-0.4	0.7	843	797
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	48.8	28.8	2.3	-0.010		29.3	2.3	843	797
Unmet needs for services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	27.6	-7.6***	2.1	-0.254	0.00	-7.6***	2.1	828	811
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.8	-0.4***	0.1	-0.227	0.00	-0.3***	0.1	828	811
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	2.6	-1.3*	0.7	-0.437	0.07	-1.2*	0.7	828	811
Employment-promoting services	17.9	-8.4***	1.7	-0.444	0.00	-8.2***	1.7	828	811

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Benefits counseling	5.0	-2.7***	0.9	-0.490	0.00	-2.4***	0.9	828	811
Financial education	6.0	-3.7***	1.0	-0.612	0.00	-3.5***	1.0	828	811
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	5.3	-2.4**	1.0	-0.386	0.02	-2.2**	1.0	828	811
Education or training supports	13.1	-4.4***	1.5	-0.281	0.00	-4.3***	1.6	828	811
Referral services	5.9	-3.8***	1.0	-0.660	0.00	-3.7***	1.0	828	811
Transportation	5.3	-1.3	1.1	-0.180	0.21	-1.3	1.0	828	811
Health	4.3	-0.5	1.0	-0.073	0.64	-0.4	1.0	828	811
Accommodations	1.2	-0.1	0.6	-0.038	0.89	-0.1	0.5	828	811
Other skills training	17.3	-8.2***	1.6	-0.449	0.00	-8.1***	1.7	828	811
Any other services	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.266	0.34	0.6	0.6	828	811
VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	3.8	21.3***	1.2	1.293	0.00	21.4***	1.2	1,541	1,540
Duration from RA to VR application									
Within the first 6 months	0.9	0.1***	0.4	0.079	0.00	0.2***	0.4	1,541	1,540
7 to 12 months	1.1	5.6	0.7	1.131		5.6	0.7	1,541	1,540
13 to 18 months	1.8	15.5	1.0	1.472		15.6	1.0	1,541	1,540
Did not apply within 18 months of RA	96.2	-21.3	1.2	-1.292		-21.4	1.2	1,541	1,540
Received VR services since RA	2.5	13.4***	1.0	1.203	0.00	13.4***	1.0	1,541	1,540
Types of VR services received since RA									
Education and training	1.0	3.0***	0.6	0.863	0.00	3.0***	0.6	1,541	1,540
Career	1.1	0.6	0.4	0.272	0.14	0.6	0.4	1,541	1,540
Other	1.0	7.1***	0.7	1.292	0.00	7.1***	0.7	1,541	1,540

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aWe identified these services as key transition services because PROMISE programs were required to offer them. The PROMISE 18-month survey included more detailed questions about providers of these services than about providers of other services.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12c.2. CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Enrolled in school at the time of the survey	93.2	0.5	1.3	0.051	0.68	0.2	1.2	834	799
Supplementary outcomes									
Ever enrolled in school since RA	99.0	0.4	0.4	0.296	0.38	0.3	0.4	833	800
Received special education or had an IEP since RA	88.4	0.1	1.5	0.006	0.95	0.1	1.6	851	822
Had a Section 504 plan since RA	41.1	5.0*	2.7	0.124	0.06	5.1*	2.7	711	692
Received GED, certificate of completion, or high school diploma since RA	10.6	1.7	1.6	0.100	0.28	1.5	1.6	830	794
Job-related training since RA									
Received any job-related training	10.8	21.9***	1.9	0.843	0.00	22.0***	2.0	829	799
Received any job-related training credential	1.7	6.0***	1.0	0.942	0.00	6.0***	1.0	825	799
Type of school attended since RA									
None	1.0	-0.4	0.4	-0.322	0.25	-0.3	0.4	830	794
Regular middle or high school or college	83.1	-1.0	1.9	-0.041		-0.9	1.9	830	794
Specialized school for students with disabilities	10.3	2.1	1.6	0.125		1.8	1.6	830	794
Home-schooled	2.5	-1.1	0.7	-0.370		-1.0	0.7	830	794
Other	3.0	0.4	0.9	0.085		0.4	0.9	830	794
Highest grade completed at the time of the survey									
8th grade or lower	3.3	1.1	1.0	0.186	0.15	1.2	1.0	823	793
9th to 11th grade	79.6	-4.7	2.0	-0.161		-4.2	2.1	823	793
12th grade	13.0	2.1	1.7	0.107		1.9	1.7	823	793
Some post-secondary education	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.410		0.9	0.6	823	793
Ungraded program/home-schooled/other	3.0	0.4	0.8	0.079		0.2	0.8	823	793
Educational accommodations since RA									
Received educational accommodations	82.0	-1.3	1.9	-0.052	0.50	-1.3	1.9	827	789
Any unmet need for educational accommodations	22.6	2.1	2.2	0.072	0.33	2.1	2.2	777	755

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p -value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t -test. The p -value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12c.3. CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Ever employed in a paid job since RA	15.0	19.4***	2.1	0.659	0.00	19.7***	2.1	832	799
Supplementary outcomes									
Employed in a paid or unpaid job since RA	21.8	24.9***	2.3	0.694	0.00	24.8***	2.3	833	799
Employment in the year before the survey									
Any paid employment	9.5	21.0***	1.9	0.899	0.00	21.3***	1.9	833	798
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	0.8	0.7***	0.2	0.150	0.00	0.7***	0.2	830	797
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	448	343**	142	0.126	0.02	372***	138	827	797
Employment at the time of survey									
Any paid employment	4.8	6.0***	1.3	0.538	0.00	6.2***	1.3	833	798
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.1	0.9**	0.4	0.106	0.03	1.0**	0.4	833	798
Weekly earnings (\$)	11	8*	4	0.093	0.06	9**	4	831	798
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	13.0	19.7***	1.4	0.716	0.00	20.1***	1.4	1548	1549
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	227	102***	37	0.083	0.01	94**	44	1548	1549

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12c.4. CaPROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.0	0.1	0.5	0.011	0.86	0.3	0.5	597	532
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.1	-1.1	0.7	-0.516	0.12	-1.1	0.7	584	523
Supplementary outcomes									
Scores on subdomains of self-determination at the time of the survey									
Autonomy (scale: 0 to 300)	132.7	5.4	3.6	0.091	0.13	7.1**	3.6	601	541
Psychological empowerment (scale: 0 to 100)	89.5	-0.8	1.1	-0.042	0.47	-0.7	1.1	600	539
Self-realization (scale: 0 to 100)	10.5	-1.1	1.0	-0.063	0.29	-1.1	1.0	599	537
At the time of the survey, youth expected to:									
Get post-secondary education	72.3	0.2	2.7	0.006	0.95	-0.3	2.7	584	523
Live independently at age 25	58.1	4.4	3.0	0.110	0.14	5.7*	3.0	578	516
Be financially independent at age 25	82.8	-2.5	2.4	-0.101	0.29	-1.8	2.4	580	520
Be employed at age 25	91.5	1.3	1.6	0.106	0.44	1.8	1.6	594	534
Be prevented from working at age 25 because of:									
Disability or health reasons	22.8	-2.5	2.5	-0.089	0.32	-3.3	2.5	590	530
Unreliable transportation	16.9	-1.3	2.3	-0.060	0.56	-1.6	2.2	585	527
Inability to find a job	22.1	-2.5	2.5	-0.093	0.31	-2.9	2.4	586	526
School or training enrollment	28.2	-3.0	2.7	-0.094	0.26	-3.8	2.7	579	526
Inaccessible workplaces	17.6	-0.4	2.3	-0.016	0.87	-1.3	2.3	584	518
Risk of losing benefits	12.4	0.5	2.0	0.025	0.82	-0.1	2.0	582	522
Not wanting to work	10.2	-0.3	1.8	-0.020	0.87	-0.7	1.8	586	526
Others not believing he or she can work	16.0	-3.0	2.2	-0.149	0.16	-3.4	2.1	586	525
Other reasons	1.2	0.3	0.7	0.148	0.65	0.2	0.7	583	526
At the time of the survey, parent expected youth to:									
Get post-secondary education	56.2	1.6	2.5	0.041	0.51	1.7	2.5	799	779
Live independently at age 25	32.9	-1.0	2.4	-0.027	0.68	-0.1	2.4	765	744
Be financially independent at age 25	63.0	3.5	2.4	0.092	0.15	4.0*	2.4	808	771
Be employed in a paid job at age 25	82.6	3.0*	1.8	0.137	0.09	3.7**	1.8	824	777
Parent believed it important for youth to become independent in some way at the time of the survey									
	95.9	0.7	0.9	0.111	0.48	0.9	0.9	837	817

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Parent usually or always expected youth to do chores at the time of the survey	4.4	1.1	1.1	0.146	0.29	1.4	1.1	841	818

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test.

*/**/** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12c.5. CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	99.2	0.2	0.4	0.167	0.63	0.1	0.4	845	818
Supplementary outcomes									
Health insurance type at the time of the survey									
Public	97.2	-0.2	0.8	-0.042	0.80	-0.3	0.8	836	806
Private	6.6	0.3	1.2	0.028	0.82	0.3	1.3	839	810
Private purchased through an Affordable Care Act health exchange	0.4	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		n.a.	n.a.	838	806
General health status at the time of the survey									
Poor	4.3	-0.2	1.0	-0.029	0.40	-0.2	1.0	828	792
Fair	16.7	-2.6	1.8	-0.119		-2.5	1.8	828	792
Good	40.7	-1.7	2.4	-0.044		-1.9	2.5	828	792
Very good	21.8	2.5	2.1	0.084		2.4	2.1	828	792
Excellent	16.5	2.0	1.9	0.085		2.2	1.9	828	792
ADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Walking, standing, or climbing stairs	17.6	0.1	1.8	0.003	0.96	-1.0	1.9	832	796
Personal care and getting around inside the home	25.8	-1.7	2.1	-0.053	0.42	-3.0	2.1	831	797
Speaking, communicating with others	55.8	-4.2*	2.4	-0.103	0.09	-4.7*	2.5	830	797
Hearing normal conversations	21.0	0.3	2.0	0.010	0.89	0.1	2.0	829	796
Seeing, even with the use of prescription glasses	18.0	1.8	1.9	0.072	0.34	1.6	2.0	827	798
None of the above	29.7	1.9	2.3	0.055	0.40	2.7	2.3	832	797
Needed help with or equipment for at least one ADL at the time of the survey	44.9	-0.7	2.4	-0.016	0.78	-2.3	2.5	827	788
IADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Planning and carrying out activities to achieve a goal	47.0	-3.4	2.5	-0.082	0.17	-4.2*	2.5	826	789
Learning, remembering, or concentrating	66.7	-3.6	2.4	-0.096	0.12	-3.5	2.4	833	798
Getting around outside of the home	33.0	-0.2	2.3	-0.006	0.92	-1.4	2.3	832	794
None of the above	26.6	3.4	2.2	0.102	0.13	3.3	2.2	832	797
Needed help with or equipment for at least one IADL at the time of the survey	59.2	-3.6	2.4	-0.090	0.14	-4.1*	2.5	827	788

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Substance use in the 30 days before the survey									
Smoking	1.9	0.1	0.7	0.031	0.89	0.2	0.7	827	797
Alcohol	2.3	-0.2	0.8	-0.055	0.80	-0.1	0.7	826	796
Marijuana	2.0	0.5	0.7	0.138	0.51	0.6	0.8	827	796
Other illicit drug	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.810	0.15	0.4	0.3	829	797

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

n.a. = not available.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12c.6. CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth’s use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	98.7	0.3	0.3	0.036	0.31	0.3	0.3	1,541	1,540
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	22,294	158	833	0.007	0.85	120	836	1,541	1,540
Supplementary outcomes									
Enrollment since RA									
Medicaid managed care	92.8	1.3	0.9	0.125	0.14	1.6*	0.9	1,541	1,540
Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	36.2	1.9	1.6	0.050	0.23	1.1	1.7	1,541	1,540
Medicaid capitated behavioral health	n.d.								
Medicaid payments since RA									
Any Medicaid payments	99.3	0.3	0.3	0.407	0.20	0.3	0.3	1,541	1,540
Average monthly Medicaid payments (\$)	1,239	9	46	0.007	0.85	7	46	1,541	1,540
Average monthly fee-for-service payments (\$)	601	9	46	0.007	0.84	6	46	1,541	1,540
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	638	-0	9	-0.001	0.96	0	9	1,541	1,540

Source: State Medicaid program data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges’ g for continuous outcomes and Cox’s Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/**Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12c.7. CaPROMISE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey	7,362	330*	171	0.091	0.05	279	182	828	798
Supplementary outcomes									
SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	96.8	-1.0*	0.6	-0.169	0.10	-0.8	0.7	1,548	1,549
Total SSA payments (\$)	10,732	-26	107	-0.007	0.81	-35	136	1,548	1,549
SSI payments (\$)	10,331	-13	108	-0.003	0.90	-79	146	1,548	1,549
OASDI payments (\$)	401	-13	28	-0.008	0.65	44	61	1,548	1,549
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	88.8	-0.5	0.8	-0.033	0.46	-1.3	1.2	1,548	1,549
SSI and OASDI	7.3	-0.4	0.5	-0.032		0.3	0.9	1,548	1,549
OASDI only	0.7	0.0	0.3	0.017		0.2	0.3	1,548	1,549
None	3.2	0.9	0.6	0.152		0.8	0.7	1,548	1,549
Income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	7,114	72	85	0.025	0.40	58	104	1,548	1,549
Youth resided with parent at the time of the survey	99.2	-0.9	0.6	-0.468	0.10	-1.0*	0.6	840	809
Household income in the calendar year before the survey									
Less than \$10,000	22.8	-2.9	2.1	-0.106	0.33	-3.1	2.1	801	780
\$10,000 to \$19,999	34.5	0.9	2.4	0.024		0.4	2.4	801	780
\$20,000 to \$29,999	24.1	-0.7	2.1	-0.025		-0.4	2.1	801	780
\$30,000 or more	18.7	2.8	2.0	0.105		3.1	2.0	801	780
Any household member participated in non-SSA public assistance programs at the time of the survey	54.9	-0.3	2.3	-0.008	0.88	0.0	2.4	836	804

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12c.8. CaPROMISE: Impacts on family’s receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any family support services since RA	39.7	13.5***	2.4	0.331	0.00	14.2***	2.4	841	812
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of family support services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	9.8	8.7***	1.7	0.447	0.00	8.8***	1.7	848	818
Education or training supports	9.8	0.6	1.5	0.039	0.69	0.5	1.5	848	825
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	7.3	1.6	1.4	0.130	0.25	1.7	1.4	849	820
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	12.8	10.9***	1.9	0.454	0.00	11.3***	1.9	844	823
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	5.5	4.7***	1.3	0.410	0.00	4.9***	1.3	845	823
Parent training and information on youth’s disability ^a	23.0	10.3***	2.2	0.310	0.00	10.6***	2.2	845	823
Parent networking support	15.9	6.3***	1.9	0.250	0.00	6.2***	1.9	850	825
Any key support services received since RA	22.9	13.5***	2.2	0.399	0.00	14.2***	2.2	842	809
Hours of key support services received since RA	25.9	6.2	9.3	0.041	0.51	6.5	9.0	826	798
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.3	0.2***	0.0	0.228	0.00	0.2***	0.0	841	808
Usefulness of key services received since RA									
No key service reported	77.1	-13.6***	2.2	0.000	0.00	-14.2***	2.2	839	807
No service rated somewhat or very useful	0.9	-0.3	0.5	0.000		-0.3	0.5	839	807
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	22.0	13.9	2.2	0.000		14.4	2.2	839	807
Unmet needs for family services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	15.2	-3.5**	1.7	-0.184	0.04	-3.3*	1.7	845	819
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.4	-0.2***	0.0	-0.169	0.00	-0.2***	0.1	845	819
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	1.7	-0.6	0.6	-0.269	0.30	-0.5	0.6	845	819
Education or training supports	4.8	-1.9**	1.0	-0.323	0.04	-1.8*	1.0	845	819
Employment-promoting services	8.6	-2.7**	1.3	-0.250	0.03	-2.8**	1.3	845	819
Benefits counseling	4.0	-2.0**	0.8	-0.421	0.02	-2.0**	0.8	845	819
Financial education	3.3	-2.3***	0.7	-0.733	0.00	-2.0***	0.7	845	819
Referral services	3.7	-2.0***	0.8	-0.499	0.01	-2.0**	0.8	845	819
Transportation	3.6	-1.5*	0.8	-0.331	0.07	-1.5*	0.8	845	819
Health	3.8	-1.8**	0.8	-0.407	0.03	-1.8**	0.8	845	819
Any other services	5.9	-2.2**	1.0	-0.288	0.04	-2.0*	1.0	845	819
Enrolling parent’s engagement with VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.020	0.95	0.0	0.4	935	964

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Received VR services since RA	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.020	0.96	0.0	0.3	935	964

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless noted otherwise.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aThese services were required of the PROMISE programs. With the exception of parent training and information on youth's disability, we asked more detailed questions about providers of these services in the PROMISE 18-month survey than providers of other support services. The outcome measures related to key support services presented in this table reflect all required services except parent training and information on youth's disability.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12c.9. CaPROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	16.5	5.0***	1.9	0.199	0.01	5.3***	1.9	846	820
Supplementary outcomes									
Highest educational attainment by either parent at the time of the survey									
Not a high school graduate	37.5	0.2	2.3	0.004	0.28	-0.3	2.3	855	827
High school diploma or GED	32.3	-4.8	2.3	-0.138		-5.1	2.3	855	827
Some post-secondary education	14.8	2.0	1.8	0.090		2.6	1.8	855	827
College degree	11.9	1.4	1.7	0.078		1.6	1.7	855	827
Some post-graduate degree	1.4	0.7	0.7	0.256		0.8	0.7	855	827
Missing	2.1	0.5	0.7	0.128		0.4	0.7	855	827
Either parent was enrolled in education or job skills training at the time of the survey	6.8	0.2	1.3	0.018	0.88	0.4	1.3	847	820
Either parent received a diploma, GED, certificate of completion, or professional license since RA	5.8	0.4	1.2	0.038	0.77	0.7	1.2	848	822

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12c.10. CaPROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent was employed since RA	55.3	1.1	2.4	0.027	0.65	0.7	2.4	848	820
Supplementary outcomes									
Either parent was employed in the month before the survey	55.7	2.8	2.4	0.069	0.24	2.3	2.4	838	813
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	1,108	122*	68	0.088	0.07	120*	70	836	812
Parents' earnings in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	22,380	467	527	0.020	0.38	-356	900	1,311	1,318
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	25.9	0.9	2.2	0.030	0.67	0.9	2.2	837	812

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12c.11. CaPROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	24,160	463	532	0.021	0.38	-244	868	1,311	1,318
Supplementary outcomes									
Parents' SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	19.0	-0.1	1.5	-0.003	0.96	0.6	1.5	1,311	1,318
Total SSA payments (\$)	2,705	66	234	0.010	0.78	207	244	1,311	1,318
SSI payments (\$)	1,155	-37	135	-0.011	0.78	-29	136	1,311	1,318
OASDI payments (\$)	1,550	103	192	0.020	0.59	236	203	1,311	1,318
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	8.2	-0.7	1.0	-0.059	0.68	-0.6	1.0	1,311	1,318
SSI and OASDI	3.6	0.8	0.8	0.124		0.9	0.8	1,311	1,318
OASDI only	7.2	-0.3	1.0	-0.027		0.4	1.0	1,311	1,318
None	81.0	0.2	1.5	0.008		-0.6	1.5	1,311	1,318
Either parent had health insurance at the time of the survey	88.5	1.0	1.5	0.063	0.50	1.2	1.5	832	815
Medicaid enrollment and payments since RA (from state Medicaid program data)									
Enrolled in Medicaid	83.9	0.6	1.6	0.029	0.70	1.0	1.7	935	964
Enrolled in Medicaid comprehensive managed care	75.7	-2.2	1.9	-0.071	0.25	-2.2	2.0	935	964
Enrolled in Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	0.8	-0.1	0.4	-0.057	0.86	-0.1	0.4	935	964
Total Medicaid payments (\$)	5,581	-303	280	-0.048	0.28	-254	286	935	964

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group and region fixed effects to account for stratified random assignment in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12d.1. MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any transition services since RA	89.9	6.5***	1.3	0.671	0.00	6.4***	1.3	793	776
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	40.5	26.1***	2.4	0.652	0.00	25.7***	2.4	788	778
School transition planning	72.1	1.5	2.2	0.047	0.49	1.4	2.3	789	778
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	51.9	20.9***	2.4	0.551	0.00	20.8***	2.4	787	766
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	6.1	26.8***	1.9	1.222	0.00	27.1***	1.9	787	776
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	19.2	16.1***	2.2	0.505	0.00	16.1***	2.2	789	774
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	41.5	5.5**	2.5	0.135	0.03	5.7**	2.5	779	762
Help accessing education or training	37.0	14.8***	2.5	0.366	0.00	14.4***	2.5	788	771
Life skills training	55.9	2.3	2.5	0.056	0.36	2.2	2.5	788	773
Help with assistive technology	27.9	3.0	2.3	0.088	0.19	3.2	2.3	773	767
Other services	7.2	6.4***	1.5	0.428	0.00	6.5***	1.5	785	777
Received any key transition services since RA	65.2	17.8***	2.2	0.582	0.00	17.6***	2.2	789	763
Hours of key transition services received since RA	434.8	-80.0**	35.4	-0.116	0.02	-80.2**	35.9	772	755
Number of key transition service providers since RA	1.0	0.5***	0.1	0.416	0.00	0.5***	0.1	788	761
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA									
No key service reported	34.8	-17.8***	2.2	-0.006	0.00	-17.6***	2.2	787	761
No service rated somewhat or very useful	2.7	0.9	0.9	0.023		0.8	0.9	787	761
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	62.6	17.0	2.3	-0.024		16.9	2.3	787	761
Unmet needs for services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	29.5	-2.5	2.3	-0.075	0.27	-2.4	2.3	784	764
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.7	-0.1	0.1	-0.076	0.13	-0.1	0.1	784	764
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	3.3	-1.0	0.8	-0.221	0.24	-1.0	0.8	784	764
Employment-promoting services	16.2	-2.8	1.8	-0.138	0.11	-2.7	1.8	784	764

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Benefits counseling	3.1	-0.3	0.8	-0.060	0.73	-0.4	0.9	784	764
Financial education	5.7	-1.6	1.1	-0.211	0.15	-1.6	1.1	784	764
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	2.8	-0.2	0.8	-0.057	0.76	-0.2	0.8	784	764
Education or training supports	13.6	-0.7	1.7	-0.036	0.69	-0.5	1.7	784	764
Referral services	1.3	0.4	0.6	0.155	0.53	0.4	0.6	784	764
Transportation	3.4	0.8	1.0	0.129	0.42	0.8	1.0	784	764
Health	3.9	-0.9	0.9	-0.153	0.36	-0.7	0.9	784	764
Accommodations	1.8	0.4	0.7	0.115	0.59	0.3	0.7	784	764
Other skills training	14.7	-4.9***	1.7	-0.279	0.00	-4.9***	1.7	784	764
Any other services	3.1	-1.2	0.8	-0.312	0.13	-1.2	0.8	784	764
VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	5.9	0.7	1.1	0.069	0.54	0.6	1.1	933	927
Duration from RA to VR application									
Within the first 6 months	1.8	-0.4	0.6	-0.158	0.60	-0.4	0.6	933	927
7 to 12 months	1.9	0.7	0.7	0.201		0.7	0.7	933	927
13 to 18 months	2.2	0.3	0.7	0.085		0.3	0.7	933	927
Did not apply within 18 months of RA	94.1	-0.6	1.1	-0.067		-0.6	1.1	933	927
Received VR services since RA	5.6	0.6	1.1	0.070	0.55	0.6	1.1	933	927
Types of VR services received since RA									
Education and training	0.6	-0.1	0.3	-0.113	0.75	-0.1	0.4	933	927
Career	2.2	-0.9	0.6	-0.323	0.14	-0.9	0.6	933	927
Other	1.0	-0.6*	0.3	-0.645	0.07	-0.6*	0.4	933	927

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p -value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t -test. The p -value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aWe identified these services as key transition services because PROMISE programs were required to offer them. The PROMISE 18-month survey included more detailed questions about providers of these services than about providers of other services.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12d.2. MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Enrolled in school at the time of the survey	84.1	-0.5	1.9	-0.022	0.79	-0.5	1.9	758	742
Supplementary outcomes									
Ever enrolled in school since RA	97.4	-1.1	0.9	-0.227	0.22	-1.3	0.9	759	742
Received special education or had an IEP since RA	87.3	-1.8	1.7	-0.095	0.28	-1.8	1.7	787	779
Had a Section 504 plan since RA	47.9	-2.2	2.7	-0.054	0.41	-2.0	2.7	664	686
Received GED, certificate of completion, or high school diploma since RA	13.2	0.1	1.7	0.003	0.97	-0.4	1.8	752	737
Job-related training since RA									
Received any job-related training	17.2	6.3***	2.1	0.238	0.00	6.6***	2.1	756	741
Received any job-related training credential	2.8	0.9	0.9	0.174	0.34	0.8	0.9	755	740
Type of school attended since RA									
None	2.6	1.2	0.9	0.232	0.53	1.3	0.9	756	738
Regular middle or high school or college	79.8	-1.0	2.1	-0.035		-1.2	2.1	756	738
Specialized school for students with disabilities	11.9	0.0	1.6	0.002		0.2	1.7	756	738
Home-schooled	1.4	-0.6	0.5	-0.355		-0.6	0.6	756	738
Other	4.4	0.4	1.1	0.051		0.3	1.1	756	738
Highest grade completed at the time of the survey									
8th grade or lower	7.4	0.9	1.4	0.078	0.23	1.2	1.4	749	734
9th to 11th grade	73.9	0.7	2.2	0.021		1.0	2.3	749	734
12th grade	17.1	-2.8	1.9	-0.128		-3.2	1.9	749	734
Some post-secondary education	0.6	0.9	0.5	0.596		0.8	0.5	749	734
Ungraded program/home-schooled/other	1.1	0.3	0.6	0.142		0.2	0.6	749	734
Educational accommodations since RA									
Received educational accommodations	85.2	-1.8	1.9	-0.084	0.33	-1.6	1.9	756	736
Any unmet need for educational accommodations	24.8	1.3	2.3	0.040	0.58	1.8	2.3	742	726

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p -value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t -test. The p -value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12d.3. MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Ever employed in a paid job since RA	22.0	18.6***	2.3	0.535	0.00	18.6***	2.4	756	738
Supplementary outcomes									
Employed in a paid or unpaid job since RA	36.1	18.3***	2.5	0.454	0.00	18.3***	2.5	758	739
Employment in the year before the survey									
Any paid employment	17.7	16.8***	2.2	0.563	0.00	16.7***	2.2	758	738
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.6	1.3***	0.3	0.190	0.00	1.3***	0.3	755	737
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	831	531***	198	0.141	0.01	538***	202	751	735
Employment at the time of survey									
Any paid employment	9.4	3.5**	1.6	0.222	0.03	3.4**	1.6	758	738
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	2.5	1.5**	0.7	0.124	0.02	1.5**	0.7	758	738
Weekly earnings (\$)	25	7	6	0.064	0.22	7	6	756	737
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	21.3	12.8***	2.0	0.393	0.00	12.9***	2.1	935	930
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	431	221***	72	0.143	0.00	225***	72	935	930

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12d.4. MD PROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.4	0.4	0.5	0.051	0.38	0.4	0.5	576	577
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.9	-0.8	0.7	-0.342	0.27	-0.9	0.7	567	570
Supplementary outcomes									
Scores on subdomains of self-determination at the time of the survey									
Autonomy (scale: 0 to 300)	144.7	3.2	3.1	0.060	0.31	3.1	3.2	581	582
Psychological empowerment (scale: 0 to 100)	89.2	0.1	1.1	0.003	0.96	0.0	1.1	580	579
Self-realization (scale: 0 to 100)	7.6	0.1	0.9	0.009	0.88	0.1	0.9	577	579
At the time of the survey, youth expected to:									
Get post-secondary education	59.7	0.4	2.9	0.009	0.90	0.5	2.9	567	570
Live independently at age 25	70.3	3.8	2.6	0.113	0.16	3.9	2.7	558	566
Be financially independent at age 25	80.3	2.7	2.2	0.108	0.24	3.2	2.3	567	574
Be employed at age 25	95.7	-1.0	1.2	-0.138	0.39	-1.0	1.3	573	576
Be prevented from working at age 25 because of:									
Disability or health reasons	16.9	-0.7	2.2	-0.033	0.74	-0.3	2.2	570	571
Unreliable transportation	14.6	0.3	2.1	0.013	0.90	0.1	2.1	568	572
Inability to find a job	15.2	0.7	2.1	0.031	0.75	0.7	2.1	568	567
School or training enrollment	13.8	0.6	2.0	0.032	0.75	0.5	2.1	567	568
Inaccessible workplaces	10.2	0.7	1.9	0.046	0.70	0.8	1.8	562	566
Risk of losing benefits	8.4	0.9	1.7	0.070	0.58	1.1	1.7	562	566
Not wanting to work	5.9	1.7	1.5	0.167	0.25	1.8	1.5	570	571
Others not believing he or she can work	8.4	-0.6	1.6	-0.052	0.70	-0.7	1.6	568	570
Other reasons	0.2	1.0*	0.5	1.152	0.06	1.0**	0.5	571	567
At the time of the survey, parent expected youth to:									
Get post-secondary education	43.6	-2.9	2.5	-0.073	0.24	-3.3	2.5	759	751
Live independently at age 25	43.3	-0.1	2.6	-0.001	0.98	0.0	2.6	719	719
Be financially independent at age 25	66.8	-2.1	2.3	-0.056	0.38	-1.5	2.5	752	746
Be employed in a paid job at age 25	86.6	2.6	1.6	0.146	0.12	2.9*	1.7	762	759
Parent believed it important for youth to become independent in some way at the time of the survey									
	94.8	1.1	1.1	0.155	0.29	1.3	1.1	777	766

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Parent usually or always expected youth to do chores at the time of the survey	9.8	0.3	1.5	0.021	0.84	0.1	1.5	775	765

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12d.5. MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.2	-0.7	0.7	-0.211	0.32	-0.8	0.7	778	767
Supplementary outcomes									
Health insurance type at the time of the survey									
Public	93.0	-0.2	1.3	-0.015	0.90	-0.2	1.3	742	724
Private	8.0	-0.3	1.4	-0.027	0.81	-0.7	1.4	771	762
Private purchased through an Affordable Care Act health exchange	0.4	-0.2	0.3	-0.504	0.48	-0.2	0.3	764	750
General health status at the time of the survey									
Poor	3.5	0.2	0.9	0.029	0.63	0.1	1.0	754	735
Fair	12.8	1.9	1.8	0.096		1.4	1.8	754	735
Good	31.8	-1.6	2.4	-0.046		-1.4	2.4	754	735
Very good	25.6	-2.3	2.2	-0.077		-2.1	2.2	754	735
Excellent	26.4	1.9	2.3	0.058		2.1	2.3	754	735
ADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Walking, standing, or climbing stairs	10.3	1.0	1.5	0.061	0.52	0.2	1.6	755	737
Personal care and getting around inside the home	12.5	2.1	1.7	0.111	0.20	1.5	1.7	754	736
Speaking, communicating with others	43.5	1.8	2.5	0.044	0.47	1.5	2.6	752	734
Hearing normal conversations	14.6	0.4	1.8	0.020	0.83	0.8	1.9	754	733
Seeing, even with the use of prescription glasses	16.0	-0.4	1.9	-0.016	0.85	-0.3	1.9	752	737
None of the above	42.4	-0.7	2.5	-0.018	0.77	-0.4	2.6	752	735
Needed help with or equipment for at least one ADL at the time of the survey	24.4	3.9*	2.2	0.121	0.07	3.5	2.3	749	730
IADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Planning and carrying out activities to achieve a goal	33.0	-1.8	2.4	-0.049	0.46	-2.0	2.4	746	733
Learning, remembering, or concentrating	62.3	-0.3	2.5	-0.008	0.90	-0.4	2.5	753	736
Getting around outside of the home	14.3	1.5	1.8	0.073	0.40	0.9	1.8	754	731
None of the above	33.6	0.1	2.4	0.001	0.98	0.3	2.5	751	736
Needed help with or equipment for at least one IADL at the time of the survey	44.1	0.4	2.5	0.010	0.87	-0.0	2.6	747	733

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Substance use in the 30 days before the survey									
Smoking	7.2	2.0	1.4	0.159	0.17	2.2	1.4	750	734
Alcohol	3.0	1.8*	1.0	0.304	0.06	1.8*	1.0	755	732
Marijuana	5.6	1.4	1.3	0.142	0.28	1.4	1.3	753	731
Other illicit drug	1.0	-0.3	0.5	-0.255	0.49	-0.3	0.5	754	734

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12d.6. MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	97.3	0.7	0.5	0.058	0.21	0.7	0.5	933	927
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	24,900	2,509	1,697	0.068	0.14	2,526	1,712	933	927
Supplementary outcomes									
Enrollment since RA									
Medicaid managed care	92.7	1.1	1.1	0.108	0.29	1.1	1.2	933	927
Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	1.8	1.8**	0.7	0.418	0.02	1.7**	0.7	933	927
Medicaid capitated behavioral health	n.d.								
Medicaid payments since RA									
Any Medicaid payments	99.5	0.1	0.3	0.124	0.76	0.1	0.3	933	927
Average monthly Medicaid payments (\$)	1,383	139	94	0.068	0.14	140	95	933	927
Average monthly fee-for-service payments (\$)	809	137	94	0.067	0.15	136	95	933	927
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	574	3	23	0.005	0.91	5	23	933	927

Source: State Medicaid program data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges’ g for continuous outcomes and Cox’s Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/**Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12d.7. MD PROMISE: Impacts on youth's economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,865	708***	220	0.160	0.00	873***	234	752	738
Supplementary outcomes									
SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	96.8	0.7	0.7	0.141	0.32	1.1	0.7	936	930
Total SSA payments (\$)	10,688	115	131	0.031	0.38	289*	169	936	930
SSI payments (\$)	10,077	23	134	0.006	0.87	170	188	936	930
OASDI payments (\$)	610	92*	49	0.041	0.06	119	103	936	930
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	84.9	0.1	0.9	0.004	0.70	-1.0	1.7	936	930
SSI and OASDI	10.6	0.3	0.8	0.016		1.7	1.5	936	930
OASDI only	1.2	0.2	0.5	0.113		0.3	0.5	936	930
None	3.2	-0.6	0.7	-0.125		-1.1	0.7	936	930
Income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	7,393	307***	117	0.105	0.01	417***	135	935	930
Youth resided with parent at the time of the survey	98.0	-1.4*	0.8	-0.329	0.09	-1.4*	0.8	781	764
Household income in the calendar year before the survey									
Less than \$10,000	31.9	2.2	2.4	0.060	0.81	3.0	2.5	735	731
\$10,000 to \$19,999	28.8	-0.8	2.4	-0.025		-0.4	2.4	735	731
\$20,000 to \$29,999	19.6	-0.2	2.1	-0.007		-0.3	2.1	735	731
\$30,000 or more	19.7	-1.2	2.0	-0.047		-2.3	2.0	735	731
Any household member participated in non-SSA public assistance programs at the time of the survey	73.4	-0.3	2.2	-0.010	0.88	0.4	2.3	770	764

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12d.8. MD PROMISE: Impacts on family’s receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any family support services since RA	47.7	15.6***	2.5	0.386	0.00	15.9***	2.5	781	771
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of family support services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	17.6	10.5***	2.1	0.367	0.00	10.7***	2.1	791	775
Education or training supports	11.2	3.1*	1.7	0.170	0.06	3.2*	1.7	790	777
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	12.0	3.6**	1.7	0.185	0.04	3.6**	1.7	790	774
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	14.3	27.2***	2.2	0.879	0.00	27.3***	2.2	789	776
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	10.9	16.1***	1.9	0.671	0.00	16.1***	1.9	789	776
Parent training and information on youth’s disability ^a	28.0	10.0***	2.4	0.275	0.00	10.3***	2.4	787	777
Parent networking support	15.7	-2.5	1.8	-0.122	0.16	-2.3	1.8	788	776
Any key support services received since RA	33.0	24.0***	2.4	0.599	0.00	23.9***	2.5	785	771
Hours of key support services received since RA	57.3	-20.7*	12.5	-0.106	0.10	-19.9	12.2	765	756
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.5	0.3***	0.0	0.328	0.00	0.3***	0.0	784	770
Usefulness of key services received since RA									
No key service reported	67.0	-23.8***	2.5	0.000	0.00	-23.9***	2.5	782	768
No service rated somewhat or very useful	1.0	2.0	0.7	0.000		1.9	0.7	782	768
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	32.0	21.8	2.5	0.000		22.1	2.5	782	768
Unmet needs for family services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	19.2	-3.8**	1.9	-0.160	0.05	-3.7*	1.9	787	773
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.4	-0.1	0.1	-0.072	0.16	-0.1	0.1	787	773
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	3.4	-1.7**	0.8	-0.425	0.03	-1.7**	0.8	787	773
Education or training supports	5.3	-0.5	1.1	-0.065	0.65	-0.3	1.1	787	773
Employment-promoting services	10.4	-2.8*	1.5	-0.208	0.06	-2.6*	1.5	787	773
Benefits counseling	3.0	-0.2	0.9	-0.041	0.82	-0.2	0.9	787	773
Financial education	3.6	-0.9	0.9	-0.185	0.29	-1.1	0.9	787	773
Referral services	1.8	0.0	0.7	0.003	0.99	0.0	0.7	787	773
Transportation	2.5	0.5	0.8	0.119	0.53	0.5	0.8	787	773
Health	2.9	-0.6	0.8	-0.135	0.50	-0.6	0.8	787	773
Any other services	4.5	-1.2	1.0	-0.201	0.21	-1.2	1.0	787	773
Enrolling parent’s engagement with VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	1.5	0.4	0.8	0.148	0.59	0.5	0.8	550	535

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Received VR services since RA	1.1	0.5	0.7	0.217	0.48	0.5	0.7	550	535

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless noted otherwise.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aThese services were required of the PROMISE programs. With the exception of parent training and information on youth's disability, we asked more detailed questions about providers of these services in the PROMISE 18-month survey than providers of other support services. The outcome measures related to key support services presented in this table reflect all required services except parent training and information on youth's disability.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12d.9. MD PROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	23.7	1.0	2.2	0.033	0.64	1.0	2.2	782	769
Supplementary outcomes									
Highest educational attainment by either parent at the time of the survey									
Not a high school graduate	20.8	-1.3	2.0	-0.048	0.66	-0.7	2.0	795	781
High school diploma or GED	45.4	-1.6	2.5	-0.039		-2.1	2.5	795	781
Some post-secondary education	18.0	2.1	2.0	0.083		2.0	2.0	795	781
College degree	12.5	0.3	1.7	0.016		-0.1	1.7	795	781
Some post-graduate degree	2.2	-0.3	0.7	-0.087		-0.3	0.7	795	781
Missing	1.3	0.8	0.6	0.289		1.1	0.7	795	781
Either parent was enrolled in education or job skills training at the time of the survey	7.4	-0.2	1.3	-0.021	0.86	-0.1	1.3	781	771
Either parent received a diploma, GED, certificate of completion, or professional license since RA	11.2	-1.3	1.6	-0.082	0.41	-1.3	1.6	783	770

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12d.10. MD PROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent was employed since RA	54.5	2.7	2.5	0.066	0.28	2.1	2.5	781	773
Supplementary outcomes									
Either parent was employed in the month before the survey	48.7	0.4	2.5	0.010	0.88	-0.3	2.5	781	773
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	890	79	65	0.063	0.22	50	66	777	770
Parents' earnings in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	18,465	-1,005*	521	-0.044	0.05	-1,391	1,084	883	870
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	27.9	-0.5	2.2	-0.015	0.83	-1.4	2.3	781	773

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12d.11. MD PROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	20,498	-546	536	-0.025	0.31	-899	1,044	883	870
Supplementary outcomes									
Parents' SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	21.3	4.0**	2.0	0.136	0.04	4.2**	2.0	883	870
Total SSA payments (\$)	3,090	641**	312	0.095	0.04	694**	321	883	870
SSI payments (\$)	1,229	44	175	0.012	0.80	69	175	883	870
OASDI payments (\$)	1,861	597**	259	0.106	0.02	625**	269	883	870
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	7.7	1.1*	1.3	0.090	0.08	1.1*	1.3	883	870
SSI and OASDI	5.3	-0.4	1.1	-0.052		-0.3	1.1	883	870
OASDI only	8.3	3.3	1.4	0.225		3.4	1.4	883	870
None	78.7	-4.0	2.0	-0.136		-4.2	2.0	883	870
Either parent had health insurance at the time of the survey	95.4	-0.5	1.1	-0.070	0.63	-0.5	1.1	755	756
Medicaid enrollment and payments since RA (from state Medicaid program data)									
Enrolled in Medicaid	82.8	2.9	2.1	0.134	0.16	3.7*	2.2	550	535
Enrolled in Medicaid comprehensive managed care	74.0	1.7	2.5	0.054	0.51	1.8	2.6	550	535
Enrolled in Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		n.a.	n.a.	550	535
Total Medicaid payments (\$)	9,105	342	627	0.032	0.59	528	639	550	535

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

n.a. = not available.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12e.1. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any transition services since RA	91.4	2.6**	1.2	0.239	0.03	2.7**	1.2	879	870
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	35.2	21.4***	2.4	0.531	0.00	21.6***	2.3	865	866
School transition planning	72.8	0.1	2.1	0.002	0.98	0.1	2.1	874	868
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	45.6	14.4***	2.4	0.352	0.00	14.0***	2.4	873	855
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	6.7	6.2***	1.4	0.436	0.00	6.0***	1.4	869	859
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	16.9	4.3**	1.9	0.171	0.02	4.1**	1.9	880	866
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	38.7	6.1**	2.4	0.152	0.01	5.9**	2.4	860	851
Help accessing education or training	30.4	7.9***	2.2	0.214	0.00	7.2***	2.3	876	856
Life skills training	50.0	5.9**	2.4	0.143	0.01	5.5**	2.4	878	869
Help with assistive technology	26.3	3.0	2.2	0.092	0.16	3.0	2.2	859	861
Other services	8.2	2.6*	1.4	0.186	0.06	2.4*	1.4	883	864
Received any key transition services since RA	58.3	16.1***	2.3	0.443	0.00	15.9***	2.2	867	861
Hours of key transition services received since RA	415.5	-38.0	35.0	-0.054	0.28	-37.8	35.0	851	850
Number of key transition service providers since RA	0.9	0.3***	0.0	0.311	0.00	0.3***	0.0	866	860
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA									
No key service reported	41.7	-16.1***	2.3	0.005	0.00	-15.9***	2.2	865	859
No service rated somewhat or very useful	2.3	-0.1	0.7	0.016		0.1	0.8	865	859
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	56.0	16.2	2.3	0.025		15.8	2.3	865	859
Unmet needs for services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	23.7	-0.2	2.1	-0.005	0.94	-0.2	2.0	867	851
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.6	-0.0	0.1	-0.006	0.91	0.0	0.1	867	851
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	2.9	-0.1	0.8	-0.015	0.93	0.1	0.8	867	851
Employment-promoting services	11.2	1.3	1.6	0.075	0.41	1.4	1.6	867	851

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Benefits counseling	3.1	-0.4	0.8	-0.094	0.60	-0.4	0.8	867	851
Financial education	4.6	0.4	1.1	0.057	0.68	0.7	1.0	867	851
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	3.2	0.7	0.9	0.117	0.47	0.7	0.9	867	851
Education or training supports	12.0	-1.7	1.5	-0.106	0.26	-1.4	1.5	867	851
Referral services	2.8	0.1	0.8	0.011	0.95	0.2	0.8	867	851
Transportation	4.3	-0.2	1.0	-0.037	0.80	-0.2	1.0	867	851
Health	4.7	-0.3	1.0	-0.044	0.76	-0.0	1.0	867	851
Accommodations	2.2	0.5	0.7	0.119	0.53	0.7	0.7	867	851
Other skills training	12.2	-0.8	1.6	-0.047	0.60	-0.6	1.6	867	851
Any other services	1.3	0.2	0.5	0.087	0.72	0.1	0.6	867	851
VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	1.7	-0.1	0.6	-0.051	0.82	-0.2	0.6	978	978
Duration from RA to VR application									
Within the first 6 months	0.3	-0.0	0.3	-0.080	0.57	0.0	0.3	978	978
7 to 12 months	0.6	-0.4	0.3	-0.558		-0.4	0.3	978	978
13 to 18 months	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.149		0.2	0.4	978	978
Did not apply within 18 months of RA	98.3	0.2	0.6	0.068		0.2	0.6	978	978
Received VR services since RA	0.9	-0.1	0.5	-0.066	0.84	-0.2	0.4	978	978
Types of VR services received since RA									
Education and training	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.192	0.70	-0.0	0.3	978	978
Career	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.250	0.50	0.2	0.4	978	978
Other	0.7	-0.5	0.3	-0.664	0.12	-0.5*	0.3	978	978

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aWe identified these services as key transition services because PROMISE programs were required to offer them. The PROMISE 18-month survey included more detailed questions about providers of these services than about providers of other services.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12e.2. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Enrolled in school at the time of the survey	95.1	-0.7	1.1	-0.091	0.50	-0.8	1.1	853	838
Supplementary outcomes									
Ever enrolled in school since RA	99.3	-0.1	0.4	-0.051	0.87	-0.0	0.4	853	837
Received special education or had an IEP since RA	93.1	-0.4	1.2	-0.037	0.73	0.1	1.2	882	871
Had a Section 504 plan since RA	50.9	-0.3	2.6	-0.006	0.92	-0.3	2.6	761	758
Received GED, certificate of completion, or high school diploma since RA	4.2	-0.3	1.0	-0.041	0.79	-0.3	1.0	850	835
Job-related training since RA									
Received any job-related training	14.2	9.0***	1.9	0.365	0.00	8.8***	1.9	851	836
Received any job-related training credential	2.3	-0.2	0.7	-0.045	0.83	-0.1	0.7	851	836
Type of school attended since RA									
None	0.7	-0.0	0.4	-0.011	0.61	0.0	0.4	851	836
Regular middle or high school or college	62.2	0.7	2.3	0.018		0.2	2.4	851	836
Specialized school for students with disabilities	34.4	-0.3	2.2	-0.009		0.0	2.3	851	836
Home-schooled	0.2	-0.2	0.1	-0.750		-0.1	0.2	851	836
Other	2.5	-0.2	0.7	-0.052		-0.1	0.8	851	836
Highest grade completed at the time of the survey									
8th grade or lower	8.7	1.2	1.4	0.088	0.81	0.9	1.4	832	827
9th to 11th grade	77.2	-2.0	2.1	-0.068		-1.5	2.1	832	827
12th grade	5.6	1.0	1.2	0.104		1.0	1.2	832	827
Some post-secondary education	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.085		-0.0	0.4	832	827
Ungraded program/home-schooled/other	8.0	-0.2	1.3	-0.020		-0.4	1.3	832	827
Educational accommodations since RA									
Received educational accommodations	86.0	2.1	1.7	0.114	0.21	1.8	1.7	839	825
Any unmet need for educational accommodations	23.8	2.5	2.2	0.080	0.26	2.7	2.2	805	785

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p -value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t -test. The p -value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12e.3. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Ever employed in a paid job since RA	23.1	5.7***	2.1	0.182	0.01	5.3**	2.1	852	837
Supplementary outcomes									
Employed in a paid or unpaid job since RA	33.8	5.6**	2.3	0.148	0.02	5.4**	2.4	852	837
Employment in the year before the survey									
Any paid employment	16.8	4.5**	1.9	0.187	0.02	4.3**	1.9	851	837
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.1	0.3	0.2	0.072	0.16	0.3	0.2	849	835
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	571	19	99	0.009	0.85	11	102	847	833
Employment at the time of survey									
Any paid employment	7.6	1.8	1.4	0.145	0.19	1.4	1.4	852	837
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	1.5	0.3	0.4	0.050	0.32	0.3	0.3	851	837
Weekly earnings (\$)	15	0	3	0.004	0.93	-0	3	851	836
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	20.2	3.7**	1.8	0.129	0.04	3.2*	1.9	985	980
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	338	41	47	0.039	0.38	23	47	985	980

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges’ g for continuous outcomes and Cox’s Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12e.4. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	49.5	-0.2	0.5	-0.020	0.76	-0.3	0.5	505	509
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.3	0.3	0.7	0.097	0.72	0.5	0.8	494	503
Supplementary outcomes									
Scores on subdomains of self-determination at the time of the survey									
Autonomy (scale: 0 to 300)	146.8	1.3	3.7	0.023	0.72	0.3	3.6	510	510
Psychological empowerment (scale: 0 to 100)	90.7	-1.6	1.1	-0.094	0.14	-1.8	1.1	506	512
Self-realization (scale: 0 to 100)	8.9	0.7	1.0	0.045	0.48	0.7	1.0	507	511
At the time of the survey, youth expected to:									
Get post-secondary education	63.3	1.6	3.0	0.042	0.60	1.1	3.1	494	503
Live independently at age 25	65.0	4.1	2.9	0.112	0.16	3.9	3.0	490	495
Be financially independent at age 25	86.1	-3.7	2.3	-0.169	0.11	-3.6	2.3	495	505
Be employed at age 25	94.1	0.6	1.4	0.072	0.65	0.8	1.4	504	507
Be prevented from working at age 25 because of:									
Disability or health reasons	20.8	-3.4	2.5	-0.135	0.17	-3.8	2.5	497	503
Unreliable transportation	18.0	-1.9	2.4	-0.083	0.42	-2.2	2.4	501	500
Inability to find a job	20.7	-0.1	2.6	-0.004	0.97	0.2	2.6	497	501
School or training enrollment	22.3	-3.9	2.5	-0.147	0.12	-3.8	2.5	502	503
Inaccessible workplaces	14.5	-1.9	2.2	-0.097	0.39	-2.2	2.2	491	493
Risk of losing benefits	14.1	-2.4	2.1	-0.131	0.25	-2.3	2.1	500	498
Not wanting to work	9.5	0.5	1.8	0.032	0.80	0.5	1.9	497	503
Others not believing he or she can work	13.4	-2.4	2.1	-0.136	0.25	-2.7	2.0	499	501
Other reasons	1.4	-0.5	0.7	-0.300	0.44	-0.4	0.7	496	503
At the time of the survey, parent expected youth to:									
Get post-secondary education	47.1	-1.1	2.4	-0.026	0.66	-1.6	2.4	847	817
Live independently at age 25	34.7	1.8	2.3	0.047	0.45	0.8	2.4	805	787
Be financially independent at age 25	64.3	0.4	2.3	0.010	0.86	-0.3	2.3	844	830
Be employed in a paid job at age 25	83.0	1.9	1.7	0.085	0.28	1.5	1.8	858	831
Parent believed it important for youth to become independent in some way at the time of the survey									
	95.2	1.4	0.9	0.216	0.13	1.3	0.9	876	854

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Parent usually or always expected youth to do chores at the time of the survey	7.4	0.5	1.3	0.040	0.72	-0.0	1.3	879	860

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12e.5. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.7	-0.1	0.5	-0.039	0.88	-0.1	0.5	883	863
Supplementary outcomes									
Health insurance type at the time of the survey									
Public	95.3	-0.4	1.0	-0.050	0.71	-0.4	1.0	873	852
Private	7.4	-1.3	1.2	-0.124	0.28	-1.1	1.2	875	840
Private purchased through an Affordable Care Act health exchange	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.068	0.85	-0.0	0.3	873	830
General health status at the time of the survey									
Poor	3.5	-0.3	0.9	-0.061	0.39	-0.4	0.9	849	826
Fair	14.6	-2.3	1.7	-0.121		-1.9	1.7	849	826
Good	33.9	1.2	2.3	0.031		1.2	2.3	849	826
Very good	24.3	3.1	2.1	0.100		2.8	2.1	849	826
Excellent	23.6	-1.7	2.1	-0.057		-1.7	2.1	849	826
ADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Walking, standing, or climbing stairs	14.1	-0.7	1.6	-0.036	0.65	-0.2	1.7	851	833
Personal care and getting around inside the home	16.6	1.2	1.7	0.050	0.50	1.3	1.8	849	830
Speaking, communicating with others	50.1	-2.0	2.4	-0.049	0.40	-1.8	2.4	848	830
Hearing normal conversations	15.8	0.5	1.7	0.024	0.76	0.2	1.8	844	833
Seeing, even with the use of prescription glasses	14.5	0.1	1.7	0.005	0.96	0.0	1.7	850	828
None of the above	36.6	2.2	2.3	0.056	0.34	1.7	2.4	848	831
Needed help with or equipment for at least one ADL at the time of the survey	34.1	-0.9	2.2	-0.023	0.69	-0.7	2.3	841	823
IADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Planning and carrying out activities to achieve a goal	41.2	-2.6	2.3	-0.067	0.26	-1.9	2.4	844	827
Learning, remembering, or concentrating	59.9	0.5	2.4	0.014	0.82	1.7	2.4	849	829
Getting around outside of the home	23.5	-0.9	2.0	-0.030	0.66	-0.4	2.0	850	829
None of the above	33.4	0.2	2.3	0.005	0.94	-0.9	2.3	849	829
Needed help with or equipment for at least one IADL at the time of the survey	50.9	-2.7	2.4	-0.065	0.26	-1.8	2.5	846	827

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Substance use in the 30 days before the survey									
Smoking	3.3	1.0	0.9	0.162	0.30	1.2	1.0	848	829
Alcohol	3.5	-0.1	0.9	-0.019	0.91	-0.1	0.9	848	825
Marijuana	5.0	1.1	1.1	0.131	0.32	1.2	1.1	848	825
Other illicit drug	0.6	-0.0	0.4	-0.036	0.93	-0.0	0.4	849	827

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12e.6. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	n.d.								
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	n.d.								
Supplementary outcomes									
Enrollment since RA									
Medicaid managed care	n.d.								
Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	n.d.								
Medicaid capitated behavioral health	n.d.								
Medicaid payments since RA									
Any Medicaid payments	n.d.								
Average monthly Medicaid payments (\$)	n.d.								
Average monthly fee-for-service payments (\$)	n.d.								
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	n.d.								

Source: State Medicaid program data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges’ g for continuous outcomes and Cox’s Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/**Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12e.7. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey	7,820	65	132	0.021	0.62	36	152	848	834
Supplementary outcomes									
SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	97.9	-0.6	0.6	-0.153	0.34	-1.1	0.7	986	981
Total SSA payments (\$)	11,292	-10	116	-0.003	0.93	-81	156	986	981
SSI payments (\$)	10,714	17	118	0.004	0.89	60	172	986	981
OASDI payments (\$)	579	-27	37	-0.015	0.46	-141*	83	986	981
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	85.5	-0.4	0.9	-0.019	0.38	0.9	1.6	986	981
SSI and OASDI	11.6	-0.7	0.6	-0.043		-2.0	1.4	986	981
OASDI only	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.097		-0.0	0.4	986	981
None	2.1	1.0	0.7	0.232		1.1	0.7	986	981
Income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	7,460	47	96	0.018	0.63	-24	115	985	980
Youth resided with parent at the time of the survey	98.6	-0.2	0.6	-0.085	0.71	0.1	0.6	873	855
Household income in the calendar year before the survey									
Less than \$10,000	35.4	2.0	2.3	0.053	0.43	1.7	2.4	844	812
\$10,000 to \$19,999	32.3	-0.4	2.3	-0.010		-0.8	2.3	844	812
\$20,000 to \$29,999	17.8	-2.8	1.8	-0.123		-2.5	1.8	844	812
\$30,000 or more	14.4	1.1	1.8	0.054		1.5	1.8	844	812
Any household member participated in non-SSA public assistance programs at the time of the survey	73.1	1.1	2.0	0.034	0.59	1.6	2.1	877	854

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges’ g for continuous outcomes and Cox’s Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12e.8. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on family’s receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any family support services since RA	49.7	7.9***	2.4	0.194	0.00	7.1***	2.4	880	863
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of family support services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	13.8	5.1***	1.8	0.226	0.00	4.7***	1.8	883	869
Education or training supports	11.5	-2.3	1.4	-0.155	0.10	-2.4	1.4	885	868
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	7.5	0.1	1.3	0.006	0.96	0.3	1.3	884	869
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	16.6	12.7***	2.0	0.444	0.00	12.5***	2.0	885	869
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	10.9	5.2***	1.7	0.272	0.00	5.3***	1.6	884	867
Parent training and information on youth’s disability ^a	33.1	6.5***	2.3	0.171	0.00	6.2***	2.3	883	864
Parent networking support	17.0	9.2***	2.0	0.333	0.00	8.3***	1.9	885	869
Any key support services received since RA	29.6	9.9***	2.3	0.268	0.00	9.5***	2.3	878	865
Hours of key support services received since RA	30.3	-3.6	8.6	-0.028	0.68	-3.0	8.4	862	850
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.4	0.1***	0.0	0.180	0.00	0.1***	0.0	877	863
Usefulness of key services received since RA									
No key service reported	70.4	-9.5***	2.3	0.000	0.00	-9.5***	2.3	876	861
No service rated somewhat or very useful	1.2	0.1	0.6	0.000		0.2	0.6	876	861
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	28.4	9.3	2.3	0.000		9.3	2.3	876	861
Unmet needs for family services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	12.5	1.3	1.6	0.068	0.43	1.8	1.6	882	867
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.3	-0.0	0.1	-0.023	0.63	-0.0	0.1	882	867
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	2.9	-1.3*	0.7	-0.349	0.09	-1.1	0.7	882	867
Education or training supports	3.9	1.4	1.0	0.194	0.17	1.5	1.0	882	867
Employment-promoting services	6.1	0.2	1.2	0.023	0.85	0.4	1.2	882	867
Benefits counseling	2.5	-0.6	0.7	-0.156	0.43	-0.5	0.7	882	867
Financial education	3.3	-0.8	0.8	-0.173	0.33	-0.6	0.8	882	867
Referral services	3.0	-0.6	0.8	-0.126	0.47	-0.6	0.8	882	867
Transportation	2.2	-0.6	0.7	-0.207	0.36	-0.6	0.6	882	867
Health	3.0	0.3	0.9	0.059	0.73	0.5	0.8	882	867
Any other services	4.5	-0.7	1.0	-0.109	0.45	-0.6	1.0	882	867

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Enrolling parent's engagement with VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	0.1	1.1***	0.4	1.417	0.01	1.1***	0.4	840	818
Received VR services since RA	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.376	0.34	0.3	0.4	840	818

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless noted otherwise.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aThese services were required of the PROMISE programs. With the exception of parent training and information on youth's disability, we asked more detailed questions about providers of these services in the PROMISE 18-month survey than providers of other support services. The outcome measures related to key support services presented in this table reflect all required services except parent training and information on youth's disability.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12e.9. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	19.4	3.1	1.9	0.114	0.11	3.2	1.9	885	862
Supplementary outcomes									
Highest educational attainment by either parent at the time of the survey									
Not a high school graduate	30.5	1.1	2.1	0.031	0.14	-0.1	2.2	887	876
High school diploma or GED	30.1	3.4	2.2	0.096		3.8	2.2	887	876
Some post-secondary education	14.7	-3.1	1.6	-0.166		-2.3	1.6	887	876
College degree	19.1	0.3	1.9	0.011		0.6	1.9	887	876
Some post-graduate degree	2.7	-1.1	0.7	-0.324		-1.1	0.7	887	876
Missing	3.0	-0.6	0.7	-0.139		-0.9	0.7	887	876
Either parent was enrolled in education or job skills training at the time of the survey	5.5	1.9	1.2	0.192	0.11	1.8	1.2	883	864
Either parent received a diploma, GED, certificate of completion, or professional license since RA	7.2	2.6*	1.4	0.203	0.06	2.8**	1.3	886	865

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12e.10. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent was employed since RA	46.6	0.1	2.3	0.002	0.98	1.1	2.4	884	864
Supplementary outcomes									
Either parent was employed in the month before the survey	44.7	-2.5	2.2	-0.062	0.26	-1.4	2.4	878	863
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	736	-13	48	-0.012	0.79	9	51	875	859
Parents' earnings in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	15,326	463	480	0.022	0.33	1,528	956	951	910
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	22.9	-1.6	1.9	-0.066	0.39	-0.7	2.0	877	863

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12e.11. NYS PROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	17,986	511	481	0.026	0.29	1,343	909	951	910
Supplementary outcomes									
Parents' SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	31.0	-0.5	1.3	-0.015	0.68	-2.4	2.1	951	910
Total SSA payments (\$)	4,196	35	148	0.005	0.81	-323	313	951	910
SSI payments (\$)	1,933	-6	93	-0.001	0.95	-113	202	951	910
OASDI payments (\$)	2,263	41	119	0.008	0.73	-209	248	951	910
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	13.2	-0.0	0.6	-0.001	0.94	-0.8	1.5	951	910
SSI and OASDI	6.9	0.4	0.7	0.035		0.0	1.2	951	910
OASDI only	10.9	-0.3	0.6	-0.018		-1.6	1.4	951	910
None	69.0	-0.1	0.8	-0.002		2.4	2.1	951	910
Either parent had health insurance at the time of the survey	92.4	-1.1	1.1	-0.088	0.32	1.1	1.2	872	851
Medicaid enrollment and payments since RA (from state Medicaid program data)									
Enrolled in Medicaid	n.d.								
Enrolled in Medicaid comprehensive managed care	n.d.								
Enrolled in Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	n.d.								
Total Medicaid payments (\$)	n.d.								

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12f.1. WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's receipt of transition services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any transition services since RA	89.7	5.0***	1.3	0.434	0.00	5.1***	1.4	799	759
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	43.5	30.6***	2.3	0.794	0.00	30.7***	2.4	798	763
School transition planning	67.9	2.6	2.3	0.073	0.27	2.6	2.4	789	758
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	54.0	17.0***	2.4	0.444	0.00	16.8***	2.4	800	756
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	8.4	12.6***	1.8	0.646	0.00	12.6***	1.8	797	757
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	15.2	15.4***	2.1	0.547	0.00	15.4***	2.1	798	760
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	38.1	7.3***	2.5	0.181	0.00	7.3***	2.5	791	739
Help accessing education or training	31.8	6.8***	2.4	0.182	0.00	6.2**	2.4	789	752
Life skills training	55.0	6.0**	2.5	0.150	0.02	6.2**	2.5	794	760
Help with assistive technology	23.7	7.1***	2.3	0.218	0.00	7.3***	2.3	786	746
Other services	8.2	4.0***	1.5	0.267	0.01	3.9**	1.5	797	761
Received any key transition services since RA	63.8	19.9***	2.2	0.647	0.00	20.0***	2.2	800	755
Hours of key transition services received since RA	342.5	2.7	33.7	0.004	0.94	5.2	33.8	781	745
Number of key transition service providers since RA	1.1	0.6***	0.1	0.497	0.00	0.6***	0.1	799	753
Usefulness of key transition services received since RA									
No key service reported	36.2	-19.9***	2.2	0.025	0.00	-20.0***	2.2	798	753
No service rated somewhat or very useful	3.2	-0.2	0.9	0.036		-0.3	0.9	798	753
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	60.7	20.1	2.2	-0.010		20.3	2.3	798	753
Unmet needs for services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	26.0	-1.1	2.2	-0.035	0.62	-1.4	2.2	794	749
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.6	-0.1	0.1	-0.045	0.38	-0.1	0.1	794	749
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	1.6	0.0	0.7	0.018	0.94	0.0	0.7	794	749
Employment-promoting services	13.1	-0.1	1.7	-0.008	0.93	-0.4	1.7	794	749

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Benefits counseling	2.3	-0.2	0.8	-0.056	0.80	-0.2	0.8	794	749
Financial education	5.0	-0.5	1.1	-0.062	0.66	-0.7	1.1	794	749
Self-advocacy or self-determination training	4.1	-2.2**	0.9	-0.458	0.02	-2.1**	0.9	794	749
Education or training supports	12.2	0.4	1.7	0.024	0.80	0.3	1.7	794	749
Referral services	1.6	-0.4	0.6	-0.183	0.48	-0.5	0.6	794	749
Transportation	2.7	-0.4	0.8	-0.089	0.65	-0.5	0.8	794	749
Health	3.5	-0.3	0.9	-0.060	0.73	-0.3	0.9	794	749
Accommodations	2.7	0.1	0.9	0.016	0.93	0.2	0.9	794	749
Other skills training	11.5	-2.3	1.6	-0.152	0.14	-2.4	1.6	794	749
Any other services	2.7	-0.8	0.8	-0.224	0.28	-0.9	0.8	794	749
VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	14.0	82.9***	1.3	3.176	0.00	83.0***	1.3	949	946
Duration from RA to VR application									
Within the first 6 months	3.9	93.1***	0.8	4.040	0.00	93.0***	0.8	949	946
7 to 12 months	4.3	-4.5	0.7	.		-4.3	0.7	949	946
13 to 18 months	5.7	-5.7	0.7	-2.932		-5.7	0.8	949	946
Did not apply within 18 months of RA	86.0	-82.9	1.3	-3.188		-83.0	1.3	949	946
Received VR services since RA	8.8	71.3***	1.6	2.261	0.00	71.6***	1.6	949	946
Types of VR services received since RA									
Education and training	3.0	51.4***	1.7	2.221	0.00	51.7***	1.7	949	946
Career	9.7	42.3***	1.9	1.401	0.00	42.9***	1.9	949	946
Other	2.6	78.0***	1.4	3.049	0.00	78.1***	1.4	949	946

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aWe identified these services as key transition services because PROMISE programs were required to offer them. The PROMISE 18-month survey included more detailed questions about providers of these services than about providers of other services.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12f.2. WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's education and job-related training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Enrolled in school at the time of the	90.6	2.0	1.4	0.155	0.17	2.2	1.4	746	729
Supplementary outcomes									
Ever enrolled in school since RA	98.5	0.5	0.6	0.277	0.33	0.6	0.6	746	729
Received special education or had an IEP since RA	89.6	-1.0	1.5	-0.065	0.49	-0.9	1.6	799	762
Had a Section 504 plan since RA	42.6	-1.7	2.7	-0.042	0.53	-1.9	2.7	667	649
Received GED, certificate of completion, or high school diploma since RA	5.6	-0.8	1.1	-0.103	0.47	-0.9	1.2	743	725
Job-related training since RA									
Received any job-related training	19.8	19.8***	2.3	0.594	0.00	19.8***	2.3	742	728
Received any job-related training credential	1.9	8.1***	1.2	1.057	0.00	7.9***	1.2	739	727
Type of school attended since RA									
None	1.5	-0.5	0.6	-0.279	0.36	-0.6	0.6	743	726
Regular middle or high school or	89.3	-1.8	1.6	-0.107		-1.6	1.7	743	726
Specialized school for students with disabilities	5.4	1.7	1.2	0.172		1.6	1.3	743	726
Home-schooled	2.3	-0.2	0.8	-0.051		-0.2	0.8	743	726
Other	1.4	0.9	0.7	0.295		0.8	0.7	743	726
Highest grade completed at the time of the survey									
8th grade or lower	10.1	-2.6*	1.5	-0.194	0.09	-2.4	1.5	741	719
9th to 11th grade	80.7	5.2	1.9	0.229		5.1	2.0	741	719
12th grade	7.7	-2.6	1.3	-0.270		-2.6	1.3	741	719
Some post-secondary education	0.7	0.1	0.4	0.078		0.1	0.4	741	719
Ungraded program/home-schooled/other	0.8	-0.1	0.4	-0.113		-0.1	0.5	741	719
Educational accommodations since RA									
Received educational	89.5	-0.8	1.6	-0.050	0.62	-0.8	1.6	738	724
Any unmet need for educational accommodations	28.8	-1.8	2.3	-0.053	0.45	-2.3	2.4	721	696

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p -value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t -test. The p -value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/****Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12f.3. WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Ever employed in a paid job since RA	30.6	11.2***	2.5	0.297	0.00	10.6***	2.5	745	729
Supplementary outcomes									
Employed in a paid or unpaid job since RA	45.0	10.0***	2.6	0.243	0.00	9.7***	2.6	745	729
Employment in the year before the survey									
Any paid employment	26.3	13.6***	2.4	0.395	0.00	12.9***	2.4	745	728
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	2.2	0.9**	0.4	0.133	0.01	0.8**	0.4	740	725
Total earnings from all jobs (\$)	882	394***	146	0.143	0.01	372**	148	739	723
Employment at the time of survey									
Any paid employment	15.5	3.2	2.0	0.143	0.10	3.1	2.0	745	728
Weekly hours worked in paid jobs	3.8	0.7	0.7	0.049	0.35	0.6	0.7	745	728
Weekly earnings (\$)	30	6	6	0.057	0.27	6	6	744	726
Ever employed during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	28.9	15.1***	2.1	0.399	0.00	14.8***	2.2	949	946
Earnings during the first calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	555	105*	62	0.070	0.09	115*	69	949	946

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12f.4. WI PROMISE: Impacts on self-determination and expectations (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.8	-0.0	0.5	-0.003	0.95	0.0	0.5	604	592
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.1	-0.3	0.8	-0.096	0.70	-0.3	0.8	593	578
Supplementary outcomes									
Scores on subdomains of self-determination at the time of the survey									
Autonomy (scale: 0 to 300)	145.3	4.2	3.1	0.077	0.18	4.5	3.1	607	595
Psychological empowerment (scale: 0 to 100)	86.2	-0.7	1.2	-0.034	0.56	-0.5	1.2	607	594
Self-realization (scale: 0 to 100)	11.6	-0.8	1.0	-0.047	0.41	-1.0	1.0	604	594
At the time of the survey, youth expected to:									
Get post-secondary education	55.1	9.4***	2.8	0.238	0.00	9.6***	2.9	593	578
Live independently at age 25	70.6	-0.1	2.6	-0.004	0.96	-0.7	2.7	588	577
Be financially independent at age 25	74.6	4.0	2.4	0.135	0.10	4.1*	2.5	597	584
Be employed at age 25	92.0	1.3	1.5	0.117	0.38	1.3	1.5	604	596
Be prevented from working at age 25 because of:									
Disability or health reasons	23.9	-1.8	2.4	-0.062	0.46	-2.0	2.5	598	587
Unreliable transportation	21.1	-2.8	2.3	-0.105	0.24	-2.6	2.3	595	583
Inability to find a job	23.7	-2.2	2.4	-0.077	0.36	-2.1	2.4	599	584
School or training enrollment	17.0	0.5	2.2	0.023	0.80	0.5	2.2	595	585
Inaccessible workplaces	14.6	-0.1	2.0	-0.007	0.95	-0.2	2.1	591	576
Risk of losing benefits	14.0	-0.2	2.0	-0.008	0.94	-0.3	2.0	592	576
Not wanting to work	10.6	-1.4	1.7	-0.094	0.42	-1.4	1.7	601	593
Others not believing he or she can work	15.9	-0.7	2.1	-0.032	0.73	-1.2	2.1	598	588
Other reasons	2.2	-1.0	0.8	-0.355	0.20	-1.1	0.8	603	594
At the time of the survey, parent expected youth to:									
Get post-secondary education	40.2	1.8	2.5	0.045	0.47	1.9	2.6	762	734
Live independently at age 25	42.3	4.4*	2.6	0.108	0.09	3.7	2.6	725	693
Be financially independent at age 25	57.6	4.1*	2.5	0.104	0.09	3.3	2.5	768	741
Be employed in a paid job at age 25	85.1	4.1**	1.7	0.226	0.02	3.8**	1.7	775	745
Parent believed it important for youth to become independent in some way at the time of the survey									
	96.0	1.2	0.9	0.217	0.21	1.2	0.9	781	755

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Parent usually or always expected youth to do chores at the time of the survey	5.8	1.1	1.2	0.114	0.36	0.9	1.2	786	758

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12f.5. WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth's health and health insurance (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	97.6	1.4**	0.7	0.543	0.03	1.5**	0.7	780	755
Supplementary outcomes									
Health insurance type at the time of the survey									
Public	92.2	2.0	1.4	0.194	0.14	1.6	1.4	727	704
Private	9.5	0.9	1.5	0.062	0.54	1.6	1.6	769	742
Private purchased through an Affordable Care Act health exchange	0.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		n.a.	n.a.	769	742
General health status at the time of the survey									
Poor	3.6	1.1	1.0	0.171	0.40	1.0	1.0	744	727
Fair	14.1	1.2	1.9	0.057		1.3	1.9	744	727
Good	35.9	-0.3	2.5	-0.007		-0.1	2.5	744	727
Very good	25.4	1.3	2.3	0.042		1.2	2.3	744	727
Excellent	21.0	-3.4	2.0	-0.132		-3.4	2.1	744	727
ADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Walking, standing, or climbing stairs	12.9	-1.5	1.7	-0.088	0.35	-0.7	1.7	745	728
Personal care and getting around inside the home	13.2	0.7	1.7	0.037	0.68	1.6	1.8	744	728
Speaking, communicating with others	46.9	-2.4	2.6	-0.058	0.36	-1.9	2.6	744	725
Hearing normal conversations	17.1	-0.5	1.9	-0.023	0.78	-0.1	2.0	745	726
Seeing, even with the use of prescription glasses	15.8	2.4	2.0	0.103	0.22	2.4	2.0	743	728
None of the above	38.8	-1.6	2.5	-0.041	0.52	-2.6	2.5	746	726
Needed help with or equipment for at least one ADL at the time of the survey	29.0	0.7	2.3	0.021	0.76	1.8	2.4	741	722
IADL difficulties at the time of the survey									
Planning and carrying out activities to achieve a goal	35.5	1.9	2.5	0.049	0.46	2.6	2.5	739	719
Learning, remembering, or concentrating	65.2	-0.4	2.5	-0.011	0.87	0.0	2.5	743	727
Getting around outside of the home	14.3	1.8	1.9	0.085	0.33	2.8	1.9	742	725
None of the above	27.9	1.7	2.3	0.050	0.47	1.2	2.4	744	725
Needed help with or equipment for at least one IADL at the time of the survey	52.4	-1.5	2.6	-0.035	0.57	-0.6	2.6	742	724

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted <i>p</i> -value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Substance use in the 30 days before the survey									
Smoking	8.7	-1.1	1.4	-0.088	0.44	-1.5	1.4	743	723
Alcohol	4.0	-0.4	1.0	-0.066	0.69	-0.5	1.0	744	723
Marijuana	6.5	-1.3	1.2	-0.150	0.26	-1.7	1.2	743	723
Other illicit drug	0.5	-0.2	0.3	-0.365	0.45	-0.3	0.3	745	726

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' *g* for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The *p*-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed *t*-test. The *p*-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

n.a. = not available.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12f.6. WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s use of Medicaid (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcomes									
Percentage of months enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.2	0.1	0.7	0.009	0.84	0.2	0.7	949	946
Total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	10,648	284	782	0.016	0.72	396	800	949	946
Supplementary outcomes									
Enrollment since RA									
Medicaid managed care	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.429	0.24	0.4	0.4	949	946
Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	3.5	0.5	0.9	0.086	0.56	0.7	0.9	949	946
Medicaid capitated behavioral health	5.4	0.4	1.0	0.048	0.69	0.1	1.0	949	946
Medicaid payments since RA									
Any Medicaid payments	98.2	-0.2	0.6	-0.061	0.77	-0.3	0.6	949	946
Average monthly Medicaid payments (\$)	592	16	43	0.016	0.72	22	44	949	946
Average monthly fee-for-service payments (\$)	502	10	38	0.012	0.79	19	39	949	946
Average monthly capitated payments (\$)	90	6	14	0.018	0.70	3	14	949	946

Source: State Medicaid program data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges’ g for continuous outcomes and Cox’s Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12f.7. WI PROMISE: Impacts on youth’s economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey	7,852	471***	181	0.130	0.01	343*	193	740	724
Supplementary outcomes									
SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	97.1	0.1	0.7	0.022	0.88	0.4	0.7	950	946
Total SSA payments (\$)	10,861	129	129	0.037	0.32	106	161	950	946
SSI payments (\$)	10,256	170	151	0.044	0.26	148	178	950	946
OASDI payments (\$)	604	-41	89	-0.021	0.64	-42	89	950	946
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	82.3	2.5	1.7	0.109	0.51	2.5	1.7	950	946
SSI and OASDI	13.8	-1.8	1.5	-0.098		-1.7	1.5	950	946
OASDI only	1.0	-0.3	0.4	-0.250		-0.3	0.4	950	946
None	2.9	-0.3	0.7	-0.073		-0.4	0.7	950	946
Income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	7,375	214*	111	0.077	0.05	208	129	949	946
Youth resided with parent at the time of the survey	96.6	-0.8	1.0	-0.127	0.42	-0.7	1.0	785	759
Household income in the calendar year before the survey									
Less than \$10,000	33.6	-5.5*	2.3	-0.157	0.07	-6.3**	2.4	760	720
\$10,000 to \$19,999	31.1	0.1	2.4	0.004		0.2	2.4	760	720
\$20,000 to \$29,999	19.1	2.5	2.1	0.093		2.4	2.1	760	720
\$30,000 or more	16.3	2.9	1.9	0.121		3.7	2.0	760	720
Any household member participated in non-SSA public assistance programs at the time of the survey	66.0	0.6	2.4	0.016	0.81	-0.7	2.4	775	749

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges’ g for continuous outcomes and Cox’s Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12f.8. WI PROMISE: Impacts on family’s receipt of services (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Received any family support services since RA	48.1	15.1***	2.5	0.375	0.00	15.6***	2.5	793	759
Supplementary outcomes									
Types of family support services received since RA (italics indicate key transition services)									
<i>Case management</i> ^a	17.2	19.9***	2.2	0.633	0.00	19.7***	2.2	793	762
Education or training supports	12.7	5.3***	1.8	0.248	0.00	5.1***	1.8	794	762
<i>Employment-promoting services</i> ^a	13.5	7.1***	1.9	0.308	0.00	6.9***	1.9	795	765
<i>Benefits counseling</i> ^a	12.5	20.3***	2.1	0.745	0.00	20.8***	2.1	788	764
<i>Financial education</i> ^a	7.4	12.7***	1.7	0.697	0.00	12.7***	1.7	794	765
Parent training and information on youth’s disability ^a	25.8	12.0***	2.4	0.338	0.00	12.1***	2.3	795	762
Parent networking support	12.5	2.2	1.7	0.114	0.20	2.6	1.7	795	765
Any key support services received since RA	30.3	21.3***	2.4	0.543	0.00	21.4***	2.4	788	761
Hours of key support services received since RA	44.6	-12.6	10.9	-0.073	0.25	-13.5	10.7	773	748
Number of key support service providers since RA	0.5	0.3***	0.0	0.347	0.00	0.3***	0.0	787	760
Usefulness of key services received since RA									
No key service reported	69.7	-21.4***	2.5	0.000	0.00	-21.4***	2.4	787	758
No service rated somewhat or very useful	0.9	1.3	0.7	0.000		1.3	0.7	787	758
Any service rated somewhat or very useful	29.4	20.1	2.5	0.000		20.1	2.5	787	758
Unmet needs for family services or supports since RA									
Any unmet service or support needs	15.9	2.1	1.9	0.090	0.27	1.8	1.9	789	761
Number of unmet service or support needs	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.045	0.39	0.0	0.1	789	761
Types of unmet service and support needs									
Case management	1.8	0.1	0.7	0.030	0.90	0.1	0.7	789	761
Education or training supports	4.7	1.3	1.1	0.162	0.24	1.2	1.1	789	761
Employment-promoting services	6.3	2.5*	1.3	0.216	0.06	2.2	1.3	789	761
Benefits counseling	2.7	-0.7	0.8	-0.188	0.38	-0.7	0.8	789	761
Financial education	2.5	0.7	0.9	0.147	0.44	0.6	0.8	789	761
Referral services	1.8	-0.2	0.7	-0.063	0.80	-0.3	0.7	789	761
Transportation	3.5	0.2	1.0	0.043	0.80	0.1	0.9	789	761
Health	3.0	0.3	0.9	0.064	0.72	0.3	0.9	789	761
Any other services	3.9	0.3	1.0	0.047	0.76	0.0	1.0	789	761

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Enrolling parent's engagement with VR services (from state VR agency data)									
Applied for VR services since RA	2.5	0.5	0.8	0.120	0.50	0.6	0.8	862	868
Received VR services since RA	1.2	1.0	0.6	0.378	0.10	0.9	0.6	862	868

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless noted otherwise.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

^aThese services were required of the PROMISE programs. With the exception of parent training and information on youth's disability, we asked more detailed questions about providers of these services in the PROMISE 18-month survey than providers of other support services. The outcome measures related to key support services presented in this table reflect all required services except parent training and information on youth's disability.

*/**/** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12f.9. WI PROMISE: Impacts on parents' education and training (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	27.7	0.1	2.3	0.004	0.95	-0.3	2.3	785	760
Supplementary outcomes									
Highest educational attainment by either parent at the time of the survey									
Not a high school graduate	22.4	-1.9	2.0	-0.069	0.31	-2.3	2.1	803	767
High school diploma or GED	35.8	-3.0	2.4	-0.080		-2.8	2.4	803	767
Some post-secondary education	18.9	2.9	2.1	0.110		2.8	2.0	803	767
College degree	19.7	1.9	2.0	0.072		1.6	2.0	803	767
Some post-graduate degree	2.3	-0.6	0.7	-0.173		-0.4	0.7	803	767
Missing	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.307		1.2	0.6	803	767
Either parent was enrolled in education or job skills training at the time of the survey	8.9	1.7	1.5	0.115	0.26	1.4	1.5	783	761
Either parent received a diploma, GED, certificate of completion, or professional license since RA	10.3	-0.9	1.5	-0.064	0.54	-0.8	1.5	789	762

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test. The p-value for a multinomial categorical variable, which we present in the row for the first category, is based on a chi-square test across all categories.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level. For multinomial categorical variables, this reflects a joint test for the differences across all categories, which is presented in the row for the first category.

Table A.12f.10. WI PROMISE: Impacts on parents' employment and earnings (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Either parent was employed since RA	57.7	3.8	2.5	0.095	0.13	4.2*	2.5	788	758
Supplementary outcomes									
Either parent was employed in the month before the survey	52.7	5.3**	2.5	0.131	0.03	6.2**	2.5	789	758
Parents' earnings from all jobs in the month before the survey (\$)	930	208***	71	0.151	0.00	231***	73	787	755
Parents' earnings in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	17,350	65	512	0.003	0.90	57	896	917	914
Either parent was offered health insurance through a job held in the month before the survey	26.3	-0.2	2.2	-0.005	0.94	0.4	2.3	789	758

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/**Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

Table A.12f.11. WI PROMISE: Impacts on parents' economic well-being (percentage unless otherwise noted)

	Control mean	Regression adjusted impact	Regression adjusted standard error	Regression adjusted effect size	Regression adjusted p-value	Unadjusted impact	Unadjusted standard error	Treatment group sample size	Control group sample size
Primary outcome									
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	20,160	-74	523	-0.004	0.89	-81	848	917	914
Supplementary outcomes									
Parents' SSA payments in 18-month period since RA (from SSA data)									
Received any SSA payments	31.6	-2.0	2.1	-0.056	0.35	-2.3	2.2	917	914
Total SSA payments (\$)	4,447	-201	333	-0.028	0.55	-225	333	917	914
SSI payments (\$)	2,022	-115	208	-0.025	0.58	-151	210	917	914
OASDI payments (\$)	2,425	-86	267	-0.015	0.75	-74	265	917	914
Type of SSA payments received									
SSI only	13.3	-1.3	1.5	-0.071	0.57	-1.7	1.5	917	914
SSI and OASDI	8.0	0.7	1.3	0.058		0.6	1.3	917	914
OASDI only	10.3	-1.4	1.4	-0.095		-1.2	1.4	917	914
None	68.4	1.9	2.1	0.055		2.3	2.2	917	914
Either parent had health insurance at the time of the survey	93.0	1.3	1.3	0.130	0.32	0.7	1.3	756	730
Medicaid enrollment and payments since RA (from state Medicaid program data)									
Enrolled in Medicaid	86.9	0.5	1.5	0.025	0.76	0.1	1.6	862	868
Enrolled in Medicaid comprehensive managed care	58.2	3.8*	2.3	0.097	0.10	3.5	2.4	862	868
Enrolled in Medicaid 1915(c) waiver	2.2	0.5	0.7	0.120	0.53	0.4	0.7	862	868
Total Medicaid payments (\$)	7,724	270	534	0.024	0.61	232	531	862	868

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey unless otherwise noted.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and both the regression-adjusted and unadjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE. The implied means for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. For the adjusted estimates, we used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For the unadjusted estimates, we only include an indicator for being assigned to the treatment group in the regression model. Reported effect sizes are calculated as Hedges' g for continuous outcomes and Cox's Index for binary or categorical outcomes. We report heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors (White 1980). For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse. The p-value for a continuous or binary variable is based on a two-tailed t-test.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

VIII. IMPACT ESTIMATES FOR SUBGROUPS

To understand whether the PROMISE programs had different impacts on different types of youth, we estimated impacts for several subgroups. In order to limit the statistical problem of multiple comparisons (Schochet 2008), we estimated subgroup impacts on primary outcome measures only and restricted the number of subgroups examined. For each PROMISE program, we identified three sets of subgroups defined by the following characteristics of the youth when they enrolled in PROMISE: sex (females versus males); age (youth age 14 and 15 versus age 16); and primary impairment (intellectual or developmental disabilities, other mental impairments, and other disabilities). For the ASPIRE program, we also analyzed three state subgroups: Arizona; Colorado; and the remaining four states in the consortium (Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Utah).

We created an indicator variable for each subgroup. When comparing impacts for a set of subgroups, we ran multivariate regressions that included an indicator for each of the relevant subgroups as well as interaction between the subgroup indicators and the treatment indicator. For example, to analyze program impacts on two comparison subgroups, we estimated:

$$Y_i = \beta_1 Treatment_i * Subgroup1_i + \beta_2 Treatment_i * Subgroup2_i + \beta_3 Subgroup1_i + \beta_4 Subgroup2_i + \lambda X_i + \epsilon_i$$

where i denotes the individual observation, $Subgroup1_i$ and $Subgroup2_i$ denote the indicators for each of the comparison subgroups, $Treatment_i$ denotes the indicator for assignment to the treatment group, X_i denotes the vector of covariates, and ϵ_i denotes the error term. β_1 and β_2 are the parameters of primary interest because they denote the estimated program impact for each of the respective subgroups. We used two-sided t -tests to determine whether the estimated program impact on each subgroup was statistically significantly different from zero. We also tested whether the estimated program impacts on the subgroups were significantly different from each other, using t -tests when examining two comparison subgroups and using chi-squared tests when examining three comparison subgroups.

Tables A.13 to A.16 present the subgroup impact estimates.

Table A.13a. Arkansas PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	80.2	15.5	0.00***	508	504	86.4	9.0	0.00***	274	247	0.04++
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	97.9	0.1	0.89	488	493	75.4	-3.3	0.40	261	225	0.39
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	14.2	38.1	0.00***	488	493	31.3	30.3	0.00***	261	226	0.13
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	49.6	0.4	0.45	414	413	49.6	0.4	0.60	232	191	1.00
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.7	-0.2	0.63	412	405	99.0	-1.7	0.19	230	188	0.27
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	96.6	-0.7	0.56	507	502	93.2	-2.6	0.30	266	238	0.50
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.1	0.6	0.50	559	597	96.4	-0.8	0.54	308	289	0.37
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	11,872	1,269	0.25	559	597	10,141	1,030	0.49	308	289	0.90
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,461	717	0.00***	486	492	8,547	1,388	0.00***	259	224	0.19
Family received any family support services since RA	39.9	25.5	0.00***	508	501	42.8	22.2	0.00***	269	246	0.54
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	20.9	2.3	0.38	506	504	20.5	0.3	0.93	271	245	0.66

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent was employed since RA	56.5	0.9	0.78	507	506	56.8	-3.1	0.47	271	245	0.46
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	19,464	413	0.52	568	598	18,337	371	0.67	315	292	0.97

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+ /++ /+++ Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.13b. ASPIRE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	87.0	8.9	0.00***	562	548	91.9	6.7	0.00***	250	235	0.42
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	96.7	-0.4	0.74	543	544	81.0	-7.6	0.05*	240	232	0.08+
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	15.6	2.9	0.20	541	542	24.3	8.3	0.03**	241	231	0.23
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	50.6	-1.1	0.06*	412	414	50.7	0.4	0.63	179	175	0.15
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.0	0.9	0.24	397	396	99.3	-3.8	0.05**	173	170	0.02++
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	99.3	-0.8	0.25	553	542	97.3	1.2	0.41	240	229	0.26
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	92.5	1.6	0.19	614	667	91.6	2.3	0.19	279	296	0.73
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	24,174	2,230	0.16	614	667	26,205	29	0.99	279	296	0.43
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,148	-18	0.94	540	542	7,428	255	0.47	239	230	0.51
Family received any support services since RA	46.3	15.8	0.00***	560	552	42.9	27.3	0.00***	248	233	0.03++
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	24.6	1.5	0.56	555	543	22.6	4.6	0.24	243	230	0.51

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent was employed since RA	58.7	-1.1	0.71	561	556	57.8	2.2	0.61	249	235	0.53
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	24,001	312	0.68	619	616	24,662	-1,892	0.14	280	272	0.13

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+ / + + / + + + Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.13c. CaPROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	89.8	5.9	0.00***	567	526	93.9	1.2	0.52	284	295	0.06+
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	99.2	-0.8	0.22	560	516	82.2	1.8	0.57	274	283	0.43
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	11.7	20.3	0.00***	558	516	21.2	18.5	0.00***	274	283	0.69
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.6	-0.6	0.34	390	349	46.8	1.5	0.11	207	183	0.07+
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.3	-1.6	0.07*	383	344	98.8	-0.3	0.82	201	179	0.35
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	100.0	-0.6	0.05*	565	523	97.7	1.6	0.10	280	295	0.03++
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	98.3	0.6	0.16	1,022	991	99.3	-0.2	0.62	519	549	0.17
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	22,449	-284	0.78	1,022	991	22,015	1,011	0.49	519	549	0.46
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,170	147	0.43	556	515	7,714	757	0.03**	272	283	0.12
Family received any family support services since RA	37.2	14.1	0.00***	562	520	44.2	12.8	0.00***	279	292	0.79

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	16.0	5.9	0.01**	564	523	17.2	3.4	0.30	282	297	0.54
Either parent was employed since RA	58.4	-1.7	0.57	566	524	49.9	5.9	0.15	282	296	0.13
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	24,100	1,117	0.11	855	839	24,266	-736	0.37	456	479	0.09+

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+/**/+ Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.13d. MD PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	89.4	5.8	0.00***	399	414	90.5	7.1	0.00***	394	362	0.62
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	97.3	-1.3	0.31	389	390	69.7	1.4	0.68	369	352	0.45
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	17.4	22.4	0.00***	387	389	27.1	14.2	0.00***	369	349	0.08+
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	49.1	-0.2	0.77	290	288	47.8	1.0	0.14	286	289	0.21
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.6	-1.7	0.06*	287	285	98.2	0.0	0.97	280	285	0.23
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.8	-1.0	0.25	395	411	97.5	-0.3	0.81	383	356	0.61
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.3	1.9	0.02**	471	491	98.5	-0.7	0.32	462	436	0.01++
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	26,760	2,937	0.23	471	491	22,806	2,333	0.32	462	436	0.86
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,465	817	0.00***	385	388	8,303	563	0.10*	367	350	0.56
Family received any family support services since RA	48.3	17.5	0.00***	395	412	46.9	13.8	0.00***	386	359	0.47

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	25.7	-1.2	0.69	397	411	21.3	3.5	0.25	385	358	0.27
Either parent was employed since RA	57.9	1.5	0.66	395	413	50.5	4.3	0.23	386	360	0.57
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	20,518	-273	0.72	449	466	20,476	-901	0.24	434	404	0.56

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+ / + + / + + + Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.13e. NYS PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	89.9	3.3	0.04**	611	598	94.9	1.4	0.43	268	272	0.43
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	98.6	-0.8	0.29	597	575	87.5	-1.9	0.53	256	263	0.74
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	21.5	4.4	0.07*	596	575	26.7	9.2	0.02**	256	262	0.31
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	49.7	-0.4	0.48	346	348	49.3	0.4	0.67	159	161	0.47
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.9	-0.2	0.80	344	344	97.0	1.3	0.44	150	159	0.43
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.7	0.4	0.54	613	593	98.9	-1.2	0.30	270	270	0.25
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	n.d.					n.d.					
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	n.d.					n.d.					
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,568	196	0.20	594	573	8,370	-197	0.45	254	261	0.20
Family received any family support services since RA	49.8	8.3	0.00***	613	590	49.3	7.0	0.10	267	273	0.80
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	19.1	4.3	0.07*	615	591	20.1	0.5	0.89	270	271	0.36
Either parent was employed since RA	48.2	1.9	0.49	614	591	43.0	-4.2	0.30	270	273	0.21

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	18,707	575	0.32	666	622	16,429	339	0.70	285	288	0.82

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test.

+ / + + / + + + Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.13f. WI PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by age

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	87.8	6.0	0.00***	538	492	93.2	3.4	0.06*	261	267	0.32
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	97.6	1.0	0.26	506	474	77.4	2.6	0.48	240	255	0.67
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	26.4	10.9	0.00***	505	474	38.5	12.9	0.00***	240	255	0.70
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.8	-0.1	0.84	403	390	48.8	0.2	0.85	201	202	0.78
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.3	-0.9	0.39	395	380	97.6	0.8	0.59	198	198	0.34
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.4	1.0	0.12	530	494	96.2	2.2	0.14	250	261	0.46
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	95.6	0.8	0.37	632	617	97.3	-1.1	0.31	317	329	0.17
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	11,284	-981	0.31	632	617	9,455	2,717	0.04**	317	329	0.03**
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,568	439	0.04**	502	471	8,383	587	0.08*	238	253	0.71
Family received any family support services since RA	48.6	14.0	0.00***	533	492	47.1	17.4	0.00***	260	267	0.51
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	27.0	0.8	0.77	531	494	29.0	-1.3	0.75	254	266	0.67

Outcome	Age 14 and 15					Age 16					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent was employed since RA	58.7	2.9	0.34	533	494	55.9	5.5	0.21	255	264	0.63
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	20,125	-358	0.58	609	596	20,227	493	0.58	308	318	0.44

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+ / + + / + + + Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.14a. Arkansas PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender

Outcome	Male					Female					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	82.6	12.6	0.00***	521	502	81.6	14.9	0.00***	261	249	0.49
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	90.6	-1.1	0.58	503	478	91.2	-2.9	0.30	246	240	0.59
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	19.4	35.3	0.00***	503	478	19.9	37.4	0.00***	246	241	0.67
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	49.5	0.5	0.37	430	401	49.7	0.3	0.74	216	203	0.84
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.3	-0.6	0.37	428	393	100.0	-0.9	0.17	214	200	0.80
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	95.1	-1.2	0.42	516	497	96.3	-2.0	0.29	257	243	0.71
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	95.5	0.5	0.62	581	585	97.6	-0.6	0.54	286	301	0.42
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	11,220	566	0.61	581	585	11,477	2,236	0.14	286	301	0.38
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,851	875	0.00***	501	476	7,711	1,226	0.00***	244	240	0.39
Family received any family support services since RA	41.9	22.5	0.00***	518	499	38.8	28.3	0.00***	259	248	0.27
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	20.7	1.7	0.52	517	502	21.0	1.3	0.71	260	247	0.94

Outcome	Male					Female					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent was employed since RA	58.2	0.1	0.99	518	503	53.3	-1.7	0.70	260	248	0.75
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	20,085	822	0.20	592	588	17,165	-570	0.51	291	302	0.20

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+/**/+++ Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.14b. ASPIRE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender

Outcome	Male					Female					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	88.8	7.8	0.00***	542	527	87.8	9.3	0.00***	270	256	0.59
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	91.2	-2.2	0.25	522	516	93.3	-4.6	0.07*	261	260	0.45
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	20.7	3.4	0.17	521	513	13.5	7.5	0.02**	261	260	0.31
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	50.2	-0.2	0.73	390	391	51.4	-1.5	0.10*	201	198	0.22
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.4	0.3	0.74	377	375	98.5	-1.9	0.25	193	191	0.25
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.9	-0.2	0.71	530	517	98.3	-0.0	0.99	263	254	0.86
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	92.4	1.5	0.23	591	655	91.9	2.5	0.14	302	308	0.63
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	24,509	-458	0.77	591	655	25,414	5,603	0.02**	302	308	0.03**
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,403	141	0.57	520	512	6,885	-73	0.77	260	260	0.53
Family received any support services since RA	45.5	22.9	0.00***	538	528	45.0	12.0	0.01***	270	257	0.04**
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	23.6	2.1	0.43	534	518	25.0	3.2	0.41	264	255	0.82

Outcome	Male					Female					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent was employed since RA	59.3	-1.5	0.61	540	530	56.8	3.0	0.47	270	261	0.37
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	24,219	-233	0.77	595	601	24,170	-656	0.56	304	287	0.75

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+/**/** Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.14c. CaPROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender

Outcome	Male					Female					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	91.5	4.5	0.00***	592	543	90.8	3.8	0.09*	259	278	0.80
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	93.2	0.2	0.89	572	524	93.3	1.1	0.61	262	275	0.74
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	14.3	21.4	0.00***	570	524	16.5	15.3	0.00***	262	275	0.18
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.4	-0.6	0.36	410	350	47.3	1.5	0.11	187	182	0.07+
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the	99.4	-1.8	0.04**	404	342	98.7	0.1	0.92	180	181	0.21
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	99.1	0.1	0.82	585	538	99.3	0.3	0.61	260	280	0.82
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	98.4	0.3	0.40	1,049	1,027	99.2	0.2	0.55	492	513	0.87
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	21,226	389	0.69	1,049	1,027	24,433	-320	0.84	492	513	0.70
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,462	155	0.47	567	524	7,168	688	0.01**	260	274	0.12
Family received any family support services since RA	41.3	10.8	0.00***	583	538	36.6	19.3	0.00***	258	274	0.11

Outcome	Male					Female					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	16.9	3.9	0.10	584	540	15.5	7.5	0.03**	262	280	0.38
Either parent was employed since RA	55.9	-0.9	0.76	587	540	54.3	5.2	0.22	261	280	0.24
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	24,289	71	0.91	894	881	23,900	1,277	0.17	417	437	0.28

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test.

+/**/** Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.14d. MD PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender

Outcome	Male					Female					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	90.4	5.1	0.00***	530	486	89.0	9.2	0.00***	263	290	0.11
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	86.2	-3.1	0.19	507	463	80.6	4.2	0.19	251	279	0.07+
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	19.8	18.2	0.00***	504	462	25.8	19.3	0.00***	252	276	0.83
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.1	0.1	0.90	368	356	48.9	1.0	0.23	208	221	0.36
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.8	-1.2	0.22	362	350	99.1	-0.0	0.96	205	220	0.37
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.2	-1.0	0.28	522	483	98.3	-0.2	0.87	256	284	0.58
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.6	1.4	0.06*	626	590	98.5	-0.6	0.41	307	337	0.06+
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	24,311	3,170	0.13	626	590	25,932	1,256	0.66	307	337	0.59
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,895	643	0.02**	503	461	7,815	827	0.02**	250	277	0.69
Family received any family support services since RA	48.1	17.4	0.00***	523	484	46.9	12.1	0.00***	258	287	0.31

Outcome	Male					Female					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	23.3	-0.2	0.95	526	482	24.3	3.2	0.39	256	287	0.46
Either parent was employed since RA	54.3	0.4	0.89	524	485	54.8	6.9	0.09*	257	288	0.21
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	20,210	287	0.67	594	551	20,996	-2,120	0.02**	289	319	0.03++

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+/**/+++ Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.14e. NYS PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender

Outcome	Male					Female					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	91.6	3.0	0.04**	600	577	91.1	1.8	0.43	279	293	0.65
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	94.9	-1.5	0.27	581	566	95.6	0.9	0.58	272	272	0.26
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	24.0	4.8	0.06*	580	565	21.3	7.7	0.04**	272	272	0.51
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	49.1	0.1	0.88	336	345	50.4	-0.7	0.47	169	164	0.49
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	97.4	0.8	0.43	330	340	100.0	-0.5	0.46	164	163	0.32
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.6	0.0	0.97	603	576	99.0	-0.3	0.74	280	287	0.77
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	n.d.					n.d.					
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	n.d.					n.d.					
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,724	75	0.65	577	564	8,020	45	0.84	270	271	0.92
Family received any family support services since RA	47.6	9.8	0.00***	602	573	53.7	4.0	0.33	278	290	0.25
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	19.8	2.9	0.21	604	571	18.7	3.5	0.30	281	291	0.89
Either parent was employed since RA	47.3	-1.4	0.60	604	574	45.2	3.2	0.42	280	290	0.33

Outcome	Male					Female					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	18,717	585	0.31	651	608	16,514	352	0.68	300	302	0.82

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed *t*-test.

+ / + + / + + + Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.14f. WI PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by gender

Outcome	Male					Female					<i>p</i> -value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	<i>p</i> -value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	90.9	3.6	0.02**	535	503	87.3	7.6	0.00***	264	256	0.17
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	91.0	1.7	0.34	490	484	89.8	2.5	0.31	256	245	0.78
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	32.7	11.2	0.00***	489	484	26.6	11.3	0.01***	256	245	0.99
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.0	0.3	0.62	392	382	50.1	-0.6	0.44	212	210	0.36
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.1	0.2	0.85	385	374	98.0	-1.2	0.46	208	204	0.46
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	97.8	1.2	0.14	519	500	97.3	1.8	0.10	261	255	0.63
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.0	0.7	0.39	636	631	96.4	-1.0	0.46	313	315	0.28
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	8,658	1,326	0.11	636	631	14,636	-1,816	0.27	313	315	0.09+
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,903	563	0.01**	486	480	7,752	292	0.32	254	244	0.47
Family received any family support services since RA	50.5	16.5	0.00***	530	504	43.2	12.5	0.00***	263	255	0.46
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	29.3	-0.8	0.77	525	502	24.6	2.1	0.58	260	258	0.53

Outcome	Male					Female					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Either parent was employed since RA	58.3	3.4	0.26	526	502	56.5	4.4	0.30	262	256	0.85
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	20,250	89	0.89	615	612	19,978	-404	0.67	302	302	0.66

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+/**/+++ Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.15a. Arkansas PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	86.3	10.0	0.00***	340	321	79.8	15.9	0.00***	342	328	78.2	15.7	0.00***	100	102	0.18
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	94.1	-3.4	0.10	331	307	87.5	-0.8	0.76	322	313	91.6	1.0	0.79	96	98	0.53
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	14.7	40.1	0.00***	331	308	22.4	34.7	0.00***	322	313	25.2	27.5	0.00***	96	98	0.21
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	49.4	0.3	0.73	278	253	49.3	0.9	0.20	290	270	50.7	-0.8	0.49	78	81	0.44
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.2	0.0	0.96	275	249	99.6	-1.7	0.07*	289	263	100.0	0.1	0.49	78	81	0.17
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	95.9	-1.1	0.51	338	316	95.3	-3.2	0.08*	335	324	94.8	3.4	0.20	100	100	0.13
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.1	0.1	0.92	374	365	96.1	-0.1	0.90	382	399	96.8	1.0	0.59	111	122	0.87
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	8,283	2,807	0.03**	374	365	12,325	-287	0.82	382	399	17,027	6	1.00	111	122	0.23

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,684	847	0.00***	329	307	7,847	1,244	0.00***	321	312	8,022	601	0.24	96	98	0.54
Family received any support services since RA	40.5	29.0	0.00***	339	316	41.3	23.1	0.00***	337	329	40.3	14.0	0.04**	101	102	0.15
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	19.4	2.9	0.36	339	317	20.3	0.5	0.88	338	330	26.6	0.5	0.94	100	102	0.85
Either parent was employed since RA	58.3	-0.5	0.90	339	318	55.5	-0.3	0.94	339	331	54.9	-1.2	0.86	100	102	0.99
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	20,536	749	0.35	375	366	16,984	-22	0.97	394	403	21,760	357	0.84	114	121	0.77

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of Arkansas PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+/**/+++ Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is jointly significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.15b. ASPIRE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment

Outcome	Intellectual disability					Other mental disability					Non mental disability					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	91.0	5.3	0.00***	379	341	88.8	8.5	0.00***	210	242	83.8	13.4	0.00***	223	200	0.06+
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	93.4	-3.6	0.09*	366	336	90.0	-3.3	0.31	200	236	91.7	-1.6	0.57	217	204	0.84
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	14.9	1.4	0.61	365	335	24.9	8.0	0.07*	200	234	16.0	6.9	0.06*	217	204	0.31
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	50.2	-0.6	0.46	279	253	50.2	-0.8	0.33	162	196	51.9	-0.6	0.55	150	140	0.97
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.1	-1.8	0.13	268	242	97.4	1.5	0.27	157	189	98.5	-0.9	0.58	145	135	0.18
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.5	-1.7	0.13	371	333	98.3	1.8	0.04**	207	238	99.4	0.2	0.75	215	200	0.04++
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	90.8	2.2	0.18	413	420	92.4	3.2	0.05*	235	298	93.9	0.7	0.70	245	245	0.61
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	24,594	917	0.59	413	420	17,601	3,164	0.14	235	298	33,904	1,518	0.64	245	245	0.71

Outcome	Intellectual disability					Other mental disability					Non mental disability					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	6,990	106	0.68	365	335	7,570	355	0.39	198	234	7,231	-299	0.45	216	203	0.52
Family received any support services since RA	45.8	16.5	0.00***	375	340	46.5	23.2	0.00***	209	240	43.0	20.2	0.00***	224	205	0.50
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	24.8	1.8	0.57	374	334	24.9	-0.4	0.92	207	238	21.6	6.6	0.11	217	201	0.47
Either parent was employed since RA	59.0	-2.6	0.47	376	342	57.1	-1.8	0.70	210	242	59.3	6.0	0.19	224	207	0.31
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	24,327	-664	0.48	414	392	22,622	-1,222	0.28	242	268	25,850	949	0.52	243	228	0.44

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+ / + + / + + + Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is jointly significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.15c. CaPROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	93.0	2.1	0.21	395	400	90.8	6.3	0.01**	212	182	88.6	6.3	0.01**	244	239	0.25
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	94.2	-0.4	0.79	388	398	90.4	0.5	0.86	206	171	93.8	1.7	0.43	240	230	0.74
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	14.8	16.9	0.00***	387	397	17.8	23.5	0.00***	205	172	13.4	20.5	0.00***	240	230	0.44
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	47.9	-0.2	0.83	261	264	48.2	-0.5	0.61	180	131	48.1	1.2	0.19	156	137	0.40
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.2	-2.6	0.04**	255	261	100.0	-0.6	0.24	176	127	98.2	0.9	0.55	153	135	0.18
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.5	0.8	0.28	395	400	99.5	-0.5	0.59	207	181	100.0	-0.4	0.33	243	237	0.35
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	98.7	0.3	0.53	736	736	97.9	0.8	0.29	370	357	99.1	-0.0	1.00	435	447	0.68
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	19,949	460	0.62	736	736	20,578	440	0.76	370	357	27,527	-723	0.74	435	447	0.87
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,294	572	0.01***	385	397	7,489	176	0.68	204	172	7,380	110	0.72	239	230	0.41

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Family received any support services since RA	38.3	15.6	0.00***	391	395	37.5	21.2	0.00***	209	182	43.9	4.0	0.38	241	235	0.03++
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	17.6	1.2	0.65	394	401	18.4	8.6	0.04**	208	182	13.0	8.4	0.02**	244	237	0.17
Either parent was employed since RA	56.2	-0.6	0.87	394	401	50.6	6.8	0.18	210	182	57.6	-1.4	0.76	244	237	0.41
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	24,116	574	0.46	615	625	19,620	968	0.32	345	323	28,199	-179	0.87	351	370	0.73

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of CaPROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+ /++ /+++ Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is jointly significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.15d. MD PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	93.2	3.9	0.03**	297	293	89.0	7.3	0.00***	380	364	84.8	10.6	0.01***	116	119	0.19
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	86.9	-0.4	0.89	286	285	80.5	-2.3	0.45	364	339	87.9	4.9	0.21	108	118	0.34
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	15.0	20.2	0.00***	284	284	27.9	18.0	0.00***	365	337	21.6	17.0	0.00***	107	117	0.87
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.3	-0.1	0.89	195	209	48.3	0.4	0.51	301	290	49.1	1.6	0.20	80	78	0.52
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	99.0	-1.1	0.39	192	205	98.6	-0.5	0.66	296	286	100.0	-1.4	0.32	79	79	0.86
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.6	-1.0	0.36	292	290	97.8	-0.5	0.67	373	359	98.4	-0.8	0.67	113	118	0.94
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	98.0	-0.0	0.99	340	340	97.0	0.9	0.28	451	441	96.5	1.7	0.28	142	146	0.56
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	20,041	5,449	0.02**	340	340	26,414	-3,696	0.07*	451	441	31,646	15,092	0.03**	142	146	0.00+++
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,800	320	0.38	284	284	8,117	957	0.00***	362	337	7,281	855	0.12	107	117	0.41

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Family received any support services since RA	49.0	16.6	0.00***	293	289	47.6	16.3	0.00***	374	363	44.7	10.8	0.10	114	119	0.72
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	24.3	-1.4	0.70	293	289	21.3	4.0	0.19	376	360	29.6	-3.1	0.59	113	120	0.39
Either parent was employed since RA	53.7	7.0	0.08*	294	290	53.1	2.3	0.52	373	363	60.7	-6.9	0.27	114	120	0.18
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	20,603	112	0.90	323	313	19,018	-438	0.55	424	419	24,754	-2,371	0.09*	136	138	0.32

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of MD PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+ / + + / + + + Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is jointly significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.15e. NYS PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	92.2	3.8	0.01**	500	499	90.7	3.3	0.20	228	210	90.0	-2.1	0.56	151	161	0.32
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	96.8	-1.1	0.34	492	481	91.2	-0.7	0.82	213	203	95.4	0.5	0.85	148	154	0.83
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	19.3	4.8	0.07*	491	481	33.6	12.2	0.01***	213	202	20.4	-1.2	0.79	148	154	0.12
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.9	0.1	0.93	278	278	49.8	0.3	0.78	159	147	51.1	-1.9	0.15	68	84	0.37
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	97.2	1.1	0.36	267	274	99.3	-0.0	1.00	159	145	100.0	-1.5	0.31	68	84	0.39
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	98.8	-0.2	0.73	506	496	98.6	0.2	0.85	226	210	98.7	0.1	0.95	151	157	0.93
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	n.d.					n.d.					n.d.					
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	n.d.					n.d.					n.d.					
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,786	-36	0.81	489	480	7,994	395	0.24	211	202	7,674	-100	0.72	147	153	0.46

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Family received any support services since RA	53.8	1.1	0.73	503	494	41.1	23.4	0.00***	227	210	48.5	7.6	0.18	150	159	0.00+++
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	19.1	2.7	0.28	505	494	20.3	6.3	0.11	229	211	19.2	-0.8	0.85	151	157	0.48
Either parent was employed since RA	43.0	3.2	0.29	505	497	50.5	-5.4	0.22	228	209	52.4	-1.9	0.73	151	158	0.25
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	17,435	773	0.23	540	517	17,820	-479	0.58	257	239	20,093	1,164	0.32	154	154	0.40

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of NYS PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

n.d. = no data available.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+/**/+++ Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is jointly significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.15f. WI PROMISE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by primary impairment

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	92.2	4.3	0.02**	318	292	88.4	5.7	0.01***	335	345	87.9	5.0	0.15	146	122	0.89
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	93.5	2.0	0.28	298	286	87.8	0.7	0.79	304	331	91.9	4.6	0.13	144	112	0.62
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	22.1	12.9	0.00***	297	286	38.5	10.5	0.01***	304	331	28.1	9.2	0.11	144	112	0.83
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	48.8	-0.8	0.30	233	221	48.6	0.2	0.77	263	286	49.3	1.1	0.38	108	85	0.38
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.2	-0.8	0.56	229	217	97.5	1.2	0.33	258	279	100.0	-3.2	0.07*	106	82	0.12
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	97.3	2.1	0.05**	308	292	97.4	1.3	0.24	326	342	99.1	0.2	0.88	146	121	0.49
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	96.8	-0.1	0.90	365	360	95.7	1.2	0.22	406	429	96.0	-2.0	0.25	178	157	0.26
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	8,367	195	0.86	365	360	10,489	632	0.58	406	429	16,314	-463	0.85	178	157	0.91
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	7,655	478	0.06*	296	284	8,099	600	0.04**	301	328	7,595	148	0.75	144	112	0.71

Outcome	Intellectual or developmental disability					Other mental impairment					Other impairment					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Family received any support services since RA	47.2	17.5	0.00***	314	290	47.9	14.1	0.00***	333	348	50.4	13.3	0.02**	146	121	0.77
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	23.5	0.8	0.83	311	292	32.5	-1.2	0.75	327	345	23.9	2.2	0.68	147	123	0.86
Either parent was employed since RA	53.4	6.5	0.11	313	292	59.3	1.5	0.68	328	344	62.9	3.8	0.52	147	122	0.67
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data)	19,145	945	0.25	351	347	18,864	-485	0.52	401	420	26,259	-1,291	0.37	165	147	0.29

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of WI PROMISE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+ / + + / + + + Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is jointly significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

Table A.16. ASPIRE: Impact estimates on primary outcomes, by ASPIRE region

Outcome	ASPIRE Arizona					ASPIRE Colorado					ASPIRE other states					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Youth received any transition services since RA	87.3	8.1	0.00***	411	388	91.3	7.7	0.00***	175	174	88.3	9.0	0.00***	226	221	0.93
Youth enrolled in school at the time of the survey	92.8	-3.6	0.08*	398	388	93.5	-0.4	0.89	171	172	89.1	-3.8	0.22	214	216	0.60
Youth ever employed in a paid job since RA	12.2	6.0	0.02**	398	387	23.1	3.8	0.39	169	171	24.9	3.5	0.41	215	215	0.83
Youth self-determination score at the time of the survey (scale: 0 to 100)	49.9	-0.1	0.86	304	295	51.0	-0.7	0.47	133	132	51.4	-1.5	0.10*	154	162	0.49
Youth expected to complete high school or GED at the time of the survey	98.5	0.4	0.69	294	283	97.8	-0.1	0.95	126	127	98.8	-2.2	0.18	150	156	0.39
Youth had health insurance at the time of the survey	99.2	-1.6	0.06*	406	386	98.9	0.5	0.62	171	172	97.6	1.6	0.19	216	213	0.06+
Percentage of months youth enrolled in Medicaid since RA	92.8	1.9	0.18	436	469	96.9	-0.1	0.97	198	211	87.2	4.1	0.06*	259	283	0.27
Youth total Medicaid expenditures since RA (\$)	27,409	611	0.67	436	469	23,460	88	0.98	198	211	21,470	4,254	0.12	259	283	0.48
Youth total income (earnings and SSA payments) in the year before the survey (\$)	6,704	372	0.11	397	387	7,981	-388	0.44	170	171	7,552	-90	0.80	213	214	0.27

Outcome	ASPIRE Arizona					ASPIRE Colorado					ASPIRE other states					p-value for subgroup difference
	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	Control mean	Impact	p-value	Treatment group size	Control group size	
Family received any support services since RA	45.0	14.0	0.00***	407	392	49.4	10.6	0.05**	174	172	42.7	34.5	0.00***	227	221	0.00+++
Either parent received any education or job skills training since RA	22.9	4.7	0.12	406	387	28.3	-7.3	0.11	172	171	22.6	6.0	0.14	220	215	0.05+
Either parent was employed since RA	53.6	4.1	0.24	408	395	60.4	-5.2	0.33	175	174	65.1	-2.9	0.51	227	222	0.25
Parents' total income in the calendar year after RA (from SSA data) (\$)	22,194	1,779	0.06*	423	419	25,953	-1,402	0.26	198	197	26,031	-2,903	0.02**	278	272	0.01+++

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey; SSA administrative records; state Medicaid data.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group in each subgroup, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of ASPIRE for the particular subgroup. The adjusted mean for the treatment group in each subgroup can be calculated by adding the impact estimate for that subgroup to the observed mean for the control group in that subgroup. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. For outcomes measured with data from the PROMISE 18-month survey, we weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/*** Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test.

+ /++ /+++ Difference in impact estimates across subgroups is jointly significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a chi-squared test.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

IX. IMPACTS ON SERVICE HOURS BY SCHOOL AND NONSCHOOL PROVIDERS

We suspect that the survey data used to develop the measures of hours of key services received by the youth and their families—total hours of key transition services received by youth and total hours of key support services received by their family members—might overestimate the hours of key services received from school-based providers. Because the use of school and nonschool-based providers likely differ systematically between the treatment and control group, the mismeasurement might bias the impact estimates for key service hours. To explore this issue further, we disaggregated the measures of youth and family key service hours into those delivered by school- versus nonschool-based providers and assessed the impacts on these disaggregated measures. In this chapter, we provide background on how the key service hour information was collected in the survey, why we believe there is a mismeasurement issue, and why the mismeasurement may bias the key service hour impact estimates.

The 18-month parent survey collected information about the providers of key transition services that youth received and the providers of key support services that family members received during the 18-month follow-up period. We used this information to calculate total hours of services received by the youth and their families. We used the following information about the extent to which the youth (or family member) interacted with each provider of key services identified by respondents:

- “Since [random assignment date], how many months did [youth/family member] go to [provider]?” Response options ranged from 1 to 18.
- “Since [random assignment date], when [youth/family member] saw [provider], about how often did [he/she] go?” Response options were every day, more than once a week, weekly, more than once a month, about once a month, and less than once a month.
- “On average, how long was each meeting or session?” Response options were less than an hour, about one hour, about two hours, about three hours, about four hours, or more than four hours per meeting.

We calculated total hours of key service receipt in two steps. First, for each provider, we calculated the total hours of key services received from this provider as the product of the number of months the enrollee saw that provider, the frequency per month, and the hours spent per session. We then calculated the total hours of the youth or family’s key services by summing the hours across all the providers of key transition or support services.

We suspect that some survey respondents may have provided us estimates of their total time spent with a provider rather than the time spent receiving the key services as queried by the survey. The potential for this type of mismeasurement is likely to be trivial for most types of providers, but it might be significant for school-based services. If the youth received key transition services from a school where he or she also received regular schooling, the parent respondent might have provided estimates of how often the youth went to school and how long the youth spent at school or in special education classes each day, which would be significantly

longer than the time spent receiving the specific key transition services queried.¹⁷ Such mismeasurement would result in the service intensity measure overestimating the hours of the youth's key service receipt. A similar issue could have arisen in our measure of the intensity of the family's key service receipt if a family member received key support services at a college or school where he or she also received regular schooling.

This potential measurement error could have biased our estimates of impacts on youth's total hours of key transition services if receipt of school-based key transition services was systematically different between treatment and control group youth. This might be the case if PROMISE services crowded out school-based key services for treatment group youth, resulting in a smaller proportion of treatment group youth receiving key services from school-based providers. Because of the mismeasurement issue, school-based key service hours for control group youth would be inflated disproportionately relative to treatment group youth, thus biasing the total key service hour estimates. Because we cannot rule out such a possibility, we cannot definitively claim that the impact estimates on total key service hours are unbiased. If they are biased, we believe they would be biased downwards.

To explore this issue further, we estimated the impacts on the disaggregated measures of youth and family key service hours. The results for youth shown in Table A.17 suggest that two programs, Arkansas PROMISE and WI PROMISE, likely increased the hours of key transition services youth received from nonschool service providers. Also, at least one program, MD PROMISE, may have reduced the hours of key transition services received from school-based providers, suggesting some substitution of school-based key services with PROMISE services. For parents and families, no program had any impact on the separate measures of hours of key support services received from school- and nonschool-based providers.

The analysis suggests that mismeasurement might be affecting our key service hour impact estimates for youth, but we cannot base our conclusion about the impacts of PROMISE on youth key service hours on nonschool key services alone because the exclusion of school- and college-based providers would foil our random assignment design. For example, if being assigned to the treatment group caused more youth in that group to seek and receive key services from nonschool providers, which are not susceptible to the mismeasurement problem, then a nonschool measure of key service receipt would systematically exclude a greater proportion of key service providers for the control group than for the treatment group, thus creating upward bias in our estimates of differences in key service hours. We consider the results of the disaggregated key service hour measures as suggestive evidence of program impacts on key service intensity.

¹⁷ The survey did not ask about the frequency and duration of each type of service delivered during the school day because it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for parents to accurately report that information.

Table A.17. Impact on youth's and parents' receipt of key services from school- and nonschool-based providers

	Control mean	Difference	p-value
Arkansas PROMISE			
Hours of key transition services youth received from nonschool providers since RA	39.9	50.3	0.00***
Hours of key transition services youth received from school providers since RA	221.9	-26.5	0.36
Hours of key support services family received from noncollege providers since RA	35.2	4.9	0.63
Hours of key support services family received from college providers since RA	5.6	4.8	0.38
ASPIRE			
Hours of key transition services youth received from nonschool providers since RA	71.4	1.1	0.94
Hours of key transition services youth received from school providers since RA	339.9	-11.2	0.76
Hours of key support services family received from noncollege providers since RA	26.8	13.8	0.17
Hours of key support services family received from college providers since RA	13.9	-3.8	0.60
California PROMISE			
Hours of key transition services youth received from nonschool providers since RA	47.4	1.2	0.92
Hours of key transition services youth received from school providers since RA	234.8	47.5	0.12
Hours of key support services family received from noncollege providers since RA	22.7	2.6	0.74
Hours of key support services family received from college providers since RA	3.2	3.5	0.45
Maryland PROMISE			
Hours of key transition services youth received from nonschool providers since RA	82.5	14.3	0.43
Hours of key transition services youth received from school providers since RA	352.3	-94.3	0.00***
Hours of key support services family received from noncollege providers since RA	49.2	-15.7	0.18
Hours of key support services family received from college providers since RA	8.1	-5.1	0.30
New York State PROMISE			
Hours of key transition services youth received from nonschool providers since RA	80.2	-0.3	0.99
Hours of key transition services youth received from school providers since RA	335.3	-37.7	0.25
Hours of key support services family received from noncollege providers since RA	23.4	-3.4	0.64
Hours of key support services family received from college providers since RA	6.9	-0.2	0.97
Wisconsin PROMISE			
Hours of key transition services youth received from nonschool providers since RA	41.5	25.7	0.05**
Hours of key transition services youth received from school providers since RA	301.1	-23.0	0.48
Hours of key support services family received from noncollege providers since RA	37.4	-14.0	0.14
Hours of key support services family received from college providers since RA	7.2	1.4	0.76

Source: PROMISE 18-month survey.

Note: This table shows the observed means for the control group, which is our estimate of the counterfactual, and the regression-adjusted impact estimates of the six PROMISE programs (see Chapter II, Section A). The adjusted mean for the treatment group can be calculated by adding the impact estimate to the observed mean for the control group. We used baseline characteristics as explanatory variables in the regression model. We weighted statistics to adjust for survey nonresponse.

*/**/***Impact estimate is significantly different from zero at the .10/.05/.01 level using a two-tailed t-test

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

X. COST ANALYSIS METHODS AND ESTIMATES

As discussed in Chapter II, Section B of the report, the PROMISE cost analysis produced estimates of the economic cost to implement each PROMISE program, including the costs not directly incurred by the program, such as volunteer labor and donated facilities or supplies. In this appendix, we present four tables that provide additional details about the cost analysis. Table A.18 describes the seven-step analytic framework we used for the cost analysis. Tables A.19 and A.20 present the definitions of input categories and program components used in the cost analysis, respectively. Table A.21 shows the 12-month cost accounting period over which program activity log data were collected as well as the corresponding sample size of staff who provided the activity log data for each PROMISE program. Tables A.22a to A.22f present the detailed estimates from the cost analysis, including those by input category and program component.

Table A.18. PROMISE program cost analytic framework

Analysis step	Explanation of step
1. Identify program cost components	We identified the program service components (e.g., employment services, education services, and case management services) and program administration components (e.g., training and technical assistance) for the cost analysis. For these components, we included services delivered to enrollees directly by program staff, services delivered by contractors, and program services delivered through formal but nonmonetary agreements between the lead agency and other organizations.
2. Collect and classify cost data	<p>We collected information about the costs associated with delivering the program components; that is, the cost of inputs (such as staff, office space, and purchased services) required to provide the components identified in Step 1. Data collection procedures involved working with program staff to obtain relevant financial documents and conducting interviews with the program's financial administrator, program staff, and others involved in the demonstration about costs and additional services that enrollees may have received. Data collection also included the administration of staff activity logs reflective of two, one-week periods during which staff documented their time spent performing work within each of the program's service and administration components.</p> <p>We assigned program costs to four overarching input cost categories: (1) personnel or labor costs of program employees, including wages and fringe benefits, (2) other direct costs of providing services to enrollees (payments made directly to enrollees or made to purchase services on behalf of enrollees), (3) indirect costs (e.g., administrative costs and overhead costs such as rent and internet service), and (4) costs of donated goods and services (e.g., volunteer labor and donated office space).</p>
3. Assess costs for a steady-state period	We assessed costs for a twelve-month accounting period of relatively steady-state program operations. This period was generally free of costs associated with (a) planning for the program's implementation, (b) recruiting and enrolling program participants, and (c) closing down the program. Thus, the costs incurred during this period reflected the costs of operating a steady-state program.
4. Determine the market value of resources used	For donated goods and services for which no internal program valuations were available, we assigned dollar values equal to what it would have cost to purchase those resources on the open market. We obtained those values either through staff assessments or published data (such as data on average wages by labor category and average rental rates for office space).
5. Calculate total program cost	We compiled the information from the above steps to calculate the total cost of the program during the accounting period as well as the cost of each of the four input cost categories (labor, other direct costs, indirect costs, and costs of donated goods and services) identified in Step 2.
6. Calculate component costs	We assigned costs to the program service and administrative components identified in Step 1 following either of two approaches. (1) When the cost of a program input (for example, job coaching services) was clearly and exclusively related to a specific component, we allocated all of the item's costs to that component. (2) When the cost of a program input (for example, rent and utilities) was not clearly and exclusively related to a specific component, we used a formula based on the activities reported by staff members to allocate the costs across the relevant components. For each service or administrative component, we summed costs across all of the inputs pertaining to that component to obtain the component's total cost.
7. Calculate unit costs	We standardized the measure of total program cost from Step 5 by converting it to four measures of unit cost: the average cost per enrollee, the average cost per enrollee-month, the average cost per participant, and the average cost per participant-month. To do this, we combined the measure of total program cost with administrative data that identified (1) the number of youth and families who ever enrolled or participated, and (2) the average number of months that they were enrolled in the program (that is, from the date of their enrollment to the program end date). These unit cost measures facilitate comparisons across the PROMISE programs and may be valuable for planning similar interventions in the future.

Note: In Steps 1-3, "costs" refers to the resources used to operate a program. These resources may be measured in dollars or in other units, such as staff hours or square feet of office space. In Step 4, dollar valuations are applied to the resources used to obtain dollar-denominated measures of costs. In Steps 5-7, all costs are measured in dollars.

Table A.19. Input cost category definitions

Input category	Definition
Labor costs	Salaries and fringe benefits for direct employees of the PROMISE program
Other direct costs	Payments made directly to enrollees and services purchased on behalf of enrollees (including, most notably, services provided by organizations under contract to or otherwise formally affiliated with the PROMISE program)
Indirect costs	Costs of supports purchased to operate the program (e.g., office supplies, staff travel, equipment, rent and utility costs, and general administrative costs)
Costs of donated goods and services	Volunteered time, donated goods, and donated meeting spaces

Table A.20. Program component definitions

Program component	Definition
Direct services	
Case management services	Services that involve working with youth and families on issues not included in the other direct service categories, below, such as checking in, coordinating with other programs, providing life skills training, connecting youth to social and health services, and dealing with legal, transportation, or housing issues
Career services and work-based learning experiences	Services for youth and family members related to employment, including career counseling, finding jobs and volunteer activities, preparing resumes, talking with employers, job coaching, summer employment experiences, and other employment support activities
Education- and school-related services	Services for youth and family members related to secondary or postsecondary education and training, including transition meetings, individualized education program-related activities, education counseling, registration assistance, and education support services
Benefits counseling and financial literacy training services	Services that involve working with or on behalf of youth and families regarding benefits (such as SSI, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and housing), work incentives, how earnings affect benefits, and financial literacy counseling and supports
Youth self-determination services	Services related to empowering youth by encouraging self-advocacy and self-determination and promoting self-sufficiency
Parent and family training and information services	Services related to working with parents or guardians and families in supporting and advocating for their youth and families
Program administration	
Evaluation	Activities related to program-initiated evaluation, reporting, and monitoring (not including activities of the national evaluation of PROMISE programs)
Training and technical assistance	Activities related to the receipt or delivery of staff training to improve knowledge and skills in working with youth, families, and the community
Other program administration	All other activities related to oversight of the program and staff, reporting requirements of the Department of Education, and general administration

Note: Selected PROMISE program staff submitted estimates of their time spent on the nine program components during two, one-week periods. We used time-use data gathered from program staff, including staff who had provided contracted services, to calculate the proportion of staff time devoted to each component, which informed our allocation of program costs across components. Staff time-use logs included three additional categories: (1) travel (time spent traveling to or from meetings, events, and trainings, including those not specifically with or on behalf of youth and families); (2) other PROMISE activities (any activities related to your PROMISE program that do not fall into the above categories); (3) leave (time or days taken off (from your usual PROMISE work period) for holidays, vacations, illness, or personal/family reasons). We did not include these categories in our analysis of program costs.

Table A.21. Program cost period and activity log completion dates with sample sizes

Program	Cost period	Activity log	
		Collection dates	Sample size
Arkansas PROMISE	October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017	Round 1: August 8, 2016 – August 14, 2016	33
		Round 2: October 3, 2016 – October 9, 2016	32
ASPIRE	October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017	Round 1: August 8, 2016 – August 14, 2016	42
		Round 2: October 24, 2016 – October 30, 2016	37
CaPROMISE	July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017	Round 1: September 12, 2016 – September 18, 2016	40
		Round 2: September 19, 2016 – September 25, 2016	40
MD PROMISE	July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017	Round 1: August 8, 2016 – August 14, 2016	38
		Round 2: October 24, 2016 – October 30, 2016	36
NYS PROMISE	October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017	Round 1: July 25, 2016 – July 31, 2016	23
		Round 2: October 31, 2016 – November 6, 2016	24
WI PROMISE	October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017	Round 1: August 22, 2016 – August 29, 2016	28
		Round 2: November 28, 2016 – December 4, 2016	25

Table A.22a. Arkansas PROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component

	Direct services							Program administration		
	Total	Case management services	Career services and work-based learning experiences	Education- and school-related services	Benefits counseling and financial literacy training services	Youth empowerment services	Parent training and information services	Evaluation	Training and technical assistance	Other program administration
Labor costs										
Management	\$845,133	\$76,405	\$22,729	\$16,769	\$6,841	\$20,419	\$15,200	\$76,706	\$61,239	\$548,824
Line staff	\$2,276,083	\$1,282,819	\$188,537	\$175,744	\$68,896	\$206,810	\$147,389	\$59,792	\$57,701	\$88,396
Subtotal for labor costs	\$3,121,216	\$1,359,224	\$211,265	\$192,513	\$75,738	\$227,229	\$162,589	\$136,497	\$118,940	\$637,220
Percent of total costs by category and component	33.22%	14.47%	2.25%	2.05%	0.81%	2.42%	1.73%	1.45%	1.27%	6.78%
Other direct costs										
Purchased services	\$4,269,469	\$744,975	\$1,830,189	\$206,094	\$80,911	\$224,439	\$134,493	\$235,078	\$349,685	\$463,605
Enrollee payments	\$776,278	\$202,736	\$501,738	\$35,989	\$2,898	\$7,264	\$4,907	\$3,295	\$4,801	\$12,650
Subtotal for other direct costs	\$5,045,747	\$947,711	\$2,331,926	\$242,083	\$83,809	\$231,702	\$139,400	\$238,373	\$354,487	\$476,256
Percent of total costs by category and component	53.71%	10.09%	24.82%	2.58%	0.89%	2.47%	1.48%	2.54%	3.77%	5.07%
Indirect costs										
Equipment and capital costs	\$43,175	\$20,195	\$3,221	\$3,105	\$1,348	\$3,377	\$2,281	\$1,532	\$2,232	\$5,882
Other indirect costs	\$491,538	\$140,504	\$25,335	\$22,946	\$9,808	\$25,631	\$17,739	\$30,581	\$30,160	\$188,833
General administrative costs	\$637,932	\$298,398	\$47,596	\$45,880	\$19,912	\$49,903	\$33,709	\$22,640	\$32,985	\$86,910
Subtotal for indirect costs	\$1,172,644	\$459,098	\$76,152	\$71,931	\$31,068	\$78,911	\$53,729	\$54,753	\$65,377	\$281,625
Percent of total costs by category and component	12.48%	4.89%	0.81%	0.77%	0.33%	0.84%	0.57%	0.58%	0.70%	3.00%
Costs of donated goods and services										
Donated goods	\$10,410	\$4,869	\$777	\$749	\$325	\$814	\$550	\$369	\$538	\$1,418
Volunteers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Donated facilities	\$44,808	\$20,959	\$3,343	\$3,223	\$1,399	\$3,505	\$2,368	\$1,590	\$2,317	\$6,104
Subtotal for costs of donated goods and services	\$55,218	\$25,829	\$4,120	\$3,971	\$1,724	\$4,319	\$2,918	\$1,960	\$2,855	\$7,523
Percent of total costs by category and component	0.59%	0.27%	0.04%	0.04%	0.02%	0.05%	0.03%	0.02%	0.03%	0.08%
Total costs										
Total	\$9,394,824	\$2,791,862	\$2,623,464	\$510,499	\$192,338	\$542,162	\$358,636	\$431,853	\$541,659	\$1,402,623
Percent of total costs by category and component	100%	29.72%	27.92%	5.43%	2.05%	5.77%	3.82%	4.59%	5.77%	14.93%

Note: Data reflects Arkansas PROMISE costs from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017.

Table A.22b. ASPIRE cost analysis by input category and program component

	Total	Direct services						Program administration		
		Case management services	Career services and work-based learning experiences	Education- and school-related services	Benefits counseling and financial literacy training services	Youth empowerment services	Parent training and information services	Evaluation	Training and technical assistance	Other program administration
Labor costs										
Management	\$1,395,375	\$26,657	\$0	\$0	\$2,546	\$9,624	\$0	\$84,198	\$558,523	\$713,827
Line staff	\$912,142	\$559,991	\$35,824	\$78,400	\$6,062	\$67,178	\$19,764	\$21,819	\$88,238	\$34,865
Subtotal for labor costs	\$2,307,517	\$586,648	\$35,824	\$78,400	\$8,608	\$76,802	\$19,764	\$106,017	\$646,761	\$748,693
Percent of total costs by category and component	40.69%	10.34%	0.63%	1.38%	0.15%	1.35%	0.35%	1.87%	11.40%	13.20%
Other direct costs										
Purchased services	\$2,451,596	\$1,364,113	\$72,976	\$32,177	\$303,581	\$231,502	\$98,781	\$103,294	\$117,427	\$127,744
Enrollee payments	\$59,575	\$31,893	\$722	\$1,616	\$652	\$2,056	\$650	\$1,107	\$6,314	\$14,565
Subtotal for other direct costs	\$2,511,171	\$1,396,006	\$73,698	\$33,793	\$304,233	\$233,558	\$99,431	\$104,401	\$123,741	\$142,309
Percent of total costs by category and component	44.28%	24.62%	1.30%	0.60%	5.36%	4.12%	1.75%	1.84%	2.18%	2.51%
Indirect costs										
Equipment and capital costs	\$11,580	\$608	\$25	\$10	\$1	\$2	\$5	\$1,021	\$5,491	\$4,417
Other indirect costs	\$431,609	\$167,709	\$5,997	\$8,731	\$2,893	\$9,220	\$2,633	\$24,027	\$90,258	\$120,141
General administrative costs	\$409,397	\$115,077	\$5,890	\$11,315	\$1,702	\$11,092	\$3,020	\$22,397	\$116,161	\$122,743
Subtotal for indirect costs	\$852,586	\$283,393	\$11,912	\$20,056	\$4,597	\$20,314	\$5,658	\$47,446	\$211,909	\$247,301
Percent of total costs by category and component	15.03%	5.00%	0.21%	0.35%	0.08%	0.36%	0.10%	0.84%	3.74%	4.36%
Costs of donated goods and services										
Donated goods	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Volunteers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Donated facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal for costs of donated goods and services	\$0	\$0	\$10	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Percent of total costs by category and component	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total costs										
Total	\$5,671,276	\$2,266,047	\$121,434	\$132,249	\$317,438	\$330,674	\$124,854	\$257,864	\$982,411	\$1,138,303
Percent of total costs by category and component	100%	39.96%	2.14%	2.33%	6.06%	5.37%	2.20%	4.55%	17.32%	20.07%

Note: Data reflects ASPIRE costs from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017.

Table A.22c. CaPROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component

	Direct services						Program administration			
	Case management services	Career services and work-based learning experiences	Education- and school-related services	Benefits counseling and financial literacy training services	Youth empowerment services	Parent training and information services	Evaluation	Training and technical assistance	Other program administration	
Total										
Labor costs										
Management	\$357,784	\$7,156	\$7,156	\$7,156	\$7,156	\$7,156	\$0	\$0	\$35,778	\$286,227
Line staff	\$1,076,218	\$149,810	\$435,127	\$83,845	\$48,419	\$81,846	\$101,989	\$64,559	\$92,418	\$18,205
Subtotal for labor costs	\$1,434,002	\$156,965	\$442,283	\$91,001	\$55,575	\$89,002	\$101,989	\$64,559	\$128,196	\$304,432
Percent of total costs by category and component	12.13%	1.33%	3.74%	0.77%	0.47%	0.75%	0.86%	0.55%	1.08%	2.58%
Other direct costs										
Purchased services	\$9,716,474	\$2,114,943	\$901,782	\$559,122	\$326,379	\$603,168	\$672,338	\$855,894	\$2,256,133	\$1,426,715
Enrollee payments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal for other direct costs	\$9,716,474	\$2,114,943	\$901,782	\$559,122	\$326,379	\$603,168	\$672,338	\$855,894	\$2,256,133	\$1,426,715
Percent of total costs by category and component	82.19%	17.89%	7.63%	4.73%	2.76%	5.10%	5.69%	7.24%	19.09%	12.07%
Indirect costs										
Equipment and capital costs	\$3,306	\$775	\$337	\$210	\$123	\$201	\$213	\$272	\$710	\$466
Other indirect costs	\$152,490	\$35,759	\$15,530	\$9,701	\$5,667	\$9,275	\$9,802	\$12,542	\$32,741	\$21,472
General administrative costs	\$515,186	\$120,813	\$52,470	\$32,775	\$19,146	\$31,336	\$33,116	\$42,371	\$110,615	\$72,545
Subtotal for indirect costs	\$670,982	\$157,348	\$68,337	\$42,686	\$24,936	\$40,812	\$43,131	\$55,185	\$144,066	\$94,483
Percent of total costs by category and component	5.68%	1.33%	0.58%	0.36%	0.21%	0.35%	0.36%	0.47%	1.22%	0.80%
Costs of donated goods and services										
Donated goods	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Volunteers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Donated facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal for costs of donated goods and services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Percent of total costs by category and component	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total costs										
Total	\$11,821,458	\$2,429,256	\$1,412,402	\$692,809	\$406,890	\$732,981	\$817,458	\$975,638	\$2,258,395	\$1,825,630
Percent of total costs by category and component	100%	20.55%	11.95%	5.86%	3.44%	6.20%	6.92%	8.25%	21.39%	15.44%

Note: Data reflects CaPROMISE costs from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

Table A.22d. MD PROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component

	Direct services						Program administration			
	Case management services	Career services and work-based learning experiences	Education- and school-related services	Benefits counseling and financial literacy training services	Youth empowerment services	Parent training and information services	Evaluation	Training and technical assistance	Other program administration	
Total										
Labor costs										
Management	\$227,121	\$0	\$0	\$1,914	\$1,150	\$0	\$0	\$94,148	\$55,048	\$74,861
Line Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal for labor costs	\$227,121	\$0	\$0	\$1,914	\$1,150	\$0	\$0	\$94,148	\$55,048	\$74,861
Percent of total costs by category and component	4.02%	0.00%	0.00%	0.03%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%	1.67%	0.97%	1.32%
Other direct costs										
Purchased Services	\$5,305,052	\$1,075,394	\$724,796	\$257,179	\$557,271	\$544,968	\$79,246	\$637,379	\$888,747	\$540,072
Enrollee payments	\$101,991	\$0	\$101,991	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal for other direct costs	\$5,407,043	\$1,075,394	\$826,787	\$257,179	\$557,271	\$544,968	\$79,246	\$637,379	\$888,747	\$540,072
Percent of total costs by category and component	95.65%	19.02%	14.63%	4.55%	9.86%	9.64%	1.40%	11.27%	15.72%	9.55%
Indirect costs										
Equipment and capital costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other indirect costs	\$10,948	\$2,299	\$1,505	\$562	\$232	\$1,165	\$169	\$1,968	\$1,585	\$1,462
General administrative costs	\$7,958	\$1,671	\$1,094	\$409	\$169	\$847	\$123	\$1,430	\$1,152	\$1,062
Subtotal for indirect costs	\$18,906	\$3,971	\$2,599	\$971	\$401	\$2,012	\$293	\$3,398	\$2,736	\$2,524
Percent of total costs by category and component	0.33%	0.07%	0.05%	0.02%	0.01%	0.04%	0.01%	0.06%	0.05%	0.04%
Costs of donated goods and services										
Donated goods	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Volunteers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Donated facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal for costs of donated goods and services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Percent of total costs by category and component	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Total costs										
Total	\$5,653,071	\$1,079,365	\$829,386	\$260,064	\$558,822	\$546,980	\$79,539	\$734,926	\$946,531	\$617,457
Percent of total costs by category and component	100%	19.09%	14.67%	4.60%	9.89%	9.68%	1.41%	13.00%	16.74%	10.92%

Note: Data reflects MD PROMISE costs from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

Table A.22e. NYS PROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component

	Direct services							Program administration		
	Case management services	Career services and work-based learning experiences	Education- and school-related services	Benefits counseling and financial literacy training services	Youth empowerment services	Parent training and information services		Evaluation	Training and technical assistance	Other program administration
Total										
Labor costs										
Management	\$660,646	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$139,758	\$187,381	\$333,508
Line staff	\$1,231,996	\$703,625	\$319,395	\$58,919	\$8,343	\$31,653	\$30,674	\$4,398	\$73,822	\$1,165
Subtotal for labor costs	\$1,892,642	\$703,625	\$319,395	\$58,919	\$8,343	\$31,653	\$30,674	\$144,156	\$261,203	\$334,673
Percent of total costs by category and component	24.02%	8.93%	4.05%	0.75%	0.11%	0.40%	0.39%	1.83%	3.31%	4.25%
Other direct costs										
Purchased services	\$5,381,551	\$1,106,633	\$328,521	\$64,160	\$2,565	\$18,894	\$992,329	\$715,375	\$766,102	\$1,386,972
Enrollee payments	\$5,061	\$2,754	\$304	\$104	\$11	\$111	\$245	\$540	\$289	\$702
Subtotal for other direct costs	\$5,386,612	\$1,109,387	\$328,825	\$64,264	\$2,576	\$19,005	\$992,575	\$715,915	\$766,391	\$1,387,674
Percent of total costs by category and component	68.35%	14.08%	4.17%	0.82%	0.03%	0.24%	12.59%	9.08%	9.72%	17.61%
Indirect costs										
Equipment and capital costs	\$2,734	\$1,488	\$164	\$56	\$6	\$60	\$133	\$292	\$156	\$379
Other indirect costs	\$78,509	\$42,722	\$4,721	\$1,609	\$165	\$1,725	\$3,806	\$8,382	\$4,485	\$10,893
General administrative costs	\$332,855	\$181,128	\$20,014	\$6,823	\$701	\$7,315	\$16,137	\$35,539	\$19,017	\$46,182
Subtotal for indirect costs	\$414,098	\$225,337	\$24,900	\$8,488	\$872	\$9,100	\$20,075	\$44,214	\$23,658	\$57,424
Percent of total costs by category and component	5.25%	2.86%	0.32%	0.11%	0.01%	0.12%	0.25%	0.56%	0.30%	0.73%
Costs of donated goods and services										
Donated goods	\$40,274	\$21,916	\$2,422	\$826	\$85	\$885	\$1,952	\$4,300	\$2,301	\$5,588
Volunteers	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Donated facilities	\$147,450	\$80,237	\$8,866	\$3,022	\$310	\$3,240	\$7,148	\$15,743	\$8,424	\$20,458
Subtotal for costs of donated goods and services	\$187,724	\$102,153	\$11,288	\$3,848	\$395	\$4,126	\$9,101	\$20,043	\$10,725	\$26,046
Percent of total costs by category and component	2.38%	1.30%	0.14%	0.05%	0.01%	0.05%	0.12%	0.25%	0.014%	0.33%
Total costs										
Total	\$7,881,077	\$2,140,502	\$684,408	\$135,519	\$12,186	\$63,885	\$1,052,425	\$924,328	\$1,061,977	\$1,805,846
Percent of total costs by category and component	100%	27.16%	8.68%	1.72%	0.15%	0.81%	13.35%	11.73%	13.48%	22.91%

Note: Data reflects NYS PROMISE costs from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017.

Table A.22f. WI PROMISE cost analysis by input category and program component

	Direct services						Program administration			
	Total	Case management services	Career services and work-based learning experiences	Education- and school-related services	Benefits counseling and financial literacy training services	Youth empowerment services	Parent training and information services	Evaluation	Training and technical assistance	Other program administration
Labor costs										
Management	\$38,637	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,076	\$5,401	\$32,160
Line staff	\$1,169,842	\$614,914	\$79,468	\$55,344	\$18,836	\$12,273	\$42,991	\$79,374	\$196,583	\$70,060
Subtotal for labor costs	\$1,208,479	\$614,914	\$79,468	\$55,344	\$18,836	\$12,273	\$42,991	\$80,450	\$201,984	\$102,220
Percent of total costs by category and component	17.17%	8.73%	1.13%	0.79%	0.27%	0.17%	0.61%	1.14%	2.87%	1.45%
Other direct costs										
Purchased services	\$2,694,971	\$21,020	\$122,648	\$1,511	\$136,256	\$102,994	\$1,001,048	\$533,282	\$7,896	\$768,317
Enrollee payments	\$762,219	\$129,625	\$230,638	\$41,467	\$218,838	\$5,442	\$16,233	\$20,465	\$48,689	\$50,821
Subtotal for other direct costs	\$3,457,191	\$150,645	\$353,286	\$42,978	\$355,094	\$108,436	\$1,017,281	\$553,747	\$56,585	\$819,138
Percent of total costs by category and component	49.11%	2.14%	5.02%	0.61%	5.04%	1.54%	14.45%	7.87%	0.80%	11.64%
Indirect costs										
Equipment and capital costs	\$59,151	\$25,573	\$3,090	\$1,838	\$717	\$1,074	\$3,190	\$4,037	\$9,606	\$10,026
Other indirect costs	\$643,395	\$278,163	\$33,609	\$19,992	\$7,800	\$11,677	\$34,696	\$43,916	\$104,483	\$109,058
General administrative costs	\$94,416	\$40,819	\$4,932	\$2,934	\$1,145	\$1,714	\$5,092	\$6,445	\$15,333	\$16,004
Subtotal for indirect costs	\$796,961	\$344,555	\$41,631	\$24,764	\$9,662	\$14,464	\$42,977	\$54,398	\$129,421	\$135,088
Percent of total costs by category and component	11.32%	4.89%	0.59%	0.35%	0.14%	0.21%	0.61%	0.77%	1.84%	1.92%
Costs of donated goods and services										
Donated goods	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Donated services	\$1,486,066	\$109,950	\$1,087,986	\$30,890	\$22,372	\$37,319	\$96,534	\$17,297	\$41,153	\$42,955
Volunteers	\$91,163	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,539	\$12,744	\$75,880
Donated facilities	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal for costs of donated goods and services	\$1,577,229	\$109,950	\$1,087,986	\$30,890	\$22,372	\$37,319	\$96,534	\$19,836	\$53,897	\$118,834
Percent of total costs by category and component	22.4%	1.56%	15.45%	0.44%	0.32%	0.53%	1.37%	0.28%	0.77%	1.69%
Total costs										
Total	\$7,039,860	\$1,219,674	\$1,562,370	\$153,975	\$405,964	\$172,492	\$1,199,784	\$708,432	\$441,887	\$1,175,281
Percent of total costs by category and component	100%	17.33%	22.19%	2.19%	5.77%	2.45%	17.04%	10.06%	6.28%	16.69%

Note: Data reflects WI PROMISE costs from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017.

REFERENCES

- Cox, D. R. *Analysis of Binary Data*. New York: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1970.
- Little, R. J. “Missing-Data Adjustments in Large Surveys.” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, vol. 6, no. 3, 1988, pp. 287–296.
- Matulewicz, Holly, Eric Grau, Arif Mamun, and Gina Livermore. “Promoting Readiness of Minors in Supplemental Security Income (PROMISE): PROMISE 60-Month Sampling and Survey Plan.” Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, June 2018.
- Raghunathan, T. E., J. M. Lepkowski, J. Van Hoewyk, and P. Solenbeger. “A Multivariate Technique for Multiply Imputing Missing Values Using a Sequence of Regression Models.” *Survey Methodology*, vol. 27, 2001, pp. 85–95.
- Rubin, D. B. “Statistical Matching Using File Concatenation with Adjusted Weights and Multiple Imputations.” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1986, pp. 87–94.
- Rubin, D. B. *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1987.
- Schochet, Peter. “Technical Methods Report: Guidelines for Multiple Testing in Impact Evaluations (NCEE 2008-4018).” Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, 2008.
- Van Buuren, S. “Multiple Imputation of Discrete and Continuous Data by Fully Conditional Specification.” *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, vol. 16, 2007, pp. 219–242.
- Wehmeyer, M. L. “Student Self-Report Measure of Self-Determination for Students with Cognitive Disabilities.” *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, vol. 31, 1996, pp. 282–293.
- White, Halbert. “A Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity.” *Econometrica*, vol. 48, no. 4, 1980, pp. 817–838.

Mathematica

Princeton, NJ • Ann Arbor, MI • Cambridge, MA
Chicago, IL • Oakland, CA • Seattle, WA
Tucson, AZ • Woodlawn, MD • Washington, DC

EDI Global, a Mathematica Company

Bukoba, Tanzania • High Wycombe, United Kingdom



mathematica-mpr.com