

Employable Outcome Analysis 2017 Update Summary

Patrick Marentette

July, 2017

Overall objective

To better understand the variables important in predicting an employable outcome among workers after Work Transition services.

Background

- Predictive modelling performed last year identified a number of variables that were statistically significant predictors of a worker achieving an employed outcome.
 - Included Completed WT Plans between Jan 1 2014 and Jun 30 2015
- We now have an extra 12 months of data (Jul 1 2015 – Jun 30 2016) so decided to update the model and check on progress of our key factors.
 - In order to achieve an even comparison the previous model was restricted to a 12 month period (Jul 1 2014 – Jun 30 2015)
- This report provides a high level summary of the findings of this comparison with a focus on any changes in the key variables previously identified.

Key Variables

Statistically significant variables identified in the previous work:

1. Worker Rep
2. Age at Injury
3. Time to Referral
4. Months to Plan Approval
5. Training Funding
6. ESL/Interpreter Request
7. Specialized Services

Key Variables

1. Worker Rep

- 2014/15 models, the odds of being employed are **40% lower** on average for workers with a Worker Representative compared to those without
- 2015/16 models, this variable is **no longer statistically significant**
- This suggests that having a Worker Representative is no longer predictive of an Employable outcome

2. Age at Injury

3. Time to Referral

4. Months to Plan Approval

5. Training Funding

6. Interpreter Request

7. Specialized Services

Key Variables

1. Worker Rep
2. Age at Injury
 - 2014/15 models, for every increase of 2.5 years in age, the odds of being employed are **reduced by 6%** on average
 - 2015/16 models, for every increase of 2.5 years in age, the odds of being employed are **reduced by 9%** on average
 - This suggests that the likelihood of being employed decreased by 3% year over year
3. Time to Referral
4. Months to Plan Approval
5. Training Funding
6. Interpreter Request
7. Specialized Services

Key Variables

1. Worker Rep
2. Age at Injury
3. Time to Referral
 - This variable was not statistically significant in the 2014/15 twelve-month models; however it was previously when the models were run with eighteen-months of data
 - 2015/16 models, for every increase of 3 months in the time to referral, the odds of being employed are **reduced by 3%** on average
 - This suggests that Time to Referral is still an area we need to focus on
4. Months to Plan Approval
5. Training Funding
6. Interpreter Request
7. Specialized Services

Key Variables

1. Worker Rep
2. Age at Injury
3. Time to Referral
4. Months to Plan Approval
 - 2014/15 models, for every increase of 3 months in the time to plan approval, the odds of being employed are **8% lower** on average
 - 2015/16 models, this variable is **no longer statistically significant**
 - This suggests that this variable was not predictive of an Employable outcome in 2015/16
5. Training Funding
6. Interpreter Request
7. Specialized Services

Key Variables

1. Worker Rep
2. Age at Injury
3. Time to Referral
4. Months to Plan Approval
5. Training Funding
 - 2014/15 models, the odds of being employed were **41% lower** for workers who completed Private training compared to those who completed Public training
 - 2015/16 models, this variable is **no longer statistically significant**
 - This suggests that the source of funding for a workers training program is no longer predictive of an Employable outcome
6. Interpreter Request
7. Specialized Services

Key Variables

1. Worker Rep
2. Age at Injury
3. Time to Referral
4. Months to Plan Approval
5. Training Funding
6. Interpreter Request
 - 2014/15 model, the odds of being employed were **70% lower** for workers who had an Interpreter Request in PBAS compared to those without
 - 2015/16 model, the odds of being employed are **75% lower** on average for workers with an Interpreter Request in PBAS compared to those without
 - This suggests that the likelihood of being employed **decreased by 5%** year over year
7. Specialized Services

Key Variables

1. Worker Rep
2. Age at Injury
3. Time to Referral
4. Months to Plan Approval
5. Training Funding
6. Interpreter Request
7. Specialized Services
 - 2014/15 model, the odds of being employed were **50% lower** for workers who received Specialized Service compared to those who did not
 - 2015/16 model, this variable is **no longer statistically significant**
 - Caution against drawing definitive conclusions given the very small sample size of workers who received Specialized Services.

Overall Summary

1. Worker Rep

- No longer a significant predictor; doesn't mean we're done.
- Continue to reinforce the positive behaviours that have helped improve this variable.

2. Age at Injury

- Outcomes decreased in 2015/16; given the overall trend of an aging workforce this must remain an area of focus.
- Continue shifting focus of workers and potential employers to the benefits of being/hiring older workers.

3. Time to Referral

- Mixed results but remains a predictor and of real importance in relation to our outcomes and overall duration.
- Reinforces the importance of continued engagement with our SD partners.

4. Months to Plan Approval

- No longer a significant predictor; but current results suggest there is still work to do.
- Continue to push the importance of proactive behaviours that help drive claims forward.

Overall Summary

5. Training Funding

- No longer a significant predictor; suggests positive shifts in both the overall number of workers attending Public and in the outcomes of those attending Private.
- Continued utilization of available Public programs and sending the right workers to Public programs will likely see this improve even further.

6. Interpreter Request

- Outcomes decreased further in 2015/16; reinforces the need for the current initiative.
- Continued focus on a dedicated approach and engagement with this population; development of best practices and suite of services available.

7. Specialized Services.

- Not a significant predictor in 2015/16 but sample size issues so should remain a focus.