EXHIBIT F

RANDOM CONTROL TRIAL

Random control trials (RCT) are considered the gold-standard of clinical trials; originating in the medical sciences, an RCT is typically used to test the efficacy of an intervention or treatment, compared to the absence of that treatment. This is done by creating two otherwise identical groups, subjecting one group to the treatment, and one group to no treatment. To the greatest extent possible, everything about the two groups should be identical, save for the treatment they get. This is the best way to find out if the treatment is the cause of any effects. This is done by finding a large enough cohort of individuals who are as similar as possible across any meaningful domains, and then placing those individuals into one group or the other entirely by chance, or at random.

In the social sciences, RCTs are somewhat more challenging to implement. Many programs and services do not allow for the withholding of "treatment" without ethical or regulatory challenges. Factors such as personal motivation, which can greatly impact results, can be harder to determine than something concrete like blood pressure. However, there is great interest in applying the discipline of a hard science evaluation to the social sciences, particularly when programs are experimental, costly, or otherwise indeterminate in their effects. Social service practitioners, law makers, and tax payers have a vested interest in finding out what works and when trying to impact a social determinant, such as employment. It can be challenging to isolate all of the variables that might affect the outcome being tested, but many programs have been able to successfully use the RCT methodology in the social sciences.

Programs with limited funding but strong demand end up with "treatment" and "control" groups simply because of capacity issues; not everyone who would like to participate will be able to. A randomized process ensures true fairness in who is able to get services, and takes advantage of a naturally occurring event (some people get treatment and some do not) to better understand if the services themselves have any lasting impact. By overlaying a random assignment into a natural limitation of services, a lot can be learned that has impacts on practice as well as policy. This can be a new way of thinking about limited slots or funding, but with the right design and methodology, this organically occurring reality can be capitalized on in a way that helps programs learn and improve.

Colorado House Bill 13-1004, the Colorado Careers Act, requires the evaluation of the ReHire Colorado program. Because this program is both experimental and costly, the Colorado Department of Human Services believes a random control trial to be the best form of program evaluation. CDHS has contracted with a 3rd party expert in random control design for social and economic impact programs, and will provide explicit direction, methodology, controls and training to selected vendors to ensure the successful implementation of a random control trial.