



Edna McConnell Clark Foundation

**EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT:
A SYNTHESIS**

Susan Jekielek, Stephanie Cochran, and Elizabeth Hair

Project Director: Kristin A. Moore, Ph.D.
Project Manager: Elizabeth C. Hair, Ph.D.

Child Trends

Washington, D.C.

May 2002

Edna McConnell Clark Foundation

**EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT:
A SYNTHESIS**

Susan Jekielek, Stephanie Cochran, and Elizabeth Hair

Project Manager: Elizabeth C. Hair, Ph.D.

Project Director: Kristin A. Moore, Ph.D.



Washington, D.C.

May 2002

We thank the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation for contributing to this document by providing funding and valuable insight regarding its form and content. In particular, we acknowledge Jackie Kaye and David Hunter. We also thank the staff at Child Trends for their invaluable assistance with this document, including Zakia Redd and Research Intern Thomson Ling.

**EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT:
A SYNTHESIS**

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... i
 INTRODUCTION..... 1
 PART I. CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS 6
 What Goals Do the Programs Address? 7
 Who Are the Program/Study Participants?..... 8
 What Activities Are Offered? 8
 What Other Characteristics Do Programs Share?..... 9
 PART II. OUTCOMES POSITIVELY AFFECTED BY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.... 10
 Educational Achievement and Cognitive Attainment..... 10
 Health and Safety..... 16
 Social and Emotional Well-Being 19
 Self-Sufficiency 22
 Summary of Employment Program Impacts..... 30
 PART III. CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE
 EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS 31
 Characteristics of Youth Participants..... 31
 Program Characteristics..... 32
 Summary of Characteristics Associated with Positive Outcomes..... 39
 PART IV. UNANSWERED QUESTIONS 40

Figure

Figure 1: Model of Youth Development..... 3

Tables

Table 1. Developmental Resources Provided by Employment Programs..... 4
 Table 2. Summary of Program Characteristics 6
 Table 3a. Effects of Employment Programs on Educational Achievement and Cognitive
 Attainment Outcomes..... 13
 Table 3b. Effects of Employment Programs on Health and Safety..... 17
 Table 3c. Effects of Employment Programs on Socioemotional Well-being 20
 Table 3d. Effects of Employment Programs on Self-Sufficiency 25
 Table 4. “Best Bets” for Effective Employment Programs 34

Appendixes

Appendix A: Program and Study Descriptions 42
 Appendix B: Program Components Offered by Program..... 70

References

Program References 72
Other References 75

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Part I. Characteristics of Employment Programs

This synthesis places youth employment programs within the context of youth development. It focuses on ten programs that serve youth under age 18, but it also considers some programs that include older youths. The programs share the broad goal of improving the employability of young people, but some take an academic approach, while others focus on job skills training. The majority of the programs are community-based, although some are school-based and one stands out as a residential program. The effects of the programs on youth outcomes in four domains—educational and cognitive attainment, health and safety, social and emotional well-being, and self-sufficiency—have been evaluated.

Part II. Documented Employment Program Outcomes

While educational achievement is not an employment outcome in itself, the attainment of a high school or college degree helps young people secure gainful employment, and many employment programs have educational goals. Employment programs appear to reduce school absences, but their impacts on other outcomes are mixed: They do not appear to improve high school grades, and they improve reading and math skills only while students are participating in the program. Many, but not all, evaluations link employment programs to the achievement of a high school diploma or general equivalency diploma (GED). One program links participation to college enrollment, while another does not. Thus, employment programs can be said to influence only a few educational and cognitive outcomes consistently.

Few employment programs have been evaluated for their impact on health and safety, but those that have appear to exert little influence. This is not surprising, because health and safety outcomes are not the primary target of job-training programs. Participation in employment programs does not have a significant impact on family formation behaviors or general health, but one program does increase knowledge of responsible sexual practices and the use of contraceptives. Findings are mixed regarding whether participation curbs drug and alcohol abuse.

Employment programs show potential for exposing youths to supportive relationships and for reducing criminal behavior during the time youths participate in them. Participants in one school-based initiative believe that their teachers give them personalized attention and have high expectations of them and that their peers are supportive. Two studies show that programs reduce the number of arrests in the short term, but that the impacts disappear when youths leave the programs.

Employment programs increase young people's exposure to career development and job training, but studies do not confidently support the expectation that the programs promote self-sufficiency. Evidence from three diverse programs indicates that

participation does not result in significantly higher employment in the long run. It may be that more intensive programs are needed: Participants in the primarily residential Job Corps program, for example, were slightly more likely than those in the control group to be employed when interviewed at a 30-month follow-up (63 percent compared to 59 percent). Job Corps was also the only program that increased the long-term earnings of participants as a whole, although another program did increase such earnings for some subgroups. Studies suggest that participation in employment programs can help youths secure better jobs (jobs with benefits, for example). Most program evaluations sought to determine whether participants were less likely to receive various types of welfare; only Job Corps reduced the overall percentage of program members receiving food stamps (but not other forms of assistance).

Part III. Characteristics Associated with Effective and Ineffective Employment Programs

Given the mixed success of employment programs, are there any program characteristics that can be identified as more promising than others? While only a few studies examine this question, some lessons can be gleaned from nonexperimental analyses:

- Program participation may be most beneficial for younger teens and youths at high risk of poor educational or employment outcomes.
- One evaluation found that the more well-structured a program, the more effective it is for sustaining youth participation.
- Some beneficial impacts were observed in all three types of programs—residential, school-based, and community-based.
- No one type of job training stands out as more effective than others.

Part IV. Unanswered Questions

This synthesis raises one main question: Why *aren't* employment programs more successful, especially with regard to employment-related outcomes? Planned variation studies would be useful to help answer another important question – What strategies are effective? A number of other questions remain unanswered:

- Are different types of job training more effective? For which groups?
- Who are the best teachers for employment programs?
- How much training in job skills is needed for successful longer-term outcomes?
- How much does skills training or education contribute to successful outcomes, compared to such services as assistance obtaining child care or searching for a job?

We conclude by suggesting that program evaluators and designers should focus on positive socio-emotional, academic, and health outcomes among youth and not just unemployment outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is a time when young people prepare for the family, work, and citizenship roles of adulthood (National Research Council, 1998). Success in these roles depends on developing personal competencies, such as self-reliance, as well as interpersonal and social competencies. Employment, secondary and postsecondary education, and training in job skills give adolescents tools that will enhance their ability to secure jobs and avoid relying on welfare in adulthood. Indeed, self-sufficiency in adulthood results from a successful constellation of experiences in childhood and youth. This synthesis of employment programs for adolescents places job preparation within the context of a general model of youth development and assesses its impact on young people's educational achievement, health and safety, social and emotional well-being, and self-sufficiency in adulthood.

Employment is clearly beneficial to adults in U.S. society. It is the key to staying out of poverty (Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1997), and research has linked good quality employment to a number of desirable psychosocial and physical outcomes, including better general health, longer life expectancy, a sense of control over the events in one's life, and mental well-being (Mirowsky & Ross, 1989). Generally speaking, society recognizes the value of work in an individual's life. This is apparent in recent legislation such as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA), which limits the length of time for which an individual may receive federal welfare benefits and requires welfare recipients to work.

Is the United States successfully preparing its young people for self-sufficiency in adulthood? Murnane & Levy argue that "during the past 20 years, the skills required to succeed in the economy have changed radically, but the skills taught in most schools have changed very little" (1996). As a result, there is a growing mismatch between the skills required by high-wage employers and the skills learned by high school graduates. The "new basic skills" needed to secure a middle-class income include "hard skills," such as problem solving and facility in reading and math, and "soft skills," such as the ability to work in groups and make effective presentations and the ability to use personal computers. These researchers advocate integrating these skills into high school curricula, arguing that they are necessary for high school and college graduates alike.

Most adolescents in the United States work. Recent estimates indicate that 57 percent of 14-year-olds and 64 percent of 15-year-olds worked in some type of job (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000). Work experience helps young people become personally and socially mature. Parents believe that jobs will teach their adolescents to be dependable, punctual, and responsible (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1986), and working adolescents are more likely to describe themselves as possessing these qualities than nonworking adolescents (Greenberger, 1984). Employment (specifically, working during the senior year in high school) is associated with positive outcomes 6 to 9 years later, particularly for young women who work moderate hours (Ruhm, 1997). The benefits include higher annual earnings, greater likelihood of receiving fringe benefits, and higher status occupations.

Most people agree that some employment is good for young people, but there is considerable controversy over how many hours of employment are appropriate. It appears that moderate employment (fewer than 20 hours per week) is beneficial for young people in both the short and the long run (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000; National Research Council, 1998; Mortimer et al., 1996; Steinberg & Cauffman, 1995). The value of working longer hours is questionable and may vary for specific groups of young people (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000; Schoenhals, Tienda, & Schneider, 1998; Ruhm, 1997; Chaplin & Hannaway, 1996).

Working longer hours can sidetrack youths from another path to economic self-sufficiency—education. Education increases the likelihood of being employed, the kind of job a person can get, and his or her income. Research has yet to demonstrate whether the adverse effects of working long hours are caused by the characteristics of the youths who choose to work those schedules (the selection effect) or to the longer work hours themselves. Research also needs to determine whether any beneficial effects of youth employment dissipate in time.

Research on youth development poses a series of specific practical questions: What do young people need for healthy development? How can adults meet those needs? What resources are appropriate, efficient, and effective for increasing self-sufficiency? And what outcomes can society realistically expect to achieve? Figure 1 presents a model of youth development, setting forth the needs of young people, the resources provided by adults, and desired outcomes. Table 1 identifies resources that work-oriented programs provide to meet adolescents' developmental needs.

Table 1. Developmental Resources Provided by Employment Programs

<u>Resources, Inputs Categories</u>	<u>Resources, Inputs from Employment Programs</u>
Adequate food, housing clothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Live-in residence
Health care - acute and preventative (physical and mental)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counseling, health education, medical treatment
Love, warm, close relationships with caring adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced student-teacher ratio, mentors
Supervision, monitoring, limit setting, control, discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced student-teacher ratio
Positive role models	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentors
High expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a
Education in academic skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School within a school environment, specialized academic assistance, college preparation, GED preparation
Training in life skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocational training integrated into high curriculum, work experience, exploration of careers, basic communication and computation skills, general occupational skills training, work readiness training, specialized courses in economic concepts, critical thinking and problem solving, quality of life, responsible sexual behavior workshop
Training in social skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training in responsible social behavior
Moral values, responsibility, character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training in responsible social behavior, job ethics
Gatekeeping, interface with schools and other organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “School within a school” environment, courses offered through schools, educational advocacy when problems arise
Routines and traditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work experience, performing unpaid chores within residential component
Community supports and services, norms, future opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of community businesses, job placement assistance, provide transportation, provide childcare, referral to external support systems, needs-based payments, financial incentives

This synthesis examines the impacts of programs designed to improve the employability of young people, thus making them more likely to be self-sufficient in adulthood. It first describes the approaches taken by employment and job skills programs, then summarizes the impacts of the programs and studies, and finally highlights elements that contribute to effective programs.

The programs reviewed here include youth under the age of 18. This distinction is pointed out because youths under 18 generally have the dual responsibilities of education and employment and are likely to be dependent on their parents for economic necessities, whereas those 18 and older are generally making the transition to self-sufficiency. This cutoff point is often blurred in real life, however. A young person who drops out of school may be thrown early into the adult roles of full-time employee or parent. Therefore, while all the programs reviewed here include youths under age 18, some also include those 18 and older.

All of the programs have been evaluated. This synthesis concentrates on evaluations that used a rigorous experimental methodology to test for the impact of a given program on youth outcomes. The experimental evaluations provide evidence of the impact of employment programs in promoting positive youth development. Our conclusions about effective program approaches, however, are generally based on quasi-experimental evaluations and nonexperimental analyses.¹

Experimental evaluations were conducted on the following programs:²

- Career Academies (CA)
- Career Beginnings (CB)
- Job Corps (JC)
- JOBSTART (JS)
- Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)
- Summer Training and Education Program (STEP)

Quasi-experimental evaluations were conducted on the following programs:

- Junior Achievement (JA)
- Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps – Career Academies (JROTC – CA)
- Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP)

A nonexperimental evaluation was conducted on the following program:

- Hospital Youth Mentoring Program (HYMP)

¹ Throughout this synthesis, applicable programs are denoted with abbreviated program names. If multiple studies are available for a single program a number, indicating the particular study that is being referenced, follows the abbreviated program name. Refer to the Program References (at the end of the document) for complete references.

² The Job Training Partnership Act and Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects are federal funding mechanisms for several distinct programs nationwide. The programs must provide specific services and meet certain standards set forth by JTPA or YIEPP. This synthesis focuses not on the funding mechanisms, but on specific programs that have been evaluated as part of an experimental impact study.

PART I. CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

All of the employment programs in this synthesis are designed to help adolescents become self-sufficient adults. Some of the initiatives focus solely on improving employment outcomes, while others include employment or job skills as components of a more comprehensive program. Program characteristics are summarized in Table 2. Appendix A provides detailed descriptions of participants, program goals and components, study objectives and measures, outcomes, and study limitations, and Appendix B lists the components of each program.

It is important to note that programs with several sites may vary by site.

Table 2. Summary of Program Characteristics

		Career Academies	Career Beginnings	Hospital Youth Mentoring	Job Corps	JOBSTART	JTPA	Junior Achievement	JROTC - Career Academy	STEP	YIEPP
Goals	Improve employability	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Stay in school and/or achieve (increase educational credentials)	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
	Prepare for college	X	X	X							
	Increase earnings					X	X				X
	Reduce dependence on welfare*						X				
	Reduce anti-social behaviors				X						
	Improve quality of life							X			
Participants	Economically disadvantaged**				X	X	X				X
	At-risk	X	X	X		X			X	X	
	Middle school (6th-8th grades)			X				X			
	High school (9th-12th grade)	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
	High school dropouts					X	X				
	Out-of-school young adults				X	X	X				X
Infrastructure	Program staff	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
	Volunteers		X					X			
Employment Activities	Job skills training classes	X			X	X			X		
	On-the-job training			X							X
	Subsidized employment			X	X					X	
	Summer employment		X							X	X
	Job search assistance, training		X	X	X	X	X				
	Training in trade skill (computer, plumbing, etc.)				X						
	Financial incentive for training					X				X	

		Career Academies	Career Beginnings	Hospital Youth Mentoring	Job Corps	JOBSTART	JTPA	Junior Achievement	JROTC - Career Academy	STEP	YIEPP
Other Activities	Academic	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Life skills training				X			X		X	
	Mentoring		X	X							
Intensity	At participants interest			X	X	X	X				
	Daily involvement	X			X			X	X		
	While in high school	X	X	X					X		X
	Summer		X							X	
	Non-summer months only	X	X						X		
Type	Residential				X						
	School-based***	X						X	X		
	Community-based		X	X	X	X	X			X	X
	Government-based initiative	X			X	X	X		X		X
Other	Details vary by site	X	X	X			X*		X		X
* This goal applies to adults only.											
** To be eligible for Job Training Partnership Act services (economically disadvantaged by JOBSTART standards) a person must be receiving public assistance; have family income at or below the poverty line or 70 percent of the lowest living standard income level; be homeless, under the definition of federal statutes; or, in some cases, be a handicapped adult whose own income fits within the guidelines but whose family income exceeds it. (from JOBSTART, p.5)											
*** Reflects services offered during normal school day. Does not reflect services that may be contracted out to local providers which may include public schools, community colleges, and proprietary schools.											

What Goals Do the Programs Address?

All of the programs in this synthesis have a goal of improving young people’s employability. Improving young people’s employability is generally achieved through increased education and experience or the acquisition of technical skills. Junior Achievement sets out to “improve the quality of life” for participants, but most other programs have more narrowly defined goals. Specifically, Job Corps, JOBSTART, the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps - Career Academy (JROTC – CA), and the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects aim to prepare participants for employment by offering vocational training and experience, helping participants identify career fields of interest, providing assistance in job placement, or any combination of these. In addition, JOBSTART, JTPA, and the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects specify increased earnings as a goal.

At the same time, a common goal in all of the programs except Junior Achievement is to get participants to stay in school, or improve their educational credentials, or both. For instance, Career Academies, Career Beginnings, and the Hospital Youth Mentoring Program aim to prepare participants for college. Programs may include goals in the

health and safety domain that will indirectly improve employability. Job Corps strives to reduce antisocial behavior, for example, and Summer Training and Education Program aims to prevent pregnancy.

Who Are the Program/Study Participants?

Most of the programs focus on adolescents who are at risk of failing in school, dropping out of school, not being able to find and maintain employment in adulthood, or both. Except for JOBSTART, which serves economically disadvantaged dropouts age 17 to 21, all of the programs include high school students. Hospital Youth Mentoring Program and Junior Achievement also offer their programs to middle-school students. Job Corps is offered to disadvantaged youths age 16 to 24, and JTPA is offered to economically disadvantaged adults and youth between the ages of 16 and 21.³

What Activities Are Offered?

Employment activities within each initiative are varied. The majority of programs offer job skills training classes, job search assistance and training, or both. In addition, JOBSTART and Summer Training and Education Program offer financial incentives for job training. Some programs offer on-the-job training, (HYMP, YIEPP) while others offer guaranteed summer employment (CB, STEP, YIEPP). In some cases, employment opportunities offered by the programs are subsidized positions (JC, STEP). Job Corps offers vocational training in specific areas such as business and clerical, health, construction, culinary arts, and building and apartment maintenance.

All of the programs that strive to improve employment potential offer at least some activities aimed at improving participants' academic achievement. Some also offer life skills training (JC, JA, STEP) and mentoring (CB, HYMP). Life skills training may encompass instruction on health education, social responsibility, community involvement, decision making, and sexual behavior. While these activities are not employment-oriented, they can have an indirect effect on employability.

Most programs covered here are community-based; that is, core activities take place in a community setting. Moreover, activities generally take place outside normal school hours. Some programs work in conjunction with other organizations, such as public schools. Career Beginnings is a collaboration of local colleges or universities (program sponsors), the public schools, and the business community. Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects, though community-based, work closely with the schools, requiring participants to be enrolled and to meet attendance and performance standards.

Other programs are school-based, offering services primarily in school buildings during normal school hours. The Career Academies and Junior Achievement programs fall into this category. Job Corps is the only residential program: 80 percent of participants

³ For the purposes of this review, JTPA results are summarized only for the youth sample of out-of-school youths age 16 to 21, and JOB Corps results are summarized only for youths age 16 to 17 when assigned to participate in the program.

are provided meals, entertainment, sports and recreation, social skills training, and other related activities in a residential setting. Counselors and residential advisors help students plan their educational and vocational curricula and create a supportive environment.

What Other Characteristics Do Programs Share?

Services are generally delivered by employed staff, though they are sometimes supplemented with volunteers (CB, JA). Employees provide career counseling and instruction. Volunteers serve as mentors in Career Beginnings, and volunteers specifically from the business community serve as instructors for Junior Achievement. Two programs, Job Corps and JOBSTART, are sponsored by JTPA.

Activities are usually offered during nonschool hours. Although details vary by site, programs generally set minimum time requirements. JOBSTART sites, for example, are required to offer at least 200 hours of basic education and 500 hours of occupational skills training per year. Summer Training and Education Program, which offers most of its services during the summer, requires 18 hours of life skills training, 90 hours of remediation, and 90 hours of part-time work over the course of two summers. Career Beginnings offers an orientation and several workshops.

Of the programs offered during school hours, two stand out as especially time-intensive: Career Academies (including JROTC – CA), which adopts a school-within-a-school approach, and Job Corps, which is a largely residential program. Junior Achievement activities are also worked into the daily school curriculum.

Several programs offer services on an open entry and exit basis, depending on the participant's interest (JC, JS, JTPA). Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects require participants to stay in school and will accept any young person who is trying to complete high school. The Career Academies and Junior Achievement are offered during the academic year. Most other programs serving high school students offer services during the school year as well as the summer months. Summer Training and Education Program takes place primarily during two consecutive summers, with relatively little support given to students during the intervening school year.

PART II. OUTCOMES POSITIVELY AFFECTED BY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

This section describes the impact of employment programs on specific outcomes in four areas of youth development: educational achievement and cognitive attainment, health and safety, social and emotional well-being, and self-sufficiency. Tables 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d summarize the findings of studies conducted on each of the programs in this synthesis. All of the studies except those in the “best bets” category are experimental. Each table contains:

- “Youth outcomes”—specific outcomes in each area of youth development that an employment program seeks to achieve.
- “Employment programs work”—specific evidence from experimental studies that a particular program had a significant positive effect on a particular developmental outcome.
- “Employment programs don’t work”—experimental evidence that, to date, a specific outcome has not been positively affected by an employment program. These findings should not be construed to mean that a particular employment program can never positively affect outcomes or that a program cannot be modified to positively affect outcomes.
- “Mixed reviews”—experimental evidence that an employment program has been shown to be effective in some, but not all, studies or that it has been found to be effective for some, but not all, groups of young people.
- “Best bets”—practices that have not been thoroughly tested but that may be important from a theoretical standpoint, whether on the basis of quasi-experimental studies, nonexperimental analyses of experimental data, analyses of longitudinal and survey studies, or wisdom from the field.

“Best Bet” approaches are discussed in Part III of this report.

Educational Achievement and Cognitive Attainment

While educational achievement is not in itself an employment outcome, the attainment of a high school diploma or college degree helps young people secure gainful employment. In fact, it is important to monitor the impact of employment programs on educational outcomes: If the programs interfere with educational progress, they may weaken a young person’s ability to achieve self-sufficiency in adulthood. Alternatively, employment programs may motivate youths to do better in school.

Two studies indicate that employment programs reduce school absences. If programs can demonstrate the importance of regular school attendance, they may improve a youth’s chances of graduating from school and may also instill an important job skill—dependability. In experimental analyses, both an intensive school-based program and a

community-based program improved youth attendance at school (CA4, CB). The Career Academies program also decreased dropout rates among youths at high risk of dropping out.

Evidence that employment programs have a positive impact on educational achievement during high school is conditional at best. Summer Training and Education Program, for example, did not improve the high school grades of participants (STEP2). Evaluators attribute this finding to the likelihood that youths need continued support through the school year to maximize the summer program's effects. Furthermore, the program improved the reading and math skills of students in the short term, (STEP1) but this impact disappeared after participants left the program (STEP2). Participation in Career Academies does not improve standardized achievement scores in reading or math (CA4).

Employment programs may influence academic attitudes and behaviors. Students who participated in Career Academies, a more intensive program, were more likely than those in the control group to report that they were motivated to attend school and that their classmates are highly engaged in school and work with them on school projects (CA2). Students in the more intensive programs also increased substantially the number of academic courses they took (JC, CA4).

Evidence that participation in employment programs leads young people to earn a high school diploma or GED is mixed. It is important to note that some programs target youths who are in school, while others target out-of-school youths. Participants in Job Corps, which targets disadvantaged youths, and JOBSTART, which targets economically disadvantaged dropouts age 17 to 21, passed the GED exam at significantly higher rates than youths in the control group. Similarly, young women who participated in the JTPA evaluation, which is geared toward out-of-school youths, were more likely to obtain a high school diploma or GED than young women in the control group. Job Corps is primarily a residential program, whereas JOBSTART and JTPA are not, yet all were successful at improving participants' chances of obtaining a high school diploma or its equivalent. Evidence also indicates that students in Career Academies, a school within a school, had significantly higher rates of graduation from high school (CA4).

On the other hand, participation in the Summer Training and Education Program did not improve high school graduation rates. Again, this may reflect at-risk youths' need for supportive services year round, not just during summer. While the Job Corps program improved GED attainment, it actually decreased a youth's chances of receiving a high school diploma.

It is not clear whether employment programs facilitate college enrollment. High school students participating in Career Beginnings were more likely to attend college compared to a control group; (CB1) however, youths age 16 to 17 participating in Job Corps were not (JC).

Summary: Educational Achievement and Cognitive Attainment

Employment programs influence only a few educational and cognitive outcomes consistently.

- Employment programs reduce absences from school.
- Evidence that employment programs have a positive impact on educational achievement in high school is conditional at best.
- Employment programs can promote positive academic attitudes and increase the likelihood that students will take academic courses.
- Overall, evidence that employment programs lead to earning a high school diploma or GED is mixed.
- One program shows that employment programs facilitate enrollment in college, while one does not.

Table 3a. Effects of Employment Programs on Educational Achievement and Cognitive Attainment Outcomes*

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
School Absences (2 experimental studies)	Substantially improved attendance and decreased dropout rates among youth at high risk of dropping out ^{CA4} Program youth had fewer unexcused absences compared to control group ^{CB}			Integrating vocational components into an academic curriculum enhances school attendance, even compared to youth in a highly structured JROTC program ^{CA5} High levels of support from teachers and peers in the 9th or 10th grade reduced school dropout and chronic absenteeism, even among high-risk youth ^{CA3}
High school grades (1 experimental study)		Programs don't work: Compared to control group program youth do not have significantly higher grades ^{STEP2}		The integration of vocational components into an academic curriculum enhances grades, even compared to youth in a highly structured JROTC program ^{CA5}
Reading skills (2 experimental studies)			Significant improvements in reading skills after 12 months and 15 months ^{STEP1} However, impact disappears after program end ^{STEP2} Did not improve standardized reading achievement test scores ^{CA4}	
Math skills (2 experimental studies)			Significant improvements in math skills after 12 months and 15 months ^{STEP1} However, impact disappears after program end ^{STEP2} Did not improve standardized math achievement test scores ^{CA4}	

* Program symbols: CA Career Academies JTPA Job Training Partnership Act
 CB Career Beginnings JA Junior Achievement
 HYMP Hospital Youth Mentoring Program CA-JROTC JROTC - Career Academies
 JC Job Corps STEP Summer Training and Education
 JS JOBSTART YIEPP Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
<p>Participation in academic courses (2 experimental studies)</p>	<p>Substantially increased academic course-taking among youth at high risk of dropping out, and also increased the likelihood of earning enough credits to graduate on-time^{CA4}</p> <p>Compared to the control group, program participation increased the percentage who ever took academic classes (youth aged 16-17 at program assignment)^{JC}</p>			<p>Students with intensive participation in School-to-Work programs took more rigorous courses, including advanced math and science courses, than those who did not participate^{MP1}</p>
<p>Attitudes about completing school (1 experimental study)</p>	<p>Compared to control youth, program youth were more likely to report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They were motivated to attend school^{CA2} • Their classmates are highly engaged in school and work with them on school projects^{CA2} 			
<p>High school credential (5 experimental studies)</p>			<p>Programs work: Compared to control group, program youth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passed GED at significantly higher rates (42.0 vs 28.6 percent)^{JS2}; 34.1 vs 17.7 during the 30 month follow-up (for those who were 16-17 at random assignment)^{JC} • Have an improved chance of graduating from high school^{CA4} <p>Programs work for subgroups: Female participants age 16-21 when assigned to the program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtained a high school or GED degree at significantly higher rates (by 11 percentage points for those who actually enrolled in program, sample of out of school youth aged 16-21 at assignment)^{JTFA} <p>Programs don't work: In long-term, program youth not significantly different from control group^{STEP2}</p> <p>Participants age 16-17 when randomly assigned to program were less likely to</p>	

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
			<p>graduate from high school than controls^{JC}</p> <p>Programs don't work for subgroups: There were no significant impacts on GED for either male youth or male youth with an arrest record^{JTPA}</p>	
<p>College Enrollment (2 experimental studies)</p>			<p>Programs work: Compared to control group, program youth more likely to attend college^{CB}</p> <p>Programs don't work: Compared to control group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No difference (disadvantaged youth 16-17 at program assignment)^{JC} 	

Health and Safety

Employment programs exert little impact on health and safety behaviors, although few evaluations of these outcomes exist.

Participation in employment programs does not have a significant impact on outcomes in the area of family formation. Participants are not less likely than their peers in control groups to live with a partner (JC), have a child (JC), live with a child (JC), delay pregnancy (STEP2), or reduce their sexual activity (STEP1). Moreover, young women who were custodial mothers when they entered a program for school dropouts were likely to *increase* childbearing (JS2).

While employment programs do not impact premature family formation, one study shows that participants do have greater knowledge of contraceptives and responsible sexual behavior and report more frequent use of contraceptives during intercourse (STEP2). This program aimed specifically to prevent pregnancy and required youth to attend classes on life issues, such as sexual behavior.

Finally, there are mixed reviews on whether employment programs influence drug and alcohol use. The Job Corps program shows no significant impact on alcohol or drug use. JOBSTART, on the other hand, does have a significant impact on the use of drugs (4 percent of the program group compared to almost 6 percent of controls report using drugs at the time of the evaluation) (JS2).

Youth who were 16 to 17 years old at the time they were assigned to Job Corps did not have significantly better general health than the control group (JC). No other studies evaluated health.

Summary: Health and Safety

Although few evaluations exist, evidence indicates that, in general, employment programs exert little impact on health and safety behaviors.

- Employment programs do not have a significant impact on family formation, but results from one study show it can increase knowledge of responsible sexual practices and use of contraceptives.
- Employment programs do not have a significant impact on general health, but only one study examined this outcome.
- One evaluation shows that programs can reduce drug use, but another does not.

Table 3b. Effects of Employment Programs on Health and Safety*

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
Family formation (3 experimental studies)		No significant impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living w/ a partner^{JC} • Having a child^{JC} • Living w/ a child^{JC} • Delaying pregnancy^{STEP2} • Reducing sexual activity^{STEP2} (Job Corps impacts measured shortly after program, youth ages 16 and 17 at random assignment; STEP measured longer term) Increased childbearing among school dropouts who were custodial mothers when they entered the program ^{JS2}		
Contraceptive knowledge (1 experimental study)	Program youth have greater knowledge of contraceptives and responsible sexual behavior practices ^{STEP2} Program youth report greater use of contraceptives during intercourse ^{STEP2}			
Self-perceived Health (1 experimental study)		Compared to control group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant differences in self-reported health (16-17 year olds at random assignment)^{JC} 		

* Program symbols:

CA	Career Academies	JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act
CB	Career Beginnings	JA	Junior Achievement
HYMP	Hospital Youth Mentoring Program	CA-JROTC	JROTC - Career Academies
JC	Job Corps	STEP	Summer Training and Education
JS	JOBSTART	YIEPP	Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
<p>Alcohol and drug use (2 experimental studies)</p>			<p>Programs work: Compared to control group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program youth (school dropouts) reported significantly lower use of drugs (4.1 vs 5.8 percent)^{J52} <p>Programs don't work: No significant differences of alcohol or illegal drug use between control group and program youth^{JC}</p>	

Social and Emotional Well-Being

Findings regarding the impact of employment programs on supportive relationships with adults and peers are far from conclusive. However, participation in one school-based program does increase the likelihood that youths will feel that their teachers give them personalized attention and have high expectations of them and that their peers are supportive (CA2).

Employment programs reduce arrest rates for young adults, but this effect tends to disappear once youths leave the programs. Participation in JOBSTART, a community-based program targeted toward school dropouts, reduced arrest rates significantly one year after participants were assigned to the program (JS2). Job Corps also reduced arrests, convictions, and incarcerations in the first year after assignment to the program (JC). However the impacts disappeared after the first year (JC).

In the longer term, programs show no significant reduction in arrest rates; sometimes, in fact, participants experience an increase in arrest rates. For example, participants in the JTPA evaluation did not have significantly different arrest rates 21 and 36 months after being assigned at random to the program; furthermore, young men without an arrest record at the time of assignment experienced an almost 11 percentage point increase (JTPA). Job Corps and JOBSTART ceased to make a difference in arrest rates by the long-term follow-up studies(JS2).

Summary: Social and Emotional Well-Being

Employment programs exhibit potential for exposing youths to supportive relationships and reducing criminal behavior as long as they participate in the program.

- Findings regarding the impact of employment programs on supportive relationships with adults and peers are promising but far from conclusive.
- Employment programs reduce arrest rates for young adults, but impacts tend to disappear once youths leave a program.

Table 3c. Effects of Employment Programs on Socioemotional Well-being*

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
<p>Positive relationships with others (1 experimental study)</p>	<p>Compared to control group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program youth more likely to report that teachers give them personalized attention and have high expectations of them^{CA2} 			<p>A number of nonexperimental evaluations indicate that integrating a vocational component into a school curriculum exposes youth to more and positive adult relationships^{MP1}:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of students that found the adults in their life helpful increased Relationships with adults at work gave students a network that supported learning and career development Youth apprentices felt that they had business contacts that will help get them jobs in the future
<p>Positive peer relationships (1 experimental study)</p>	<p>Compared to control group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program youth more likely to believe that their peers were supportive^{CA2} 			
<p>Awareness of goals and steps to achieve goals (1 experimental study)</p>	<p>Compared to control group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> program youth more likely to perceive a strong connection between what they learned in school and their longer-term education and career interests^{CA2} 			
<p>Arrest Rate, short-term (2 experimental studies^{**)})</p>	<p>Compared to control group: program youth had reduced arrests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in the first year after program assignment^{JC, JS2} Impacts were greatest for men without prior arrests^{JS2} 			

* Program symbols: CA Career Academies JTPA Job Training Partnership Act
 CB Career Beginnings JA Junior Achievement
 HYMP Hospital Youth Mentoring Program CA-JROTC JROTC - Career Academies
 JC Job Corps STEP Summer Training and Education
 JS JOBSTART YIEPP Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
<p>Arrest rate, Long-term (3 experimental studies)</p>		<p>Compared to control group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant impact 21 and 36 months after assignment^{JTPA} and 30 months after assignment^{IC} male youth without a prior arrest record experienced a 10.5 percentage point increase at second follow-up, which was 24-43 months after random assignment (out of school youth between the ages of 16 and 21 at assignment)^{JTPA} No impact found for the outcome of "ever arrested" in years 1-4 after random assignment (since there was a significant impact for year 1, this implies that the program ceased to be effective once participation ended) (sample of school dropouts)^{JS2} 		

Self-Sufficiency

Self-sufficiency in adulthood is arguably a primary indicator of healthy youth development. The programs in this synthesis stand out from other youth programs in that they aim not only to promote general development, but also to steer a young person toward an outcome—employment—that is shaped largely by environmental and demographic characteristics. Therefore, it is generally *not* the goal of these programs to have an immediate impact on earnings and employment status. In fact, increased earnings and employment may derail youths from completing high school. The findings from program evaluations should be considered with this caution in mind.

There is little reason to conclude that employment programs foster employment. While studies of Career Academies show that participants were more likely than youth in the control group to work during high school, studies of two other programs show that participants were significantly less likely to work in the first year after assignment to the program (JS2, JC). These short-term findings are not surprising and do not necessarily indicate failure: Youths may be trading employment hours for time invested in their education.

This raises another question: Does random assignment to a job training program improve a youth's long-term chances of being employed? Surprisingly, evidence from three diverse programs indicates that the answer is no. Youths in JOBSTART, which targets high school dropouts, did not have significantly higher employment rates at the three- and four-year follow-ups. Nor did young people in Career Beginnings have significantly higher employment rates in the year after high school, compared to a control group. Authors of the Career Beginnings evaluation attribute this finding to a greater percentage of participants trading work for higher education. Finally, Summer Training and Education Program did not result in significantly higher employment rates after high school.

Some evidence does suggest that employment programs increase employment. Job Corps participants were slightly more likely than youth in the control group to be employed at the 30-month follow-up (63 percent compared to 59 percent).

Employment programs do not increase short-term earnings. Of three experimental evaluations (including one residential program), none finds that participation in an employment program significantly increases short-term earnings (JC, JTPA, JS2). Although they show potential for increasing longer-term earnings, employment programs rarely increase longer-term earnings for the program group as a whole.

It is possible that program investments simply do not pay off immediately. Of three programs studied (including one residential program), only one significantly improved the longer-term earnings of program members as a group (JC). In the last quarter of a 30-month follow-up, Job Corps youths who were age 16 to 17 when they began the program had gained \$21 to \$26 in average weekly earnings. Similarly, those age 16 to 19 when they were assigned to JOBSTART had significantly higher earnings when

compared to 20- to 21-year-olds (JS2). While JOBSTART did not increase earnings for the entire group, it did increase the earnings of some subgroups compared to their peers in the control group—namely, young men with arrest records, young men who dropped out of school because of educational difficulties, and young women who dropped out of school and were not living with their own children (JS2). Finally, JTPA programs did not increase longer-term earnings for its targeted group: out-of-school youths age 16 to 21.

Do employment programs help participants stay independent of public assistance? Overall, they do not reduce the need for welfare assistance (JTPA, STEP2, JS2, JC). One residential program successfully decreased the percentage of program group members receiving food stamps (JC), and another program reduced receipt of Aid to Families with Dependent Children among young women who were childless when originally assigned to the program at random (JS2).

Some evidence indicates that employment programs help youths secure high-quality jobs—that is, jobs with higher pay and more fringe benefits. Youths in school-based and residential programs secured better jobs than youths who did not participate in an employment program. Job Corps youths had jobs with higher pay and slightly more fringe benefits, such as health insurance, paid sick and vacation leave, and retirement benefits, although they were not employed in significantly different occupations than youth in the control group (JC). Career Academy students were more likely than a comparison group to say that their jobs gave them opportunities to learn new things (CA3).

Across various types of initiatives and evaluations, youths randomly assigned to a program were exposed to activities that helped them develop career awareness and job skills. Career Academy participants were more likely than a control group to participate in both in-school and out-of-school career development (CA3). Job Corps youths received significantly more vocational training than a control group (JC).

Summary: Self-Sufficiency

Employment programs increase youths' exposure to career development and job training, but it is uncertain whether participation promotes self-sufficiency in adulthood.

- Surprisingly, there is little reason to conclude that employment programs foster employment.
- Employment programs do not increase short-term earnings.
- Employment programs show potential for increasing the longer-term earnings of younger participants, but they rarely result in longer-term earnings for participants as a whole.

- There is some indication that program impacts on earnings may be greater for younger participants (age 16 to 19).
- Overall, employment programs do not reduce the need for welfare assistance.
- Some evidence indicates that employment programs help youths secure better jobs.
- Employment programs expose youths to activities that help them develop career awareness and job skills.

Table 3d. Effects of Employment Programs on Self-Sufficiency*

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
<p>Short-term employment (3 experimental studies)</p>			<p>Programs work: Compared to comparison group, academy students were more likely to work in high school^{CA3}</p> <p>Programs don't work: Compared to control group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program group members were significantly less likely to work in the first year after assignment to the program^{JS2,JC} 	
<p>Long-term employment (4 experimental studies)</p>			<p>Programs work: Program youth age 16-17 at assignment to program were more likely to work 30 months after assignment compared to the control group (62.8 percent vs 58.9 percent)^{JC}</p> <p>Programs don't work: Compared to control group, program youth do not work significantly more:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At 3 and 4 year follow-ups (high school dropouts)^{JS2} After-high school^{STEP2} During year after high school^{CB} (attributed to greater percentage of program youth trading work for higher education)^{CB} 	

* **Program symbols:**

CA	Career Academies	JTPA	Job Training Partnership Act
CB	Career Beginnings	JA	Junior Achievement
HYMP	Hospital Youth Mentoring Program	CA-JROTC	JROTC - Career Academies
JC	Job Corps	STEP	Summer Training and Education
JS	JOBSTART	YIEPP	Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
<p>Short-term earnings (3 experimental studies)</p>		<p>Compared to a control group, earnings not significantly higher:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> during program participation or shortly thereafter (age 16-17 when assigned to program)^{JC} within first 18 months of follow-up (sample of out of school youth age 16-21)^{JTPA} <p>Annual earnings significantly less than control group in first year of follow-up (sample of school dropouts)^{JS2}</p>		
<p>Long-term earnings (3 experimental studies)</p>			<p>Programs work: In the last quarter of a 30-month follow-up of those ages 16-17 at assignment, program youth gained \$21-26 (1998 dollars) in average weekly earnings^{JC}</p> <p>Programs work for subgroups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Young men with arrest records^{JS2} Young men who dropped out of school because of educational difficulties^{JS2} Female school dropouts who were not living with own children^{JS2} Those ages 16 through 19 at assignment had significantly higher earnings 4 years later than those ages 20 and 21 at assignment^{JS2} <p>Programs don't work: No significant impacts 30 months after assignment (sample of out-of-school youth aged 16-21)^{JTPA}</p>	

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
<p>Welfare receipt (4 experimental studies)</p>			<p>Programs work: Fewer program group members received food stamps (27.5 percent vs 31.1 percent)^{JC}</p> <p>Programs don't work: AFDC receipt and food stamp receipt not significantly different for treatment group at 30 month follow-up (out of school youth aged 16-21 at assignment)^{JTPA}</p> <p>Program participation did not reduce the need for welfare assistance compared to control group^{STEP2,JS2}</p> <p>Program participation did not reduce the receipt of AFDC among youth who were 16-17 at program assignment^{JC}</p> <p>Results for subgroups: Young women without children at program assignment were the only group who were significantly less likely than their control group counterparts to receive AFDC during the later years of follow-up^{JS2}</p>	

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
<p>Quality of employment (2 experimental studies)</p>	<p>Program youth were significantly more likely than randomly assigned control group youth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to say that their jobs gave them opportunities to learn new things^{CA3} to secure higher paying jobs with slightly more fringe benefits: 41.5 percent vs 38.5 percent had paid sick leave; 14.7 percent vs 12.8 percent had child care assistance; 41.0 percent vs 38.1 percent had retirement or pension benefits available; 42.2 percent vs 39.4 percent had a dental plan available; and 25.3 percent vs 22.4 percent had tuition reimbursement or training course available^{JC} 			
<p>Participation in career development (1 experimental study)</p>	<p>Compared to control group, program youth more likely to participate in both in-school career development activities and out-of-school development activities such as career-related field trips^{CA3} Over half participated intensively^{CA3}</p>			<p>In a program that assigns mentors to youth, mentors and students report giving and receiving a lot of career guidance (includes job-shadowing, job participation, advice, etc.)^{HYMP}</p>
<p>Participation in vocational courses (1 experimental study)</p>	<p>Compared to the control group, program membership increased the amount of vocational training received by youth 16-17 at program assignment^{JC}</p>			
<p>Participation in job skills training or on the job training (no experimental analyses)</p>				<p>Integrating vocational components into a school curriculum exposes students to job skills training; students also say that the experience helped them gain a broad range of skills^{MP1}</p> <p>A program targeted explicitly at teaching job skills through planned classes facilitated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of economic concepts^{JA} Critical thinking and problem solving^{JA}

YOUTH OUTCOMES	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WORK	EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS DON'T WORK	MIXED REVIEWS	"BEST BETS"
Type of Job (1 experimental study)		Compared to control group, program group members did not have significantly different occupations ^{JC}		

Summary of Employment Program Impacts

To summarize the findings in all four domains:

- **Evaluations do not consistently agree that employment programs influence the educational and cognitive outcomes of adolescents and young adults, especially academic achievement, receipt of a high school diploma or GED, and college attendance.**
- **Employment programs reduce school absences and may foster positive academic attitudes.**
- **Employment programs exert little impact on health and safety behaviors, although few evaluations exist.**
- **Employment programs show potential to expose youth to supportive relationships and reduce criminal behavior during program participation (but not in the longer term).**
- **Overall, employment programs have disappointing impacts on employment and earnings, but show potential to improve the long-term earnings of certain groups.**
- **Employment programs increase youths' exposure to career development and job training**

PART III. CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

This section summarizes available evidence of effective and ineffective employment program practices, based on a review of the research literature (see Table 4). If evaluations were suitably designed, effective practices could be defined by a program's success in affecting youth outcomes. Unfortunately, few studies evaluate program characteristics in light of their effectiveness at producing desired outcomes. Moreover, those that do are generally not experimental. Consequently, causality can be inferred but not definitively established for these results, which are presented as "best bets" for improving developmental outcomes.

Characteristics of Youth Participants

Risk Status and Age

Employment programs provided the greatest gains for youths at high risk of poor employment or educational outcomes. Gains were made in earnings (JC), school attendance (CA4), preparation for college (CA4), and reduction of probability of arrest (CA4). This finding is strengthened by the fact that *many* outcomes were improved for high-risk youths, compared to similar youths in a control group.

Further, groups at low risk of poor educational and employment outcomes at random assignment did not experience many benefits, as measured by high school dropout rates, attendance, number of academic courses taken, math and reading achievement, fertility, drug use, and arrest rates (CA4). This finding could be considered tentative, however, because it is based primarily on one study and because participation in the program by high-risk youths did not have an impact on all outcomes measured in the study. It should be noted that low-risk youths did not experience worse outcomes as a result of participating in the study.

Two additional studies provide evidence that younger youth benefited more from an employment initiative than older youths (JC,JS2). In experimental analyses of subgroups, Job Corps enrollees age 16 to 17 experienced significant earnings gains, greater likelihood of earning a high school diploma or GED, and lower rates of incarceration (JC). Likewise, Job Start youth who were 16-19 (at program assignment) had higher earnings in the long-run compared to control group members, whereas those aged 20-21 did not.

Relationships with Adults and Peers

At least one program demonstrates that supportive adult and peer relationships are key to developing self-sufficiency. Supportive relationships are both reasonable and proven inputs in youth development (Jekielek, Moore, & Hair, 2001). While such relationships were not linked directly to employment outcomes for youths, they were linked to outcomes that promote self-sufficiency in adulthood. Youths who reported receiving

high levels of support from teachers and peers in 9th or 10th grade were less likely to drop out of high school, exhibit chronic absenteeism, or engage in risky behaviors (CA4). This finding held for 75 percent of the students served and is even more compelling because it benefited youths at greatest risk of poor education and employment outcomes.

Program Characteristics

Infrastructure

One program found that the more well structured a program, the more effective it was in terms of youth participation (CA3). Students in programs with highly structured employer partnerships or strong support for nonteaching employer coordinators reported greater participation in Career Academies and work-based learning activities than students in academies that were less structured.

Intensiveness

How do residential and school-based programs perform compared to community-based programs? While no study evaluates this question experimentally, a few answers can be gleaned from this summary. Beneficial program impacts were not limited to any one type of program. Some evidence indicates that school-based and residential programs succeed where community-based programs do not, mainly in regard to outcomes in the area of self-sufficiency. Both school-based and community-based programs reduce school absences. Career Academies are somewhat more effective at improving high school students' grades than community-based programs. On the other hand, a community-based, education-focused program (Career Beginnings) was more successful at facilitating college enrollment than other community-based programs or the largely residential Job Corps program.

In the realm of health and safety, all types of programs were shown to be ineffective at reducing teen pregnancy and suppressing family formation. One community-based program (JS2) reduced drug use slightly, but Job Corps was not successful. Both a residential program (JC) and one that is not (JS2) significantly reduced short-term arrest rates, an indicator of social and emotional well-being.

While employment programs have less than optimal impacts on self-sufficiency overall, the Job Corps program shows slightly more success than community-based programs. For example, Job Corps participants were slightly more likely than control group members to be employed at the 30-month follow-up, whereas two community-based programs (JS2, JTPA) show no significant impact. Job Corps was the only program that had a significant impact on earnings for participants as a whole—other programs increased earnings only for certain subgroups. The Job Corps and Career Academies show the most promise for improving the quality of youths' jobs. While three community-based employment initiatives (JTPA, STEP, JS2) did not reduce the need for welfare assistance for the program group as a whole, Job Corps, showed some success, albeit minimal, in decreasing dependence on food stamps.

Job Training

No one type of job training (in-class, on-the-job, or other) stands out as the most effective. Experimental group members of JTPA were assigned to different types of training based on need. That is, youths who were considered the most job-ready were likely to be assigned to on-the-job training, while those who were judged less job-ready were likely to be assigned to in-class training or other training. *In other words, assignment to a program strategy was not random, and findings may be due in part to characteristics of the participants.* None significantly increased total hours of employment or postprogram training for young men, implying that any hours of employment lost while in the program were not made up through increased employment later, and only classroom training increased total hours of employment and training for young women (JTPA). Furthermore, all types of job training had either negative or insignificant impacts on longer-term earnings for young women and for young men who had never been arrested (JTPA).

Table 4. “Best Bets” for Effective Employment Programs*

PROGRAM/ PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS	WHAT WORKS				WHAT DOESN'T WORK				MIXED REVIEWS/ CAUTIONARY NOTES				“BEST BETS”			
	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS
<p>Youth Characteristics</p> <p>Employment programs provided especially positive impacts for the youngest youth (16-17 when enrolled into program):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Earnings gains increased nearly 20 percent by the end of the follow-up period^{JC} The number earning a high school diploma or GED was up by 80 percent^{JC} Arrest rates were reduced by 14 percent and rates of incarceration for a conviction by 26 percent^{JC} <p>Those who were 16-19 at random assignment had significantly higher earnings than the control group for year 4 earnings, whereas those who were 20-21 did not^{JS2}</p>				X	For youth at low risk of poor education or employment outcomes, programs do not significantly impact	X	X	X		Program provided the greatest gains for youth at high risk ⁴ of poor education or employment outcomes:	X	X				
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dropout rates^{CA4} Attendance^{CA4} Math and reading achievement, text scores^{CA4} Fertility^{CA4} Drug-use^{CA4} Probability of arrest^{CA4} <p>(note: program did not weaken these outcomes; further, program does increase the likelihood that low risk students will graduate on-time, take career credits, and talk with a teacher about a job)</p>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased earnings^{JC,JS2} (but no impact for total 30 month earnings in JTPA) Dropout rates fell^{CA4} Attendance, number of academic courses taken increased^{CA4} The likelihood of earning enough credits to graduate on-time increased^{CA4} More remain enrolled through 12th grade^{CA4} Other youth development activities increased (working on a volunteer project, receiving academic award or scholarship)^{CA4} 						

* Youth outcome domains: E Educational Achievement, HS Health and Safety, SE Socio-emotional, SS Self-Sufficiency

Program symbols: CA Career Academies, CB Career Beginnings, HYMP Hospital Youth Mentoring Program, JC Job Corps, JS JOBSTART

JTPA Job Training Partnership Act, JA Junior Achievement, CA-JROTC JROTC - Career Academies, STEP Summer Training and Education, YIEPP Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot

⁴ (Job Corps defines high risk as very young (youth 16-17 at assignment), young mothers, and older youths without a high school diploma or GED at assignment; Career Academies define high risk as more than half had failed courses during the 9th grade, about one-third were chronically absent from school, most had low grade point averages, and over 40 percent had been held back in a previous grades; JOBSTART (study 2) defines high risk as young men who had been arrested before program entry, and young men and women who had dropped out of school because they had educational difficulties)

PROGRAM/ PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS	WHAT WORKS				WHAT DOESN'T WORK				MIXED REVIEWS/ CAUTIONARY NOTES				"BEST BETS"				
	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probability of arrest fell ^{CA4} • Planning and preparation for college increased (research college options, take SATs or ACTs, submit applications, expectation to graduate from college) ^{CA4} <p>Programs did not impact the following outcomes for groups at high risk of poor education or employment outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math and reading achievement ^{CA4} • Use of non-school hours ^{CA4} • Fertility or drug use ^{CA4} • Preparation for employment after high school ^{CA4} 								

PROGRAM/ PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS	WHAT WORKS				WHAT DOESN'T WORK				MIXED REVIEWS/ CAUTIONARY NOTES				"BEST BETS"										
	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS							
Adult and peer relationships																	<p>In nonexperimental analyses, Academies that did not enhance teacher and peer support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased dropout rates^{CA4} • Reduced school attendance^{CA4} • Reduced academic course-taking^{CA41} <p>Compared to students who reported less interpersonal support, both academy and non-academy students who reported that they received high levels of support from teachers and peers in 9th or 10th grade were less likely to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dropout of high school^{CA3} • Exhibit chronic absenteeism^{CA3} • Engage in risk-taking behaviors^{CA3} <p>This finding holds across groups at high and medium risk (about 75 percent of the students served).</p>	X	X				
Infrastructure																	<p>Students in career academies with highly structured employer partnerships or support for nonteaching employer coordinators reported higher levels of participation in CA and</p>			X	X		

PROGRAM/ PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS	WHAT WORKS				WHAT DOESN'T WORK				MIXED REVIEWS/ CAUTIONARY NOTES				"BEST BETS"				
	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	
																	work-based learning activities than those in CA that had less structure ^{CA3}

PROGRAM/ PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS	WHAT WORKS				WHAT DOESN'T WORK				MIXED REVIEWS/ CAUTIONARY NOTES				"BEST BETS"				
	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	E	H	SE	SS	
Residential or School-based vs. less intensive programs	See discussion																
Job training ⁵									Classroom training was the only service (compared to on the job training and other) that significantly increased total hours of employment and training (a difference of 355 hours), and only for young women ^{JTPA}			X	In both social and career-focused mentoring, mentors give and students receive a lot of career guidance ^{HYMP}			X	
									None of the types of training (in class, on the job training, and other) themselves significantly increased total hours of employment and training for young men, implying that hours of employment lost while in the program, if any, were not made up after the program ended ^{JTPA}								
									For all types of training (in class, on the job training, and other):								
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> negative or insignificant impacts on longer-term earnings for both females and non-arrestee male youth^{JTPA} 								

⁵ Youth were not randomly assigned to a strategy; rather, strategies were assigned based on the need of the participant. The most 'job-ready' youth tend to be assigned to the OJT/JSA service strategy. Therefore these differences among the assignees mean that the impacts estimated for each subgroup are applicable only to the individuals in that subgroup. If that service strategy were adopted for the individuals in another subgroup, there is no guarantee that the same impacts would be obtained. ^{JTPA}

Summary of Characteristics Associated with Positive Outcomes

- Employment programs may be most beneficial for younger teens and for youths at high risk of poor educational or employment outcomes.
- At least one program has demonstrated that supportive adult and peer relationships are key to producing positive outcomes related to self-sufficiency.
- One study found that the more well-structured a program, the more likely youths were to participate in it.
- Some beneficial impacts were found across school-based, residential, and community-based programs.
- No one type of job training stands out as most effective.

PART IV. UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Because unemployment in adulthood often leads to poverty for individuals, and is costly to society as well, youth employment programs operate on the principle that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. However, the program evaluations synthesized here do not confidently support the expectation that employment programs will promote self-sufficiency. Given this finding, many questions remain to be answered, including the basic one: Why *aren't* youth employment programs more effective?

Planned variation studies would be useful to help answer another important question—What strategies *are* effective?—as well as a number of the following questions:

- Does job training in itself help young people pursue career plans and future employment? The answer isn't clear. Youths in employment programs *do* participate in job training more than those who do not have access to these programs, and employers do identify basic skills—math and reading, oral communication, and computer proficiency—that would give individuals an advantage in the job market. But disappointingly, there is no evidence that training leads to proficiency in these areas.
- Are different types of training more effective? For which groups?
- Who are the best teachers for employment programs? Staff hired from outside the program to conduct workshops? Volunteer career mentors? Career mentors who are hired and trained as part of the program staff?
- How much job skills training is needed for successful longer-term outcomes?
- How much does skills training or education contribute to successful outcomes, compared to such services as assistance in obtaining child care or searching for a job?
- What is the cost of implementing effective strategies?
- How much training for the program staff is needed to achieve good outcomes for youths?

Not all of these questions are new. A common response to the question, Why aren't youth employment programs more effective? is another question: Are we giving the programs enough time before evaluating their effectiveness? Some would argue that it takes a long time before employment and earnings improvements should be expected to set in.

Another possibility is that evaluations may overemphasize the impact of programs on self-sufficiency, a young adult outcome. To compensate for that possibility, this synthesis looked at a range of age-appropriate measures of youth development, as well

as self-sufficiency. In fact, evaluations indicate that employment programs successfully reduce criminal behavior and appear to increase social support for youths. Findings regarding educational outcomes were more uncertain, and health and safety outcomes were rarely evaluated. Therefore, one final suggestion that emerges from this synthesis is to place greater emphasis on youth outcomes when designing and evaluating employment programs.

Appendix A: Program and Study Descriptions

Program: CAREER ACADEMIES

Population Served:

Size: 1,500 high schools with approximately 100-150 students at each
 Age: 8th or 9th grade at implementation, followed through the end of 12th grade
 Other Characteristics: Academies were selected to include school districts and high schools in large urban centers and small cities. On average, these school districts have higher dropout rates, unemployment rates, and percentages of low-income families.

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
School-within-a-school structure	Teachers	Throughout high school	A team of teachers is linked with a group of students
Integrated academic and vocational curriculum	High schools	Throughout high school	Topics and projects cross individual course lines; the curriculum is integrated thematically by the academy's occupational focus
Business partnerships	Employers in the community	Throughout high school	Employers assist in designing the academy program, provide workplace experiences, and can offer summer or even permanent employment to students

Program Objectives/Goals:

Information; technical and academic skills: Enhance engagement and performance in school; provide credentials and skills needed to make successful transition to postsecondary education and, eventually, a career

Study 1:

Kemple, J., & Rock, J. (1996). *Career Academies: Early implementation lessons from a 10-site evaluation*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

Provide an overview of the study; describe the 10 participating Career Academies and evaluate whether each sustains the structural elements of the Career Academy approach.

Measurement instrument:

Self-administered questionnaire at application and follow-up; school records; teacher questionnaire; interviews with staff, students, school administrators, and local employers conducted by Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, as well as observations of classes and program activities.

Evaluation:

Type: Qualitative and quantitative evaluation (nonexperimental)

Statistical techniques: univariate descriptives, significance level = .10

Population evaluated: At this first stage, 1,953 students had entered the research sample. Of these, 1,064 were assigned at random to the program group; 889 were assigned to the control group and could not participate in the academies (but could participate in other local programs).

Outcome:

None reported

Program: CAREER ACADEMIES

Other Information:

All sites implemented and sustained the demanding structural elements of the academy approach. 84 percent of the students selected to participate enrolled in the programs. Of those, 73 percent were still enrolled two years later. The academies have attracted large numbers of applicants with a high degree of demographic and educational diversity. Other results reported.

Study 2:

Kemple, J. (1997). *Career Academies: Communities of support for students and teachers: Further findings from a 10-site evaluation*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:Objective:

Assess the extent to which academies function as 'communities of support' for teachers and students

Measurement instrument:

Questionnaires completed by students and teachers during their first or second year in the study

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental: random assignment to control and treatment groups

Statistical techniques: significance testing, significance level = .10, two-tailed test

Population evaluated: 1,406 students and 468 teachers

Impacts:

Academy students were more likely than their non-academy counterparts to report that teachers give them personalized attention and have high expectations of them; to report that their classmates are highly engaged in school and work with them on school projects and assignments; to report that they were intrinsically motivated to attend school; and to perceive a strong connection between what they learned in school and their longer-term education and career interests.

Other Information:

None

Study 3:

Kemple, J., Poglinco, S., & Snipes, J. (1999). *Career Academies: Building career awareness and work-based learning activities through employer partnerships*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:Objective:

Examine the employer partnerships and how they evolved

Assess the extent to which CA increased student participation in various career awareness and work-based learning activities

Measurement instrument:

Field research

Survey administered to about 1,600 academy and non-academy students at the end of 12th grade

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental (random assignment); qualitative

Statistical techniques: regression adjusted to control for background characteristics of sample members. Significance level = .10

Population evaluated: 1,600 academy and nonacademy students at the end of 12th grade

Program: CAREER ACADEMIES

Impacts:

Students in the academy group were more likely to work, and more likely to work in jobs that were connected to school and that incorporated “high” levels of work-based learning content. More likely to be exposed to career-related themes or activities in school, and participate in job-shadowing or field trips; more likely to have high-quality work-based learning experiences during high school.

Academy students participated more frequently and intensively than nonacademy students in career awareness and work-based learning activities. Students in academies with highly structured employer partnerships or support from nonteaching employer coordinators reported greater participation in CA and work-based learning activities than those in academies with less structure.

Other Information:

None

Study 4:

Kemple, J. & Snipes, J. (2000). *Career Academies: Impacts on students’ engagement and performance in high school*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:Objective:

To what extent does the Career Academy approach alter the high school environment in ways that better support students? Change educational, employment, and youth development outcomes for students at greater or lesser risk of school failure?
How do the manner and context in which Career Academy programs are implemented influence their effects on student outcomes?

Measurement instrument:

School records (daily attendance rates, credits earned, course-taking patterns)

Student surveys (asking about school experiences, employment and work-related experiences, extracurricular activities, preparation for college and postsecondary jobs, and plans for the future)

Standardized math and reading tests.

Qualitative field research.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental; random assignment of youths who applied for the program into a program group and a control group who did not receive CA services.

Statistical techniques: difference-in-means, significance testing, significance level = .10

Population evaluated: 1,764 students; 959 in the program group, 805 in the control group

Program: CAREER ACADEMIES

Impacts:

Substantially improved outcomes, especially among students at high risk of dropping out: reduced dropout rates, improved attendance, increased academic course-taking, and increased likelihood of earning enough credits to graduate on time. Without access to academies, a high percentage of nonacademy students in the high-risk subgroup became even more disengaged from school.

Among students least likely to drop out of high school, the CA site increased the likelihood of graduating on time and increased the number of vocational course-taking by these students without reducing their likelihood of completing a basic core academic curriculum.

Did **not** improve standardized math and reading achievement test scores.

Both academy and nonacademy students who reported that they received strong support from teachers and peers in 9th or 10th grade were less likely to drop out of high school, exhibit chronic absenteeism, or engage in risk-taking behaviors than students who reported less interpersonal support.

Other Information:

High-risk students entered the study with background characteristics indicating that they were disengaged from school. More than half had failed courses during the 9th grade, about one-third were chronically absent, most had low grade-point averages, and over 40 percent had been held back in a previous grade.

Students had varying degrees of exposure to CA programs.

The evaluation does not yet include information about the rates at which these students actually graduated from high school and whether the dropouts eventually returned to pursue a degree.

Approximately 88 percent of the students selected for admission to a Career Academy actually enrolled in the programs; 58 percent of those selected remained in an academy throughout high school.

Program: CAREER BEGINNINGS

Population Served:

Size: 100-200 students per site at 24 sites throughout the United States and Canada
 Age: 11th and 12th grades
 Other Characteristics: Must meet thresholds of being at risk but also show potential for success in program: average academic achievers (middle 60 percent of their class); low to moderate family income; limited career awareness and aspirations; not a serious juvenile offender; good attendance record. Sites must meet the following requirements: 50 percent economically disadvantaged; 80 percent neither parent with a college degree; 45 percent male.

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Mentoring	Adults in community	2 years	1:1 mentor:student ratio
Academic support	Sponsoring university/college	2 years	Competency-based curriculum; workshops (college preparation, college entrance exams, career exploration, etc.)
Summer component, workforce training	Mentor	1 summer	Summer job provided after 11th grade

Program Objectives/Goals:

Information; technical and academic skills: Increased high school graduation rates
 Increased college attendance or technical training rates
 Increased employment rates after high school

Study:

Cave, G., & Quint, J. (1990). *Career Beginnings impact evaluation: Findings from a program for disadvantaged high school students*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

To evaluate the effectiveness of the program at increasing rates of college attendance and employment.

Measurement instrument:

Student interviews, conducted one and two years after random assignment (12th grade and one year after high school)

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental

Statistical techniques: Random assignment in 11th grade; regression analysis. Significance level = .10

Population evaluated: 1,233 experimental and control group students in seven sites

Program: CAREER BEGINNINGS

Impacts:

Program group members had fewer unexcused absences from school and were more likely to attend college than controls. Program group members worked significantly less than the control group during the year after high school (attributed to greater percentage of participants pursuing higher education rather than working).

Other Information: None

Program: HOSPITAL YOUTH MENTORING PROGRAM

Population Served:

Size 10 to 80 students per hospital, for a total of 515 students
 Age: 14-22 (age varies by hospital—some target middle school students; others target high school only)
 Other Characteristics: At risk of failing in school; programs partnered with a local school or district

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Mentoring	Hospital employees	About 1 year	
Employment*	Hospital	About 1 year	Paid and unpaid
Academic skills*	Schools	About 1 year	
College preparation*	Schools	About 1 year	
Interface with schools*	Schools and hospitals	About 1 year	

*The presence of these activities varies by hospital

Program Objectives/Goals:

Information; technical and academic skills: To help at-risk students complete high school and move on to postsecondary education or employment

Study:

McClanahan, W. (1998). *Relationships in a career mentoring program: Lessons learned from the Hospital Youth Mentoring Program*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

Examine the nature and content of the relationships that developed between mentors and students involved in the program.

Measurement instrument:

Telephone interviews with program coordinators
 A survey of students' and mentors' perceptions of the mentoring relationship
 A review of historical program documents
 Scales measuring time engaged in work activities, social activities, and college preparatory activities

Evaluation:

Type: Qualitative and quantitative; nonexperimental

Statistical techniques: Correlations. Significance level = .10

Population evaluated: 380 at-risk youth and their mentors from 13 hospitals (73 percent age 16-18; others were both younger and older)

Outcomes:

Each hospital adopted either a mentoring model that focused on social activities or a nonsocial approach in which youths spent most of their time on hospital work and hospital-based career development activities. Students and mentors in both models report giving and receiving a lot of career guidance in the mentoring relationship. (Mentoring outcomes not reported).

Other Information:

Some hospitals focus on social interaction between mentor and mentee; others direct mentors to focus on career activities.

Program: JOB CORPS

Population Served:

Size: Currently delivered at 119 Job Corps centers nationwide. Job Corps serves more than 60,000 new enrollees annually.

Age: 16 –24

Other Characteristics: Job Corps has been a central part of federal efforts to provide employment assistance to disadvantaged youths between the ages of 16 and 24 since 1964.

Program Components:

Component	Provided by	Duration	Description
Academic education	Center *	Open entry, open exit	Individual and self-paced. Includes remedial education, world of work (consumer education), driver education, home and family living, health education, programs for participants whose primary language is not English, and GED courses.
Vocational training	Center or national labor organizations through contracts with Job Corps	Open entry, open exit	Individual and self-paced. Includes business and clerical, health, construction, culinary arts, and building and apartment maintenance.
Residential living	Center	Open entry, open exit	Nonresidential students limited to 20 percent. Includes meals, dormitory life, entertainment, sports and recreation, center government, center maintenance, and other related activities. Required social skills training.
Health care, health education	Center	Open entry, open exit	Residential and nonresidential. Includes medical examinations and treatment; biochemical tests for drug use, sexually transmitted diseases, and pregnancy; immunizations; dental examinations and treatment; counseling; instruction on basic hygiene, preventive medicine, and self-care.

Program: JOB CORPS

Counseling	Counselors and residential advisors	During involvement in program, recruitment, placement, and transition into regular life and jobs	Help students plan their educational and vocational curricula, offer motivation, and create a supportive environment.
Job placement assistance	Placement contractors (state employment offices, private contractors, or Job Corps centers)	Open entry, open exit	Provide assistance with interviewing and resume writing and services for job development and referral. Distribute the readjustment allowance, a stipend students receive after leaving the program.

* Centers are either contracted out or U.S. Department of Agriculture centers (Civilian Conservation Centers)

Program Objectives/Goals:

Help disadvantaged youths become “more responsible, employable and productive citizens.”

Addresses key developmental needs and goals in several areas, including material resources; emotional support; information, technical and academic knowledge; and social support and interaction.

Study:

Schochet, P., Brughardt, J., & Glazerman, S. (2000). *National Job Corps Study: The short-term impacts of Job Corps on participants’ employment and related outcomes.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

Answer the questions: How effective is Job Corps overall at improving the employability of disadvantaged participants in the short term? Do Job Corps short-term impacts differ for youths with different characteristics? How effective are the residential and nonresidential components of Job Corps in the short term?

Measurement instrument:

Data at baseline, 12-month and 30-month follow-up surveys; forms filled out by counselors.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental design based on a comparison of eligible program applicants who were randomly assigned to a program group (offered the chance to enroll in Job Corps) or to a control group (not given this option); control group members could apply for other job programs

Statistical techniques: Difference in means, with significance testing; weighted analysis; analysis controls for background characteristics that may affect outcomes. Significance level = .05

Population evaluated: 11,787 youths who completed 30-month interviews.

Program: JOB CORPS

Outcome:Education and training:

Compared to the control group, program group members were more likely to receive the GED and vocational certificates and spent more hours in vocational training. Participation did not improve college attendance and had negative impacts on receiving a high school diploma for those enrolled in school at the time they were assigned to participate in Job Corps. Only youths over age 17 spent more hours in academic classes (probably because nearly half of the control group were 16 and 17 and attended high school).

Employment and earnings:

The program increased average weekly earnings after about 2 years from random assignment: In the last quarter of the 30-month follow-up period, the gain in average weekly earnings per participant was \$18, or 11 percent, compared to the control group (average earnings for all participants were \$13 higher). The program provided greater gains for very young students, female participants with children, and older youths who did not possess a high school diploma or GED at enrollment. Program group members (PGM) secured higher-paying jobs with slightly more benefits in the most recent job in quarter 10 (7.07 vs. 6.82, on average). No significant impacts on occupation.

According to several nonexperimental analyses, well under half of those who actually enrolled (39 percent) said they received job placement services, and 75 percent took “world of work” classes that taught general skills for getting and keeping a job—preparation of a resume and application, job sources and interviewing, transition issues.

Non-labor-market outcomes:

Arrest rates were reduced by 22 percent. For those age 16 and 17, arrest rate reductions were largest in the early follow-up period (about 40 percent), before they started leaving the program. Impacts were more sustained for older applicants—the arrest rate for this group did not increase as much after they left the program.

Compared to the control group, PGM reported receiving about \$300 less in public benefits and were less likely to report their health as poor or fair. The program did not significantly impact use of alcohol and illegal drugs or drug treatment services, living with a partner, having a child, or the likelihood of living with or providing support for a child.

Positive impacts for 16- and 17-year-olds are striking:

Earnings gains per participant were nearly 20 percent by the end of the follow-up period. The percentage earning a high school diploma or GED was up by 80 percent. Arrest rates were reduced by 14 percent, and rates of incarceration for a conviction by 26 percent.

Participation:

73 percent of youths given the opportunity to enroll in Job Corps did so. PGM reported staying in JC an average of 8 months, with over 25 percent staying more than 1 year.

Other Information:

Program funded through Job Training Partnership Act. Evaluation took place 30 months after assignment to the program group. Time in program varies for each individual; for many participants, the 30-month point represents short-term (about 0-15 months) impacts. Residential and nonresidential components not randomly assigned; therefore, results for this difference are not causal.

Program: JOBSTART

Population Served:

Size 13 local programs nationwide from 1985 to 1988 (2,312 eligible applicants for demonstration)

Age: 17-21

Other Characteristics: Economically disadvantaged school dropouts with poor reading skills; funded through the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982.

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Basic education	Site staff	Minimum of 200 hours offered; actual participation varied by site and individual	Self-paced and competency-based; computer-managed or -assisted; focused on reading, communication, and basic computation skills
Occupational skills training	Site staff	Minimum of 500 hours offered; actual participation varied by site and individual	Classroom setting, combined theory and hands-on experience; prepares enrollees for jobs in high-demand occupations; developed with assistance from private sector to ensure that graduates would meet the entry-level requirements of local employers
Training-related support services		Varied by site	Tailored to individual needs; include transportation and child care and some combination of work-readiness and life skills training, personal and vocational counseling, mentoring, tutorial assistance, and referral to external support systems; need-based payments or incentive payments tied to length of stay, program attendance, or performance
Job development and placement assistance	Site staff and subcontractors	Varied by site	Assist participants in finding training-related jobs

Program Objectives/Goals:

Information; technical and academic skills. In general, to improve the lives of young, low-skilled dropouts

To answer the following:

1. Could local agencies attract young, economically disadvantaged, low-skilled school dropouts into an alternative education and training program?
2. Could sites put in place a package of services designed to address the needs of these youths while working within the constraints of JTPA funding, performance standards, and administrative practices?
3. Would the young people respond favorably to this opportunity and make an investment of their time and effort by participating in the services?
4. Would the program lead to an increase in educational attainment, as measured by receipt of high school diploma or GED?

Program: JOBSTART

-
5. Would the program lead to increased employment and earnings and to impacts on other outcomes?
-

Study 1:

Cave, G. & Doolittle, F. (1991). *Assessing JOBSTART: Interim impacts of a program for school dropouts*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:Objective:

Specifically, to answer the first 3 questions and part of the 4th question listed in program goals above.

Measurement instrument:

JOBSTART enrollment form filled out by program staff; monthly report of participation in JOBSTART activities; tests of Adult Basic Education; 12- and 24-month follow-up surveys of sample designed to measure impacts of amount of education and training received, employment and earnings, and other outcomes; qualitative descriptions of the program and participants' experiences.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental; random assignment of JOBSTART applicants to experimental or control group (who did not receive JOBSTART services).

Statistical techniques: significance testing, regression analysis. Significance level = .05

Population evaluated:

1,839 out of 2,312 youths who applied for JOBSTART and who provided information at 24-month follow-up constitute the 'impact' sample; 949 enrollees in the treatment group constitute the 'implementation' analysis sample.

Impacts:

Overall, sites reported that about 89 percent of the youths assigned to the experimental group actually participated in JOBSTART. Four factors influenced the percentage who participated: Length of intake (youths dropped out when the intake period was long); open entry, open exit vs. fixed-cycle scheduling (youths assigned to fixed-cycle sites might face delays in program startup, resulting in lower participation rates); start-up or scheduling problems (such difficulties result in lower participation rates); differences in sites' attendance reporting.

Education:

33.1 percent of the experimental vs. 16.5 percent of the control group received a GED or high school diploma, a significant difference.

Employment:

As expected, more youths in the control group than in the experimental group worked during the first year of follow-up; the difference is not significant in the second year of follow-up.

Participants' earnings were significantly below those of controls in years 1 and 2. Among women living with their own children at the time of random assignment, a higher percentage of participants than controls worked in each of the two years, with the second year showing a somewhat larger impact on employment rate.

Other:

During the first 24 months of follow-up, JOBSTART had no statistically significant impacts on receipt of most public benefits, childbearing, fathering of children, provision of child support, or criminal arrests.

Other Information: None.

Program: JOBSTART

Study 2:

Cave, G., Bos, H., Doolittle, F., & Toussaint, C. (1993). *JOBSTART: Final report on a program for school dropouts*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:Objective:

To assess the difference the program made in the lives of the young people who participated in JOBSTART. Specifically, to answer all 5 questions listed in program goals listed above.

Measurement instrument:

JOBSTART enrollment form filled out by program staff; monthly report of participation in JOBSTART activities; tests of Adult Basic Education; 12-, 24-, and 48-month follow-up surveys designed to measure impacts of amount of education and training received, employment and earnings, and other outcomes; qualitative descriptions of the program and participants' experiences.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental; random assignment of JOBSTART applicants to experimental or control group (who did not receive JOBSTART services).

Statistical techniques: Significance testing; significance level = .10

Population evaluated:

1,941 out of 2,312 randomly assigned youths who had 48-month follow-up data.

Outcome:Education:

JOBSTART led to a significant increase in the rate at which participants passed the GED (42 percent vs. 28.6 percent of controls).

Employment:

In the final two years of the follow-up, the earnings of the experimental group were not significantly different from control group earnings, although their average earnings over the two years were higher by approximately \$400 per year.

Impacts on earnings were encouraging for young men with an arrest record when they entered the program (impacts were positive and statistically significant in year 4) and for young men who had dropped out of school because of educational difficulties before entering the program (in year 3)

More youth in the control group than experimental group worked during the first year of follow-up; in the second year, slightly more of the program youth than controls worked; in the third and fourth years there was no significant difference.

Other outcomes:

No significant impacts on youths' receipt of public assistance except that female participants who were not mothers when they entered the program were significantly less likely than their counterparts in the control group to receive AFDC during the later years of follow-up.

Arrest rates were reduced during the first year of follow-up for the full sample and some key subgroups. A larger impact was observed for young men without a prior arrest. However, there was only a small difference in arrests during the entire four-year period, implying that involvement in the program made a difference that did not continue once participation ended.

Program group members reported significantly lower use of drugs other than marijuana, compared to controls (4.1 percent vs. 5.8 percent).

Program: JOBSTART

Subgroups:

Custodial mothers who entered JOBSTART experienced significantly increased childbearing but no impacts on receipt of AFDC. These participants saw a \$1,004 increase in net income, resulting from increases in both earnings and welfare payments received for additional children. For other men and women, the effect of JOBSTART on income remained negative after four years of follow-up.

JOBSTART participants received substantially more services than the control group. More than 90 percent of the experimental group participated in JOBSTART and averaged 400 hours of activities.

There is no discernable pattern of effective program practices in the 13 sites. It does not seem to matter whether programs offer education followed by occupational training or offer education and training simultaneously.

Other Information:

JOBSTART is funded primarily through the Job Training Partnership Act

Program: JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

Population Served:

Size Approximately 1 million participants annually (US GAO, 1991)
 Age: Adults and out-of-school youth
 Other Characteristics: Economically disadvantaged adults age 22 and older; 16- to 21-year-olds. This is a major, ongoing national program

Program Components:

Component	Provided by	Duration***	Description
Occupational skills*	Direct or by local providers**		In-class instruction in skills such as word processing, electronics repair, and home health care
On-the-job training*	Private-sector firm (subsidized by JTPA for first 6 months)	Jobs are supposed to be permanent	Training is part of paying job
Job search assistance*	Direct or by local providers		Assessment of job skills and interest; training in job-finding techniques and help in locating job openings
Basic education			Includes Adult Basic Education (ABE), high school or General Education Development Diploma (GED) preparation, and English as a second language (ESL) classes
Work experience	Jobs may be subsidized by JTPA if in public sector	Temporary jobs	Temporary, entry-level jobs designed to provide basic employment skills and to instill effective work habits
Miscellaneous services			Assessment, job-readiness training, customized training, vocational exploration, job shadowing, and tryout employment

* Most common specific services received

** Local providers may include public schools, community colleges, proprietary schools, and community-based organizations.

*** Average length of participation in program varies widely among sites.

Program Objectives/Goals:

Program services, adults and youths: Information; technical, and academic knowledge.
 For youths—fostering attainment of educational credentials and occupational competencies, as well as increasing earnings and employment.
 For adults—increasing earnings and employment and reducing dependence on welfare.

Program: JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

Study:

Orr, L. L., Bloom, H.S., Bell, S. H., Doolittle, F., Lin, W., & Cave, G. (1996). *Does training for the disadvantaged work? Evidence from the national JTPA study*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.

Study Objectives and Measurements:Objective:

To estimate the effectiveness of Title II programs as they normally operate

Measurement instrument:

Background information form completed at application, first and second follow-up survey interviews, enrollment and tracking data from the 16 service delivery areas, state unemployment insurance records, state welfare agency records, administrative records of service delivery areas, published sources, and telephone survey of selected education and training organizations.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental; random assignment to control or treatment groups based on *recommended* services:

1. Classroom training in occupational skills (could include other services but not on-the-job training)*
2. On-the-job training (could include other services, but not classroom training in job skills)*
3. Other services not including 1 or 2 above.

*eventually, people in these groups received both classroom training and on-the-job training.

Statistical techniques: Multiple regression analysis; significance level = .10 two-tailed t-test

Population evaluated:

15,981 out of 20, 601 adults and out-of-school youths in 16 service delivery areas: that is, the 30-month earnings sample, which differs from the full experimental and 18-month samples.

Results are summarized only for out-of-school youths age 16-21.**Impacts (results summarized only for youth ages 16-21 at program assignment):**

Employment: Employment and training services received by out-of-school youths were increased beyond what they would have received in the community.

Earnings: No significant impact.

Education: Female youth in the program group were significantly more likely to obtain a high school diploma or GED during the follow-up period; there were no significant impacts for male participants.

AFDC and food stamp receipt: No significant changes.

Arrest rates: Male participants with no arrest record before entering the program experienced a significant increase in arrest rates at both follow-ups, otherwise no significant impacts.

Program practices: Non-statistically-significant effects on long-term earnings of female and never-arrested male youth receiving classroom training, on-the-job-training, and other services, compared to controls.

The only group for which JTPA significantly increased total hours of employment and training was young women who received classroom training. For other subgroups, the added hours of training came primarily at the expense of time worked, implying that hours of employment lost during the program, if any, were not made up after the program ended.

Program: JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT

Population Served:

Size Students in kindergarten through grade 12 at public schools offering the program, estimated at over 4 million students per year in the United States and approximately 1.2 million outside the United States.

Age: K-12

Other Characteristics: Available at schools that have adopted the program.

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Classes offered during the school day as part of regular curriculum	Consultants and business volunteers	During school year	<p>High school courses: Company Economics GLOBE Success Skills Leadership TITAN School Edition</p> <p>Middle school courses: Personal Economics Enterprise in Action The International Marketplace The Economics of Staying in School JA Go Figure! Exploring Math in Business JA BASE – Arts and Entertainment Edition JA BASE – Sports Edition</p> <p>Elementary School courses: A series of seven themes to help students learn about the U.S. economic system.</p>

Program Objectives/Goals:

To educate and inspire young people to value free enterprise, business, and economics to improve the quality of their lives.

Key concepts and skills covered in this program are related to several constructs, including basic cognitive skills, data collection and analysis, oral communication, technical skills, study skills, problem solving, and self-sufficiency.

Study 1:

Van Dusen, L., Borman, D., & Saeki, N. (1999). *Findings of the comprehensive summative evaluation of Junior Achievement’s high school programs*. Logan, Utah: Western Institute for Research and Evaluation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

The study assessed four high school programs: Economics, Company, Success Skills, and GLOBE to:

- Evaluate the impact of the programs on student learning of economic and business concepts.
- Assess the impact of the programs on student critical thinking with an emphasis on

Program: JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT

business decision-making.

- Measure changes in student quality of life as a result of participating in JA.
- Assess teacher and consultant perceptions of program impact.

Measurement instrument:

Objective–referenced tests

Alternative assessment—a more sensitive measure than objective–referenced tests. These tests require students to perform activities by synthesizing knowledge across concepts. Examples listed in study include portfolios, oral examinations, multimedia projects, journal entries, role plays, and simulations.

Student attitude surveys

Questionnaires for both consultants and teachers

Evaluation:

Type: Quasi-experimental (evaluations before and after program implementation)

Statistical techniques:

Objective–referenced tests – ANOVA

Alternative assessment – ANOVA

Surveys and questionnaires – inferential and nonparametric comparisons between responses before and after the test

Statistically significant at $p \leq .05$. Education is meaningful if effect size is .30 or greater.

Population evaluated: 17 local area programs with a total of 5,444 students

Outcome:

Findings are presented by program. Within each program, several successive analyses were conducted to determine specific group differences. A broad description of the findings is presented below; refer to evaluation for all findings.

Understanding of economic concepts:

- Participation in Economics, Company, and Success Skills programs is associated with students' understanding of economic concepts.
- Programs are associated with at-risk students
- Program participation related to students at all ability levels.

Critical thinking and problem solving:

- Improvements on alternative assessment results suggest that the programs are effective at encouraging students to excel to another level of learning, including synthesizing and integrating information in a way that allows them to make solid business decisions.

Quality of life:

- Program assignment was associated with workforce readiness, attitudes toward school, citizenship and deportment, and ability to make major life decisions.
- Overall, most changes were small and not statistically significant. This may be due in part to the finding that many students already held positive attitudes toward work and school and felt prepared to take on employment and general life challenges even before participating in JA.

Teacher and consultant perceptions of program:

- Teachers and consultants were of the opinion that in all programs, students gained basic business knowledge.
 - Across programs, teachers and consultants were of the opinion that students were better equipped to think critically, solve problems, and take on different perspectives than students who had not participated.
 - Across programs, teachers and consultants were of the opinion that programs influenced quality of life for students.
-

Program: JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT

Other Information: None.

Study 2:

Van Dusen, L., & Cutler, J. (1998). *Findings of the 1997-98 comprehensive evaluation of Junior Achievement's middle school programs.* Logan, Utah: Western Institute for Research and Evaluation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

To determine the learning impact of the "best" activities of the curriculum.

Measurement instrument:

Objective-referenced tests

Evaluation:

Type: Quasi-experimental, control group design

Statistical techniques:

Objective-referenced tests – ANOVA

Statistically significant at $p \leq .05$. Education is meaningful if effect size is .30 or greater.

Population evaluated: Students in grades 7 through 9 from five JA offices. Over 2,300 tests were administered to program and control groups combined.

Outcome:

Findings are presented by program in the report. Within each program, several successive analyses were conducted to determine specific group differences. A broad description of the findings is presented below; refer to evaluation for ALL findings.

The following relationships have not been experimentally evaluated; therefore, causation cannot be inferred:

- The program group significantly outperformed controls at every curriculum level. (small magnitude for Personal Economics curricula)
- Girls may benefit most from the middle school program
- Students from most ethnic groups responded well to the middle school curriculum, improving their knowledge and retaining information learned. (Note: some concepts in Enterprise in Action do not work as well with African American students, and some concepts in International Marketplace do not work as well with Hispanic students.)

Other Information:

None

Study 3:

Van Dusen, L., Snyder, R., Cutler, J., & Worthen, B. (1997). *Findings of the 1996-97 comprehensive evaluation of Junior Achievement's middle school programs.* Logan, Utah: Western Institute for Research and Evaluation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

To determine the impact of the newly revised middle school program on student learning and attitudes and to provide details about how the program is being implemented.

Measurement instrument:

Objective-referenced tests

Student attitude surveys

Classroom profile forms

Consultant forms

Project-control comparison forms

Evaluation:

Type: Quasi-experimental, control group design

Program: JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT

Statistical techniques:

Objective-referenced tests and attitude scale scores – ANOVA

Statistically significant at $p \leq .05$. Education is meaningful if effect size is .30 or greater.

Population evaluated: Students in grades 7 through 9 from five local JA offices. Data were collected from 95 7th grade, 80 8th-grade, and 66 9th-grade classes.

Outcome:

A broad description of the findings is presented below; refer to the evaluation report for ALL findings. **The following relationships have not been experimentally evaluated; therefore, causation cannot be inferred:**

Learning performance findings:

- Students in the program group significantly increased their knowledge base of economic concepts. Magnitude of impact is greatly influenced by several factors, including:
 - Breadth of economics knowledge
 - Activities presented
 - Participation in elementary school program (an earlier JA program)
 - The experience of the consultant
 - Number of activities used to supplement the program
 - Participation in other economics programs
 - Ability of students
- Student attitudes toward business and school did not change as a result of participating in the middle school program. Student attitudes were already quite positive suggesting that there may have been little room for positive change.

Other Information: None

Program: JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS—CAREER ACADEMIES

Population Served:

Size 27,490 students
 Age: Students enter in 9th or 10th grade and continue through high school graduation.
 Other Characteristics: Students may self-select but are typically referred by teachers and counselors because of subpar performance in traditional academic coursework. The JROTC career academies typically recruit students.

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
School-within-a-school structure	Teachers	Throughout high school	A team of teachers is linked with a group of students.
Block scheduling of classes and students		Throughout high school	Classes are scheduled together (usually an entire morning or afternoon), and students move between classes together. Provides scheduling flexibility.
Occupational focus			Sequence of courses and activities is designed to acquaint students with the entire breadth of a career field and to provide work-related experiences (occupational focus varies by academy)
Integrated academic and vocational curriculum			Topics and projects cross individual course lines; the curriculum is integrated thematically by the academy's occupational focus.
Common planning time for teachers			Teachers meet daily or weekly to develop curriculum, plan activities, and share reports of student problems and progress.
Reduced student-teacher ratio Business partnerships			Typically 25 or fewer students per teacher Employers assist in designing the academy program, provide workplace experiences, and can offer summer or even permanent employment to students.
Integration of JROTC staff and curriculum			JROTC personnel contribute to both planning and instructional process. JROTC coursework is integrated into program.

Program Objectives/Goals:

To prevent dropouts by creating schools within schools that provide integrated academic and vocational training.

Program: JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS—CAREER ACADEMIES

Study:

Elliot, M. N., Hanser, L. M., & Gilroy, C. L. (2000). *Evidence of positive student outcomes in JROTC career academies*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Study Objectives and Measurements:Objective:

To broaden the base of empirical analyses focusing on the efficacy of career academies. The study focuses on the effects of JROTC—Career Academy enrollment on student attendance, grades, and graduation.

Measurement instrument:

Administrative records

Evaluation:

Type: Quasi-experimental

Statistical techniques: Uses propensity weighting techniques to adjust for differences between JROTC—Career Academy and comparison students. Background characteristics are controlled (demographics, school, student cohort, standardized test scores). Ordinary Least Squares models. Significance level = .05

Population evaluated: Three groups were compared: 1) students in other career academies or magnet programs, 2) students in regular JROTC programs, and 3) students in general academic programs.

Outcome:1st year of program:

Student attendance: lower in 70 percent of cases compared to no programs, and 40 percent of cases compared to regular JROTC, with absenteeism less than half what would have been expected in many cases.

Grades: Grade-point averages higher in 60 percent of cases compared to no programs and 20 percent of cases compared to standard JROTC. The differences range from .25 to .50 grade point.

Graduation: 52 percent of JROTC—CA students graduated, significantly higher than in the standard JROTC program (28 percent) or no program (28 percent) (4-year results available for only two analytic groups).

Other Information:

Career academies take a broad approach to career development, focusing not just on careers. Standardized test scores not available for 35 percent of all students.

Program: THE SUMMER TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAM (STEP)

Population Served:

Size 100 locations nationwide serving 20,000 adolescents through 1991

Age: 14-15

Other Characteristics: Low-achieving adolescents from poor families

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Remediation	Local school district	90 hours, 2 summers	Innovative curricula and teaching methods; and computer-assisted instruction focused on reading and math skills and higher-order thinking
Part-time summer work	Local employment and training agencies	90 hours, 2 summers	Minimum wage, part-time
Life skills	Local school district	18 hours, 2 mornings per week	High-engagement summer classes focusing on life issues such as sexual behavior, drug use, careers, and community involvement
Support during school year	Local school district	Average 5-15 hours per year	Infrequent contact during school year. One-on-one adult contact, recreation, and other noneducational activities.

Program Objectives/Goals:

Information; technical and education skills. Improve school performance by preventing the loss of knowledge over summer

Prevent pregnancy to prevent dropping out of school

Study 1:

Walker, G., & Vilella-Velez, F. (1992). "Testing the model." In *Anatomy of a demonstration: The Summer Training and Education Program (STEP) from pilot through replication and postprogram impacts*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

Assess the short-term impacts of the program on participants in terms of schooling and academic performance, adolescent pregnancy and parenthood

Assess the feasibility of implementing the model in various settings and on a large scale

Measurement instrument:

Summer tests (Metropolitan Achievement Test), participant questionnaires, program records and school records.

Evaluation:

Type: Experimental; random assignment to intervention and control groups

Statistical techniques: Multiple regression analysis, significance level = .10

Program: THE SUMMER TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAM (STEP)

Population evaluated: Cohorts II and III: 2,519 youths age 14-15 at beginning of program. Approximately 86 percent were ethnic minorities, and about half lived in female-headed households.

Outcome:

Increased reading grades, math grades, and contraceptive knowledge during program participation.

Two-thirds of youth rated the program highly.

Other Information:

Full program was 15 months; program conducted mainly during summer months.

Control group participates in the local Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (SYETP) program. At two sites, controls are also guaranteed a SYETP job for the second summer.

The return rate for participants who completed the first summer was 75 percent; intensive outreach efforts were required to achieve this rate.

Study 2:

Walker, G., & Vilella-Velez, F. (1992). "Long-term Impacts." In *Anatomy of a demonstration: The Summer Training and Education Program (STEP) from pilot through replication and postprogram impacts*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

To assess 1) the impacts of the program on measures of education, reproduction behavior, early employment, and welfare, and 2) the feasibility of implementing the model in various settings on a large scale.

Measurement instrument:

In-program (summer tests, questionnaires, and program records) and postprogram (follow-up interviews and high school transcripts) data were collected.

Evaluation:

Type: Random assignment to intervention and control groups

Statistical techniques: Longitudinal evaluation; random assignment to treatment group (offered the opportunity to participate in STEP) and control group (offered a one-summer job in the federally funded SYETP); regression analysis. Significance level = .10

Population evaluated: Cohorts II and III (3,226)

Cohort II: (54 months after enrollment, or 3.25 years after program ended)

Cohort III: (42 months after enrollment, or 2.25 years after program ended)

Outcome:

Long-term impacts: Once the program ended, impacts decayed rapidly

Grades: no impact

Test scores: no impact

Dropout rate: no impact

College attendance: no impact

Knowledge of and test scores on responsible social and sexual behavior: increased

Sexual behavior: no impact

Teen pregnancy rate: no impact

Post – high school employment rate: no impact

Welfare receipt: no impact

Program: THE SUMMER TRAINING AND EDUCATION PROGRAM (STEP)

Of the youths who were not attending school, about half were working.

Other Information:

Best practices: A weakness of the program seems to have been weak or nonexistent reinforcement mechanisms to connect the summer experience to the school year; what worked in STEP in summer appeared to be practices not performed during the school year. The program had no major environmental impact; e.g., the need for money was a major reason students dropped out of high school.

Program: YOUTH INCENTIVE ENTITLEMENT PILOT PROJECTS

Population Served:

Size Not provided
 Age: 16- to 19-year-olds
 Other Characteristics: Low-income youths who had not yet graduated from high school.
 Nationwide program at several sites.

Program Components:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Provided by</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Description</u>
Guaranteed part-time work	Employers	Up to 20 hours per week during school year	At federal minimum wage
Guaranteed full-time work	Employers	Up to 40 hours per week during the summer	At federal minimum wage
Requirement to remain in program, return to school, or pursue a GED		Unlimited participation over high school enrollment period	
Other potential services			Apprenticeship, counseling, transportation, day care, medical treatment, training

Program Objectives/Goals:

Information; technical and education skills. To promote the attainment of a high school education and provide work experience in an effort to enhance the future employment possibilities of low-income youth.

YIEPP linked work experience with school by requiring participants to be enrolled in school and to meet attendance and performance standards.

During-program goals:

- Reduce school dropout rates
- Increase high school graduation rates
- Provide work experience and on-the-job training
- Provide income during the program participation period

Postprogram goal:

To increase labor productivity of participating youth, thereby increasing their earnings potential and improving their lifetime employability.

Study 1:

Farkas, G., Sit, D., Stromsdorfer, E., Trask, G., & Jerrett, R. (1982). *Impacts from the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects: Participation, work and schooling over the full program period.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

To measure short-term impacts on during-program goals.

Measurement instrument:

Longitudinal data from students who completed local field questionnaires in three successive waves of interviews.

Evaluation:

Type: Quasi-experimental (similar “matched” comparison group)

Statistical techniques: Analyses control for demographic and key site variables (to help correct for differences between the program group and “matched” controls). Significance level = .10

Program: YOUTH INCENTIVE ENTITLEMENT PILOT PROJECTS

Population evaluated: 4,033 eligible youth at the four YIEPP pilot sites and four comparison sites.

Outcomes:

The following relationships have not been experimentally evaluated; therefore, causation cannot be inferred.

Employment:

The percent of time employed during the school year was found to increase from 21.5 percent to 40.4 percent; during the summer, it increased from 30.9 percent to 42.7 percent. The cohort of 15- to 16-year-olds showed somewhat stronger effects. YIEPP significantly increased employment in the private as well as the public sector, although effects on public sector employment were greater. Employment effects were strongest for blacks and are not statistically significant for white females. YIEPP exerted little discernible effect on wage rates during the program period.

Productive activity:

The percent of time enrolled and employed increased significantly (by 13.2 percentage points); the percent of time enrolled and not employed decreased by 9.8 percentage points, and time neither enrolled nor employed decreased by 5.5 percentage points.

Participation:

Young women were more likely than young men to participate in the program, as were blacks (compared to all other races) all other races and in-school students compared to dropouts. Participation rates for the cohort of 15- to 16-year-olds were higher than rates for older youths (probably because dropouts in the younger cohort have most likely just left school and may be more easily induced to return).

Other Information: 7/8 of students studied were minority youths; incidence of childbearing was unusually high.

Study 2:

Farkas, G., Olsen, R. Stromsdorfer, E., Sharpe, L., Skidmore, F., Smith, D., & Merrill, S. (1984) *Post-program impacts of the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Study Objectives and Measurements:

Objective:

To measure postprogram impacts, based on postprogram goals.

Measurement instrument:

Longitudinal data from students who completed local field questionnaires in four successive waves of interviews.

Evaluation:

Type: Quasi-experimental (similar “matched” comparison group)

Statistical techniques: Analyses control for demographic and key site variables (to help correct for differences between the program group and the “matched” controls) Significance level = .10

Population evaluated: Much of the analysis in this report focuses on the 1,436 black youths who were not living in Denver or its comparison site, and who were 15 to 16 years old at program startup (15- to 16-year-olds are likely to behave in a way that generalizes most accurately to behavior in an ongoing program).

Program: YOUTH INCENTIVE ENTITLEMENT PILOT PROJECTS

Outcomes:

The following relationships have not been experimentally evaluated; therefore, causation cannot be inferred.

Employment:

Earnings of YIEPP group members were higher by approximately \$11 per week during the school year and after the program (\$10.48 in fall 1981). Increased earnings after the program were due primarily to increased employment and hours. The association was twice as large for young men as young women, and larger for high school graduates than for nongraduates. Hours of work increased during the program, usually at the expense of leisure, extracurricular activities, or productivity at home-- not academic activities.

Most youths felt that their chances of obtaining a good job in the future were increased by having participated in YIEPP; black youths felt the most positive.

School enrollment:

No significant effect on enrollment in or graduation from high school (this study does not replicate the first study's findings of a significant positive effect because this study focuses primarily on black youths). The authors believe these results indicate clearly that YIEPP managed to avoid the negative effects that might be expected from alternative strategies to increase youth employment without imposing any schooling requirement.

Productive activity:

There was a very large decrease in total productive activity. High school enrollment dropped sharply, and this drop was not compensated for by an increase in training or postsecondary education.

Program participation:

Rates were high—between 65 percent and 70 percent. Average length was 15 months, and more than half participated for 12 months or more. 61.5 percent of eligible blacks participated vs. 24.4 percent of whites.

Other Information:

YIEPP worked with the community to subsidize jobs.

Appendix B: Program Components Offered by Program

<u>Program</u>	<u>Components</u>
Career Academies	School-within-a-school structure, same teachers and students linked through high school Integrated academic and vocational curriculum Business partnerships offering advice, employment
Career Beginnings	Academic competency-based curriculum workshops Summer job Workforce training Mentoring
Hospital Youth Mentoring Program	Academic skills College preparation Interface with schools Employment Mentoring (activities vary by site)
Job Corps	Individual, self-paced academic instruction Individual, self-paced vocational instruction Health care Health education Counseling Job placement assistance
JOBSTART	Self-paced basic courses Occupational skills training in classroom Work-readiness and life-skills training Mentoring Needs-based assistance, transportation, child care
Job Training Partnership Act (varies widely among sites)	In-class instruction in skills such as word processing, electronics repair, and home health care On-the-job training Job search assistance Basic education (includes GED preparation) Employment Vocational exploration

Program

Components

Junior Achievement

Courses offered in success, leadership, work, and business skills

The Summer Training and Education Program

Summer academic instruction
Summer employment
Summer life skills training
Minimal support during school year

Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects

Employment
Childcare, transportation
Counseling
Medical treatment
Training

Program References

Career Academies

Kemple, J., & Rock, J. (1996). *Career Academies: Early implementation lessons from a 10-site evaluation*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Kemple, J. (1997). *Career Academies: Communities of support for students and teachers: Further findings from a 10-site evaluation*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Kemple, J.J., Poglinco, S., & Snipes, J.C. (1999). *Career Academies: Building career awareness and work-based learning activities through employer partnerships*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Kemple, J.J., & Snipes, J.C. (2000). *Career Academies: Impacts on students' engagement and performance in high school*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Career Beginnings

Cave, G., & Quint, J. (1990). *Career Beginnings impact evaluation: Findings from a program for disadvantaged high school students*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Hospital Youth Mentoring Program

McClanahan, W. (1998). *Relationships in a career mentoring program: Lessons learned from the Hospital Youth Mentoring Program*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Job Corps

Schochet, P.Z., Burghardt, J., & Glazerman, S. (2000). *National Job Corps Study: The short-term impacts of Job Corps on participants' employment and related outcomes*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

JOBSTART

Cave, G., & Doolittle, F. (1991). *Assessing JOBSTART: Interim impacts of a program for school dropouts*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Cave, G., Bos, H., Doolittle, F., & Toussaint, C. (1993). *JOBSTART: Final report on a program for school dropouts*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Job Training Partnership Act

Orr, L.L., Bloom, H.S., Bell, S.H., Doolittle, F., Lin, W., & Cave, G. (1996). *Does training for the disadvantaged work? Evidence from the national JTPA study*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Junior Achievement

Van Dusen, L., Borman, D., & Saeki, N. (1999). *Findings of the comprehensive summative evaluation of Junior Achievement's high school programs*. Logan, UT: Western Institute for Research and Evaluation.

Van Dusen, L., & Cutler, J. (1998). *Findings of the 1997-98 comprehensive evaluation of Junior Achievement's middle school programs*. Logan, UT: Western Institute for Research and Evaluation.

Van Dusen, L., Snyder, R., Cutler, J., & Worthen, B. (1997). *Findings of the 1996-97 comprehensive evaluation of Junior Achievement's middle school programs*. Logan, UT: Western Institute for Research and Evaluation.

Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps—Career Academies

Elliot, M.N., Hanser, L.M., & Gilroy, C.L. (2000). *Evidence of positive student outcomes in JROTC career academies*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Summer Training and Education Program

Walker, G., & Vilella-Velez, F. (1992). "Testing the model." In *Anatomy of a demonstration: The Summer Training and Education Program (STEP) from pilot through replication and postprogram impacts*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures. pp.23-39.

Walker, G., & Vilella-Velez, F. (1992). "Long-Term Impacts." In *Anatomy of a demonstration: The Summer Training and Education Program (STEP) from pilot through replication and postprogram impacts*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures. pp.57-64.

Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects

Farkas, G., Sit, D., Stromsdorfer, E., Trask, G., & Jerrett, R. (1982). *Impacts from the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects: Participation, work and schooling over the full program period*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Farkas, G., Olsen, R., Stromsdorfer, E., Sharpe, L., Skidmore, F., Smith, D., & Merrill, S. (1984). *Post-program impacts of the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Multiple Program Evaluations

Hughes, K.L., Baily, T.R., & Mechur, M.J. (2001). *School-to-work: Making a difference in education*. New York, NY: Institute on Education and the Economy, Teacher's College, Columbia University

Other References

- Chaplin, D. & Hannaway, J. (1996). *High school employment: Meaningful connections for at-risk youth*. Paper presented at the 1996 Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association in New York City. Available online at: www.urban.org/education/appam4b.htm
- Duncan, G.J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1997). *Consequences of growing up poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Greenberger, E. (1984). Children, family and work. In N.D. Repucci, L.A. Weithorn, E.P. Mulvey, & J. Monahan (Eds.) *Children, mental health, and the law* (pp. 103-122). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage .
- Greenberger, E. & Steinberg, L. (1986). *When teenagers work: The psychological and social costs of adolescent employment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jekielek, S., Moore, K., & Hair, E. (2001). *Mentoring programs: A synthesis*. Report prepared for the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- Mirowsky, J. & Ross, C. E. (1989). *Social causes of psychological distress*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Mortimer, J.T., Finch, M.D., Ryu, S., Shanahan, M.J., & Call, K.T. (1996). The effects of work intensity on adolescent mental health, achievement, and behavioral adjustment: New evidence from a prospective study. *Child Development*, 67(3), 1243-1261.
- Murnane, R.J., & Levy, F. (1996). *Teaching the new basic skills: Principles for educating children to thrive in a changing economy*. New York: The Free Press.
- National Research Council. (1998). *Protecting youth at work: Health, safety, and development of working children and adolescents in the United States*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Ruhm, C.J. (1997). Is high school employment consumption or investment? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 15(4), 735-776.
- Schoenhals, M., Tienda, M., & Schneider, B. (1998). The educational and personal consequences of adolescent employment. *Social Forces*, 77(2), 723-762.
- Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (1995). The impact of employment on adolescent development. *Annals of Child Development*, 11, 131-166.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2000). *Report on the youth labor force*. Available online at: www.bls.gov/opub/rylf/rylfhome.htm