

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 072

CE 029 122

AUTHOR Gilsinan, James F.; Tomey, E. Allan  
 TITLE A Comparison of Public and Private Sector  
 WORKSITES--An Interim Report. Youth Work Experience.  
 Youth Knowledge Development Report 7.7.  
 INSTITUTION Saint Louis Univ., Mo. Center for Urban Programs.  
 SPONS AGENCY Employment and Training Administration (DOL),  
 Washington, D.C. Office of Youth Programs.  
 PUB DATE May 80  
 NOTE 167p.: For related documents see CE 029 106.  
 AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing  
 Office, Washington, DC 20402 (Stock No.  
 029-014-00175-9, \$5.50).  
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Disadvantaged Youth; Dropouts;  
 Economically Disadvantaged; \*Employment Programs; Job  
 Development; Job Training; Program Development;  
 Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; \*Site  
 Analysis; Vocational Education; \*Work Experience  
 Programs; \*Youth Employment; \*Youth Programs  
 \*Private Sector; \*Public Sector  
 IDENTIFIERS

## ABSTRACT

A study compared the effectiveness of public and private sector work experience programs. In five locations equal numbers of jobs were developed in the private and public/nonprofit sectors. To equalize the incentives relative to the public sector, full wage subsidies were provided on an experimental basis in the private sector. Youth were matched in pairs and randomly assigned to one of the two sectors. They were tested at entry and completion using the Standardized Assessment System and supplemental measures. Preliminary results of the study indicated that it is harder to develop jobs and match disadvantaged out-of-school youth to jobs in the private sector, even when full wage costs are covered. Youth are more frequently terminated in the private sector. Finally, the subsequent placement rate into unsubsidized jobs as a percentage of all participants is higher in the private sector, while the placement rate into subsidized plus unsubsidized jobs is about the same. Thus, the early finding is that the benefits of private sector employment do not significantly outweigh those of public or nonprofit sector employment for dropouts, although differences are in the anticipated directions. (Related youth knowledge and development reports are available--see note.) (MN)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

# YOUTH KNOWLEDGE REFLECTION

YOUTH WORK  
A Comparison of Public and  
An International

ED203072

CE029122

May

4

# E DEVELOPMENT ART

## XPERIENCE ivate Sector Worksites— Report

80

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-  
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.



U.S. Department of Labor  
Ray Marshall, Secretary

Employment and Training Administration  
Ernest G. Green, Assistant Secretary for  
Employment and Training Administration  
Office of Youth Programs

Material contained in this publication is  
in the public domain and may be  
reproduced, fully or partially, without  
permission of the Federal Government.  
Source credit is requested but not  
required. Permission is required only  
to reproduce any copyrighted material  
contained herein.

**YOUTH KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT REPORT 7.7**

**A COMPARISON OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE  
SECTOR WORKSITES--AN INTERIM REPORT**

**James F. Gilsinan  
E. Allan Tomey**

**Center for Urban Programs  
St. Louis University**

**April 1980**

---

**For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, D.C. 20402**

## OVERVIEW

It is a conventional wisdom of employment and training policy that work experience in the private sector is preferable to work experience in the public sector. The private sector provides "real" work rather than "make work." Its standards are presumably structure demanding a day's labor for a day's pay. Thus, the experience should acclimate youth to the requirements of the work world better than less disciplined public sector work experiences. Finally, since four of five jobs are in the private sector, a private sector work experience is more likely to lead to permanent employment.

The case is not so clearcut as these arguments would suggest. Public employment and training interventions are required because the labor market will not, on its own, hire adequate numbers of economically disadvantaged, particularly minorities. There is a cost to getting employers to change behavior, whether in terms of , on-the-job training subsidies or tax credits. Stricter worksite standards may be a learning experience for some youth, but a debilitating shock for youth who need to adjust gradually to the world of work. There is no guarantee that disadvantaged youth can prove themselves in jobs or that they will be given permanent private sector employment when the temporary incentives end. Perhaps most critically, when productive work is accomplished in the public sector, the value offsets the costs of the program for a social benefit-cost perspective. When a youth is employed in the private sector, there is no such offset to whatever subsidy must be paid to encourage the employment.

On the other hand, the private sector is rarely given the same "deal" as public and nonprofit employers and hence is understandably less willing to take on the economically disadvantaged. On-the-job training subsidies and tax credits usually amount to about half of wage costs in the private sector; hundred percent wage subsidies have only been tried under Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects. In contrast, CETA has traditionally paid the full cost for employment in the public and nonprofit sector.

Clearly, then, there is a need to test some of the basic assumptions about public vs private sector work:

- o Can private sector jobs be found for dropout and disadvantaged youth if the full hiring cost is subsidized?
- o Will private employers "cream" in the hiring process more than public sector employers?
- o Are the experiences and gains of like youth employed in the public and private sectors different?

- o Will youth be fired more frequently in the private sector?
- o Will youth who work in the private sector slots move more frequently into permanent jobs?
- o Do the in-program and post-program benefits from private sector jobs offset the lack of social output?

The Public/Private Jobs Demonstration was designed to answer these questions. In five locations an equal number of jobs were developed in the private and public/nonprofit sectors; the full wage subsidy was provided on an experimental basis in the private sector to equalize the incentives relative to the public/nonprofit sector. Youth were matched into pairs and then randomly assigned to one of the two sectors. They were tested at entry and completion using the Standardized Assessment System plus supplemental measures; they will be followed up at three and eight months after the work experience period. Records are kept on job development efforts and costs during the initial period as well as at the end of the program when there are equal placement efforts for employees in the public and private sector who have not been offered permanent jobs.

The results presented in this volume, while only preliminary, set the stage for more rigorous analysis:

1. It is harder to develop jobs and match disadvantaged out-of-school youth to jobs in the private sector even when the full wage costs are covered.
2. Youth are more frequently terminated in the private sector, so that over the course of the work experience period, roughly a fifth more employment weeks are generated in the private sector from an equal number of originally filled jobs.
3. The subsequent placement rate into unsubsidized jobs as a percentage of all participants is higher in the private sector; the placement rate into subsidized plus unsubsidized jobs is about the same. In terms of earnings outcomes, thus it does not appear that private sector participants have much advantage.

In other words, the early finding is that the benefits of private sector employment do not significantly outweigh those of public or nonprofit sector employment for dropout youth although differences are in the anticipated directions. Any conclusion awaits in-program gains measures and the eight month

followup results, but at this point it would seem a good bet that aggregate differentials will be modest. If it is assumed that half of the cost of public or nonprofit sector work is returned in useful social product, a conservative assumption according to most studies of work valuations, it does not appear that the differential impacts of seeking private sector worksites are worth the costs.

This volume is one of the products of the "knowledge development" effort implemented under the mandate of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977. The knowledge development effort consists of hundreds of separate research, evaluation and demonstration activities which will result in literally thousands of written products. The activities have been structured from the outset so that each is self-standing but also interrelated with a host of other activities. The framework is presented in A Knowledge Development Plan for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, A Knowledge Development Plan for the Youth Initiatives Fiscal 1979 and Completing the Youth Agenda: A Plan for Knowledge Development, Dissemination and Application for Fiscal 1980.

Information is available or will be coming available from these various knowledge development efforts to help resolve an almost limitless array of issues. However, policy and practical application will usually require integration and synthesis from a wide array of products, which, in turn, depends on knowledge and availability of these products. A major shortcoming of past research, evaluation and demonstration activities has been the failure to organize and disseminate the products adequately to assure the full exploitation of the findings. The magnitude and structure of the youth knowledge development effort puts a premium on structured analysis and wide dissemination.

As part of its knowledge development mandate, therefore, the Office of Youth Programs of the Department of Labor will organize, publish and disseminate the written products of all major research, evaluation and demonstration activities supported directly by or mounted in conjunction with OYP knowledge development efforts. Some of the same products may also be published and disseminated through other channels, but they will be included in the structured series of Youth Knowledge Development Reports in order to facilitate access and integration.

The Youth Knowledge Development Reports, of which this is one, are divided into twelve broad categories:

1. Knowledge Development Framework: The products in this category are concerned with the structure of knowledge development activities, the assessment methodologies which are employed, validation of measurement instruments, the translation of knowledge into policy, and the strategy for disseminating findings.

2. Research on Youth Employment and Employability Development: The products in this category represent analyses of existing data, presentation of findings from new data sources, special studies of dimensions of youth labor market problems and policy analyses.

3. Program Evaluations: The products in this category include impact, process and benefit-cost evaluations of youth programs including the Summer Youth Employment Program, Job Corps, the Young Adult Conservation Corps, Youth Employment and Training Programs, Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects, and the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit.

4. Service and Participant Mix: The evaluations and demonstrations summarized in this category concern the matching of different types of youth with different service combinations. This involves experiments with work vs. work plus remediation vs. straight remediation as treatment options. It also includes attempts to mix disadvantaged and more affluent participants, as well as youth with older workers.

5. Education and Training Approaches: The products in this category present the findings of structured experiments to test the impact and effectiveness of various education and vocational training approaches including specific education methodologies for the disadvantaged, alternative education approaches and advanced career training.

6. Pre-Employment and Transition Services: The products in this category present the findings of structured experiments to test the impact and effectiveness of school-to-work transition activities, vocational exploration, job-search assistance and other efforts to better prepare youth for labor market success.

7. Youth Work Experience: The products in this category address the organization of work activities, their output, productive roles for youth and the impacts of various employment approaches.

8. Implementation Issues: This category includes cross-cutting analyses of the practical lessons concerning "how-to-do-it." Issues such as learning curves, replication processes and programmatic "batting averages" will be addressed under this category, as well as the comparative advantages of alternative delivery agents.

9. Design and Organizational Alternatives: The products in this category represent assessments of demonstrations of alternative program and delivery arrangements such as consolidation, year-round preparation for summer programming, the use of incentives and multi-year tracking of individuals.

10. Special Needs Groups: The products in this category present findings on the special problems of and adaptations needed for significant segments including minorities, young mothers, troubled youth, Indochinese refugees and the handicapped.

11. Innovative Approaches: The products in this category present the findings of those activities designed to explore new approaches. The subjects covered including the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects, private sector initiatives, the national youth service experiment, and energy initiatives in weatherization, low-head hydroelectric dam restoration, windpower and the like.

12. Institutional Linkages: The products in this category will include studies of institutional arrangements and linkages as well as assessments of demonstration activities to encourage such linkages with education, volunteer groups, drug abuse agencies and the like.

In each of these knowledge development categories, there will be a range of discrete demonstration, research and evaluation activities, focused on different policy, program and analytical issues. For instances, all experimental demonstration projects have both process and impact evaluations, frequently undertaken by different evaluation agents. Findings will be published as they become available so that there will usually be a series of reports as evidence accumulates. To organize these products, each publication is classified in one of the twelve broad knowledge development categories, described in terms of the more specific issue, activity or cluster of activities to which it is addressed, with an identifier of the product and what it represents relative to other products in the demonstration. Hence, the multiple products under a knowledge development activity are closely interrelated and the activities in each broad cluster have significant interconnections.

This preliminary analysis of the Public vs. Private Sector Jobs demonstration should be read in conjunction with The Youth Entitlement Demonstration--Private Sector Experience in the "innovative approaches" category. Also of importance are the value of output assessments in Work Valuation--The Methods and Findings for Their Application which suggest the tradeoff in socially valued output that results from the private sector focus.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| OVERVIEW  | i           |
| I. INTRODUCTION   | 1           |
| II. ANALYSIS OF WORKSITE DEVELOP DATA (LEVEL OF EFFORT) | 5           |
| III. ANALYSIS OF SAS PRETEST AND STEP                   | 23          |
| IV. FLOW OF YOUTH THROUGH PROGRAM PHASES                | 33          |
| V. ANALYSIS OF EARLY PROGRAM TERMINATORS                | 43          |
| VI. AN OVERVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES                | 63          |
| VII. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES BY SITE                      | 71          |

## I. INTRODUCTION

### Project Overview

A major goal of the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs is to explore alternative approaches for increasing the employability of disadvantaged youth. Consistent with this goal is the Public versus Private Sector Jobs Demonstration Project, a discretionary funded youth project (under CETA, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 3 - YETP). The research component of this project examines the relative benefits of serving youth through subsidized full-time jobs (100 percent of the minimum wage) in the private sector. This special project is designed to facilitate rigorous research for measuring the relative efficiency, effectiveness and impact of subsidizing public versus private jobs as a means of aiding needy youth.

The demonstration focuses on 16-21 year old YETP eligible youth who are out of school. It involves random assignment of youth to public and private sector jobs in a manner which assures comparability of youth in both types of subsidized employment. The Department of Labor has specified various other research controls to be utilized to assure that (a) program operations are designed to provide comparable manpower activities and services to youth in both subsidized employment groups, and (b) the five separate demonstration project sites around the country (Portland, Oregon; St. Louis, Missouri; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; New York, New York; and rural Minnesota) have procedures similar enough to facilitate multi-site research comparisons.

The national office of the U.S. Department of Labor contracted separately for a central research agent (for the overall demonstration of the five sites), St. Louis University's Center for Urban Programs, to be responsible for guiding the

research findings for the demonstration project.

#### Knowledge Development Objective of Project

The central knowledge development question to be answered by this demonstration research project is:

What are the differences in post-program employment and earnings outcomes for out-of-school youth who have participated in fully subsidized work experience in the public sector as compared to similar youth in fully subsidized work in the private sector?

Other analytic objectives of this "knowledge development" discretionary youth project are to determine (1) whether and how subsidized jobs in the private sector are different and/or more difficult to develop than those in the public sector, and (2) whether differential program outcomes are found for varying participant characteristics/worksites locations/project jurisdictions.

#### General Project Organization

The five program sites agreed to conduct the project, known in local areas as the Youth in Jobs project, according to a standard grant plan which was jointly developed by DOL, the Center, and the operators. Each site was to place 320 youth, evenly divided between the public and private sectors (rural Minnesota plan called for 240 youth). The grant plan specified standard requirements which would be met by all operators in the following areas:

- Project Organization
- Youth Recruitment and Selection
- Worksite Development

- Worksite Assignment and Referral
- Program Services
- Placement Services
- Participant Flow
- Participant Wage Payment Processes
- Research, Recordkeeping, and Reports

Each operator provided attachments to the standard items detailing how they would implement each project area.

Research Plan

This demonstration project is one of a number of efforts by the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs to develop a national data base. Such a data base will be used in an attempt to answer the question of what works best for whom under what conditions when dealing with the employment difficulties faced by disadvantaged youth. Accordingly, Youth In Jobs has used the standardized instrument package developed by Educational Testing Services for this purpose. The standardized package consists of a series of pre-post assessments and follow-up instruments that seek to measure changes in work related attitudes, knowledge, and the eventual employment outcomes of the youth being served.

The variety of programs established to improve the work readiness of youth have, in recent years, faced numerous criticisms. Particular concern has been expressed about the apparent overreliance on public sector jobs for providing work experience for the population of youth being served. Such jobs have been viewed as lacking appropriate supervision, challenge, skill development opportunities, and transitional potential for eventually moving the youth into the private sector. Unfortunately, while such criticisms of public sector youth efforts have been frequent, there has been little more than rhetoric supporting the assumption

that the private sector can provide superior work experiences and ultimately better employment opportunities for the unemployed sixteen to twenty-one year olds. This demonstration project has therefore developed a second set of instrumentation designed to test some of the assumptions typically made about the private sector and its availability, benefits, and transitional opportunities for disadvantaged youth. These instruments measure the level of effort needed to develop work experience slots and unsubsidized job opportunities in both the public sector and the private sector.

This report provides data on two rather distinct issues. First, data are presented comparing the level of effort needed to develop worksites in the two sectors. Further comparisions between the sectors are made by types of employers contacted and eventually utilized, and by the types of jobs provided the participating youth in each of the demonstration sites. Next, data are presented on the pretest scores youth achieved on the ETS assessments instruments. Scores are compared by site, by sector assignments, and by several demographics including age, race, sex, and reading level. The report concludes with discussions of the flow of youth through various program phases and some preliminary data on early program terminators and program completers.

## II. ANALYSIS OF WORKSITE DEVELOPMENT DATA

Worksite Developers in the five jurisdictions reported contacts with a total of 3,337 companies and agencies to solicit worksites for the Youth in Jobs Demonstration project. 305 contacts were in the public sector, 720 in the private not-for-profit sector, and 2,312 were in the private-for-profit sector.

Table I presents a summary of the data showing the number of employers and agencies contacted by site and sector.

Previous reports have indicated that sites almost always contacted smaller employers with fewer than 50 full-time employees. In most cases, the employers contacted were new to the operator.

Table II presents data on the total number of contacts made in each sector for each site. Total follow-up calls were recorded and summed to obtain Table II. Only Philadelphia had some employer contacts where more than 4 - 6 follow-up contacts were made. The number of total contacts necessary to develop a suitable number of worksites varied considerably among the five jurisdictions. 67% of the total contacts were made with private sector employers. Subsequent tables detail the level of effort required to develop worksites for the Youth in Jobs Program.

The number of employers agreeing to provide at least one worksite and the participation rate by site and sector is shown in Table III.

Overall, 30.2% of the employers contacted provided at least one worksite for the program. Participation rates by site ranged from 13.0% in Philadelphia to a high of 64.8% in St. Louis. In all sites, private not-for-profit employers participated at a higher rate than private sector companies. Except in New York and St. Louis, this also held true for public agencies.

The total number of jobs developed in each site by sector is presented in

**TABLE I**  
**TOTAL NO. OF EMPLOYERS CONTACTED**  
**BY SITE, BY SECTOR**

| <b>City</b>  | <b>Public</b> | <b>Private:<br/>Not-for-Profit</b> | <b>Private</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--------------|---------------|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| New York     | 21            | 72                                 | 307            | 400          |
| Philadelphia | -             | 486                                | 1002           | 1488         |
| St. Louis    | 40            | 52                                 | 158            | 250          |
| Minnesota    | 180           | 45                                 | 505            | 730          |
| Portland     | 64            | 65                                 | 340            | 469          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>305</b>    | <b>720</b>                         | <b>2312</b>    | <b>3337</b>  |

TABLE II  
TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACTS  
BY SITE, BY SECTOR

| <b>City</b>  | <b>Public</b> | <b>Private<br/>Not-for-Profit</b> | <b>Private</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| New York     | 35            | 83                                | 482            | 600          |
| Philadelphia | --            | 1150                              | 2100           | 3250         |
| St. Louis    | 70            | 69                                | 286            | 425          |
| Minnesota    | 355           | 84                                | 816            | 1255         |
| Portland     | 105           | 121                               | 571            | 797          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>565</b>    | <b>1507</b>                       | <b>4255</b>    | <b>6327</b>  |

TABLE III  
YOUTH IN JOBS EMPLOYER PARTICIPATION RATE  
BY SITE, BY SECTOR\*

|              | Public         | Private:<br>Not-for-Profit | Private        | TOTAL           |
|--------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| New York     | 15<br>(28.6%)  | 51<br>(70.8%)              | 147<br>(49.9%) | 213<br>(53.3%)  |
| Philadelphia | 0<br>( NA )    | 88<br>(18.1%)              | 105<br>(10.5%) | 193<br>(13.0%)  |
| St. Louis    | 23<br>(57.5%)  | 38<br>(73.1%)              | 101<br>(63.9%) | 162<br>(64.8%)  |
| Minnesota    | 91<br>(50.6%)  | 25<br>(55.6%)              | 157<br>(31.1%) | 273<br>(37.4%)  |
| Portland     | 33<br>(51.6%)  | 41<br>(63.1%)              | 101<br>(29.7%) | 175<br>(37.3%)  |
| Total        | 162<br>(53.1%) | 243<br>(33.8%)             | 611<br>(26.4%) | 1016<br>(30.2%) |

\* Total no. of employers providing at least one work site      Total no. of employers contacted

Table IV. A total of 2,459 were reported as developed for the program: 18% in the public sector, 30% in the private not-for-profit sector, and 51% in the private sector. The public/private split of these percentages reflect the need to place youth equally in the two sectors.

Table V presents data on the level of effort expended in each of the five demonstration project locations to gain worksites for enrollees. The table presents the number of contacts necessary to develop one worksite for the demonstration projects. Six contacts were required to develop one worksite in Philadelphia. Thus, a far greater level of effort was required in Philadelphia to gain a suitable number of employers for project participation. The data reported in Table V confirms the trends described in previous progress reports. Local factors that account for the higher level of effort needed in Philadelphia center on the high level of hostility to any CETA-connected program whether for youth or anyone else in the Philadelphia area. As the table shows, and as was reported previously in the interim progress reports, Minnesota also had a more difficult time in developing worksites than did the remaining locations. This appears due to the rural setting of the program and the consequent difficulties of fewer businesses and greater transportation problems.

Alternatively, St. Louis had the least trouble developing worksites. Analysis of why this might be so indicates that the Urban League has had continuous contacts with various private-sector "influentials". For example, the League used its board of directors and experienced job developers. This appears to have helped immensely in promoting Youth in Jobs among various St. Louis employers.

Table VI shows the number of jobs developed per participating company. As can be seen, the private-for-profit sector provided fewer jobs slots per par-

**TABLE IV**  
**TOTAL NO. OF JOBS DEVELOPED**  
**BY SITE, BY SECTOR**

|              | Public     | Private:<br>Not-for-Profit | Private     | TOTAL       |
|--------------|------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| New York     | 42         | 180                        | 336         | 558         |
| Philadelphia | -          | 314                        | 234         | 548         |
| St. Louis    | 167        | 133                        | 300         | 600         |
| Minnesota    | 140        | 36                         | 192         | 368         |
| Portland     | 122        | 79                         | 184         | 385         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>440</b> | <b>742</b>                 | <b>1246</b> | <b>2459</b> |

**TABLE V**  
**NUMBER OF CONTACTS NEEDED TO DEVELOP ONE JOB**  
**BY SITE, BY SECTOR**

|                                 | <b>Public</b> | <b>Private:<br/>Not-for-Profit</b> | <b>Private</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|---------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| New York                        | .83           | .46                                | 1.43           | 1.06         |
| Philadelphia                    | -             | 3.66                               | 8.97           | 5.93         |
| St. Louis                       | .42           | .52                                | 1.95           | .71          |
| Minnesota                       | 2.54          | 2.33                               | 4.25           | 3.41         |
| Portland                        | .86           | 1.53                               | 3.10           | 2.07         |
| <b>Average:<br/>(By Sector)</b> | <b>1.20</b>   | <b>2.03</b>                        | <b>3.40</b>    | <b>2.57</b>  |

**TABLE VI**  
**NUMBER OF JOBS DEVELOPED PER PARTICIPATING EMPLOYER**  
**BY SITE, BY SECTOR**

| <b>City</b>                    | <b>Public</b> | <b>Private<br/>Not-for-Profit</b> | <b>Private</b> |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| New York                       | 2.8           | 3.5                               | 2.3            |
| Philadelphia                   | -             | 3.6                               | 2.2            |
| St. Louis                      | 7.3           | 3.5                               | 3.0            |
| Minnesota                      | 1.5           | 1.4                               | 1.2            |
| Florida                        | 3.7           | 1.9                               | 1.8            |
| <b>Average<br/>(by Sector)</b> | <b>2.7</b>    | <b>3.1</b>                        | <b>2.0</b>     |

ticipating employer than did the other two sectors. This was true for all five sites. Participating private sector employers provided an average of two worksites each. Public sector agencies agreed to provide an average of 2.7 each and private non-profit groups an average of 3.1 worksites. The number of jobs per employer ranged from 7.3 (St. Louis / Public) to 1.2 (Minnesota / Private).

Tables VII and VIII present data on the number of contacts and jobs developed, respectively, by type of employer. Employers in the public and private not-for-profit sectors were classified according to functional area (consistent with the Census of Governments) and in the private sector by S.I.C. code. Table VII shows that the majority of public sector (including private non-profit) contacts were with human resource agencies (43%), followed by health/hospitals (19%) and education (11%). In the private sector 32% of the contacts were with service sector employers, 30% with trade and 20% manufacturing.

The number of jobs developed shown in Table VIII represents the results of those efforts. In the public sector 46% of the worksites were in human resource agencies, 14% in health and hospitals and 11% general administration. This is generally consistent with the distribution of total contacts (Table VII). Worksites developed in the private sector were in service (46%), trade (26%), and manufacturing (11%). Thus, the service sector provided more worksites than would have been expected based on contacts, while manufacturing provided fewer (20% of contacts versus 11% of worksites).

Table IX presents the level of effort data (number of contacts needed to develop one job) by employer S.I.C. code or functional area. This table combines Tables VII and VIII in order to examine whether there are consistent variations in required worksite development effort by employer type across sites. There does not appear to be any systematic variation by site. Small cell sizes hinder a more detailed analysis.

**TABLE VII**  
**TOTAL NO. OF CONTACTS BY SITE, BY EMPLOYER**  
**SIC CODE OR FUNCTIONAL AREA**

| <b>PUBLIC/PRIVATE NOT-FOR-PROFIT</b> | <b>NV</b>       | <b>PHIL</b>      | <b>STL</b>      | <b>MINN</b>     | <b>PORT</b>     | <b>T.</b>        |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <b>Education</b>                     | 6<br>( 5.1%)    | 81<br>( 7.0%)    | 6<br>( 1.3%)    | 86<br>(19.6%)   | 45<br>(19.9%)   | 224<br>(10.8%)   |
| <b>Highways</b>                      | 3<br>( 2.5%)    | 1<br>( 0.1%)     | -               | 22<br>( 5.0%)   | 7<br>( 3.1%)    | 33<br>( 1.6%)    |
| <b>Human Resources</b>               | 86<br>(72.9%)   | 639<br>(55.6%)   | 34<br>(24.5%)   | 67<br>(15.3%)   | 62<br>(27.4%)   | 888<br>(42.9%)   |
| <b>Health/Hospitals</b>              | 1<br>( 0.8%)    | 242<br>(21.0%)   | 35<br>(25.2%)   | 85<br>(19.4%)   | 29<br>(12.8%)   | 392<br>(18.9%)   |
| <b>Police Protection</b>             | 1<br>( 0.8%)    | -                | 8<br>( 5.8%)    | 6<br>( 1.4%)    | 8<br>( 3.5%)    | 23<br>( 1.1%)    |
| <b>Fire Protection</b>               | -               | 2<br>( 0.2%)     | 1<br>( 0.7%)    | -               | 4<br>( 1.8%)    | 7<br>( 0.3%)     |
| <b>Sewerage/Sanitation</b>           | 1<br>( 0.8%)    | -                | -               | 11<br>( 2.5%)   | 4<br>( 1.8%)    | 15<br>( 0.7%)    |
| <b>Parks/Recreation</b>              | 1<br>( 0.8%)    | 72<br>( 6.3%)    | 11<br>( 7.9%)   | 61<br>(13.9%)   | 24<br>(10.6%)   | 169<br>( 8.2%)   |
| <b>Housing/Urban Renewal</b>         | 9<br>( 7.6%)    | 75<br>( 6.5%)    | 5<br>( 3.6%)    | 4<br>( 0.9%)    | 9<br>( 4.0%)    | 102<br>( 4.9%)   |
| <b>Libraries</b>                     | 1<br>( 0.8%)    | 7<br>( 0.6%)     | 5<br>( 3.6%)    | 7<br>( 1.6%)    | 2<br>( 0.9%)    | 22<br>( 1.1%)    |
| <b>General Administration</b>        | 9<br>( 7.6%)    | 31<br>( 2.7%)    | 34<br>(24.5%)   | 90<br>(20.5%)   | 31<br>(13.7%)   | 195<br>( 9.4%)   |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                     | 118<br>(100.0%) | 1150<br>(100.0%) | 139<br>(100.0%) | 434<br>(100.0%) | 226<br>(100.0%) | 2072<br>(100.0%) |

**TABLE VII**  
(cont.)

| <b>PRIVATE</b>                         | <b>NY</b>       | <b>PHIL</b>      | <b>STL</b>      | <b>MINN</b>     | <b>PORT</b>     | <b>T.</b>        |
|--|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <b>Agriculture</b>                     | -               | -                | 3<br>( 0.7%)    | 8<br>( 0.6%)    | 8<br>( 1.0%)    | 19<br>( 0.4%)    |
| <b>Finance, Real Estate, Insurance</b> | 26<br>( 5.4%)   | 226<br>(10.7%)   | 23<br>( 5.4%)   | 67<br>( 5.3%)   | 67<br>( 8.4%)   | 408<br>( 9.6%)   |
| <b>Manufacturing</b>                   | 27<br>( 5.6%)   | 676<br>(32.2%)   | 27<br>( 6.4%)   | 23<br>( 1.8%)   | 75<br>( 9.4%)   | 828<br>(19.5%)   |
| <b>Trade: Wholesale &amp; Retail</b>   | 148<br>(30.7%)  | 379<br>(18.0%)   | 65<br>(15.3%)   | 492<br>(39.2%)  | 173<br>(21.7%)  | 1257<br>(29.5%)  |
| <b>Mining</b>                          | 4<br>( 0.8%)    | -                | -               | -               | 3<br>( 0.4%)    | 7<br>( 0.2%)     |
| <b>Construction</b>                    | 10<br>( 2.1%)   | 99<br>( 4.7%)    | 11<br>( 2.6%)   | 43<br>( 3.4%)   | 53<br>( 6.6%)   | 216<br>( 5.1%)   |
| <b>Transportation/Public Util.</b>     | -               | 80<br>( 3.8%)    | 4<br>( 0.9%)    | 18<br>( 1.4%)   | 46<br>( 5.8%)   | 146<br>( 3.5%)   |
| <b>Service</b>                         | 267<br>(55.4%)  | 641<br>(30.5%)   | 153<br>(36.0%)  | 165<br>(13.1%)  | 146<br>(18.3%)  | 1372<br>(32.2%)  |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                       | 482<br>(100.0%) | 2100<br>(100.0%) | 286<br>(100.0%) | 816<br>(100.0%) | 571<br>(100.0%) | 4255<br>(100.0%) |
| <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>                     | 600             | 3250             | 425             | 1255            | 797             | 6327             |

**TABLE VIII**  
**TOTAL NO. OF JOBS DEVELOPED BY SITE,  
 BY SIC CODE OR FUNCTIONAL AREA**

| <b>PUBLIC/PRIVATE NOT-FOR-PROFIT</b> | <b>NY</b>              | <b>PHIL</b>            | <b>STL</b>             | <b>MINN</b>            | <b>PORT</b>            | <b>T.</b>               |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Education</b>                     | <b>4</b><br>( 1.9%)    | <b>16</b><br>( 5.1%)   | <b>3</b><br>( 1.1%)    | <b>32</b><br>(18.9%)   | <b>44</b><br>(22.3%)   | <b>99</b><br>( 8.5%)    |
| <b>Highways</b>                      | -                      | -                      | -                      | <b>11</b><br>( 6.5%)   | <b>3</b><br>( 1.5%)    | <b>14</b><br>( 1.2%)    |
| <b>Human Resources</b>               | <b>171</b><br>(81.0%)  | <b>210</b><br>(67.1%)  | <b>63</b><br>(22.3%)   | <b>29</b><br>(17.2%)   | <b>65</b><br>(33.0%)   | <b>538</b><br>(45.9%)   |
| <b>Health/Hospitals</b>              | <b>1</b><br>( 0.5%)    | <b>55</b><br>(17.6%)   | <b>50</b><br>(17.7%)   | <b>36</b><br>(21.3%)   | <b>19</b><br>( 9.6%)   | <b>161</b><br>(13.7%)   |
| <b>Police Protection</b>             | <b>2</b><br>( 1.0%)    | -                      | <b>30</b><br>(10.6%)   | <b>1</b><br>( 0.6%)    | <b>4</b><br>( 2.0%)    | <b>37</b><br>( 3.2%)    |
| <b>Fire Protection</b>               | -                      | -                      | <b>1</b><br>( 0.4%)    | -                      | <b>6</b><br>( 3.1%)    | <b>7</b><br>( 0.6%)     |
| <b>Sewerage/Sanitation</b>           | <b>1</b><br>( 0.5%)    | -                      | -                      | <b>6</b><br>( 3.6%)    | <b>2</b><br>( 1.0%)    | <b>9</b><br>( 0.8%)     |
| <b>Parks/Recreation</b>              | <b>8</b><br>( 3.8%)    | <b>8</b><br>( 2.6%)    | <b>61</b><br>(21.6%)   | <b>26</b><br>(15.4%)   | <b>11</b><br>( 5.6%)   | <b>114</b><br>( 9.7%)   |
| <b>Housing/Urban Renewal</b>         | <b>12</b><br>( 5.7%)   | <b>14</b><br>( 4.5%)   | <b>20</b><br>( 7.1%)   | <b>2</b><br>( 1.2%)    | <b>11</b><br>( 5.6%)   | <b>59</b><br>( 5.0%)    |
| <b>Libraries</b>                     | -                      | <b>2</b><br>( 0.6%)    | <b>3</b><br>( 1.1%)    | <b>3</b><br>( 1.8%)    | <b>1</b><br>( 0.5%)    | <b>9</b><br>( 0.8%)     |
| <b>General Administration</b>        | <b>12</b><br>( 5.7%)   | <b>8</b><br>( 2.6%)    | <b>51</b><br>(18.1%)   | <b>23</b><br>(13.6%)   | <b>31</b><br>(15.7%)   | <b>125</b><br>(10.7%)   |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                     | <b>211</b><br>(100.0%) | <b>313</b><br>(100.0%) | <b>282</b><br>(100.0%) | <b>169</b><br>(100.0%) | <b>197</b><br>(100.0%) | <b>1172</b><br>(100.0%) |

**TABLE VIII**  
(cont.)

| <b>PRIVATE</b>                         | <b>NY</b>       | <b>PHIL</b>     | <b>STL</b>      | <b>MINN</b>     | <b>PORT</b>     | <b>T.</b>        |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <b>Agriculture, etc.</b>               | -               | -               | 4<br>1.3%)      | 4<br>( 2.0%)    | 4<br>( 3.0%)    | 12<br>( 1.0%)    |
| <b>Finance, Real Estate, Insurance</b> | 27<br>( 7.9%)   | 32<br>(13.2%)   | 30<br>( 9.4%)   | 14<br>( 7.1%)   | 18<br>(13.3%)   | 121<br>( 9.8%)   |
| <b>Manufacturing</b>                   | 18<br>( 5.3%)   | 62<br>(25.5%)   | 35<br>(11.0%)   | 10<br>( 5.1%)   | 10<br>( 7.4%)   | 135<br>(10.9%)   |
| <b>Trade: Wholesale &amp; Retail</b>   | 58<br>(16.9%)   | 43<br>(17.7%)   | 47<br>(14.8%)   | 111<br>(56.4%)  | 59<br>(43.7%)   | 318<br>(25.7%)   |
| <b>Mining</b>                          | 9<br>( 2.6%)    |                 | -               | -               | 3<br>( 2.2%)    | 12<br>( 1.0%)    |
| <b>Construction</b>                    | 16<br>( 4.7%)   | 2<br>( 0.8%)    | 10<br>( 3.1%)   | 10<br>( 5.1%)   | 3<br>( 2.2%)    | 41<br>( 3.3%)    |
| <b>Transportation/Public</b>           | -               | 13<br>( 5.4%)   | 3<br>( 0.9%)    | 4<br>( 2.0%)    | 6<br>( 4.4%)    | 26<br>( 2.1%)    |
| <b>Service</b>                         | 215<br>(62.7%)  | 91<br>(37.5%)   | 189<br>(59.4%)  | 44<br>(22.3%)   | 32<br>(23.7%)   | 571<br>(46.2%)   |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                       | 343<br>(100.0%) | 243<br>(100.0%) | 318<br>(100.0%) | 197<br>(100.0%) | 135<br>(100.0%) | 1236<br>(100.0%) |
| <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>                     | 554             | 556             | 600             | 366             | 332             | 2408             |

TABLE IX  
NUMBER OF CONTACTS NEEDED TO DEVELOP ONE JOB  
BY SITE, BY EMPLOYER SIC CODE, OR FUNCTIONAL AREA

Public/Private Non-Profit

|                                      | NYC  | PHIL. | ST. L | MINN. | PORT. |
|--------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Education                         | 1.5  | 5.1   | 2.0   | 2.7   | 1.0   |
| 2. Highways                          | -    | -     | -     | 2.0   | 2.3   |
| 3. Human Resources                   | 0.50 |       | 0.54  | 2.3   | 0.97  |
| 4. Health/Hospitals                  | 1.0  | 4.4   | 0.70  | 2.4   | 1.5   |
| 5. Police Protection                 | 0.50 | -     | 0.27  | 6.0   | 2.0   |
| 6. Fire Protection                   | -    | -     | 1.0   | -     | 0.67  |
| 7. Sewerage/Santation                | 1.0  | -     | -     | 1.8   | 2.0   |
| 8. Parks/Recreation                  | 0.13 | 9.0   | 0.18  | 2.3   | 2.2   |
| 9. Housing/Urban Renewal             | 0.75 | 5.4   | 0.25  | 2.0   | 0.82  |
| 10. Libraries                        | -    | 3.5   | 1.7   | 2.3   | 7.0   |
| 11. General Administration           | 0.75 | 15.5  | 11.3  | 30.0  | 31.0  |
| <br><u>Private-for-Profit</u>        |      |       |       |       |       |
| 12. Agriculture; Forest, etc.        | -    | -     | 0.75  | 2.0   | 2.0   |
| 13. Finance, Real Estate, Insurance  | 0.96 | 7.0   | 0.77  | 4.8   | 3.7   |
| 14. Manufacturing                    | 1.5  | 10.9  | 0.77  | 2.3   | 7.5   |
| 15. Wholesale/Retail Trades          | 2.6  | 8.8   | 1.4   | 4.4   | 2.9   |
| 16. Mining                           | 0.40 | -     | -     | -     | 1.0   |
| 17. Construction                     | 0.63 | 49.5  | 1.1   | 4.3   | 17.7  |
| 18. Transportation, Public Utilities | -    | 6.2   | 1.3   | 4.5   | 7.7   |
| 19. Services                         | 1.2  | 7.0   | 0.81  | 3.8   | 4.6   |

Table X presents the breakdown of the types of jobs developed by site, by sector. The categories are based on the occupational codes found in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (D.O.T.). One modification was introduced: a category (999) which was used for job descriptions that were impossible to categorize precisely using the other classifications. One hundred and two (4.4%) of the total number of jobs were placed in this category.

For all sectors, clerical and sales positions represented the largest category (39.9% of all jobs developed) and service positions the next highest (23.4%). No other occupational classification accounted for as much as 10% of the positions. Within sites and sectors a good deal of variation exists. However, clerical, sales, and service remain the predominant categories.

TABLE X

NUMBER OF JOBS DEVELOPED BY MAJOR D.O.T. CODE  
BY SITE, BY SECTOR

| D.O.T.<br>Category                | New York     |              |               | Philadelphia |               |              | St. Louis    |              |               | Minnesota    |               |              | Portland     |              |              | Total          |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
|                                   | Pub          | PNP          | Pri           | Pub          | PNP           | Pri          | Pub          | PNP          | Pri           | Pub          | PNP           | Pri          | Pub          | PNP          | Pri          |                |
| 0-199<br>(Prof., Tech.,<br>Man.)  | 10<br>(23.8) | 49<br>(27.6) | 7<br>(2.1)    | 0<br>(17.1)  | 51<br>(1.7)   | 4<br>(6.8)   | 6<br>(13.1)  | 15<br>(3.0)  | 9<br>(3.0)    | 10<br>(7.2)  | 5<br>(13.9)   | 2<br>(1.0)   | 17<br>(15.9) | 17<br>(21.5) | 9<br>(4.9)   | 211<br>(9.1)   |
| 200-299<br>(Clerical,<br>Sales)   | 30<br>(71.4) | 71<br>(39.9) | 150<br>(44.6) | 0<br>(37.6)  | 112<br>(38.2) | 89<br>(53.4) | 47<br>(42.1) | 48<br>(35.9) | 104<br>(49.0) | 43<br>(31.2) | 8<br>(22.2)   | 94<br>(49.0) | 48<br>(44.9) | 21<br>(26.6) | 59<br>(31.7) | 924<br>(39.9)  |
| 300-399<br>(Service)              | 2<br>(4.8)   | 45<br>(25.3) | 68<br>(20.2)  | 0<br>(34.2)  | 102<br>(18.4) | 43<br>(25.0) | 22<br>(30.7) | 35<br>(33.1) | 96<br>(10.9)  | 23<br>(16.7) | 16<br>(44.14) | 21<br>(10.9) | 15<br>(14.0) | 18<br>(22.8) | 36<br>(19.3) | 542<br>(23.4)  |
| 400-499<br>(Agricultural)         | 0<br>21      | 0<br>0       | 0<br>0        | 0<br>0       | 1<br>(0.3)    | 0<br>0       | 3<br>(3.4)   | 10<br>(8.8)  | 10<br>(3.5)   | 33<br>(23.9) | 4<br>(11.1)   | 18<br>(9.4)  | 3<br>(2.8)   | 4<br>(5.1)   | 7<br>(3.8)   | 93<br>(4.0)    |
| 500-599<br>(Processing)           | 0<br>21      | 0<br>0       | 0<br>0        | 0<br>0       | 9<br>(3.9)    | 0<br>0       | 0<br>0       | 0<br>0       | 2<br>(0.7)    | 0<br>0       | 0<br>0        | 6<br>(3.1)   | 0<br>0       | 0<br>0       | 2<br>(1.1)   | 19<br>(0.8)    |
| 600-699<br>(Machine Trades)       | 0<br>21      | 0<br>0       | 18<br>(5.4)   | 0<br>0       | 1<br>(0.3)    | 25<br>(10.7) | 1<br>(1.1)   | 0<br>0       | 17<br>(5.9)   | 1<br>(0.7)   | 0<br>0        | 12<br>(6.3)  | 2<br>(1.9)   | 1<br>(1.3)   | 16<br>(8.6)  | 94<br>(4.1)    |
| 700-799<br>(Benchwork)            | 0<br>21      | 0<br>0       | 16<br>(4.8)   | 0<br>0       | 0<br>(3.9)    | 9<br>(3.9)   | 0<br>0       | 0<br>(3.5)   | 10<br>(2.1)   | 0<br>0       | 0<br>0        | 4<br>(2.1)   | 0<br>0       | 0<br>0       | 3<br>(1.6)   | 42<br>(1.8)    |
| 800-899<br>(Structural<br>Work)   | 0<br>21      | 11<br>(6.2)  | 41<br>(12.2)  | 0<br>0       | 16<br>(5.4)   | 14<br>(6.0)  | 7<br>(8.0)   | 2<br>(1.8)   | 23<br>(7.9)   | 16<br>(11.6) | 1<br>(2.8)    | 14<br>(7.3)  | 17<br>(15.9) | 2<br>(2.5)   | 19<br>(10.2) | 183<br>(7.9)   |
| 900-998<br>(Misc.)                | 0<br>21      | 0<br>0       | 19<br>(5.6)   | 0<br>0       | 2<br>(0.7)    | 33<br>(14.2) | 0<br>0       | 2<br>(1.8)   | 14<br>(4.8)   | 3<br>(2.2)   | 0<br>0        | 9<br>(4.7)   | 3<br>(2.8)   | 8<br>(10.1)  | 14<br>(7.5)  | 107<br>(4.6)   |
| 999<br>(Multi-job<br>description) | 0<br>21      | 2<br>(1.1)   | 17<br>(5.1)   | 0<br>0       | 13<br>(4.4)   | 7<br>(3.0)   | 2<br>(2.3)   | 2<br>(1.8)   | 5<br>(1.7)    | 9<br>(6.5)   | 2<br>(5.6)    | 12<br>(6.3)  | 2<br>(1.9)   | 8<br>(10.1)  | 21<br>(11.3) | 102<br>(4.4)   |
| Total                             | 42<br>(100)  | 178<br>(100) | 336<br>(100)  | 0<br>(100)   | 298<br>(100)  | 233<br>(100) | 88<br>(100)  | 114<br>(100) | 290<br>(100)  | 138<br>(100) | 36<br>(100)   | 192<br>(100) | 107<br>(100) | 79<br>(100)  | 186<br>(100) | 2,317<br>(100) |

## Psychometric Battery

### III. ANALYSIS OF SAS PRETEST AND STEP

psychometric battery

Tables XI through XVI present data on SAS/pretest assessment instruments. These instruments assess both work related knowledge and attitudes. Participants, at the beginning of the program, responded to test items arranged into seven subscales and a reading test. The seven subscales are (1) a Vocational Attitudes Scale consisting of 30 items with a maximum possible score of 30; (2) a Job Knowledge Scale, also with a maximum scale score of 30; (3) a Job Holding Skill Scale with eleven Likert items weighted from one to three, the higher score indicating a greater degree of skill; (4) a Work Relevant Attitudes Inventory, also a Likert scale with sixteen items rated one through four, four indicating the most positive response; (5) a Job Seeking Skills Scale consisting of seventeen items, with one point assigned for each correct answer; (6) a Sex Stereotype Scale with twenty-one Likert items weighted one to three, three indicating the least amount of sex role stereotyping; and (7) a fifteen item Self Esteem Scale, with a three point Likert scale weighted in the direction of the more positive attitude. The reading assessment instrument (STEP) consisted of twenty items. Each correct response was given one point. Data is reported on approximately 1,963 pretests .

Table XI reports mean score comparisons on the pretest instruments by sector. Participants were matched on the bases of age, race, sex and a reading score (SelectABLE). Matched pairs were then randomly assigned to either the public sector or the private sector. As can be seen from the table, this randomizing procedure avoided any systematic bias in the selection of a participant for either sector. There are no significant differences on any of the subscales between the participants in the two sectors. Table XI also indicates that program participants as a group had a fairly high degree of knowledge about the world of work and fairly positive work

**TABLE XI**  
**MEAN SCORE PRETEST COMPARISON**  
**BY SECTOR**

| Subscale                | Public | Private | Significance | Explained Variation |
|-------------------------|--------|---------|--------------|---------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 20.55  | 20.70   | NS           | 0                   |
| Job Knowledge           | 22.49  | 22.38   | NS           | 0                   |
| Job Holding Skills      | 30.94  | 30.80   | NS           | 0                   |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 48.30  | 48.62   | NS           | 0                   |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 12.44  | 12.46   | NS           | 0                   |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 45.99  | 45.97   | NS           | 0                   |
| Self Esteem             | 36.57  | 36.55   | NS           | 0                   |
| STEP                    | 15.53  | 15.60   | NS           | 0                   |

attitudes at the beginning of the program. On Vocational Attitudes the average scores clustered near 21, while Job Knowledge scores averaged over twenty-two correct answers. As a group, participants also appeared to possess a fairly high degree of Job Holding Skills as measured by the pretest. Scores on Work Relevant Attitudes tend toward the higher end of the scale, as do scores on Job Seeking Skills. There appears to be little sex stereotyping. Both the Self Esteem Inventory and the STEP Test also tended toward the high end of their respective scales. Given this finding, we would expect little change to occur at the time of post-testing.

Table XII reports mean score comparisons by site. When examining scores by site systematic variation becomes evident. Minnesota generally has the highest scores, followed by Portland. Despite the systematic association between site and pretest score, however, such association appears weak. As can be seen from an examination of the Explained Variation column, site does not provide any strong explanatory power when attempting to understand pretest score variations. Tables XIII and XIV, which report score variations by sex and by race, exhibit the same pattern.

Table XIII shows that females consistently score higher on all of the pretest subscales. Again, however, despite the statistically significant association between sex and pretest scores, such association is extremely weak and therefore unable to explain to any high degree the variation in test patterns. Table XIV, on race, while showing a consistent degree of association between race and test scores, highlights the weakness of the association. Age, reflected in Table XV, shows no association with test scores.

Table XVI, which provides mean score pretest comparisons by SelectABLE, demonstrates the strongest relationship to test score variation. SelectABLE tested youth for matching purposes on verbal aptitude and computational

TABLE XII

**MEAN SCORE PRETEST COMPARISON  
BY SITE**

| Subscale                | New York | Philadelphia | St. Louis | Minnesota | Portland | Significance | Explained Variation |
|-------------------------|----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------------|---------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 19.72    | 20.16        | 20.25     | 22.14     | 21.37    | .001         | 4%                  |
| Job Knowledge           | 22.36    | 21.76        | 21.58     | 24.24     | 22.47    | .001         | 7%                  |
| Job Holding Skills      | 30.51    | 30.63        | 31.08     | 31.42     | 30.74    | .001         | 2%                  |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 47.11    | 47.62        | 48.52     | 50.75     | 48.74    | .001         | 3%                  |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 12.34    | 12.07        | 12.51     | 12.94     | 12.44    | .01          | 1%                  |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 44.69    | 46.08        | 45.27     | 47.66     | 46.71    | .01          | 1%                  |
| Self Esteem             | 36.79    | 36.90        | 37.04     | 35.57     | 36.27    | .001         | 3%                  |
| STEP                    | 15.20    | 14.80        | 15.16     | 17.48     | 15.64    | .001         | 4%                  |

ul

TABLE XIII  
MEAN SCORE PRETEST COMPARISON  
BY SEX

| Subscale                | Male  | Female | Significance | Explained Variation |
|-------------------------|-------|--------|--------------|---------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 20.03 | 21.13  | .001         | 1%                  |
| Job Knowledge           | 22.04 | 22.78  | .001         | 1%                  |
| Job Holding Skills      | 30.36 | 31.32  | .001         | 5%                  |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 47.77 | 49.07  | .001         | 0%                  |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 11.86 | 12.96  | .001         | 3%                  |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 44.05 | 47.63  | .001         | 5%                  |
| Self Esteem             | 36.30 | 36.78  | .001         | 0%                  |
| STEP                    | 14.90 | 16.14  | .001         | 2%                  |

TABLE XIV

**MEAN SCORE PRETEST COMPARISON  
BY RACE/ETHNICITY**

| Subscale                | White<br>(N=524) | Black<br>(N=1,291) | Hispanic<br>(N=114) | American<br>Indian<br>(N=22) | Asian<br>(N=8) | Significance | Explained<br>Variation |
|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 22.20            | 20.11              | 19.24               | 22.38                        | 16.25          | .001         | 6%                     |
| Job Knowledge           | 23.98            | 21.84              | 21.63               | 24.27                        | 21.00          | .001         | 7%                     |
| Job Holding Skills      | 31.33            | 30.76              | 29.97               | 30.59                        | 31.00          | .01          | 2%                     |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 50.62            | 47.68              | 47.10               | 51.09                        | 42.87          | .001         | 4%                     |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 12.99            | 12.34              | 11.22               | 12.91                        | 10.62          | .01          | 2%                     |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 47.84            | 45.37              | 44.74               | 45.91                        | 42.75          | .001         | 2%                     |
| Self Esteem             | 35.81            | 36.93              | 36.04               | 35.54                        | 35.25          | .001         | 3%                     |
| STEP                    | 17.19            | 15.03              | 14.23               | 17.10                        | 13.33          | .001         | 5%                     |

.01 1.

TABLE XV

MEAN SCORE PRETEST COMPARISON  
BY AGE

| Subscale                | 16 yrs. | 17 yrs. | 18 yrs. | 19 yrs. | 20 yrs. | 21 yrs. | Significance | Explained Variation |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|---------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 21.03   | 20.83   | 20.62   | 20.22   | 20.78   | 20.76   | NS           | 0                   |
| Job Knowledge           | 22.52   | 22.00   | 22.45   | 22.36   | 22.67   | 22.58   | NS           | 0                   |
| Job Holding Skills      | 30.65   | 30.61   | 30.98   | 30.89   | 30.86   | 31.09   | NS           | 0                   |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 47.50   | 47.86   | 48.88   | 48.43   | 48.62   | 48.91   | NS           | 0                   |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 11.70   | 11.70   | 12.43   | 12.55   | 12.96   | 12.93   | NS           | 0                   |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 44.73   | 45.75   | 45.90   | 46.12   | 46.30   | 46.63   | NS           | 0                   |
| Self Esteem             | 35.83   | 35.72   | 36.75   | 36.71   | 36.87   | 36.90   | .01          | 2%                  |
| STEP                    | 15.25   | 15.08   | 15.91   | 15.34   | 15.82   | 15.74   | NS           | 0                   |

**TABLE XVI**  
**MEAN SCORE PRETEST COMPARISON**  
**BY SELECTABLE**

| Subscale                       | High         | Medium       | Low          | Significance | Explained Variation |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|
| <b>Vocational Attitudes</b>    | <b>22.12</b> | <b>19.75</b> | <b>16.66</b> | <b>.001</b>  | <b>17%</b>          |
| <b>Job Knowledge</b>           | <b>23.78</b> | <b>21.67</b> | <b>18.56</b> | <b>.001</b>  | <b>20%</b>          |
| <b>Job Holding Skills</b>      | <b>31.27</b> | <b>30.74</b> | <b>29.34</b> | <b>.001</b>  | <b>6%</b>           |
| <b>Work Relevant Attitudes</b> | <b>51.07</b> | <b>46.55</b> | <b>42.89</b> | <b>.001</b>  | <b>17%</b>          |
| <b>Job Seeking Skills</b>      | <b>13.73</b> | <b>11.70</b> | <b>8.95</b>  | <b>.001</b>  | <b>27%</b>          |
| <b>Sex Stereotyping</b>        | <b>47.93</b> | <b>44.40</b> | <b>42.73</b> | <b>.05</b>   | <b>6%</b>           |
| <b>Self Esteem</b>             | <b>36.89</b> | <b>36.47</b> | <b>35.15</b> | <b>.001</b>  | <b>3%</b>           |
| <b>STEP</b>                    | <b>17.84</b> | <b>14.26</b> | <b>9.33</b>  | <b>.001</b>  | <b>39%</b>          |

skill. Individuals were scored High, Medium, or Low. As can be seen, these scores show a moderate but inconsistent relationship to scores on the pretest battery.

In summary, demographics (site, sex and race) appear only weakly related to pretest score variations. Age shows no relationship at all to pretest scores. Verbal and computational skills, as measured by the SelectABLE, show only a moderate but inconsistent relationship to the pretest.

#### IV. FLOW OF YOUTH THROUGH PROGRAM PHASES

Table XVII shows the flow of participants through the major program phases. The percentages shown in each cell are based on the proportion of youth (by sector) that have moved from the previous program phase. For example, of the 256 youth matched for the public sector in New York City, 231 or 90.2% started orientation. Of the 231 youth who started orientation, 87.4% (202), began a worksite assignment. Of these, 36.1% (73) have terminated with fewer than 150 days on the worksite as of March 21, 1980.

105 or 52% completed at least 151 days at the worksite (note: some youth were still on worksite assignments in the program so that the early worksite terminators and completers will not add to the total starting worksites or 100%).

From an examination of Table XVII, the following points stand out:

1. There was a wide variation by site in moving youth through the various program phases.
2. As would be expected, sector assignment begins to exert more influence on the proportion of youth moving from orientation to placement on a worksite. Sector continues its influence when early terminations are examined.
3. With one exception (New York City), a smaller proportion of youth were successfully placed on private sector worksites than on public sector worksites.
4. The difference between the public and private sectors is more pronounced when early worksite terminations are examined, with the private sector showing a higher rate of early terminations except in rural Minnesota.
5. The column on worksite completers indicates that in four of the five sites youth completed worksite experience at a higher rate in the public sector than in the private although in Portland and St. Louis the differences are slight.

The worksite terminators and completers column will not be finalized until data has been received on the youth remaining in the program.

TABLE XVII  
FLOW OF YOUTH THROUGH PROGRAM PHASES  
BY SECTOR FOR EACH SITE

| City   | Youth Matched |         | Youth Starting Orientation |                | Youth Starting Worksite |               | Early Worksite Terminators (150 days or less) |               | Worksite Completers (151 - 180+ days) |               |
|--|---------------|---------|----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|
|  | Public        | Private | Public                     | Private        | Public                  | Private       | Public  | Private       | Public                                | Private       |
| New York<br>(% moving to next program phase) | 256           | 268     | 231<br>(90.2%)             | 233<br>(86.9)  | 202<br>(87.4)           | 205<br>(88.0) | 73<br>(36.1)                                  | 94<br>(45.9)  | 105<br>(52.0)                         | 86<br>(42.0)  |
| Philadelphia                                 | 260           | 292     | 208<br>(80.0)              | 232<br>(79.5)  | 192<br>(92.3)           | 203<br>(87.5) | 73<br>(38.0)                                  | 106<br>(52.2) | 119<br>(62.0)                         | 97<br>(47.8)  |
| St. Louis                                    | 308           | 330     | 209<br>(67.9)              | 218<br>(66.1)  | 188<br>(90.0)           | 166<br>(76.1) | 86<br>(45.7)                                  | 115<br>(69.3) | 42<br>(22.3)                          | 34<br>(20.5)  |
| Rural Minnesota                              | 248           | 281     | 187<br>(75.4)              | 201<br>(71.5)  | 165<br>(88.2)           | 173<br>(86.1) | 107<br>(64.8)                                 | 108<br>(62.4) | 53<br>(32.1)                          | 61<br>(35.3)  |
| Portland                                     | 294           | 299     | 194<br>(66.0)              | 204<br>(68.0)  | 145<br>(74.7)           | 132<br>(64.7) | 105<br>(72.4)                                 | 101<br>(76.5) | 32<br>(22.1)                          | 29<br>(22.0)  |
| Total  | 1366          | 1470    | 1029<br>(75.3)             | 1088<br>(74.0) | 892<br>(86.7)           | 879<br>(80.8) | 444<br>(49.8)                                 | 524<br>(59.6) | 351<br>(39.3)                         | 307<br>(34.9) |

While some variation by site and sector exist, Table XVIII indicates that program terminations occur approximately equally over the first three 30-day increments. Generally, private sector terminations are higher although in some cases these youth had not been placed on a worksite. During the first 90 days, the distribution of terminations for a 30-day period ranged from 30.7 percent (Portland-Private - 31 to 60 days) to 7.2 percent (Philadelphia-Public - 0 to 30 days). Terminations generally slow significantly in the 91-120 and 121-150 increments and, as expected, increase for the completion phase (defined as 151-180 days in the program).

One would expect that if a youth was placed on a worksite, he/she would be less likely to terminate from the program. Table XIX indicates distributions of terminations for those youth placed on worksites (30-day increments and worksite placement). Terminations before 90 days appear relatively low in only two sites, New York and Philadelphia (St. Louis is somewhat higher because more youth started the program later and had not completed or been terminated). When complete data is available, analysis of all worksite terminations will be undertaken to determine the relative influence of program location factors and youth demographic characteristics. In four of the five sites (Minnesota is the exception) youth are more likely to complete at least 150 days at a public sector worksite than to complete this amount of time at a private sector worksite.

TABLE XVIII  
PROGRAM TERMINATIONS BY DAYS IN PROGRAM  
BY SITE, BY SECTOR

| City   | 0 - 30        |               | 31 - 60       |               | 61 - 90       |               | 91 - 120      |               | 121 - 150    |              | 151 - 180+    |               | Total          |                 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
|  | Public        | Private       | Public        | Private       | Public        | Private       | Public        | Private       | Public       | Private      | Public        | Private       | Public         | Private         |
| New York<br>(% of Total<br>column, by<br>sector) | 17<br>( 8.2%) | 28<br>(13.5)  | 29<br>(14.0)  | 23<br>(11.0)  | 21<br>(10.1)  | 29<br>(13.9)  | 20<br>( 9.6)  | 20<br>( 9.6)  | 10<br>( 4.8) | 15<br>( 7.2) | 110<br>(53.1) | 93<br>(44.7)  | 207<br>(100.0) | 208<br>(100.0)  |
| Philadelphia                                     | 15<br>( 7.2)  | 29<br>(12.5)  | 18<br>( 8.6)  | 32<br>(13.7)  | 18<br>( 8.6)  | 27<br>(21.6)  | 18<br>( 8.6)  | 21<br>( 9.0)  | 14<br>( 6.7) | 19<br>( 8.1) | 125<br>(60.1) | 104<br>(44.8) | 208<br>(100.0) | 232<br>(100.0)  |
| St. Louis  | 24<br>(16.3)  | 39<br>(20.1)  | 21<br>(14.2)  | 44<br>(22.6)  | 30<br>(20.4)  | 37<br>(19.1)  | 16<br>(10.8)  | 23<br>(11.8)  | 13<br>( 8.8) | 10<br>( 5.2) | 43<br>(29.2)  | 41<br>(21.1)  | 147<br>(100.0) | 194<br>(100.0)  |
| Rural<br>Minnesota                               | 25<br>(13.7)  | 32<br>(16.2)  | 20<br>(10.9)  | 40<br>(20.3)  | 23<br>(12.6)  | 29<br>(14.7)  | 30<br>(16.5)  | 14<br>( 7.1)  | 24<br>(13.2) | 16<br>( 8.1) | 60<br>(32.9)  | 66<br>(33.5)  | 182<br>(100.0) | 197<br>(100.0)  |
| Portland   | 46<br>(24.7)  | 36<br>(17.8)  | 32<br>(17.2)  | 62<br>(30.7)  | 34<br>(18.3)  | 28<br>(13.9)  | 25<br>(13.4)  | 30<br>(14.8)  | 8<br>( 4.3)  | 10<br>( 4.9) | 41<br>(22.0)  | 36<br>(17.8)  | 186<br>(100.0) | 202<br>(100.0)  |
| Total  | 128<br>(13.7) | 161<br>(15.6) | 120<br>(12.8) | 201<br>(19.5) | 126<br>(13.5) | 150<br>(14.6) | 109<br>(11.7) | 108<br>(10.5) | 69<br>( 7.4) | 70<br>( 6.8) | 379<br>(40.7) | 338<br>(32.8) | 931<br>(100.0) | 1028<br>(100.0) |

TABLE XIX  
WORKSITE TERMINATIONS BY DAYS ON WORKSITE  
BY SITE, BY SECTOR

| City   | 0 - 30        |               | 31 - 61       |               | 61 - 90      |               | 91 - 120     |              | 121 - 150    |              | 151 - 180+    |               | Total                         |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
|  | Public        | Private       | Public        | Private       | Public       | Private       | Public       | Private      | Public       | Private      | Public        | Private       |                               |
| New York<br>(% of Total<br>column, by<br>sector) | 14<br>( 7.9%) | 14<br>( 7.8)  | 16<br>( 9.0)  | 21<br>(11.7)  | 15<br>( 8.4) | 25<br>(13.9)  | 18<br>(10.1) | 16<br>( 8.9) | 10<br>( 5.6) | 18<br>(10.0) | 105<br>(59.0) | 86<br>(47.8)  | 178<br>(100.0) 180<br>(100.0) |
| Philadelphia                                     | 10<br>( 5.2)  | 20<br>( 9.9)  | 17<br>( 8.9)  | 30<br>(14.8)  | 14<br>( 7.3) | 21<br>(10.3)  | 15<br>( 7.8) | 20<br>( 9.9) | 17<br>( 8.9) | 15<br>( 7.4) | 119<br>(62.0) | 97<br>(47.8)  | 192<br>(100.0) 203<br>(100.0) |
| St. Louis  | 24<br>(18.8)  | 36<br>(24.2)  | 18<br>(14.1)  | 28<br>(18.8)  | 22<br>(17.2) | 26<br>(17.4)  | 12<br>( 9.4) | 12<br>( 8.1) | 10<br>( 7.8) | 13<br>( 8.7) | 42<br>(32.8)  | 34<br>(22.8)  | 128<br>(100.0) 149<br>(100.0) |
| Rural<br>Minnesota                               | 7<br>( 4.4)   | 26<br>(15.4)  | 26<br>(16.3)  | 34<br>(20.1)  | 27<br>(16.9) | 15<br>( 8.9)  | 27<br>(16.9) | 17<br>(10.1) | 20<br>(12.5) | 16<br>( 9.5) | 53<br>(33.0)  | 61<br>(36.1)  | 160<br>(100.0) 169<br>(100.0) |
| Portland   | 26<br>(19.0)  | 33<br>(25.4)  | 35<br>(25.5)  | 26<br>(20.0)  | 20<br>(14.6) | 22<br>(16.9)  | 14<br>(10.2) | 13<br>(10.0) | 10<br>( 7.3) | 7<br>( 5.4)  | 32<br>(23.4)  | 29<br>(22.3)  | 137<br>(100.0) 130<br>(100.0) |
| Total  | 81<br>(10.2)  | 129<br>(15.5) | 112<br>(14.1) | 139<br>(16.7) | 98<br>(12.3) | 109<br>(13.1) | 86<br>(10.8) | 78<br>( 9.4) | 67<br>( 8.4) | 69<br>( 8.3) | 351<br>(44.2) | 307<br>(36.9) | 795<br>(100.0) 831<br>(100.0) |

Table XX uses information from the Flow of Youth Through Program Phases (Table XVII) to focus on youth completing at least 150 days at a worksite. Completion rates for these worksite completers were computed by site and sector based on the total number of youth who began orientation and on the total number of youth who actually began a worksite. In addition, Table XX presents preliminary post-program placement data taken from the weekly monitor reports. Both tables exclude youth still in the program.

An examination of Table XX reveals that completion rates for worksite statistics were higher for those in public sector work experience in New York, Philadelphia, and St. Louis. In Portland the rates were approximately the same, while in Minnesota youth in the private sector complete at a slightly higher rate. St. Louis' low rate of completion may reflect the preliminary nature of the data. Completion rates at this time ranged from a high of 62.0% (Philadelphia-Public) to a low of 20.5% (St. Louis-Private). Overall, 39.3% of the youth starting a public sector worksite have completed at least 150 days in the program compared to 34.9% of the youth in the private sector.

As indicated in Table XVII on the Flow of Youth, a number of youth were terminated from the program after they started orientation but before they obtained a placement at a worksite. Therefore, the percentage of program starters who complete 150 days or more (shown in column 4 of Table XX) is lower than the corresponding site and sector rates for worksite starters. The overall completion rates for program starters was 34.1% for the public sector and 28.2% for the private sector.

Data on post-program placement is not available for complete analysis. However, on-site monitors in cooperation with the local operators have maintained weekly running totals of the major broad categories of post-

TABLE XX

PRELIMINARY DATA ON COMPLETION RATES  
BY SITE, BY SECTOR

| City         | Youth Starting Orientation |       | Youth Starting Worksite |     | Worksite Completers* |     | Completion Rate of Program Starters |       | Completion Rate of Worksite Starters |       |
|--------------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|-------|
|              | Pub                        | Pri   | Pub                     | Pri | Pub                  | Pri | Pub                                 | Pri   | Pub                                  | Pri   |
| New York     | 231                        | 233   | 202                     | 205 | 105                  | 86  | 45.5%                               | 36.9% | 52.0%                                | 42.0% |
| Philadelphia | 208                        | 232   | 192                     | 203 | 119                  | 97  | 57.2                                | 41.8  | 62.0                                 | 47.8  |
| St. Louis    | 209                        | 218   | 188                     | 166 | 42                   | 34  | 20.1                                | 15.6  | 22.3                                 | 20.5  |
| Minnesota    | 187                        | 201   | 165                     | 173 | 59                   | 61  | 28.3                                | 30.3  | 32.1                                 | 35.3  |
| Portland     | 194                        | 204   | 145                     | 132 | 32                   | 29  | 16.5                                | 14.2  | 22.1                                 | 22.0  |
| TOTAL        | 1,029                      | 1,088 | 892                     | 879 | 351                  | 307 | 34.1%                               | 28.2% | 39.3%                                | 34.9% |

\* Excludes youth in the program or not terminated as of March 24, 1980.

55

TABLE XXI

PRELIMINARY POST-PROGRAM DATA  
BY SITE, BY SECTOR\*

|   | New York      |              | Philadelphia |              | St. Louis    |              | Minnesota    |              | Portland     |              | Total         |               |
|---|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
|   | Pub           | Pri          | Pub          | Pri          | Pub          | Pri          | Pub          | Pri          | Pub          | Pri          | Pub           | Pri           |
| Youth Starting Program Worksite                                 | 202           | 205          | 192          | 203          | 188          | 166          | 165          | 173          | 145          | 132          | 892           | 879           |
| Transitioned to Unsubsidized Job at Worksite (Rate)             | 20<br>(9.9%)  | 51<br>(24.9) | 29<br>(15.1) | 46<br>(22.7) | 14<br>(7.5)  | 41<br>(24.7) | 16<br>(9.7)  | 28<br>(16.2) | 12<br>(8.3)  | 23<br>(17.4) | 91<br>(10.2)  | 189<br>(21.5) |
| Transitioned to Other Unsubsidized Job (by Assigned Sector)     | 49            | 22           | 20           | 13           | 14           | 5            | 31           | 23           | 12           | 4            | 126           | 67            |
| Subtotal to Unsubsidized Jobs (Rate)                            | 69<br>(34.2%) | 73<br>(35.6) | 49<br>(25.5) | 59<br>(29.1) | 28<br>(14.9) | 46<br>(27.7) | 47<br>(28.5) | 51<br>(29.5) | 24<br>(16.6) | 27<br>(20.5) | 217<br>(24.3) | 256<br>(29.1) |
| Transitioned to Subsidized Activity (by Assigned Sector)        | 18            | 6            | 4            | 1            | 1            | 0            | 24           | 13           | 2            | 1            | 49            | 21            |
| Total Unsubsidized Transitions by Post-Program Employing Sector | 35            | 107          | 33           | 75           | 16           | 58           | 25           | 73           | 15           | 36           | 124           | 349           |

\* Based on weekly monitor reports through March 24, 1980 (except St. Louis through March 17, 1980)

program placement outcomes. Table XXI presents this information as of March 24, 1980. For each site and sector, the table presents the total number of youth who started a worksite. The number of youth transitioning to unsubsidized employment at the worksite where they received their program work experience is shown in row 2. The bracketed percentage in row 2 is the transition rate to unsubsidized employment at the same site. Row 3 shows the transitions to unsubsidized employment at other sites by the sector of the youth's program assignment. For example, in New York 20 youth (9.9%) assigned in the public sector were retained at their worksite in unsubsidized employment and 49 others were placed in unsubsidized employment in any sector. Row 6 presents the unsubsidized transitions by employing sector. For example, of the 142 total unsubsidized transitions, 35 were in the public sector and 107 in the private sector.

The data indicate that youth assigned to the private sector transition more often to unsubsidized employment at the same worksite (21.5% versus 10.2%). This finding is consistent across all five sites. Private sector youth also have higher rates of unsubsidized employment when all unsubsidized jobs are counted and the youth are categorized by program sector assignment (Row 4 -- 29.1% compared to 24.3%).

As expected, when the final employing sector is considered, the private sector provided 349 unsubsidized positions compared to 124 in the public sector. This relationship held for all five sites.

## V. ANALYSIS OF EARLY PROGRAM TERMINATORS

The Youth In Jobs Demonstration Project experienced relatively high early termination rates. The rates by location were:

|                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| New York        | 27.2% |
| Philadelphia    | 65.2  |
| St. Louis       | 61.7  |
| Rural Minnesota | 58.1  |
| Portland        | 82.3  |

These relatively high early termination rates potentially limit the generalizability of any findings on the influence of either public sector or private sector work experience. If the population of youth who complete the program is essentially different than the population terminating early, then such differences must be taken into account when assessing long-term outcomes.

Various demographic characteristics are related to early worksite terminations. In order to carry out such an analysis, it was necessary to collapse cells, thereby creating categories with sufficient cases for the application of statistical procedures. Thus, the three categories of race (White, Black, and Other) were combined to form two categories (White and Non-White) and Selectable scores (High, Medium, and Low) were not differentiated. In interpreting these statistics, it should be noted that some individuals have terminated from the program in order to begin unsubsidized employment on their own; therefore an early termination need not necessarily be considered a negative outcome. Also, the criterion which was employed in order to determine who terminated early was rather stringent. Any participant who began working at either a public or private sector worksite but who did not complete a full six months of subsidized employment was considered an early terminator.

Initially, a chi-square test was performed to determine whether the factors of sector, race, age, sex, and program location had any relationship to early termination rates. The results indicated statistically significant relationships between all five factors and early terminations.

In order to determine the relative strength of relationships between sector, race, age, sex, program location, and early termination rates, coefficient phi\* was calculated for each of the five factors and termination rates. As a result of these calculations, it was determined that program location had the strongest relationship to early termination (phi = .33794), and sex the weakest (phi = .08305). Intermediate between these extremities is the relationship between race and early termination rates (phi = .11011), sector and early termination rates (phi = .10021), and age and early termination rates (phi = .09101).

In view of the relatively weak relationships between each of the factors outlined above and early terminations, any interpretations to be made from the data at hand have to be done with the utmost of caution. However, there does appear to be a constellation of characteristics which, at this time, bear some relationship to early termination rates.

In order to more precisely determine relationships of this nature, a perusal of various cross-tabulations is instructive. (See Appendix B for a more detailed presentation of the cross-tabulations). In regard to sector, it is noted that a greater percentage of the participants in the private sector terminated prior to completion of the subsidized employment period than did those in the public sector (60.8 percent to

---

\*In analyzing the strength of the relationship between location and early terminations, Cramer's V was used as the equivalent of phi, since location by program status is a five by two matrix.

50.8 percent). Such results may be confirmatory in terms of previous assumptions concerning the nature of private and public employment programs, inasmuch as private employers are generally assumed to be more demanding of employees than public employers.

EARLY TERMINATORS AND CONTINUEPS,

BY SECTOR

|             | Private        | Public         |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Terminators | 396<br>(50.8%) | 479<br>(60.85) |
| Continuers  | 382<br>(49.2%) | 314<br>(39.2%) |

Chi-square = 15.33425,  $\alpha < .05$   
Phi = .10021

In regard to race, it is noted that 52.7 percent of non-whites terminated early as opposed to 65.3 percent of whites. These statistics appear to have been affected by the unique program circumstances in rural Minnesota and in Portland, the two predominately white programs. Travel problems in rural Minnesota and competing programs that paid higher than the minimum wage in Portland are factors that seem to have contributed to high early terminations rates at these two sites.

In regard to age, 67.6 percent of those in the 16-17 age category terminated the program prior to completion, whereas only 52.8 percent of those in the 18-21 age category did so.

EARLY TERMINATORS AND CONTINUERS,  
BY RACE

|             | Non-White      | White          |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Terminators | 619<br>(52.7%) | 256<br>(65.3%) |
| Continuers  | 556<br>(47.3%) | 136<br>(34.7%) |

Chi-square = 19.49135,  $\alpha < .05$   
Phi = .11011

EARLY TERMINATORS AND CONTINUERS,  
BY AGE

|             | 16-17          | 18-21          |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Terminators | 217<br>(67.6%) | 658<br>(52.8%) |
| Continuers  | 104<br>(32.4%) | 588<br>(47.2%) |

Chi-square = 22.05299,  $\alpha < .05$   
Phi = .09101

Males had a greater likelihood of early termination than did females. Preliminary interviews with program operators suggest that males were more easily able to find higher paying jobs than were females. Confirmation of this will, however, have to await the analysis of status at termination data which is still being supplied by the program operators.

EARLY TERMINATORS AND CONTINUERS,  
BY SEX

|             | Male           | Female         |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Terminators | 432<br>(60.3%) | 443<br>(52.1%) |
| Continuers  | 284<br>(39.7%) | 408<br>(47.9%) |

Chi-square = 10.47453,  $\alpha < .05$   
Phi = .08305

Finally, there is a somewhat strong degree of relationship between program location and a youth's tendency to continue in, or terminate from the program. The relationship between program location and a youth's tendency to remain in the program is approximately three times stronger than the relationship between any other variable and a youth's tendency to remain in, or terminate from a program. This suggests that the manner in which a program is operated in different sites, or conditions unique to a particular site, may have more influence on early terminations than either the demographic characteristics of youth examined in this regard or sector placement.

## TERMINATORS AND CONTINUERS

## BY LOCATION

|            | New York       | Philadelphia   | St. Louis      | Rural Minn.    | Portland       |
|------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Drop Outs  | 100<br>(27.2%) | 259<br>(65.2%) | 214<br>(61.7%) | 192<br>(58.1%) | 107<br>(82.3%) |
| Continuers | 267<br>(72.8%) | 138<br>(34.8%) | 133<br>(38.3%) | 133<br>(40.9%) | 23<br>(17.7%)  |

Chi Square = 178.84459  $\alpha < .5$ 

Cramer's V = .33794

In order to examine this question further, therefore, program terminators were compared with program completers on pretest scores. Tables XXII, XXIII and XXIV report these comparison for varying lengths of time in the program.

Table XXII compares those with minimum program exposure (defined as being in the program less than thirty days) with those who were in the program for a month or more. An examination of Table XXII shows that, for the most part, the two groups did not differ significantly from each other on pretest scores. Statistically significant associations emerge

TABLE XXII  
MEAN PRETEST SCORES BY  
MINIMUM PROGRAM PENETRATION

| Subscale                | Minimum Program Penetration (1-30 days) | In Program Longer than 30 Days | Significance ( $c < .05$ ) | Explained Variation |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 20.4971                                 | 20.6379                        | NS                         | 0                   |
| Job Knowledge           | 21.8140                                 | 22.4914                        | S                          | 0                   |
| Job Holding Skills      | 30.5205                                 | 30.9051                        | S                          | 0                   |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 47.2440                                 | 48.5779                        | S                          | 0                   |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 12.2456                                 | 12.4661                        | NS                         | 0                   |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 44.9941                                 | 46.0709                        | NS                         | 0                   |
| Self Esteem             | 36.1453                                 | 36.5985                        | NS                         | 0                   |
| STEP                    | 15.7075                                 | 15.5476                        | NS                         | 0                   |

on only three scales. Minimum program penetrators had significantly lower pretest scores on the Job Knowledge scale, the Job Holding Skills scale, and the Work Relevant Attitudes inventory. There were no statistically significant differences on the other five scales. Even on the

scales where a statistically significant association between staying in the program longer and a higher score is exhibited the association appears to be extremely weak. Thus, an examination of the explained variation column shows that pretest scores would not be helpful in determining who is likely to terminate from the program within the first thirty days.

Table XXIII compares those who were in the program ninety days or less with those who remained in the program more than ninety days. This

TABLE XXIII  
MEAN PRETEST SCORES BY  
EARLY PROGRAM TERMINATION

| Subscale                | 90 Days or Less In Program | More than 90 Days In Program | Significance ( $\alpha < .05$ ) | Explained Variation |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 20.6018                    | 20.6416                      | NS                              | 0                   |
| Job Knowledge           | 22.0126                    | 22.7157                      | S                               | 1%                  |
| Job Holding Skills      | 30.6299                    | 31.0341                      | S                               | 1%                  |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 47.9309                    | 48.8197                      | S                               | 0                   |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 12.1490                    | 12.6474                      | S                               | 1%                  |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 45.2659                    | 46.4549                      | S                               | 1%                  |
| Self Esteem             | 36.2176                    | 36.7883                      | S                               | 1%                  |
| STEP                    | 15.1780                    | 15.8007                      | S                               | 1%                  |

comparison shows that on all but one scale a statistically significant association exists between pretest scores and the likelihood of being in the program more than ninety days. The only exception to this is the Vocational

Attitudes scale. Nevertheless, the association appears extremely weak, as is shown by the explained variation column.

Finally, Table XXIV presents the comparison of pretest scores by program completion. Program completers are defined as those who were in the program one hundred and fifty-one or more days. Non-completers are

TABLE XXIV  
MEAN PRETEST SCORES BY  
PROGRAM COMPLETION

| Subscale                | Non-Completers<br>(0-150 Days) | Completers<br>(151 Days<br>or More) | Significance<br>( $\alpha < .05$ ) | Explained<br>Variation |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 20.6299                        | 20.6203                             | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Job Knowledge           | 22.2901                        | 22.6070                             | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Job Holding Skills      | 30.7271                        | 31.0488                             | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 47.9991                        | 49.0309                             | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 12.2737                        | 12.6595                             | S                                  | 0                      |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 45.7607                        | 46.2438                             | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Self Esteem             | 36.3284                        | 36.8405                             | S                                  | 1%                     |
| STEP                    | 15.3626                        | 15.7886                             | S                                  | 0                      |

defined as anybody who was in the program one hundred and fifty days or less. This comparison shows that there is significant statistical association between program completion and a higher pretest score on five of the eight scales. Those likely to complete scored significantly higher on the Job Holding Skills scale, the Work Relevant Attitude inventory,

the Job Seeking Skills scale, the Self Esteem scale, and the STEP reading test locator. No significant difference was found between the two groups on Vocational Attitudes, Job Knowledge and Sex Stereotyping. The associations that do emerge, however, are again extremely weak.

These data, when combined with the demographic data on early terminators (see appendix), suggest early termination is only weakly associated with youth characteristics existing prior to program entry. Those statistically significant associations that do emerge seem to be a result of sample size. When sample sizes exceed three hundred, a statistically significant difference between groups is likely to emerge. Such differences, however, are not usually of practical significance. The decision about whether or not to continue in a program appears, therefore, to be largely a situational one. For the most part, factors precipitating early termination seem to be alternative opportunities existing in the environment, either recreational or work related. There is some qualitative evidence offered for this interpretation in the case studies. For example, Portland, which had the highest dropout rate, also had the most opportunities for youth in other types of programs and in the non-subsidized job market. Further, many of the program operators noted that even those who had completed the program were, in some instances, likely to put off seeking unsubsidized work because of the felt need for a rest from the marketplace. Further investigation of this point is warranted, and will be undertaken as reasons for program termination are analyzed. At this point, however, it does not appear that early terminators are essentially different from those who complete the program. Even when early terminators are compared to completers within each sector, no clear differences emerge on pretest scores. Tables XXV through XXX report such comparisons. Thus, from the

**TABLE XXV**  
**MEAN PRETEST SCORES BY**  
**MINIMUM PROGRAM PENETRATION**  
**(PRIVATE SECTOR)**

| Subscale                | Minimum Program Penetration<br>(1-30 Days) | In Program Longer Than<br>30 Days | Significance<br>( $\alpha < .05$ ) | Explained Variation |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 20.7692                                    | 20.6895                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Job Knowledge           | 21.7582                                    | 22.4409                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Job Holding Skills      | 30.5000                                    | 30.8355                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 47.9101                                    | 48.6895                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 12.5335                                    | 12.4503                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 44.8864                                    | 46.0791                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Self Esteem             | 36.5055                                    | 36.5515                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| STEP                    | 15.6076                                    | 15.5910                           | NS                                 | 0                   |

TABLE XXVI  
 MEAN PRETEST SCORES BY  
 MINIMUM PROGRAM PENETRATION  
 (PUBLIC SECTOR)

| Subscale                | Minimum Program Penetration<br>(1-30 Days) | In Program Longer Than<br>30 Days | Significance<br>( $\alpha < .05$ ) | Explained Variation |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Vocational Attitudes    | 20.1875                                    | 20.5848                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Job Knowledge           | 21.8765                                    | 22.5436                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Job Holding Skills      | 30.5432                                    | 30.9773                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Work Relevant Attitudes | 46.4937                                    | 48.4622                           | S                                  | 1%                  |
| Job Seeking Skills      | 11.9259                                    | 12.4828                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Sex Stereotyping        | 45.1111                                    | 46.0624                           | NS                                 | 0                   |
| Self Esteem             | 35.7407                                    | 36.6475                           | S                                  | 1%                  |
| STEP                    | 15.8235                                    | 15.5023                           | NS                                 | 0                   |

TABLE XXVII  
 MEAN PRETEST SCORES BY  
 EARLY PROGRAM TERMINATION  
 (PRIVATE SECTOR)

| Subscale                   | 90 Days or Less<br>In Program | More Than 90<br>Days In<br>Program | Significance<br>( $\alpha < .05$ ) | Explained<br>Variation |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Vocational<br>Attitudes    | 20.7919                       | 20.6193                            | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Job<br>Knowledge           | 21.9912                       | 22.6975                            | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Job Holding<br>Skills      | 30.6541                       | 30.9292                            | S                                  | 0                      |
| Work Relevant<br>Attitudes | 48.1611                       | 48.9945                            | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Job Seeking<br>Skills      | 12.1567                       | 12.7047                            | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Sex<br>Stereotyping        | 45.1652                       | 46.6327                            | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Self<br>Esteem             | 36.2306                       | 36.8703                            | S                                  | 1%                     |
| STEP                       | 15.2313                       | 15.8668                            | S                                  | 1%                     |

TABLE XXVIII  
 MEAN PRETEST SCORES BY  
 EARLY PROGRAM TERMINATION  
 (PUBLIC SECTOR)

| Subscale                   | 90 Days or Less<br>In Program | More Than 90<br>Days In<br>Program | Significance<br>( $\alpha < .05$ ) | Explained<br>Variation |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Vocational<br>Attitudes    | 20.3510                       | 20.6613                            | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Job<br>Knowledge           | 22.0411                       | 22.7319                            | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Job Holding<br>Skills      | 30.5976                       | 31.1268                            | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Work Relevant<br>Attitudes | 47.6239                       | 48.6650                            | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Job Seeking<br>Skills      | 12.1386                       | 12.5968                            | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Sex<br>Stereotyping        | 45.3994                       | 46.2981                            | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Self<br>Esteem             | 36.2000                       | 36.7715                            | S                                  | .3                     |
| STEP                       | 15.1066                       | 15.7404                            | S                                  | 1%                     |

TABLE XXIX  
MEAN PRETEST SCORES BY  
PROGRAM COMPLETION (PRIVATE SECTOR)

| Subscale                   | Non-Completers<br>(0-150 Days) | Completers<br>(151 Days<br>or More) | Significance<br>( $\alpha < .05$ ) | Explained<br>Variation |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Vocational<br>Attitudes    | 20.6800                        | 20.7222                             | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Job<br>Knowledge           | 22.1980                        | 22.6541                             | S                                  | 0                      |
| Job Holding<br>Skills      | 30.6871                        | 30.9849                             | S                                  | 0                      |
| Work Relevant<br>Attitudes | 48.1302                        | 49.3620                             | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Job Seeking<br>Skills      | 12.2888                        | 12.7143                             | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Sex<br>Stereotyping        | 45.6383                        | 46.4799                             | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Self<br>Esteem             | 36.3184                        | 36.8945                             | S                                  | 1%                     |
| STEP                       | 15.3688                        | 15.9118                             | S                                  | 0                      |

TABLE XXX  
MEAN PRETEST SCORES BY  
PROGRAM COMPLETION (PUBLIC SECTOR)

| Subscale                   | Non-Completers<br>(0-150 Days) | Completers<br>(151 Days<br>or More) | Significance<br>( $\alpha < .05$ ) | Explained<br>Variation |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Vocational<br>Attitudes    | 20.5669                        | 20.5364                             | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Job<br>Knowledge           | 22.4063                        | 22.5682                             | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Job Holding<br>Skills      | 30.7778                        | 31.1012                             | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Work Relevant<br>Attitudes | 47.8330                        | 48.7583                             | S                                  | 1%                     |
| Job Seeking<br>Skills      | 12.2547                        | 12.6144                             | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Sex<br>Stereotyping        | 45.9142                        | 46.0496                             | NS                                 | 0                      |
| Self<br>Esteem             | 36.3411                        | 36.7958                             | S                                  | 1%                     |
| STEP                       | 15.3546                        | 15.6852                             | NS                                 | 0                      |

analysis to date, it would seem that the findings emerging from this demonstration project can be much more easily generalized to the whole population of youth likely to be served by such a program.

#### PRELIMINARY TRENDS IN SELECTED 90-DAY FOLLOW-UP DATA

Preliminary ninety day follow-up information was analyzed for approximately 329 youth. Of these, 45.6% reported that they were working full-time. Twenty one and one-tenth percent reported that they were working part-time, while 27.6% reported that they were in school or engaged in another training program. The next three tables (XXXI through XXXIII) report the association between subsidized work experience in either the private sector or the public sector and each of these three outcomes. As can be seen, there does not appear to be at this time an association emerging between sector placement and status at ninety days.

Ninety day follow-up also asks whether or not the program was helpful in locating full-time employment. Table XXXIV reports the preliminary analysis of this question for 157 respondents. (This question was asked only to those who had, in fact, found full-time employment.) As the table shows, perception of program helpfulness did not vary by sector assignment. Further, most of those responding felt that the program was helpful in locating full-time employment opportunities.

TABLE XXXI  
FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY SECTOR

|               | Public | Private |
|---------------|--------|---------|
| Full-time     | 79     | 71      |
| Not Full-time | 94     | 85      |

$$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$$

TABLE XXXII  
PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY SECTOR

|               | Public | Private |
|---------------|--------|---------|
| Full-time     | 37     | 32      |
| Not Full-time | 134    | 124     |

$$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$$

TABLE XXXIII  
SCHOOL OR OTHER TRAINING  
BY SECTOR

|           | Public | Private |
|-----------|--------|---------|
| School    | 50     | 41      |
| No School | 121    | 118     |

$$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$$

TABLE XXXIV  
PROGRAM HELPFULNESS IN LOCATING  
FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY SECTOR

|             | Public | Private |
|-------------|--------|---------|
| Helpful     | 62     | 55      |
| Not Helpful | 20     | 20      |

$$\chi^2 = \text{NS}$$

## VI. AN OVERVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

### Organization and Staffing

The Youth in Jobs Program operators were both prime sponsors and community based organizations. In the latter case, the agencies were well established in the community and had at least some experience with youth employment and training programs. Because Youth in Jobs was presented as a one-time demonstration project, all operators treated it as a quasi-independent program. There was some limited use of other agency support personnel, but this was not the major thrust for staffing.

Local project directors were generally recruited from within the organization, or had worked previously with the YIJ program operator. Most other project staff were recruited for the project using the operators usual hiring procedures. Most staff had previous experience in some areas of human resources although individual experience levels varied widely.

The counselor/job developer position usually included the responsibility for youth outreach and recruitment, worksite development and referral, participating in program orientation sessions, on-going counseling and post-program placement activities. This multiplicity of roles created problems in several cases, when time constraints required the counselors to do several tasks simultaneously. The situation was also exacerbated when hiring was done immediately before or during program start-up orientation. This added to the counselors' feeling that they were always behind. Counselors also appeared to want to stress the service delivery aspect of this role. This created a certain tension between the research goal of the demonstration and the service delivery component.

### Youth Outreach and Recruitment

Youth outreach did not present a problem in the larger cities in the demonstration. Although program operators used a variety of outreach techniques, an ample number of eligible youth were recruited for the pool. In Portland and rural Minnesota, more intensive recruiting methods were necessary. This appears to reflect the stronger local economy in Portland and the wide geographic area with its consequent transportation problem in Minnesota.

Sites reported losing some youth who wanted immediate service, since they were out of school, and were not willing to wait for the matching process as required by the research design. These cases do not appear to be substantial. However, operators suggested that there may have been some instances of more motivated and job ready youth obtaining employment without the assistance of the program. To the extent this "reverse creaming" occurred, it tended to leave the demonstration with enrollees who were more difficult to place than those typically found in on-going service programs. It should be noted that any impact this would have had would have been equal between the public and private sectors.

### Orientation

The Youth in Jobs staff conducted the program orientation, including the administration of the ETS pre-test except in Portland where this function was subcontracted to the local community college. After some initial start-up difficulties in several cities, all programs presented orientation in approximately 2½ days.

The orientation generally focused on interviewing procedures, filling out job applications and necessary world-of-work attitudes. Additionally, counselors used the orientation period to determine enrollees' interests

and any previous work experience. This was particularly essential when programs attempted to develop worksites to match enrollee interests.

Some youth terminated from the program during this phase. Occasionally, this occurred because the youth did not like the random sector assignment yielded by the matching process. More often these early terminations reflected the youth's more complete understanding of the 25 week work experience phase of the demonstration.

#### Worksite Development

Worksite development was conducted by the counselor/job developers with varying degrees of additional support from the parent organization of the program operator. Most of the sites attempted to use their organizational contacts, but had to expand well beyond this effort in order to secure the required 160 worksites in each sector. Only the St. Louis Urban League seemed able to utilize their established base in the community for the development of a sizeable number of worksites. All sites used a variety of additional techniques, including media announcements and cold calls to interest prospective employers in the program.

The YIJ counselors found that public sector (including non-profit) agencies were more responsive to the program. This was attributed to several factors. First, the public sector had greater familiarity with government sponsored employment and training programs, such as the Summer Youth Employment Program or PSC. Second, public agencies were less concerned about government "red tape" since they had often participated in similar programs. Third, budget constraints for public and non-profit agencies made a subsidized worker particularly attractive.

Private sector companies were more reluctant to participate in Youth in Jobs. Lack of familiarity with such programs, fear of "red tape," and reluctance to hire relatively low skilled youth were reasons cited by counselors for the greater worksite development effort needed in the private sector. Counselor/job developers achieved the greatest success with small to medium sized businesses (less than 50 employees) where the owner or manager was in a position to decide whether or not to participate. Larger companies often already had commitments to other youth-related programs. Also, approvals were required from several levels of the corporate structure, which usually required too much time for the six months demonstration project. For example, one major corporation notified the site that they would in fact participate one month after the last enrollees had been placed, and approximately eight months after the initial request had been made.

Discussion with operators, participating employers and local monitors made it clear that many employers who agreed to participate were attracted by the 25 weeks of subsidized work experience. However, more importantly, many seemed interested in having an opportunity to evaluate the potential of the youth to become a suitable full-time employee. A number of employers expressed the view that they would not have taken a chance on the enrollee without the program. With the subsidy and the YIJ counselors introduction, employers were willing to provide work experience for the enrollees.

Several issues emerged during the worksite development phase. First, employers with union representation usually did not want to participate. This does not mean that unions would be uncooperative, merely that employers would rather not ask the union for a concurrence for the program. The feeling seemed to be that discussions with unions about something like this would

be too complex to explain without creating some current or future union demands. Second, even with 100% subsidy for the 25 week work experience, employers were primarily interested in providing basic, entry level positions. These are used as the basis for judging whether to make a more substantial investment in training the youth, after he/she has proved to be a stable reliable worker. Third, some employers declined to participate because they were not allowed to supplement the enrollees' wage to bring it up to their entry level wages. While some employers were obviously pleased to have the enrollee at no cost, others were concerned about the impact on morale, both of existing workers and the enrollee, of different pay rates for the same position.

#### Worksite Referral

Worksite referrals were generally provided by the YIJ counselors, often from a central listing or job bank. Due to the number of youth being processed through orientation and the limited time for assessment, referrals were made based on the staff's judgment concerning enrollees' skills and interests and the worksite requirements. This was in accord with the focus of the demonstration project on work experience positions that would typically be available to a similar program. Detailed screening and assessment was not envisioned as necessary for these entry level positions.

The worksite referral generally worked satisfactorily, especially in the public sector. The lack of more careful screening and the experimental nature of random sector assignment created more difficulties in the private sector, particularly for companies that expected participants to possess a high skill level. The public and non-profit sectors have usually participated in employment and training programs without being overly selective,

particularly when providing work experience slots for youth. However, the private sector was more selective before hiring the enrollee and was less tolerant of erratic behavior or performance. In smaller private sector family business, however, there appeared to be some effort at flexibility. In many instances, the effort to accommodate youth in these type of firms approached that of the public sector. This did not mean lack of supervision. On the contrary, the interest shown combined work supervision with concern for the youth's personal life.

#### Work Experience

Although five sites met the goal of placing 320 youth (fewer in Minnesota), attrition from worksites was relatively high. Most of the programs actually had more than 320 youth in work experience at their peak periods. The high attrition, however, meant that the initial time table for placing all enrollees by June 15, 1979 had to be substantially altered. Programs were permitted to recruit and place enrollees through mid-September. This three month extension required that project staff continue recruiting youth and develop worksites for longer than anticipated. The additional counselor/job developer effort in these areas may have contributed somewhat to the high turnover in work experience slots. However, there are several other factors concerning the nature of the work experience which should be considered.

The work experience slots were primarily entry level positions. Some program orientations that stressed careers had raised youth expectations above what participating employers were willing to offer. Additionally, the 16-18 year old out-of-school YIJ youth often had a range of personal and environmental factors which made it difficult to perform adequately at the worksite. These factors appeared to generate the bulk of terminations.

Counselors and, to a lesser extent, enrollees noted that the public sector worksites, when compared with those in the private sector, did not appear to offer as close supervision nor the opportunity to master marketable skills. Indications are that this stems from the nature of the jobs available in those settings and the method the public sector had traditionally used to provide work experience for youth.

#### Supportive Services and On-Going Counseling

As a demonstration work experience project, supportive services and on-going counseling were to be provided at a relatively low level. Supportive services could be provided by the program operator directly or through referrals to existing community resources. The most common supportive service was assistance with transportation by issuing bus passes or tokens. Health exams, work related clothing and day care were also provided, but for relatively few enrollees. Generally, program operators provided supportive services as they do for their continuing programs. Therefore, some provided services directly, while others used referrals as the primary source.

The number and approximate timing of on-going counseling contacts were specified in the Standard Grant Plan. The purpose was two-fold: to ensure a minimum level of contact between the enrollee and counselor, and to enable the counselor to make an effort with the participating employer to transition the youth at the worksite at the end of the 25 week subsidized work experience. Most sites found it difficult to make counseling contacts during the summer when youth recruiting and worksite development were still under way. An exception was Philadelphia, where worksite development and youth recruitment was essentially completed before Youth in Jobs began.

### Transition and Post-Program Placement Activities

Youth in Jobs counselors approached worksites during the work experience phase to determine whether enrollees would transition to unsubsidized employment at the worksite. These contacts were partially successful in the private sector, but budget constraints and the availability of other subsidized workers generally precluded transition in the public sector. The private non-profit portion of the public sector was in between the other two sectors. In those cases where the youth was not expected to transition, counselors began to obtain referrals (a minimum of two was specified in the Standard Grant Plan) for enrollees.

Two factors often complicated the final weeks of the work experience portion of YIJ. First, enrollees who were not going to be transitioned were very discouraged and often terminated. Youth who had done well on the worksite were especially disheartened. Second, many youth were not interested in continued employment. Their attitude was that they had completed their six month program -- now it was time for a vacation. Despite these circumstances, a number of youth transitioned at their worksite.

In addition, many enrollees were able to obtain unsubsidized employment through referrals made by the counselors. Most jobs were in the private sector. Counselors did note that the work experience for enrollees in the private sector, even when the youth was not transitioned, seemed to prepare them better for other work. However, this feeling is not substantiated by preliminary data.

## VII. IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES BY SITE

### NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

#### Organization and Staffing

United Neighborhood Houses (UNH), the program operator in New York, is a private, non-profit federation of settlement houses. UNH provides technical assistance, fund raising and other like services to its thirty-six member houses. While UNH obtains and administers several types of grants and contracts, it has no administrative control over the individual settlement houses.

Youth In Jobs (YIJ) was administered centrally by UNH making use of its members to provide some services and locations easily accessible to youth in the New York area. While information regarding the program was disseminated to all settlement houses, not all thirty-six decided to participate. Approximately fifteen houses, generally those with the larger youth populations, did participate in YIJ.

Staffing for YIJ initially consisted of one full-time director and five job developer/counselors, in addition to support and clerical staff. Unfortunately, it was not until May, 1979 that these individuals were all on board. As late as August, 1979, one job developer/counselor was moved into the position of assistant director. An additional person was then hired to fill the vacated job developer/counselor slot. This brought the total number of staff to eight.

The staff members were all experienced in job development and various other types of employment programs. This previous experience ranged from three to eight years. Most also had experience in working with youth, mainly through a court referral program. Previous staff experience was helpful in implementing certain phases of this demonstration project. However, there appeared to be a lack of communication regarding several specific YIJ project requirements. The addition of the assistant director seemed to improve staff communications with a

consequent improvement in data collection and information retrieval processes.

The job developer/counselors were responsible for all phases of implementation except initial recruitment, eligibility verification, and processing payroll. Late hiring, diverse staff responsibilities, and time line pressures negatively impacted various phases of implementation.

#### Outreach and Recruitment

Each participating settlement house assigned a liaison to work with UNH in recruiting youth for the program. The liaison was normally an individual who specialized in youth programs and had considerable on-going contact with youth. Information was disseminated by the liaisons through flyers, word of mouth, and signs in the settlement houses. Youth, therefore, learned of YIJ on their home territory from people generally familiar to them.

The liaisons:

- 1) took the youth's application;
- 2) gave a brief description of the program;
- 3) told the youth what documents were necessary for eligibility verification;
- 4) received these documents;
- 5) forwarded the application and other paperwork to the central office;
- 6) assisted in notifying youth of appointments at the central office.

Early meetings with the liaison revealed some confusion regarding YIJ and some dissatisfaction with the feedback on the status of individual youth. The Center for Urban Programs, in conjunction with the project director, clarified the research and demonstration nature of the project. Further, the project director agreed to provide timely status reports to the liaisons.

The central office, once they reviewed applications and verifications, called youth in for administration of the SelectABLE. The SelectABLE was administered to various size groups generally at the central office. However, when a large enough group was available in an area a counselor would go to that settlement house to administer the test. UNH then forwarded the appropriate information to CUP for the matching process. It seemed that UNH was applying stricter eligibility requirements than necessary for YETP, as the majority of youth were receiving some type of welfare benefits. Also UNH developed its own application form. This requested general information, but much of it was not obtained in accordance with standard CETA definitions.

While recruitment levels varied over time there seemed to be no problem in obtaining enough eligible applicants in New York.

#### Orientation

Orientations in New York began in mid-April prior to full staffing. One of the first counselors hired did have experience in curriculum design and was on board early enough to develop a structured orientation. The content and method varied slightly since all counselors were responsible for conducting orientations. Early planning helped to maintain basic consistency.

Areas covered included work habits, dress, appearance, attitude, interactive behavior, and resume writing. Group interaction and role playing were the basic tools for conveying the information along with several paper and pencil worksheets for individual self-assessment and planning.

While counselors sometimes had problems conducting orientation in conjunction with other duties, it was generally agreed that this time was valuable for building a relationship with the youth. This later helped counselors in matching youth to an appropriate worksite. While orientations consisted of about forty

to fifty youth, after additional staff came on board, the larger group was able to be divided into smaller segments for parts of the orientation.

As with SelectABLE testing, orientations were conducted at the central office and at a few of the settlement houses when large enough numbers were available.

There seemed to be no problems associated with administering the pretest according to the guidelines. While there were no refusals, several youth balked at the types of questions. In addition to ETS test instruments, UNH administered a basic math test and some typing tests when youth expressed interests in clerical positions.

#### Worksite Development

New York's strategy for worksite development involved a number of tactics. These tactics included: notifying UNH community centers as to program needs, placement of ads in local black and ethnic papers, contact with UNH local suppliers, contact with a Department of Commerce program working for economic development in New York City, Youth In Jobs staff's personal contacts, and additional agency contacts. Some job developer/counselors also had success with cold calls or visits. In a few instances employers spread the word and UNH was contacted.

In attempting to develop worksites in the private sector, UNH faced problems with large businesses. Corporate headquarters shied away from placing disadvantaged youth in positions of public contact. Some larger firms required so many levels of concurrence that time prohibited their participation, while still others were participating in different employment programs.

Union shops presented problems in both sectors. Many declined participation based on the wage level and/or the duration of the subsidized portion of the

program.

Coordination of worksite development activities was informal. However, job developers were aware of certain individuals having more contacts or experience with particular industries. Other job developers concentrated on exploring specific job areas as listed in the phone book.

Late staff hiring did result in some problems with worksite development. It caused confusion over program priorities when there was an insufficient bank of jobs available prior to the completion of the first orientation. In consultation with CUP, it was decided that future orientations were to be delayed, pending the development of a sufficient number of worksites.

#### Worksite Referral and Work Experience

As with most other sites in the project, the majority of the youth were hired on the first referral. The private sector did have a higher occurrence of second and third referrals, reflecting their greater selectivity. Also, private sector employers tended to want to interview more than one youth at a time. For the most part, youth were able to be referred out and hired within two weeks after completing orientation. The one major exception was youth in the early orientation group, who waited up to six weeks while counselors caught up on worksite development.

Some problems did develop with youth who did not want certain types of jobs, mainly those involving "dirty" or heavy work. Others did not want to work in the public sector, primarily because of previous program experience. Counselors expressed a need for more screening in terms of youth who were or were not ready for work experience.

One other issue that arose was an unwillingness of youth to venture out of their own territory. Even though New York's transportation system is

relatively good and youth were provided with detailed directions to interviews, the youth still expressed a strong desire to work on their "turf."

During the work experience itself, very few worksites were terminated.

For those that were the reasons varied:

1. the job description and duties differed considerably;
2. several lie detector tests were required;
3. racial or sexual conflicts arose.

In general the counselors reported good worksite supervision, although they seemed to feel that the private sector worksite had consistently better supervision. Employers in the private sector, however, were more demanding and therefore terminated youth quicker for poor attendance and work habits. On the other hand, the public sector tended to be more lenient or laissez-faire about work habits.

New York was the only site that reached the goal of 320 youth in work experience. This does not mean that they did not experience problems with both terminations and drop outs from work experience, however. Counselors cited attendance and punctuality as the most common recurring problems leading to terminations.

#### Supportive Services and On-Going Counseling

Supportive services were not used to a great extent in New York. All youth were provided with transportation allowance until their first paychecks were received. Other supportive services seemed to have been minimal and provided on an as needed basis.

On-going counseling took two forms, those required by the Standard Grant Plan and additional contacts. Early required contacts were delayed due to the combination of time constraints and the wide variety of simultaneous counselor

responsibilities. However, counselors seemed to be readily accessible to both the youth and the employers. Informal communications among the staff made it possible for a counselor to be of assistance even if the assigned counselor was unavailable.

#### Post-Program Placement Activities

While hampered by several factors, UNH was able to place youth and provide two, if not more, referrals for youth who were interested in further employment. Factors hampering post-program placement were:

- 1) YIJ wage made many youth ineligible for certification under the Targeted Tax Credit Program.
- 2) These wages also made many youth ineligible for other CETA service through the New York Prime Sponsor.
- 3) A number of youth were unwilling to cooperate with placement activities.

In addition, job developer/counselors felt that youth suffered from basic deficiencies in reading and writing skills. There was also a sense of discouragement when transitions did not occur at their worksite.

UNH did establish two outside resources for assisting youth who had finished work experience and were still looking for work. The New York telephone company coordinated a series of workshops in communications and the use of the telephone in obtaining employment. Also, J.C. Penney conducted a ten hour seminar on the World of Corporate Work.

UNH used a combination of methods to develop post-program placements:

- 1) job development with companies previously contacted under worksite development;
- 2) personal contacts of job developer/counselors with other program personnel;
- 3) contacting potential employers on SBA loan lists;
- 4) helping youth use want ads.

Counselors felt that a review session on job seeking and interviewing skills would have improved post-program placement results.

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

Organization and Staffing

The Council for the Revitalization of Employment and Industry was the program operator in Philadelphia through a subcontract with the Philadelphia CETA prime sponsor. The Council is a private, non-profit, economic development corporation which serves people in industry. It is a unique partnership formed among business, labor, and government. Founded in 1974, the Council has developed an approach to economic development which emphasizes a strengthening of the industrial sector in the city of Philadelphia with attention also directed toward the human side. The concerns of business, human resources, and industry have combined to provide an effective range of programs to meet the needs of people in industry.

The YIJ program director was hired by February 19th with additional staffing taking place in early March. By March 7th an assistant director and six counselor/job developers had been hired. Previous staff experience included work with other CETA programs, teaching, counseling, industry affiliation and administration. The staff was augmented by an administrative assistant/secretary and a clerk typist, both hired at a later date.

The counselor/job developers were responsible for implementing all phases of the program including recruitment, eligibility confirmation, job development, orientation activities, job referral, counseling and monitoring of job sites. The assistant director was responsible to the director for testing, recruitment and job placement schedules, and supervision of day-to-day activities of the counselor/job developer. The administrative assistant/secretary was responsible for coordination of record keeping and forwarding of all records to the appropriate parties. The clerk typist was responsible for typing, filing, and assisting

the administrative assistant with record keeping. A researcher was hired by the Council in July to do some independent follow up investigation of program drop-outs.

#### Outreach and Recruitment

Recruitment efforts began in early April. Activities included sending information packets, containing a letter from the President of the Council, a copy of the YIJ brochure, and a copy of the fact sheet for participants, to every community agency in the city. YIJ staff also spoke before a number of community groups and newspaper ads appeared in three local papers. Newspaper ads appeared to be the most effective method of informing youth of the YIJ program.

Youth were directed to call or come to the YIJ office location. At the interview, if an applicant appeared eligible, intake information was filled out on the local prime sponsor's application forms. Documentation of eligibility including proof of age, address, and a drop slip or diploma were copied and included in the applicant's file. The SelectABLE was administered at this time. Youth were then informed they would be notified if selected for participation in YIJ.

#### Orientation

Philadelphia held the first orientation during the week of April 23rd. Youth who were matched by CUP were notified of acceptance into the program by either a phone call or a letter.

The first orientation series ran for one full day with a break for lunch. Two groups were precessed through this abbreviated orientation, with approximately forty youth per group. ETS tests were administered by the assistant director in the morning. No additional tests were administered. Youth were

divided into six groups immediately after the tests to meet with the counselors. During the short time before lunch, counselors attempted to find out interests, experiences, and special skills the youth had in an attempt to match youth interests with available worksites.

The afternoon session ran for four hours and was divided into four sections dealing with the world-of-work: 1) interviewing techniques and self-presentation; 2) work relationships, behavior, and labor unions; 3) budgeting, banking and money management; 4) individual meetings with counselors. The afternoon session was led by the project director. All six counselors participated, with counselors assigned to each of the four sections. At the conclusion of the session, youth were asked to return the next day for job referral.

After the first abbreviated orientation sessions, Philadelphia used the following Standard Grant Plan. Two problems that emerged, physical space and length of orientation, were solved. Arrangements were subsequently made at a center city hotel to hold future orientations there. They were lengthened to three days, and participants were provided with the full range of orientation material as outlined in the standard grant plan. Each orientation had approximately forty youth participating. Six separate orientation sessions were held, with the last session occurring in mid-June.

#### Worksite Development

Philadelphia's strategy for worksite development, which began six weeks prior to the first orientation, gave them a definite advantage for placement compared to the other demonstration sites.

The city was divided into six sectors according to zip codes, with each sector being assigned to one of the counselor/job developers. Each counselor/job developer was responsible for developing a list of potential employers in

their given area. Employer lists were developed through the use of the Chamber of Commerce Directory, personal contacts, various lists of non-profit agencies, community services in the area, the Whole City Catalog, directory of available services for youth in the city, phone books, and referrals from other employers.

After development of the lists, notice of the program was mailed to the various companies and agencies. These notices included a cover letter from the president of the Council, a copy of the YIJ brochure, and an employer factsheet. Approximately 1800 notices were mailed as a result of these efforts, in three groups of 500 and one group of 300. These notices were mailed on Fridays as a means of facilitating the staff's initial contacts. The following Monday, a call was made to the perspective employer. It was hoped that by the time a YIJ counselor/job developer contacted the employer, he/she would be familiar with YIJ through the notices. However, in many cases the YIJ staff found the notice went no further than the secretary's desk and that the person in the position of making decisions actually knew nothing about the program. This was particularly true in the private sector. In the public sector, a large number of non-profit agencies contacted the program staff before the staff could contact them.

Philadelphia found it much easier to contract with non-profit agencies than private concerns. Within the first month of development, staff members had commitments from non-profit agencies for well over the 160 required jobs slots. Private sector employers seemed unwilling to become involved with the project. Many potential employers refused to have anything to do with any CETA connected program regardless of the advantages. Many commented on extensive paperwork, even after staff members explained the small amount of paperwork involved in

this particular demonstration. Some employers' previous experience with youth programs left them with negative feelings toward government sponsored employment programs. Others made it evident that CETA and youth programs were oriented toward assisting a black population and they did not want to participate in such programs. Despite these problems, Philadelphia secured more than the required 160 slots in the private sector by mid April.

There were no jobs developed in the public governmental sector. Philadelphia's understanding, outlined in a memo from their federal representative, was that they would not be expected to develop jobs in this sector. A number of local conditions, including a strong civil service system and public employee unions, dictated this course of action.

#### Worksite Referral and Work Experience

Counselors initially conferred among themselves to ascertain the participant's interests and what might be an appropriate worksite referral. Referrals were set up by the job developer, who made an appointment for the interview. For the most part, youth were hired on the first referral. As Philadelphia had used the strategy of developing jobs first and recruiting youth second, youth did not have to wait any appreciable period between orientation and referrals. By mid-June Philadelphia had 295 participants in jobs and were optimistic regarding the attainment of the program goal (320). However, during July, August and September, the program began to experience a rapidly escalating early termination rate. By the end of August, Philadelphia had depleted its replacement pool without reaching the goal of 320.

The heaviest early termination rate occurred in the private sector. The staff felt there were specific reasons for that. First, nearly every placement in the non-profit sector was with a social service agency. Many of these agencies are in existence to deal with the type of people YIJ was targeted to

include and thus had people available on site to work with the participant and staff to resolve problems. In addition, given budget constraints and other problems, YIJ provided these agencies with a much needed employee and they were willing to be more patient and flexible in hopes of retaining the participants for the entire length of the program.

Second, major problems concerning worksite assignment evolved from the expectations of the participants and the demands of the employers. In the case of the participants, many individuals had specific kinds of jobs in mind which were either not available or beyond their ability. Some youth were also not happy with their sector assignment, particularly if it was to the public sector.

In regard to employers, their demands were out of line with the skills that were available. Many participants were high school drop-outs with only minimal skills and minimal job experience, making it difficult to provide many employers with a participant. As a result, many youth in the private sector were either terminated by the employer or quit on their own.

Third, those involved with the private sector were unaccustomed to the "corporate environment," and found it strange and seemingly hostile. The few days of orientation devoted to the "world-of-work" could not adequately prepare them for this environment. This was less of a problem in the public sector, since many youth were used to dealing with social service agencies.

Forty-three individuals were terminated after three referrals: nineteen in the public; twenty-four in the private. In some cases, particularly in the public sector, the youth was not satisfied with the sector assignment and continued to refuse placement even when a worksite was offered. In the private sector, employers turned down youth because of the low quality of skills, or the feeling that the participants' attitudes and responses were not acceptable.

Three worksites were dropped after receiving three referrals.

An additional problem emerged in Philadelphia, potentially affecting the research design. Three youth were put in a sector opposite that assigned by CUP. While these may have been accidental misplacements, it appeared that in at least one or two instances they were a result of tension between the service delivery component of the program and its research-demonstration goal. A letter to the project director, indicating the serious nature of the misplacements and their potential negative impact on the research design, solved the problem.

#### Supportive Services and On-Going Counseling

Supportive services provided by the program seemed to be minimal. All participants received up to two weeks of transportation assistance until receipt of their first pay check. Other services such as day care were referred out to the appropriate agencies. The Council has on its staff a consultant who provides counseling services on an as needed basis. A few of the participants were referred to the counselor because of psychological problems that were manifesting themselves in poor work habits. Supportive services appeared to be given on an as needed basis.

On-going counseling was in compliance with the Standard Grant Plan. Because Philadelphia had jobs developed early, counselors did not have to play catch up on counseling contacts. In addition, youth were calling counselors informally regarding problems and/or seeking information.

#### Post-Program Placement Activities

Philadelphia participants began to complete their twenty-five weeks of work in mid-October. While some were retained at their worksites, project staff had a large number of youth for which they attempted to provide at least two job referrals. During this time, staff not only made referrals, but they helped participants put resumes together, answer job ads, call for interviews, secure

targeted tax credit documentation, and in some cases accompanied the individual to the job interviews. In many instances, staff would arrange for interviews (as many as five for some participants) only to have the participant fail to show up.

The last working participants completed on February 15, 1980. From that time to YIJ program termination date (April 15th) staff focused on getting as many program participants as possible into job interviews or jobs. As of mid-April, the program had 202 completers, with 66 hired at the worksite, 32 hired elsewhere and 5 put into other subsidized programs. A total of 99 youth are still looking for employment.

Due to the economic slowdown in the first quarter of 1980, the effectiveness of post-program placement was severely limited. Staff found it very difficult to place youth at entry level positions for which so many were now qualified.

It also appeared that many of the participants placed with a social service agency for their twenty-five weeks of work experience had not developed any marketable skills. They seemed to have a harder time finding jobs, showing lack of job seeking skills.

Finally, a number of youth did not want a job after the twenty-five weeks of work experience. They felt they had done their part, and were looking forward to some time off.

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Organization and Staffing

The organizational structure designed by the Urban League to implement the program was two tier involving both the national and local office. The Department of Labor contracted with the National Urban League for this demonstration project. Their Standard Grant Plan described four national level positions related to the project. National involvement occurred primarily through their project monitor. The St. Louis Urban League subcontracted with the national organization to operate the YIJ project. St. Louis Youth in Jobs staff prepared statistical and narrative reports to keep the national monitor informed on project operations. The local unit has had sixty-one years of experience in St. Louis, and operates six employment related programs in addition to YIJ.

To implement the project at the local level, a project director, a project associate, six employment specialists, and a secretary were hired. The project director was an employee of the Urban League transferred to YIJ. The project associate and employment specialists had educational backgrounds in the social sciences and previous work experience in education or social work. Staffing was not completed until the latter part of June, which presented a number of problems in the initial phases of implementation.

This full time staff was augmented by existing Urban League staff, including the agency's director who helped in developing jobs and contacting board members to enlist their aid; the Urban League receptionist who certified enrollees and administered the SelectABLE; the pre-employment program instructors who assisted in orientation; and additional Urban League staff

who participated in worksite development.

Responsibilities were divided among the staff. The project director was largely responsible for getting information to CUP -- names, tests, replacement information -- in a timely fashion. The project associate maintained the required statistics, files on the youth, and generally assisted the YIJ staff. The secretary prepared payroll information, while the employment specialists or Urban League van drivers picked up the timesheets at the worksites. The employment specialists had multiple roles and operated on a team basis. They were responsible for developing worksites, orientation activities, job referrals, and counseling youth.

Project staff appeared to be confused regarding the goals of the demonstration effort. When the CUP research team conducted staff orientation, only the project director and one employment specialist from the YIJ staff had been hired and were present. Additional staff came on board after the orientation and consequently gained their understanding of the program through reading the Standard Grant Plan. The lack of clarity on program goals was further complicated by a lack of communication between staff members and the local Urban League administration.

#### Recruitment and Selection

Recruitment methods included articles in two St. Louis daily newspapers as well as in local black newspapers, radio spots, agency contacts, and word of mouth. The Urban League also contacted agencies serving similar youth including the League for Adequate Welfare, Boy's Club, Youth Center, and one St. Louis County sponsored YETP program. The mass media blitz appeared to be the biggest help in drawing youth to the program.

Recruitment began in early May. Youth came in person to the Urban League

office. The receptionist gave them the application, income verification forms, and administered the SelectABLE. Those youth who were out of school for less than ninety days were given Counselor Certification Forms which, when returned by their school counselor, verified their non-school status. Income verification was handled by the Urban League's receptionist in the following manner. Normally a youth was given an income form to complete and sign. In some instances, a youth was asked to bring an ADC card or parents were called to check on income status. If the youth had no idea of the amount of income earned and no ADC card, the receptionist asked the number of people living in the household. If it was seven or under, she assigned \$1000 to each person. If there were more than seven, she divided the \$1000 in half. When questioned, the project director noted that the majority of the youth were referred from other programs where they had to be CETA eligible. No formal check was used.

The Urban League utilized a recruitment card which contained information pertinent to matching. It was not until after youth were matched that a more detailed application was developed. The application, however, lacked information in accord with standard CETA definitions.

The Urban League had two recruitment phases. The second phase was initiated due to a perceived need for higher skilled youth and fear of a higher than anticipated termination rate. This second phase did not generate the anticipated numbers of higher skilled youth.

Youth were notified of their program selection by the project director. Those not reached by phone were sent letters detailing the appropriate information.

## Orientation

The initial orientation session, May 15-17, lasted three half days with ETS testing comprising Day I activities. Enrollees were divided into two groups of approximately fifty each, based upon their choice of attending morning (9:00-11:00) or afternoon (1:00-3:00) sessions. Employment specialists, then only recently hired, conducted orientation with the assistance of other Urban League staff. Content of the orientation emphasized job application and interview skills. Activities included role playing of interviews and completion of an employment application form. Sessions were held in a large room at the Urban League's location. Because of the room's size, it was very easy to become distracted and hard to concentrate on the activities.

Subsequent orientations were lengthened to comply with the Standard Grant Plan. The general format remained the same, although the location was changed to a smaller room. An additional day of orientation provided an opportunity for the employment specialists to meet individually with the enrollees and arrange job referrals at that time. While individual meetings were held, films relating basic job skills were shown to the rest of the group. In another change, youth completed a lengthened resume, complete with picture, to provide counselors with more pertinent information on individual skills and experience. A total of nine orientations were held with most sessions having approximately twenty-five participants in attendance. Staff seemed to feel these small orientation groups were somewhat counter productive in demanding staff time. Staff felt that their time would have been better utilized in worksite development, placement and recruitment of "more suitable" youth.

The major problem with orientation seemed to stem from the late hiring of staff. They were at a disadvantage when conducting the first orientation sessions since they had little opportunity to discuss strategies and ideas for orientation. This resulted in a very disorganized first orientation. In addition, with the large numbers of youth participating in the first orientation and the lack of jobs developed, many youth waited for a long period of time before they were referred.

#### Worksite Development

The Urban League used a variety of methods to develop worksites. Staff placed classified advertisements for employers in local newspapers. They also telephoned area employers using personal or Urban League contacts, classified ads, and the yellow pages. In the public sector, all United Way agencies were contacted by mail to notify them of the program. Many of the small, private sector companies which made up most of the private sector placements responded to the newspaper ads. Employers who were called without any previous contact were reluctant to participate, fearful of involvement with a government sponsored youth employment program. Worksite development in larger companies was also problematic.

Considerable staff time was diverted by attempting to locate the correct contact person in the corporate structure who could make a judgment about participating in the demonstration project. When such an individual was finally located, cooperation was generally not forthcoming. Generally, staff felt this program was much more attractive to the small and medium size businesses.

As a result of the late hiring of staff, employment specialists had little time available to do much worksite development before the first orientation. While the first orientation had 119 participants, only 48

worksites had been developed by the orientation's end. Due to lack of jobs developed, a large number of youth were not referred to a worksite for a long period of time.

The Urban League staff wanted a large pool of youth to choose from for worksite referrals and placement. The employers, particularly in the private sector, were requesting youth with higher skill levels than available. The project director seemed to create an environment which emphasized the needs of employers as opposed to the needs of the program's youth population. Counselors, on the other hand, were more oriented toward youth needs. These differing staff perceptions complicated worksite development efforts.

An additional problem occurred because the YIJ program coincided with summer vacation for high school and college youth. Many employers had already filled their available slots and were unwilling to take on additional youth.

As the initial June 15 deadline approached, additional Urban League staff helped in worksite development. The public sector was divided into federal, state, local and union categories with different developers working on each. Urban League board members were contacted as well as employers involved in previous placements. Worksites were geographically limited to the City of St. Louis and its immediate, surrounding county suburbs to alleviate transportation difficulties.

The Urban League experienced problems in knowing some of the specifics of worksite development. Specifically, the Standard Grant Plan stated that no more than eight jobs were to be developed at any one place. There were at least two instances where more than the allotted eight jobs were developed. County Parks and Recreation had forty-seven jobs, and at the Bi-State

Development Agency twenty-six jobs were developed.

Worksite Referral and Work Experience

Initially, job matching and work experience were handled by the project associate, but as the deadline approached, all employment specialists assisted. The process involved selecting an enrollee whose skills matched those an employer was seeking for the job. An employment specialist contacted both the youth regarding his/her interest in the job, and the employer to set up an interview. The Urban League provided transportation to the interview from their office if youth needed it.

The project associate emphasized that they did not push a youth into a job despite deadline pressures. The staff believed there was no advantage in a poor match because the youth and employer would be unhappy, and the whole effort repeated. Generally, youth was placed on first referral, with few youth needing a second or third referral.

It appeared that the private sector was more selective, with some employers requesting to interview as many as three youth before choosing one to hire. When informed that this was not possible, several employers withdrew from the program.

Despite staff efforts to secure well-matched placements, some youth who left the program cited dissatisfaction with their worksite. Many participants did not like the available jobs and refused to go to interviews. As terminations continued to increase, staff speculated that there was often a discrepancy among job expectations, the reality of youth skills, and the qualifications that certain jobs demanded. Consequently, staff faced the dilemma of youth and employers with unrealistic expectations of each other.

Public sector employers were more realistic because of previous employment programs. Also, many public sector agencies exist to deal with the same type of people who were placed on jobs with the agency. In addition, the program provided the agencies with a much needed employee and therefore were willing to be more flexible and tolerant. On the other hand, private sector employers were not very tolerant of such things as tardiness and absenteeism, and many initiated terminations. Many were concerned about the negative effect of poor enrollee work habits on other full-time staff members.

Staff noted that youth with previous work experience were doing better on their worksite placements and appeared to have a lower termination rate than those without experience. Those without experience appeared fearful of calling employers if they were going to be late or ill. The St. Louis program also experienced a communication gap with many employers. Many youth were terminated for a week or more before counselors were notified.

#### Supportive Services and On-Going Counseling

The Urban League provided minimal supportive services to participants. A total of 700 weekly bus passes were issued during orientation and job referral. Grooming kits were also passed out during this period. Haircuts were provided at no cost. Eleven youth required physical examinations and seven needed special work clothes before they could start work. Typing manuals were provided to two youth to help improve their skills on the job. Other than those services mentioned, supportive services were provided on an as needed basis.

On-going counseling took place at 30, 90, 120, 150, and 180 day

intervals during the work experience. Employers were asked to fill out a form rating "work habits and attitudes." While the form was designed to provide a uniform assessment of participant activities, quality of the reports varied by counselor, worksite supervisor and youth. Employers seemed to regard the high number of counselor visits as a nuisance. After the discussion with employers, counselors spoke with youth to get their general comments and feelings. Other counseling was provided on an as needed basis.

The thirty and ninety day contacts were delayed because of the diverse demands on counseling time, including worksite development and placement.

The Urban League has had to change office locations three times during the life of the program. Even though all moves were in the same building, this might have impacted on the youths' ability to contact their counselors. For instance, during the third move, the entire YIJ staff was given a week off with the exception of the receptionist.

#### Post Program Placement Activities

Post program placement has been difficult given the present economic situation in St. Louis. Both the city and county have leveled a hiring freeze on their respective offices. The unemployment rate has continued to rise in St. Louis, partially as a result of the downturn in the car industries. Given general economic conditions, there also appears to be a low turnover rate in other entry level positions.

The St. Louis termination rate is very high; approximately 290 youth who started work experience have quit, relocated or refused services. Several youth were promised transitioning by their employers but refused to work beyond the six months. Many were just not interested in another

job after the six months. They were ready for a vacation and a "don't call us we'll call you" attitude prevailed.

Other environmental influences appear to affect post-program behavior. Youth have cited a number of reasons for not continuing with the program or not desiring placement. These include seeking unemployment benefits, maintaining ADC status, lack of interest, lack of available day care, etc.

Program personnel felt that the public sector did not provide youth with marketable skills for obtaining unsubsidized employment.

Non-subsidized permanent placements total twenty-five (seventeen public, two private-non-profit, six private). Two of these placements are with the public sector and twenty-three in the private sector. Fifty-three transitions were made at the worksite (four public, ten private). The combined total of currently employed, non-subsidized youth is seventy-eight.

Thirty-two youth were referred to subsidized activities which included Job Corps, OIC, Street Academy, other CETA programs including the Arthur J. Kennedy Skill Center, and Adult Education. Only one followed through and applied. Sixteen youth enrolled in academic educational programs following work experience.

Several youth have been rehired by their worksite employer. Many of these have been called back as temporary help and at least one case, the youth has been working full-time "temporarily" for the past four months.

The St. Louis site had some difficulty in administering the post-test. There seemed to be some confusion over who received the post-test and when it was to be given. The original instructions specified that those participants who had been in the program for ninety days would be post-tested. The program operator felt that with the high termination rate St. Louis

was experiencing, coupled with confusion over what the ninety days stood for, staff was instructed to interview all participants who they thought were likely to be early terminators. Therefore, if a counselor was administering the post-test and someone else in the program was there, they too were given a post-test. According to data received at CUP, a moderately large number of youth were post-tested early.

## RURAL MINNESOTA

### Organization and Staffing

Rural Minnesota Concentrated Employment Program (RMCEP), a non-governmental prime sponsor, was the YIJ program operator in rural Minnesota. RMCEP's jurisdiction includes approximately 22,000 square miles and 19 counties of primarily agricultural and resort land. While the rural nature of this program site necessitated a unique organization, RMCEP was able to accommodate YIJ with few modifications of the Standard Grant Plan.

Originally, there were eleven subsites scattered throughout the jurisdiction. Fairly early in the program, these were consolidated to seven. This reduction was accomplished by dropping one site, Moorehead, due to its inability to recruit enough youth for matching, and then joining sites which were in close proximity for recruitment and orientation purposes. The resulting subsites were as follows: Bemidji, Brainerd, Detroit Lakes, Fergus Falls, Little Falls/Long Prairie, Morris/Alexandria, and Staples/Wadena. As RMCEP uses a similar structure of multiple sites in its normal programming, this did not disrupt the organization.

In each subsite there was at least one full-time staff member assigned specifically to YIJ and responsible for all phases of YIJ implementation. There were at least two sites that required two staff people because of the large geographic area to be covered. In addition, each site was supplemented by existing RMCEP administrative, program and support staff

throughout the project. This will be evident in several implementation areas discussed later.

In general, RMCEP attempted to begin the project with experienced staff and simultaneously hire less experienced individuals to whom YIJ operations would be transferred. New staff was a mixture of persons who had previously worked for RMCEP in other programs, some who had other experience working with youth, and a few recent college graduates. This method of working in new staff resulted in a relatively smooth operation, including data collection and paperwork transfer.

There was an overall project director, located at the central office in Detroit Lakes, who coordinated all seven subsites in the operation of YIJ. He was also responsible for communication of policy, research issues, and other administrative duties. This person was experienced in both the RMCEP system and the operation of work experience type programs. There was no assistant director. Center directors and team leaders in the regular RMCEP system made this position unnecessary. The director also had support staff in the central office for clerical, bookkeeping and data collection functions.

Since most staff members were on board prior to the recruitment of youth, RMCEP was able to provide them with early and relatively complete training sessions including: research design, research requirements, orientation plans, paper and data requirements and special internal procedures. There appeared to be some tension between the desire for service delivery and the needs of the research design. Nevertheless, staff training prior to youth recruitment helped encourage cooperation and participation with the research goals of the demonstration.

### Outreach and Recruitment

RMCEP initially used its normal channels of recruitment including radio spots, newspaper ads and flyers posted in various community settings. As recruitment lagged and dropouts increased, they supplemented these methods with: (1) a heavy media campaign, (2) a concentrated effort to obtain lists of dropouts and recent graduates from high school counselors, and (3) stepped up referrals from other components of their youth programming.

YIJ staff experienced good cooperation from regular summer programs. These programs, as a result of less funding, applied a stricter criteria for eligibility and concentrated their efforts on in-school youth. A number of youth who were not eligible for these programs were eligible for YIJ and were therefore referred.

The rural setting presented some special problems in the recruiting phase of the program. In many instances, for example, the distance from home to the agency or recruiting center was considerable. In one notable case, a youth had to ride his bicycle fourteen miles to the center one way. Recruitment was also affected by the relative infrequency of various local newspapers, some of which were only available weekly or every two weeks. The rural Minnesota program also had to compete with jobs available in the tourist industry, most of which paid higher than the minimum wage (especially when tips were included).

Initial application processing and intake (including administration of the SelectABLE) was done at most sites by the individual who performed these tasks for other RMCEP programs. As a prime sponsor, RMCEP used its standard application and eligibility verification methods.

### Orientation

Although orientation sessions were conducted by the job developer/counselors at the various subsites, they were generally consistent in content. Several counselors did, however, use different tools and methods. Sessions usually included five to ten youth. Staff tended to bring in other RMCEP staff members for specific segments, as appropriate. Orientation generally lasted three days. Toward the end of the orientation phase, when the number of new program starters decreased, individual subsite orientation sessions were consolidated. Youth were transported to one centrally located site and, when necessary, lodged over night.

Orientation sessions included: introduction to program rules, ice-breakers, interviewing, writing a resume, appropriate dress and behavior, and barriers to job goals. Most counselors made use of some exercises in self-assessment and career interests. Most also used a combination of lecture, movies and role playing.

Orientation was also used to determine what jobs a youth would be interested in and to pinpoint previous work experience. This was done in both group and individual sessions.

RMCEP administered ETS tests but did not use any other testing. Orientation began in late March, 1979 and continued through August 15, 1979.

### Worksite Development

RMCEP used a worksite development strategy that fit the rural nature of the area and its own organization particularly well. Prior to the start of any youth in the program, RMCEP conducted a limited public relations campaign, primarily to let employers know what YIJ was. Simultaneously,

YIJ staff canvassed internal resources (i.e., job developers for other programs) to identify which employers, public and private, would be receptive to the program. This also served to alert counselors to the types of jobs available. In addition, especially in the smaller rural communities, job developer/counselors were able to utilize their personal contacts. The combination of internal communication and personal contact provided a worksite development strategy unique to RMCEP.

Job developer/counselors developed very few worksites without having specific youth in mind. Even though many were developed in the two days following orientation sessions, over 70% of the youth were placed in a worksite within two weeks of completing orientation.

There were, however, a few problems developing worksites. Several youth lived in out-of-the-way places where it was difficult to develop a job. Certain communities were saturated by more youth from that area than jobs available.

Finally, several areas were limited by the number of potential employers in a particular sector.

RMCEP tended to develop worksites with smaller employers but this seemed to be a result of the fact that there were very few large employers in the jurisdiction.

#### Worksite Referral and Work Experience

Due to the more individualized worksite development RMCEP experienced few problems in placing a youth in a work experience slot. Most youth were hired on the first referral and only a few were terminated for not being hired in three referrals.

The problems that did exist were for the most part unique to RMCEP:

- 1) Public transportation is essentially non-existent and youth had difficulties getting to potential worksites;
- 2) travel distance was great if not prohibitive - (one youth walked several miles each way from the nearest bus stop);
- 3) an undesirable family reputation , in certain of the small towns, made it difficult for a youth to be placed in his/her home community ;
- 4) transportation for RMCEP's high school dropouts was negatively impacted by a state law that prevents youth from obtaining a driver's license until they are nineteen years old.

Two other problems with worksite referral were common to all five sites. First, youth, through the matching process, were sometimes assigned to a sector incompatible with their job interest. Second, there was a stigma attached to high school dropouts that affected even subsidized employment. RMCEP may have experienced more of this due to the fact that their program population was comprised of 50% high school dropouts. Counselors observed that the stigma was stronger for more recent high school dropouts.

Work experience itself tended to provide good experience and supervision, although counselors generally agreed that the private sector was considerably better than the public sector in this regard. Further, private sector employers, while providing a stricter work environment, consistently notified job developers of problems and sought their assistance with solutions. On the other hand, public employers were lax in such notification. There were, however, few worksites dropped from use. Also, private sector employers seemed to feel more obligated to train the youth for possible

retention. This may have accounted for youth assigned to the public sector complaining of "boring" jobs (i.e. jobs with no training) more frequently than those in the private sector. These "boring" jobs also seemed to contribute to early terminations.

RMCEP experienced a fairly high dropout rate both prior to and after starting work experience. Several factors were cited to account for this:

- 1) delays associated with the research design;
- 2) the time of year (in general, the summer months are a good time to find a job over minimum wage in the area);
- 3) youth leaving the area (a common problem to the jurisdiction as a whole);
- 4) negative peer pressure;
- 5) poor self-image.

#### Supportive Services and On-Going Counseling

RMCEP provided the most diverse supportive services. In addition to transportation allowance before the first pay check, youth received, on an as needed basis, day care, special work clothes, tools and physicals. Several youth also received assistance with rent, the purchase of a vehicle and moving expenses. These latter were provided only in extreme circumstances. Special training, required by state law for several youth hired at hospitals, was also provided.

Face to face contacts were limited by the distances counselors were required to travel. Therefore, except with contacts required by the Standard Grant Plan, most were conducted by telephone.

Counselors stated that youth who had problems at a worksite continued

to have them even after counseling. The effort counselors exerted in keeping a youth on a worksite, left little time for in-depth personal problem solving.

#### Post Program Placement Activities

In addition to a relatively successful direct transition of youth in the private sector, RMCEP's job developer/counselors made a concerted effort to place youth after completion of work experience. Most youth who were available for work did get two referrals and some received more. Availability of the youth was, however, an issue. A significant number were more interested in taking a vacation than in finding further employment.

The job development strategy paralleled worksite development. RMCEP did however take advantage of the Targeted Tax Credit Program by meeting with accounting firms in their jurisdiction to explain it. They considered this more beneficial than attempting to explain it to private employers, who might not realize the extent of the benefit.

RMCEP, because of its status as a prime sponsor, did not experience a problem in facilitating additional subsidized activity for a youth where attempts at unsubsidized placement had failed.

One significant factor cited by job developer/counselors regarding direct transition in the private sector was that these employers felt obligated to hire a youth who had stayed with them for the full six months of the demonstration. Employers expressed a preference for keeping youth on who they knew, had trained, and who had become productive. The public sector, however, most often cited budget constraints as the reason for not transitioning a youth. Public employers also seemed more interested in obtaining additional subsidized youth.

PORLAND, OREGON

Organization and Staffing

The City of Portland Human Resources Bureau, a CETA prime sponsor, was the Youth in Jobs (YIJ) program operator in Portland. The prime's jurisdiction encompasses the city of Portland itself.

For the duration of YIJ, the prime sponsor was undergoing a major reorganization. This contributed to the seeming isolation of YIJ from the rest of the prime.

The staff consisted of a director and six counselors. During the summer months several staff additions were made:

- 1) one person to take applications at the Central office;
- 2) one person to operate the job bank;
- 3) temporary assistance of three counselors from another program to aid outreach and worksite development.

The project itself lacked clerical support staff during much of the summer. Record keeping was therefore seriously impeded. When the project finally obtained clerical support, record keeping and data transmittal did improve.

The director was previously employed by the prime sponsor and was transferred to YIJ. The counselors, with one exception, were recent college graduates with little previous experience. While the director was located in the central administrative office, each counselor was assigned to one of five area offices. The most populated area was assigned two counselors. The decentralization of the staff was not supported by a strong sense of coordination or direction. As exhibited in various phases of implementation the job developer/counselors generally seemed to be unaware of both the

specifics of the YIJ project and where they fit in relation to the system and each other.

#### Recruitment and Outreach

Recruitment activities focused initially on community-based organizations, other CETA programs, and the state employment service. Counselors individually contacted area high schools to obtain lists of dropouts. An attempt was then made to contact persons on the list and solicit their interest in the program. None of these recruiting methods produced sufficient numbers of youth. Consequently, radio spots and newspaper advertisements were instituted during May. During the two week period these were used, approximately thirty applicants a day applied for YIJ.

Initially, recruitment and intake forms were completed at each of the five area field offices by the six YIJ counselors. This procedure was utilized for approximately sixty to ninety days at which time an additional staff member was hired to serve as an intake specialist at the central office. Applicants were then referred to the central office where the SelectABLE was administered and the list of names for submission to St. Louis University's Center for Urban Programs (CUP) was compiled.

After matches were received from CUP, counselors contacted applicants to schedule them for orientation sessions and issue bus passes. Counselors reported they could not contact a number of youth after they had been matched. In addition, many youth apparently obtained jobs on their own while awaiting notification from the YIJ program.

Certain problems were associated with the recruitment phase. First, a readily accessible pool of eligible youth were not available. After the initial pool of youth was depleted it was extremely difficult and time

consuming to solicit additional applicants. Second, the time frames associated with the project did not allow for proper screening of applicants and therefore many youth were recruited that were not appropriate for this program.

The third major problem Portland encountered was competition between programs for youth. One program that particularly affected YIJ was a special youth component under PSE which paid \$3.50 an hour compared to YIJ \$2.90 an hour.

Finally, Portland did not cross check youth applications among the five area offices. Therefore some youth reapplied at a different youth center and were subsequently placed at a different worksite.

#### Orientation

Enrollee orientation was conducted under subcontract by Portland Community College. The Youth in Jobs Orientation was essentially the same as PCC's ongoing assessment program (Career Research Center) that was established earlier for other CETA programs and community based organizations. PCC personnel indicated that the characteristics (education level, experience and expectations) of enrollees in this program were very similar to enrollees of other programs.

Orientation was conducted at the college's Ross Island Center which is located in Southwest Portland about five miles from the city center. The center was relatively accessible by public transportation, although some enrollees had to travel in excess of fifteen miles and make several bus changes. Bus passes were provided to each enrollee for the days spent in orientation.

Initially, orientation was conducted in three day cycles. It was later condensed to two and one-half day cycles, allowing two groups of youth to

complete in one week, rather than extending a group into a new week. Each session was designed to accommodate thirty enrollees. Time was divided equally between career exploration and selection, and world-of-work attitudes. The initial section, career exploration and selection, involved a great deal of paperwork and testing. The remaining time was spent on the skills needed to get and keep a job. This world-of-work information was presented largely through lecture with minimal presented role playing. A summary of the career assessment phase of the orientation for each enrollee was provided to counselors in the hope that this would facilitate match to the worksite. Counselors reported that since the instruments stressed career choices, they were of little use in placing youth on entry level worksites. Therefore, enrollee expectations negatively impacted worksite referral and placement due to the higher level of specialization and training for their occupational preferences.

Testing and instrumentation included the following:

- 1) Pre-program Survey (ETS)
- 2) Step Locator (ETS)
- 3) Reading level test (GATES)
- 4) Math level test (WRAT)
- 5) Survey of career interests (California Occupational Preference System (COPS))
- 6) Research of career interests. (Enrollees utilize Oregon's computer based career information system to determine the entrance requirements, wages, demand, and general working conditions of careers in which they are interested. At the completion of this activity, enrollees completed a Career Handbook).
- 7) Completion of Career Research Center competency handbook. This handbook enables enrollees to list the career development skills they have acquired.
- 8) Completion of employment application and job resume.

The reading and math tests were instituted as a result of enrollees experiencing difficulty with the COPS. Reading levels had been found to be as low as second grade, with a majority at barely a sixth grade level, which approach minimal competency necessary for COPS.

Portland's orientation presented a number of problems. Many enrollees were led to view the intent of YIJ as technical/vocational training due to the stress placed on career choice during the orientation sessions. Additionally, little emphasis was placed on general work requirements and necessary work habits and attitudes. Because of these problems, the drop out rate increased significantly between the completion of orientation and the start of work experience.

#### Worksite Development

Several methods were employed in worksite development. The project director made a presentation on the program to the Portland Rotary Club. This presentation and subsequent follow-up produced 26 work experience positions.

Counselors worked individually using both personal contacts and random phone contacts with employers throughout the area. There appeared to be little use of established agency contacts. As a result of enrollee expectations for more specialized and technical jobs a direct mail solicitation and contacts with the National Alliance of Business were initiated late in June in order to provide additional "desirable" worksites. The worksites developed from all these methods were channelled to the central job bank which was maintained at PCC.

The majority of worksites were developed by the end of May with some additional development taking place in July and August. The need for this later development effort arose because developed positions were not filled in a timely fashion. Both lack of available youth and conflicting job expectations contributed to this.

Development was performed by the YIJ counseling staff and was interspersed with other program phases (i.e., recruitment, O and A, placement, etc.). This presented numerous problems for the staff as the multitude of responsibilities combined with the time frame were difficult to accomplish efficiently. From all appearances, it seemed that there was little to no coordination between the counselors regarding development. In many instances a counselor would be soliciting the participation of an employer only to find another counselor there to develop jobs. Consequently, more than one counselor developed jobs at a given company or agency which resulted in continuous confusion and duplication of efforts.

#### Worksite Referral and Work Experience

After enrollees completed the orientation at PCC, they were referred back to their counselors. At this time, the counselor reviewed the available openings in the job bank (this procedure was subsequently changed) and determined whether any positions matched enrollee interests. If an opening existed which the enrollee indicated he/she would accept, the counselor then contacted the potential worksite to inform them that the enrollee would call to arrange for an interview. Although the enrollee was responsible for informing the counselor of the result of the interview, the counselors frequently had to contact the enrollee or the employer to determine enrollee status.

As noted, a person was later hired to do the matching and keep track of the job bank openings. Due in part to the level of coordination and communication required, the job bank system never worked as well in practice as the concept of a centralized source of openings might indicate.

Most private sector worksites in Portland appeared to be in small to medium sized firms. Enrollees assigned to the public sector were placed in

city government and non-profit agencies. As was the situation in other YIJ sites, the previous experience of public agency personnel with low-income out-of-school youth appears to have contributed to fewer difficulties in placing and retaining youths at these sites.

#### Supportive Services and On-Going Counseling

Other than bus passes, supportive services seemed to be minimal and were provided on an as needed basis.

During the entire duration of YIJ, there seemed to be a basic tension exhibited by the counselors between their project responsibilities and the perceived need to provide counseling. Portland in fact seems to have had a high incidence of non-required counseling contacts.

#### Post Program Placement Activities

Similar to worksite development activities, post-program placement seemed to lack a strategy. There also appeared to be some confusion on two key issues, determining eligibility for unsubsidized referral and the effort required for job development. Most referrals were limited to work experience completers (twenty-five weeks). Further, a significant number of referrals were limited to newspaper want ads and the employment service. Portland made little use of its potential advantages as a CETA prime sponsor which could more easily transition youth to further subsidized activities.

APPENDIX B  
DOCUMENTS USED IN THE  
DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

113

123

GRANT PLAN

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE SECTOR

JOB DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

NOTE: This grant plan is for a national youth demonstration project being implemented in five separate prime sponsor jurisdictions. To facilitate comparable grant plans from all five areas, a standard grant plan is being utilized for the various projects. Only the attachments to the standard grant plan provide descriptions which necessarily vary from one project to another.

---

, 1979

115

130

## PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

### OVERVIEW

The Public vs. Private Sector Jobs Demonstration Project is a discretionary funded youth project (under CETA, Title IV, Part A, Subpart 3 - YETP) which aims to examine the relative benefits of serving youth through subsidized full-time jobs (100 percent of the minimum wage) in the private sector as compared to jobs in the public (and private nonprofit) sector. This special project is designed to facilitate rigorous research for measuring the relative efficiency, effectiveness and impact of subsidizing public vs. private jobs as a means of aiding needy youth.

The demonstration will focus on 16-21 year old YETP eligible youth who are out-of-school. It will involve random assignment of youth to public and private sector jobs in a manner which assures comparability of youth in both types of subsidized employment. The Department of Labor has specified various other research controls to be utilized to assure that (a) program operations are designed to provide comparable manpower activities and services to youth in both subsidized employment groups, and (b) the five separate demonstration project sites around the country (Portland, Oregon; St. Louis, Missouri; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; New York, New York; and rural Minnesota) have procedures similar enough to facilitate multi-site research comparisons.

The national office of the U.S. Department of Labor has separately contracted for a central research agent (for the overall demonstration at the five sites), St. Louis University's Center for Urban Programs, to be responsible for guiding the implementation of all research controls at project sites, conducting post-program participant follow-up surveys, and completing data analysis to distill research findings for the demonstration project.

## KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF PROJECT

The central knowledge development question to be answered by this demonstration project is:

What are the differences in post-program employment and earnings outcomes for out-of-school youth who have participated in fully subsidized work experience in the public sector as compared to similar youth in fully subsidized work in the private sector?

The project has been designed to assure that comparable samples of youth are enrolled in both public and private sector subsidized jobs. Also, other program controls will be implemented to help the project in its aim to have rigorous research analysis completed for measuring the relative effectiveness of the two groups of subsidized jobs in increasing the employability of disadvantaged youth.

Other analytic objectives of this "knowledge development" discretionary youth project are to determine (1) whether and how subsidized jobs in the private sector are different and/or more difficult to develop than those in the private sector, and (2) whether differential program outcomes are found for varying participant characteristics/worksites locations/project jurisdictions.

## DEMONSTRATION PROJECT PLAN

This plan for the "Public vs. Private Sector Jobs Demonstration Project" to be implemented in \_\_\_\_\_, is described in the following sections:

1. Project Organization
2. Youth Recruitment and Selection
3. Worksite Development
4. Worksite Assignment and Referral
5. Program Services
6. Placement Services
7. Participant Flow
8. Participant Wage Payment Processes
9. Research, Recordkeeping, and Reports
10. Budget

### 1. Program Organization

The \_\_\_\_\_ will implement the demonstration project using the organization specified in Attachment 1. The attachment provides a description of the overall project organization, including an identification of the service deliverer organizations utilized and a delineation of the lines of communication and authority for the project.

## 2. Youth Recruitment and Selection

Plans for recruiting project participants are described in Attachment 2. Included is an identification of the characteristics of the target population based on the profile of youth served in \_\_\_\_\_ in FY 1978 programs under YETP. Also described in the attachment is pertinent information concerning eligibility determination and verification.

The process of selecting participants involves providing the St. Louis University Center for Urban Programs (CUP) with the following information for potential participants: age, sex, race, and results of the Select ABLE. CUP will determine by matching and random assignment procedures which applicants are to be provided full-time, minimum wage, public sector subsidized jobs, and which are to be provided full-time, minimum wage, private sector subsidized jobs. As noted in Attachment 2, applicants are notified of their selection for program participation once this CUP determination is made.

Recruitment efforts will be geared to identify at least 425 eligible youth; the exact number necessary will depend on how feasible it is for youth characteristics to be matched by CUP starting with an initial pool of at least 100 applicants.

Project youth will meet YETP eligibility requirements except that only 16-21 year olds will be enrolled who are (a) unemployed, (b) not currently in a work experience or OJT program, (c) not "college bound," and (d) out of school at least 90 days. Pertinent definitions and actions in this matter are as follows:

(1) College bound youth are defined for the purposes of this project as those youth who have definite plans for full-time enrollment in a post-secondary education institution. The term "college bound" is used in its broadest sense,

and is meant to cover any post-secondary experience, including junior college and technical school, as well as 4-year institutions. If the applicant has been out of school for 1 year, it will be assumed that the person is not college bound. If the applicant is a recent high school graduate, a note from the individual's high school counselor, identifying the person as non-college bound, will be sufficient. It will be assumed that high school dropouts are not college bound.

(2) Being out of school at least 90 days is defined as not having attended an educational institution for at least 90 days prior to applying for the project. If a youth has not been out of school for 90 days, then either a high school diploma or a letter from a high school counselor stating that the individual was officially out-of-school prior to application for the project will be sufficient to qualify the youth for project enrollment.

### 3. Worksite Development

Plans for worksite development are described in Attachment 3. Included is a description of the process and procedures to be used. Also, provided in the attachment is a timetable for having a total of 320 worksites which will (a) be equally divided between private sector employers and public sector employers (public sector includes private nonprofit organizations -- use of these organizations should approximate the proportional extent to which they are now used in prime sponsor YETP work experience programs), (b) provide full-time work experience (not to exceed 40 hours per week) at the Federal minimum wage for a 25 week duration, (c) have been developed to accumulate a worksite pool which will enable referrals to employers during the youth's first week of program participation, and (d) be filled by youth no later than June 15, 1979.

The number of worksites an employer may provide cannot exceed 20 percent of the employer's full-time work force, up to a maximum of eight worksites. However, more than two participants will not work in close proximity to each other (e.g., in the same work area, work crew, etc.).

The same organizational unit will be responsible for developing worksites in both the public and private sectors. Each member of the unit's staff who conducts worksite development will develop equal numbers of jobs in both the public and private sectors.

Staff who develop worksites will (a) provide all employers contacted with the standard "Employer Fact Sheet" developed for the demonstration project, (b) complete the demonstration project's standard "Worksite Agreement" and related job description(s) for the worksites to be included in the project, and (c) complete the standard "Worksite Development Log" established for the demonstration project.

#### 4. Worksite Assignment and Referral

Plans for assignment of participants to specific worksites are described in Attachment 4. These plans include details on (a) the information and process used in conducting the participant-worksite match, (b) arranging participant referrals to employers, and (c) the timetable for placing youth in the project's 320 worksites.

Each project participant will be assigned to a specific worksite in either the public or private sector as designated by CUP. Each staff member responsible for worksite assignment will serve equal numbers of youth designated for the public and private sectors. Worksite assignment and referral will take place during the first week of a youth's program participation.

If a youth referred to a particular worksite is not acceptable to the employer, no more than two additional referrals may be made for that worksite. While an employer may receive a maximum of three referrals for each worksite, the referrals are to be made only one at a time only after specific rejection of a previously referred youth. Any worksite not filled after three referrals will be dropped from the demonstration project.

Each participant will be allowed a maximum of three worksite referrals. If a youth fails to show up for an employer referral without good cause, it will be counted as one of the three referrals. Any youth who is not placed on a worksite after three referrals will be terminated from the demonstration project.

Worksite referral outcome will be determined by project staff as quickly as possible. Each worksite referral and outcome will be entered in appropriate project records.

Within the first 30 calendar days after being on a worksite, either the worksite employer or youth participant can elect to terminate the participant's

assignment. In such cases, where the project staff determines that the worksite is still desirable, a replacement participant may be provided. Youth who terminate due to poor working conditions (as verified by project staff) may be reassigned to another worksite to complete their 25-week work experience. In such cases, the original worksite will be dropped from the project. In no case will a youth have a second worksite reassignment.

Youth terminated from the project within the first 60 calendar days of program participation may be replaced by a comparable youth as designated by CUP. Termination of any participant will not affect any other participant. If terminations occur, CUP will be notified and will assign a youth replacement to fill the vacated worksite from the applicant pool. Youth replacements will be provided employment for a full 6-month period. In no case will more than one youth replacement be made at any particular worksite.

## 5. Program Services

Plans for program services for participants (i.e., manpower and supportive services) are described in Attachment 5. Included are details on procedures to be used in the first week of program participation in which the youth is (a) administered the demonstration project's standard "Pre-Test Battery" and "STEP Locator," (b) provided orientation to the demonstration project and the world of work, (c) assessed with respect to information needed for the participant-worksite match, (d) assigned and referred to a specific worksite, and (e) provided extended orientation as time permits.

In addition, Attachment 5 describes other program services to be delivered during the entire duration of program participation, and how these delivered services will be recorded.

Once an applicant pair has been matched and randomly assigned by CUP to the public and private sectors, project staff will notify these youth of their acceptance into the project. Youth are considered program participants once they first attend the project's orientation activities.

The first week of program services will be organized as follows:

a. One day for:

- (1) administration of the project's test batteries,
- (2) dissemination of information about the project and about the rules and requirements for participation, and
- (3) assessment for the participant-worksite match.

b. Two days for providing participants with orientation to the world of work.

c. Two days for:

- (1) assignment to the worksite (participant-worksite match),
- (2) referral and any re-referral to worksites, and
- (3) extended orientation if time permits.

Every effort will be made to have a group setting in which the project will provide youth orientation to the project and world of work, as well as administer the project's standard "Pre-Test Battery" and "STEP Locator." In any event, each staff member who conducts these program services will serve an equal number of youth assigned to public and private sector worksites. Also, each staff member who assesses participants for the worksite match will do so for an equal number of youth assigned to public and private sector worksites.

Various support services as needed and available will be made equally accessible to participants at public and private sector worksites. However, all participants will receive up to two weeks of transportation assistance until receipt of their first paycheck. Every effort will be made to have all program services provided when the participant is not working in order to avoid job disruption at the worksite.

Each project counselor (or coach, coordinator, etc.) will:

- (a) serve an equal number of participants at worksites in the public and private sectors,
- (b) make worksite monitoring visits as follows:
  - 1) during the first month of youth participation: to ascertain whether the participant needs to be reassigned and/or the worksite needs to be dropped,
  - 2) during the third month of youth participation: to assess the likelihood of having the youth make the direct transition to an unsubsidized job with the worksite employer, and
  - 3) during the fourth-sixth months of youth participation: to reassess the possibility of transition to an unsubsidized job, and

(c) contact worksite employers concerning participant work hour time-sheets and any special employer reactions to the participants. Counselors will make other contacts with employers and participants as needed. Each counselor contact and its outcome will be entered in appropriate project records.

## 6. Placement Services

Plans for placement services to assist participants in obtaining unsubsidized employment or other positive outcomes are described in Attachment 6. Included are details on how placement services will be delivered and outcomes recorded in appropriate project records. Each project staff member who is responsible for delivering placement services will serve an equal number of participants in public and private sector worksites.

In cases where on the basis of worksite monitoring it is anticipated that the participant will obtain an unsubsidized job with the worksite employer, this commitment will be verified to establish that the youth has completed appropriate job application processes, and has received official employer notification of the job commitment.

In cases where it is not anticipated that the participant will obtain an unsubsidized job with the worksite employer, placement services will be provided during the final 90 days of the worksite experience. These efforts will be directed to transition youth to an unsubsidized job regardless of whether it is in the public or private sector. Placement services for these participants will be implemented to insure that each such youth receives at least two referrals to unsubsidized job openings (at least one referral will be made prior to the youth's completion of the 25 week work experience period, and other referrals will be made before the end of the 30 day period following work experience completion).

In cases where the second referral to an unsubsidized job does not result in placement, efforts will be made during the subsequent 30 day period to place the youth into more advanced employment and training programs or to achieve other positive outcomes.

Each project staff person who provided placement services will record all activities and outcomes in the standard "Job Development Log" established for the demonstration project. During the anticipated final 2-3 weeks of the youth's program participation, the standard "Post-Test" and Program Completion Instrument" for the demonstration project will be administered for all youth who have been enrolled in the project for at least 90 calendar days. Further details on this matter are provided in Attachment 7.

7. Participant Flow

Attachment 8 provides a description of the participant flow for the demonstration project through February 15, 1980.

## 8. Participant Wage Payment Processes

Attachment 9 describes the methods to be utilized for (a) collecting participant work hour timesheets, (b) preparing paychecks, and (c) delivering the paychecks to youth. The project will have centralized payroll processing and recordkeeping and youth payroll records will be identifiable and readily accessible to CUP for research purposes of the demonstration project.

## 9. Research, Recordkeeping, and Reports

Project staff will be responsible for completing, maintaining, and providing CUP ready access to all financial and program activity and service records and reports required of prime sponsors under YETP (e.g., participant record, QSPC, PSS, FSR, etc.). Also, project staff will complete, maintain, and provide copies of the following special record instruments selected and developed for the demonstration project: (a) Select ABLE, (b) STEP Locator, (c) Individual Participant Profile, (d) Pre and Post Program Tests, (e) Worksite Development Log, (f) Job Development Log, (g) Program Completion Instrument. CUP staff will instruct project staff on how to administer and otherwise utilize these special record instruments for the demonstration project. CUP staff also will computerize all data on these record instruments for use in conducting multi-variate research analyses and preparing research reports, copies of which will be forwarded to project staff.

In addition to CUP access to project records during the course of youth participation, continued access will be provided to assist CUP in locating youth in efforts to administer the standard "Program Follow-Up Survey," for the demonstration projects by interviewing youth 3 and 8 months after they terminate the project to identify their post-program employment and earnings experience.

10. Budget

Attachment 10 provides a Program Planning Summary (completed only for sections pertaining to enrollment in view of the demonstration research aspects of the project), and a Budget Information Summary (BIS). Also, the project staffing plan is provided showing the number of staff, their job titles, and a brief description of their duties. The full-time director of the project will periodically make such information and data readily available to CUP to be used for research purposes of the project.

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE WORKSITE DEVELOPMENT LOG

The worksite development log should be used to record all worksite development efforts for the Youth in Jobs Demonstration Program. Each developer should complete a separate form(s) for each day as each activity takes place. Each Monday copies of all worksite development logs used in the previous calendar week should be mailed to:

Center for Urban Programs  
St. Louis University  
221 N. Grand Blvd.  
St. Louis, Missouri 63103  
Attn: Youth in Jobs Demonstration

Originals should be retained by the program operator.

The following sections explain how to complete each of the corresponding items on the worksite development log.

Developer's Name: Each individual responsible for developing worksites for this demonstration project will use the worksite development log to record all contacts for this purpose. On each sheet used, the name of the individual whose efforts are recorded below should be written on this line. At no time should more than one developer's efforts be shown on the same sheet.

Jurisdiction: The worksite developer will fill in one of the following locations to indicate the jurisdiction of the appropriate program operator: Minnesota, New York, Philadelphia, Portland, or St. Louis. This will be done for each page used.

Date: Each worksite developer will use a separate sheet(s) to record each day's efforts and will fill in on this line the date the activity took place (month/day/year). At no time should efforts which occurred on different days be recorded on the same sheet. However, if more than one page is needed to record all activity for the same day simply recording the date (along with the Developer's Name and Jurisdiction) at the top of another page is sufficient.

Name of Company/Agency

Street Address, Zip, (A/C) Phone: There are two (2) lines allotted for each contact. On the first line fill in the full name of the company or agency involved. Use the same name for the potential employer for all subsequent contacts. Do not abbreviate or use initials unless that is the commonly accepted name (e.g., IBM). On the second line write the full street address, the zip code, the area code, and the phone number. This information should

also be included for all contacts with that company/agency. This address should be the physical location of the company/agency and not a Post Office Box or other type of mailing address. If the address or phone number changes while contacts are still being made please enter the most current at the time of the specific contact.

Initial/Follow-up: For the first contact with the company/agency regarding this demonstration project "I" should be circled to indicate Initial. Any subsequent contacts regarding this demonstration project are considered Follow-ups and "F" should be circled. Note the last contact that could be considered a follow-up is the point when a Worksite Agreement is signed.

Old/New: The worksite developer should complete this item only at the time of the initial contact for this demonstration program. The developer should circle Old (O) if this potential employer has been contacted prior to the demonstration project regarding some other program (e.g., PSE, OJT, placement). Any employer is considered old whether or not the previous contact was successful. If this particular company/agency has not been contacted previously by the program operator New (N) should be circled.

Public/Private Non-Profit/Private Profit: This item should only be completed at the time of the initial contact. The developer should circle whichever of the following that best indicates the sector of the economy in which the potential employer operate; Public (Pub), Private Non-Profit (PNP), Private Profit (PP).

Size of Employer: This item should be completed only at the time of the initial contact. The developer should fill in the approximate number of full-time employees of this company/agency. If there are other offices, plants, etc. of this company please indicate only the number that work within or closest to your jurisdiction (i.e., at those sites which youth from your jurisdiction might be placed for the demonstration project.)

Employer Classification: This item should be completed only at the time of the initial contact. The worksite developer will fill in the number of the category listed below that best describes the potential employer's type of business or work. One of the first eight (8) classifications should be used for Private Profit employers and the last eleven (11) for either Public or Private Non-Profit employers.

Private Profit

- 1 = Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
- 2 = Finance, Real Estate and Insurance
- 3 = Manufacturing
- 4 = Wholesale and Retail Trades

5 = Mining  
6 = Construction  
7 = Transportation and Public Utilities  
8 = Services

Public or Private Non-Profit

9 = Education  
10 = Highways  
11 = Human Resources (including welfare)  
12 = Health and Hospitals  
13 = Police Protection  
14 = Fire Protection  
15 = Sewerage and Sanitation  
16 = Parks and Recreation  
17 = Housing and Urban Renewal  
18 = Libraries  
19 = General Administration

Method of Contact: For each contact the worksite developer should circle one of the following methods: Phone (P), Letter (L), or Visit (V).

Actual Length of Time (minutes): The worksite developer should fill in the number of minutes spent making each contact. If the method is a visit do not include the travel time.

Results:

The worksite developer should circle one of the following codes to indicate the results of each contact. If a letter is the method of contact OL should be indicated and nothing else. "Yes" (#2) should be used at two times, once when the potential employer gives a verbal commitment to provide work experience slots and again when the Worksite Agreement is finalized and signed with the employer (i.e., the last worksite development contact). The only time more than one item should be circled is if #6 is a result in addition to 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5.

Results

1 = No  
2 = Yes or Worksite Agreement finalized with employer  
3 = Need more information  
4 = Need time to think/cheat  
5 = You should talk to someone else in the organization  
6 = Referral to another organization for possible slot  
OL = Only letter contact

## WORKSITE DEVELOPMENT LOG

| Developer's Name _____                         |             | Jurisdiction _____   |   | Date _____                                     |                      |                                |                   |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---|--|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Name of Company/Agency,<br>Street Address, Zip | (A/C) Phone | Initial/<br>Followup | Old/New<br>Public/<br>Private Non-Profit/<br>Private Profit | Size of Employer<br>Employer<br>Classification | Method of<br>Contact | Actual Length<br>of Time (min) | Results           |
| 1) _____<br>_____<br>( )                       |             | I F                  | O N<br>Pub PNP PP   |  | P L V                |                                | 1 2 3 4<br>5 6 OL |
| 2) _____<br>_____<br>( )                       |             | I F                  | O N<br>Pub PNP PP   |  | P L V                |                                | 1 2 3 4<br>5 6 OL |
| 3) _____<br>_____<br>( )                       |             | I F                  | O N<br>Pub PNP PP   |  | P L V                |                                | 1 2 3 4<br>5 6 OL |
| 4) _____<br>_____<br>( )                       |             | I F                  | O N<br>Pub PNP PP   |  | P L V                |                                | 1 2 3 4<br>5 6 OL |
| 5) _____<br>_____<br>( )                       |             | I F                  | O N<br>Pub PNP PP   |  | P L V                |                                | 1 2 3 4<br>5 6 OL |
| 6) _____<br>_____<br>( )                       |             | I F                  | O N<br>Pub PNP PP   |  | P L V                |                                | 1 2 3 4<br>5 6 OL |
| 7) _____<br>_____<br>( )                       |             | I F                  | O N<br>Pub PNP PP   |  | P L V                |                                | 1 2 3 4<br>5 6 OL |
| 8) _____<br>_____<br>( )                       |             | I F                  | O N<br>Pub PNP PP   |  | P L V                |                                | 1 2 3 4<br>5 6 OL |
| 9) _____<br>_____<br>( )                       |             | I F                  | O N<br>Pub PNP PP   |  | P L V                |                                | 1 2 3 4<br>5 6 OL |

Results: {1 = No; 2 = Yes; 3 = Need more information; 4 = Need time to think/check; 5 = You should talk to someone else in organization;  
6 = Referral to another organization for possible slot; OL = Only letter contact.}

DRAFT

Instructions for the Job Development  
and Placement Activity Log

PURPOSE

The Job Development and Placement Activity Log will be used to record efforts to develop post-program placements for youth who have participated in the Youth in Jobs Program.

The Standard Grant Plan outlines three types of placement efforts. The first starts in the third month of a youth's program participation and is an integral part of the counseling and worksite monitoring activity, Counselors begin in the third month to assess the possibility of the youth making a direct transition to an unsubsidized job with his/her worksite employer. This activity continues each month until the youth completes work experience but is not considered to be job development. Therefore, these contacts should not be recorded on this form but should be recorded on the counseling contact record.

The second type of placement effort starts during the last 90 days of work experience. If the counselor's initial attempt to assess the possibility of direct transition does not result in a definite commitment to retain the youth, efforts to place the youth in an unsubsidized job may begin. Each youth will receive at least two referrals to unsubsidized job openings. At least the first job referral will take place prior to the completion of the work experience component of the program. The second job referral must occur within the 30 days following the completion of work experience. All efforts to develop unsubsidized jobs should be recorded on this log.

Note the following points:

- 1) A youth is not limited to two referrals, but each youth will get at least two referrals.

2) While at least one of the referrals will occur during the last 90 days of work experience there is no prohibition against more than one occurring in this same time period.

3) The random sector assignment provided by C.U.P. for the youth's work experience does not determine the sector for referrals to unsubsidized jobs (e.g., a youth in the private sector for work experience may receive referrals for an unsubsidized job in either or both sectors.)

The third type of placement effort is for a subsudized activity. This may start only after a second unsuccessful referral to an unsubsidized job. In no case, may a referral be made to a subsidized activity before two referrals for unsubsidized jobs are made. Efforts to obtain a subsidized placement (e.g., in an employment and training program) should be recorded on this form.

As youth are hired or placed in the developed positions or when it has been determined that the specific company/agency will not hire a youth, a readable copy of this form should be sent to:

Center for Urban Programs  
St. Louis University  
221 N. Grand Blvd.  
St. Louis, Missouri 63103  
Attn: Youth in Jobs Program

#### FORMAT

The format of the Job Development and Placement Activity Log requires that the information be recorded by company/agency. Therefore each company/agency will have its own log. All information in items 1 through 7 should be completed even if the employer refuses to provide a job placement for the youth:

Jurisdiction: The job developer will fill in one of the following locations to indicate the jurisdiction of the appropriate operator: Minnesota, New York, Philadelphia, Portland or St. Louis.

Developer: Each developer should keep his/her own log on each company. If two different developers contact the same company there would be two logs for that company. The developer should enter his/her name on this line.

Name of Company/Agency: Enter the full name of the company or agency on this line.

Street Address, ZIP: Enter the full address and zip code for this company or agency.

(A/C) Phone: Enter the area code and telephone number on this line.

Sector: Circle the correct sector. Public (PUB), Private Non-Profit (PNP), Private-for-Profit (PP).

Size of Employer: Enter the approximate number of full-time employees of this company/agency. If there are other offices, plants, etc. of this company, indicate only the number of employees at the site at which a youth would be placed. While this is an approximate number, you should not give a range (e.g. 20 - 30). You should give an integer. (e.g. 14)

Employer Classification: Enter the number of the category listed below that best describes the potential employer's type of business or work. One of the first eight classifications should be used for Private-for-Profit employers and the last eleven for either Public or Private Non-Profit employers.

Private Profit

- 1 = Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
- 2 = Finance, Real Estate and Insurance
- 3 = Manufacturing
- 4 = Wholesale and Retail Trades
- 5 = Mining
- 6 = Construction
- 7 = Transportation and Public Utilities
- 8 = Services

Public or Private Non-Profit

- 9 = Education
- 10 = Highways
- 11 = Human Resources (including welfare)
- 12 = Health and Hospitals
- 13 = Police Protection
- 14 = Fire Protection
- 15 = Sewerage and Sanitation
- 16 = Parks and Recreation
- 17 = Housing and Urban Renewal
- 18 = Libraries
- 19 = General Administration

Provided YIJ Work Experience: If the potential employer provided a work experience slot for a Youth in Jobs participant (i.e., any youth actually worked for this employer), circle Yes. If a youth in YIJ did not work for this employer, circle No.

Unsubsidized Activity/Subsidized Activity (If subsidized, type): If the potential employer is not providing a job through an employment and training program paying at least a portion of the wages then circle unsubsidized. Note: An employer that receives some type of government funds, e.g. a contract from the Federal Government for some goods or services and employs a youth to work providing those goods or services is still considered unsubsidized. If the placement is in an employment or training program paying at least a portion of the wages, circle subsidized and indicate the type of program. The following are possible types of programs: Work experience, Training, and On-the-Job Training (OJT).

Contacts: In this section you should enter each contact (and all the information) necessary to develop a job or to determine that no job can be developed with this employer. A job is considered developed when you can enter information under Positions Developed. If you need to make more than six (6) contacts you should start a second log for that company indicating the jurisdiction, developer, name of company/agency and attach the two (or more) sheets together. You should not record contacts that are made only to arrange appointments for the youth's interviews. Follow the same procedure for development efforts with companies/agencies providing subsidized placements.

Date of Contact: Indicate the date the contact was made e.g. 5/10/79 for each contact.

Method of Contact: For each contact circle one of the following methods: Phone (P), Letter (L), or Visit (V).

Actual Length of Time: (Min.): Fill in the number of minutes spent making each contact. If the method is a visit do not include the travel time.

Results: Circle one of the following codes to indicate the result of each contact.

1 = No, this should be circled only if the answer is an definite no.

2 = Yes, this may be circled at two times, first when you have an initial commitment and second when you have the information required in Positions Developed.

3 = Need more information; this should be used when the potential employer requests additional information from you that is not provided at the time of the contact.

4 = Need time to think/check; this should be used if the potential employer requests some time to think about the

job, check what might be available, check with a superior or supervisors, etc.

5 = You should talk to someone else in the organization; this should be used when the person you have contacted refers you to a superior, the personnel department, etc.

6 = Referral to another organization for a possible job; this should be used if the potential employer provides you with company to contact other than his/her own that may also be a potential employer. Also the only time more than one result may be circled is if #6 is one of them.

OL = Only letter contact; this should only be circled if the method of contact is a letter.

NC = No contact, busy, no answer, etc.; this should be used in a number of situations: the phone is busy, there is no answer, the phone has been disconnected, the person you need to talk to is not available.

Positions Developed: In this section you will be recording in detail the successful results of the development contacts.

Job Title: Enter the title of the job developed e.g. clerk typist, food service helper, mechanics helper, laborer. If this is the result of developing a subsidized placement enter the job title for the subsidized job or the job the youth will be trained for (e.g., if the youth will be in a pre-apprenticeship program for electricians you would enter, apprentice electrician.) You should enter each different job title separately (e.g. if you develop one custodial position and one clerical aid, enter each on a separate line.)

Number of Jobs: Enter next to each job title the number developed. If there is one custodian, enter "1"; if there are two clerical aids enter "2".)

Starting Wage (Hourly): Enter the hourly starting wage for each position developed. If you are unable to determine the hourly wage please indicate monthly, weekly after the amount. If this is for a subsidized activity enter the wage per hour for a subsidized job, or "allowance payment" for a training program.

Hours Per Week: Enter for each job the average number of hours per week that the youth will work e.g. 40, 35, 20. If this is for a subsidized activity enter either the number of hours per week that the youth will work or the number of hours that the youth will participate in the training program.

**Referrals:** In this section you will record information about each youth who is referred to the job(s) developed.

**Name of youth referred:** Enter the full name of each youth referred to this company/agency.

**Date-of-referral:** Enter the date that the youth being referred is scheduled to meet with the potential employer (fill out an application, interview, etc.).

**Job Referred For:** Enter the number for the job title the youth is going to apply for. For example, clerical aid is number one (1) under Positions Developed. The youth is being referred for a clerical aid position, enter "1" in this column.

**Results:** Circle Hired (H) or Not Hired (NH) whichever is appropriate. If this is a training program, Accepted should be recorded as Hired (H) and Not Accepted should be recorded as Not Hired (NH).

**Job Hired For:** If the result is hired enter the number of the job title listed in the Positions Developed. In most cases it should be the same as the job referred for but in some cases it won't. Also, if the potential employer decides to hire a youth for a position that was not listed under Positions Developed, please add this to the list in the section with all necessary information.

**Scheduled Start Date:** If the youth is hired, enter the day the youth is scheduled to start the job or the subsidized activity.

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT ACTIVITY LOG

Jurisdiction \_\_\_\_\_ Developer \_\_\_\_\_

a) Name of Company/Agency \_\_\_\_\_

b) Street Address, Zip \_\_\_\_\_

(A/C) Phone ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

3) Sector: PUB/PNP/PP 4) Size of Employer: \_\_\_\_\_ 5) Employer Classification \_\_\_\_\_

6) Provided YIJ work experience: Yes No

7) Unsubsidized Activity/Subsidized Activity (If subsidized, type: \_\_\_\_\_)

CONTACTS

| Date of Contact | Method of Contact | Actual Length of Time (Min.) | Results *         |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1)              | P L V             |                              | 1 2 3 4 5 6 OL NC |
| 2)              | P L V             |                              | 1 2 3 4 5 6 OL NC |
| 3)              | P L V             |                              | 1 2 3 4 5 6 OL NC |
| 4)              | P L V             |                              | 1 2 3 4 5 6 OL NC |
| 5)              | P L V             |                              | 1 2 3 4 5 6 OL NC |
| 6)              | P L V             |                              | 1 2 3 4 5 6 OL NC |

\* Results: (1=No; 2=Yes; 3=Need more information; 4=Need time to think/check;  
5=You should talk to someone else in organization; 6=Referral to another organization  
for a possible job; OL=Only letter contact; NC=No contact, busy, no  
answer, etc.)

POSITIONS DEVELOPED

| Job Title | # Jobs | Starting Wage (Hourly) | Hours Per Week |
|-----------|--------|------------------------|----------------|
| 1)        |        |                        |                |
| 2)        |        |                        |                |
| 3)        |        |                        |                |
| 4)        |        |                        |                |
| 5)        |        |                        |                |

REFERRALS

| Name of Youth Referred | Date of Referral | Job Ref. For | Results | Job Ref. For | Scheduled Start Date |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------|---------|--------------|----------------------|
| 1)                     |                  |              | H NH    |              |                      |
| 2)                     |                  |              | H NH    |              |                      |
| 3)                     |                  |              | H NH    |              |                      |
| 4)                     |                  |              | H NH    |              |                      |
| 5)                     |                  |              | H NH    |              |                      |
| 6)                     |                  |              | H NH    |              |                      |

Jurisdiction \_\_\_\_\_

Week ending \_\_\_\_\_

**On Site Monitor's Worksheet**

The following questions should be answered by the project director in your jurisdiction.

- 1.) How many names have been submitted to CUP? \_\_\_\_\_
- 2.) How many youth have been removed from the pool prior to being matched? \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.) How many youth have been matched by CUP in the Public Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 4.) How many matched youth have been notified (or atleast attempts have been made to notify these youth) to start orientation but did not show up in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 5.) How many youth have started orientation but failed to complete  
in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 6.) How many youth have completed orientation in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 7.) How many youth who have completed orientation have not been accepted by a worksite after three referrals  
in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 8.) How many youth have started work experience during the orientation week in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 9.) How many youth have started work experience during the first week after orientation in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 10.) How many youth have started work experience during the second week after orientation in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 11.) How many youth have started work experience during the third week after orientation or later in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

On Site Monitor's Worksheet (cont'd)

- 12.) How many youth have been scheduled to start work experience (i.e. been accepted by a worksite employer) but did not show up to start in the Private Sector?  
in the Public Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 13.) How many youth completed orientation but have never been placed in a work experience slot (do not include those who received three referrals (#7) or those who were accepted but did not show up for work (#12) in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 14.) How many youth are working at this time in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 15.) How many youth have been terminated from the program after starting work experience in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 16.) How many youth have been transferred to a second work experience slot in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non-Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 17.) How many youth have participated in work experience for 30 days or less in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 18.) How many youth have participated in the program (in a paid status) for at least 60 days in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 19.) How many youth have participated in the program (in a paid status) for at least 90 days in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non-Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 20.) How many youth have received the Pretest? \_\_\_\_\_
- 21.) How many youth have received the Step Locator? \_\_\_\_\_
- 22.) How many youth have received the Post Test? \_\_\_\_\_
- 23.) How many signed worksite agreements are there  
in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non-Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 24.) How many work experience slots are included in the signed worksite agreements in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non-Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_

ON SITE MONITOR'S WORKSHEET

Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

Week ending: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1.) How many youth are working at this time in the Public Sector?  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 2.) How many youth have been terminated from the program after  
starting work experience in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 3.) How many youth have participated in the program (in a paid  
status) for at least 60 days in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 4.) How many youth have participated in the program ( in a paid  
status) for at least 90 days in the Public ( Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 5.) How many youth have received the Post Test? \_\_\_\_\_
- 6.) How many youth have received the completion instrument? \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.) How many youth have been transitioned to an unsubsidized job with  
the company/agency that was their work experience site  
in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 8.) How many youth have transitioned to an unsubsidized job in a  
company/agency other than the site of their work experience  
(Note: the Sector here should reflect the sector of the Youth's  
work experience assignment)  
from the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
from the Private Non Profit Sector?  
from the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 9.) Indicate how many youth transitioned to jobs from question 8  
above by the sector of the placement  
in the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
in the Private Non Profit Sector?  
in the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 10.) How many youth have transitioned to a subsidized activity  
(Note: the Sector here should reflect the sector of the Youth's  
work experience assignment) from the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
from the Private Non Profit Sector?  
from the Private for Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 11.) How many youth have completed the Program (i.e. 25 weeks of  
work experience) but have not yet been transitioned  
from the Public (Gov't) Sector?  
from the Private Non Profit Sector? \_\_\_\_\_

- 12.) How many 90 day follow-up interviews have been completed with  
youth \_\_\_\_\_  
in the Public Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_
- 13.) How many 240 day follow-up interviews have been completed with  
youth \_\_\_\_\_  
in the Public Sector? \_\_\_\_\_  
in the Private Sector? \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX C**  
**MATCHING PROCEDURES AND**  
**RANDOM ASSIGNMENT STRATEGY**

**151**

**154**

## MATCHING PROCEDURES AND THE RANDOM ASSIGNMENT STRATEGY

The process of selecting participants involves providing the St. Louis University Center for Urban Programs (CUP) with the following information for potential participants: age, sex, race, and the results of the select ABLE. CUP will determine by matching and random assignment procedures which applicants are to be provided full-time, minimum wage, public sector subsidized jobs, and which are to be provided full-time, minimum wage, private sector subsidized jobs. Recruitment efforts will be geared to identify at least 425 eligible youth; the exact number necessary will depend upon how feasible it is for youth characteristics to be matched by CUP starting with an initial pool of at least 100 applicants.

When the initial pool of 100 applicants is received by CUP, individuals will be selected and assigned using a two-step strategy. The first analysis will display a distribution of the group by race and sex characteristics within a six-cell table. The table is presented below.

TABLE I

|        | BLACK | WHITE | OTHER |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| MALE   |       |       |       |
| FEMALE |       |       |       |

Percentages appearing in each cell will provide the researcher with an initial guideline for determining the race and sex composition of each of the experimental groups. Once this initial determination is made, the first 100 applicants

will then be placed in one of 36 cells based on the possible combinations of race, sex, age, and select ABLE characteristics. The 36-cell grid is presented below.

TABLE 2

| Black | MALE |        |     | FEMALE |        |     |
|-------|------|--------|-----|--------|--------|-----|
|       | High | Medium | Low | High   | Medium | Low |
| 16-17 | 1    | 2      | 3   | 4      | 5      | 6   |
| 18-21 | 7    | 8      | 9   | 10     | 11     | 12  |
| White | 13   | 14     | 15  | 16     | 17     | 18  |
| 16-17 | 19   | 20     | 21  | 22     | 23     | 24  |
| Other | 25   | 26     | 27  | 28     | 29     | 30  |
| 18-21 | 31   | 32     | 33  | 34     | 35     | 36  |

Applications will be assigned a number between 1 and 36 based on specific cell location. Those cells that have three or more people appearing in them will be designated as the beginning pool from which public or private sector job assignments will be made. The decision for then determining which of these specific cells will be drawn from will be based on the percentage distributions provided by the initial six-cell table.

As groups of applicants are received by CUP, percentages within both the six-cell and 36-cell tables will be updated, with the new distributions being

used as the guideline for determining the makeup of the public and private sector work experience groups. The use of this two-step procedure will allow for the most efficient assignment of potential enrollees, and at the same time provide the most rigorous sampling and assignment techniques for insuring some kind of statistical representation within the experimental groups. The maximum potential of this design, however, can only be realized if program operators send CUP fairly large groups of applicants. After the initial 100 potential enrollees are analyzed, groups of between 30 and 50 will be necessary to make rigorous sampling possible.

Once appropriate cells are designated, a simply randomizing procedure will be used to determine which individuals are assigned to the public sector, which to the private sector, and which remain in the cell for future possible assignment.