

five New York boroughs. Additional staff had to be hired to cover this spread. A letter of commitment from the Chancellor of the Board of Education was obtained, assuring a coordination of effort between the schools and the prime.

The Peer Homework Helper program, a special adaptation for the 1978-79 school year, was developed by the Entitlement staff for youth who need tutorial help in their course work. The program is also a worksite for the Entitlement youth who are acting as tutors. The response to this innovation has been excellent, and the program hopes to expand the services, using enrichment funds.

New York City has implemented a very low-key recruitment campaign since the program's initiation. The initial response to the program was so overwhelming that referrals from school counselors, community organizations and word of mouth have been sufficient. Ever since the program got fully underway during the summer, enrollments have been at or above the projected level. To date, New York has enrolled 681 youth and terminated 113, leaving 568 currently in the program.

#### Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The Entitlement area is located in School District Four in North Philadelphia in a community which is made up almost entirely of Black residents. While there is some lower middle-class housing, the area is primarily made up of public housing units, unrenovated private housing, factories and two miles of railroad track. The area is only half residential, and the public housing units have remained 40 percent empty since the program's beginning.

The original program plans projected an eventual total enrollment of 292, but the projection was reduced to 166 in late 1978. The actual enrollment as

of March 31, 1979 was 145. The original projections did not include a breakdown between out-of-school and in-school youth, but there have never been more than 12 previously out-of-school youth enrolled in the program. The formal program innovations are participation in local unions and substantial private-sector involvement.

The Philadelphia Entitlement program is operated under the auspices of the city's Area Manpower Planning Council (AMPC), as are the rest of the metropolitan CETA programs. The prime sponsor contracts out Entitlement and all but one of its other programs. Although AMPC remains active through general program oversight and monitoring, the Philadelphia School District is the managing agent. The Council for Revitalization for Employment and Industry in Philadelphia has a subcontract to perform job development and job-related counseling and to act as an employer liaison.

The school district also manages the Philadelphia YETP program, which is housed in the same building as Entitlement. Since AMPC depends so heavily upon contractors and the district already operates similar school/work programs, the district was considered to be a logical choice to manage Entitlement. However, AMPC is concerned that the program management is not now as effective as it could be; so this structure may soon be changed pending the conclusions reached by a consulting agency that is now studying the program and its management.

The prime sponsor's relationship with the Council for Revitalization for Employment and Industry in Philadelphia is a newer linkage, but the Council now has obtained a second, direct contract from AMPC. While the Council operates its own service programs, it has had no previous manpower contracts. Entitle-

ment also marks the first time the school district and the council have worked together.

A slow start-up caused the school district to try to enroll large numbers of students in the quickest manner possible. The result is that the overwhelming majority of participants are in-school youth. Later efforts to recruit out-of-school youth have yielded little success. Recruitment methods that have since been used include a van and bullhorn, pamphlets, radio announcements and door-to-door canvassing. According to program staff, out-of-school youth seem to be dissuaded by the limited amount of working hours available through the program, since many are financially responsible for themselves.

Job development and matching are handled by the Council. After an informal assessment is made, a youth is matched with a job from the job bank. Interest as well as skill is a factor during placement, but is not always the determining factor. The process is relatively efficient; the backlog of unplaced participants is usually small. Originally, the local unions were concerned that Entitlement youth would displace adult workers, but most of those early fears have been allayed.

Since the school district is the managing agent, some concessions have been more easily obtained than might otherwise have been the case. Staff members have regular access to school records, meeting rooms and facilities. They receive daily attendance printouts from each involved school. But on bigger issues that involve policy change, such as early dismissal or academic credit for the Entitlement experience, the small size and relative unimportance of the program become apparent.

Some problems, such as school and worksite standards and union cooperation, have been resolved. Others, such as high management costs and unproductive inter-agency relationships, are now being worked on. The lack of out-

of-school youth remains a problem that program staff are trying to remedy through more attractive jobs and services.

#### Steuben County, New York

The seven contiguous school districts in rural Steuben County which make up the Entitlement area were chosen because they are not substantially served by the county's other manpower programs. The worksites developed for the youth reflect the limited job and training prospects the area provides, and the program's desire to provide innovative and interesting work situations: painting and pottery, theater work, forestry and a few work experience jobs in the public sector.

Steuben County CETA administers the Entitlement project from an out-stationed YIEPP office in Addison. This office is responsible for recruitment and enrollment, job development and some counseling. Subcontracted functions include certification, done by the N.Y. State Employment Service and payroll, done by SCEOP, a local Community Action Program (CAP) agency. Alternative education is provided under subcontract to a state agency (BOCES), and counseling is done by Rural Farm Workers, Inc. Corning Community College provides the children's and mobile theater worksites, and the N.Y. State Department of Environmental Conservation sponsors the forestry worksites. All subcontracts are coordinated and monitored by the Entitlement coordinator and the CETA administrator, and all of the agencies have been utilized in the past for other CETA programs.

The program got off to a slow start with only the sociodrama worksites operating during the first part-time component. Besides a low active enrollment of 50 youth, the worksite was unpopular with the youth and the community;

although it was discontinued in the summer, its negative effects were felt for a long time. Later, theater and forestry and art worksites were added in different parts of the Entitlement area, which offered participants a greater choice and eased the problem of transportation between home, school and the job. Twenty-five jobs were developed in the area's schools and public agencies, and these are the only program jobs which are not run and supervised by full-time Entitlement staff. There are enough jobs for all the participants, and more will be developed in the next year to provide for increased enrollment.

Recruitment and enrollment were problematic at start-up, due to a misunderstanding of the income eligibility criteria and the resulting expenditure of energy on trying to enlarge the Entitlement area. A new program coordinator was hired in the early summer, and he has vigorously recruited participants, using the media, referrals from public agencies and word-of-mouth. The program originally planned to serve 240 youth based on 70 percent of the lower living standard, about 40 percent of whom were to be out-of-school. Using the OMB guidelines, Steuben has managed to enroll 210 youth, including 40 out-of-schoolers, and as of March, 1979, there were 137 participants on board.

The seven participating schools were not initially enthusiastic about Entitlement. Relations between the program and the schools have greatly improved over the year, and there have been no problems in obtaining larger participant grades. The GED classes are now held in two locations at opposite ends of the Entitlement area to ease transportation, and four youths have passed the GED exam to date.

The counseling program was put in place in September and has made a qualitative difference in the program for the participants. The four counselors have taken youth to visit large area employers and local colleges to expand

their awareness of post-program opportunities. The counselors see the youth on the worksites several times a week, and are responsible for monitoring their work and school performance and attendance. Three formal evaluations have been done to date, and almost all the youth have met the program standards. Those who did not, received remedial tutoring and a temporary reduction in their work hours until they brought their school grades up to par.

This Entitlement program has improved considerably over the past year. Enrollments are up, and terminations are down; there are enough jobs for the participants and the transportation problems, though inherent in a rural program, have been diminished. Entitlement is now viewed by the community residents as a benefit, and should continue to be so through the end of the demonstration.

#### Syracuse, New York

Syracuse is one of the two Tier II sites where the Entitlement area comprises the entire city. The Entitlement area is comparable to the school district lines, since both are coterminous with the city limits. Original estimates indicated that there were 1,875 Entitlement-eligible youth in Syracuse, of whom about 1,238 could be expected to participate in YIEPP. Out-of-school enrollment projections were intentionally kept low (10 percent of the estimated eligible drop-out population) because of the availability of other competing programs for out-of-school youth.

The Entitlement program is administered through the Office of Federal and State Aid Coordination (OFSAC), which was created seven years ago to facilitate the coordinated use of funds for the delivery of human services in the city of Syracuse. The function of this office is to review and coordinate all city grant applications for human services, to pursue federal grant-in-aid funding,

and to continuously monitor and analyze the delivery of human services in Syracuse. In addition, OFSAC has the responsibility to make available to any agency its expertise in writing grant applications and to provide technical assistance in program development and implementation.

Each of OFSAC's four divisions( planning unit, fiscal and grant management unit, office of program evaluation and operations unit) is involved in implementing and managing Entitlement. A close cooperative (non-financial) arrangement exists with the Syracuse Public School System, but there are no major subcontractors or other managing agents.

Entitlement intake is accomplished by the field stationing of Syracuse Youth Services (SYS) intake counselors. SYS is charged with operating the city's youth programs under OFSAC's umbrella. Counselors are divided into five local geographical areas, which are zoned to include the participating high schools and alternative education programs. The Syracuse Employment and Training Agency (SETA) is responsible for all adult employment programs under OFSAC. SETA job development specialists cooperate with SYS in the development of worksites in both the public and private sector.

Syracuse youth programs have traditionally served pregnant teenagers and ex-offenders, both of whom were identified as groups to be served in Syracuse's proposed program innovations. The site has merely continued to do so. SYS was originally set up (with LEAA funds) as a referral source for youthful ex-offenders and generally has had a large ex-offender caseload. SYS cooperates actively with the Young Mothers Educational Development (YMED) program run by the school district. This program provides day care for young mothers, as well as jobs for the same mothers in the day-care center. No special enrollment levels were

projected by the Syracuse Entitlement program, which simply indicated that it would continue service to these youths.

Entitlement provides an expanded youth employment program, operating through the existing youth employment delivery structure. Major emphasis is placed on worksite development in the private-for-profit sector. Entitlement staff developed a private-sector wage subsidy reduction plan, which provides for worksite sponsors paying 25-50 percent of participants' wages. A large number of Syracuse's private-sector worksites are small, family-run businesses.

Syracuse staff report an increasing level of involvement of handicapped participants in Entitlement. OFSAC and SYS want to encourage greater participation of these youth, but there are special problems, like transportation, which have limited their participation. An arrangement has been worked out with the Syracuse School District to provide transportation of handicapped youth from school to the worksite. This is a costly arrangement, and Entitlement staff are exploring other funding possibilities to facilitate this program.

With the exception of out-of-school enrollment difficulties, implementation of Entitlement has proceeded in a smooth manner. Because of good planning on the part of the OFSAC/SYS staffs, a smooth transition from the full-time summer program to the part-time autumn program was effected. Job placements to private- and public-sector worksites have been made according to Syracuse's long-standing policy of giving private sector priority to the older youths (i.e., juniors, seniors and those with the best program records).

In-school enrollment has held steady for some time now. This is attributed to the distribution of a pre-screening/recruitment device (in the form of a postcard) in the schools. One portion of the card describes Entitlement, its wages and working hours, and the other portion is a self-addressed, postage-

paid mailer which youths return to SYS with the pertinent personal information.

Syracuse's efforts to attract out-of-school youth have not been especially successful as compared to its rather strong showing in enrolling the in-school population. The problem with the out-of-school group seems to be the existence of another employment program sponsored by ACTION. This 8 million dollar program is run by Youth Community Services (YCS), a local private nonprofit agency which serves 16-21-year-olds in both the city of Syracuse and Onondaga County. The program has no economic or income guidelines and guarantees youth a job in the public sector with a \$78.00 per week stipend. This "no-strings" program competes with Entitlement for the out-of-school population. SYS staff expect that the increase in the minimum wage will attract more youth into Entitlement, especially during the summer. SYS and YCS have an agreement whereby no youths can drop out of Entitlement to go into the ACTION program.

The program is generally well managed and supervised. OFSAC and SYS have a clear understanding of how each unit's role is related to that of other units. Good communication and cooperation exists between the prime sponsor, the mayor's office, the school system, organized labor, and public and private sectors. The integration of Entitlement with the city's ongoing programs has been sound and well conceived.

APPENDIX C

MDRC REPORTS ON THE ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION

SCHEDULE FOR FORTHCOMING RESEARCH REPORTS

| <u>REPORT</u>                                                                            | <u>ISSUES COVERED</u>                                                                                                                                                                          | <u>DATE</u>     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Preliminary Report on Participation Rates and Return to School and School Drop-out Rates | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Participati n rates of the baseline sample in the pilot sites through December, 1978</li> <li>● Return to school and school drop-out rates</li> </ul> | November, 1979  |
| Implementation of Entitlement through September, 1979                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Implementation issues</li> </ul>                                                                                                                      | March, 1980     |
| Report on In-Program Impacts through Summer, 1979                                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Participation rates</li> <li>● Employment impacts</li> <li>● Schooling impacts</li> </ul>                                                             | April, 1980     |
| Quality of Work                                                                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Assessment of nature and quality of jobs provided</li> </ul>                                                                                          | April, 1980     |
| Private Sector Participation in Entitlement                                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Issues of private sector involvement in the demonstration</li> </ul>                                                                                  | June, 1980      |
| Entitlement in Rural Areas                                                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Implementation and participation issues in Mississippi and selected Tier II rural programs</li> </ul>                                                 | September, 1980 |
| Final Implementation Research Report                                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Implementation issues</li> </ul>                                                                                                                      | March, 1981     |
| Report on In- and Post-Program Impacts through June, 1980                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Participation rates</li> <li>● Employment impact</li> <li>● Schooling impacts including return to school and school drop-out rates</li> </ul>         | April, 1981     |
| Final Report on In- and Post-Program Impacts                                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Post-program impacts through September, 1981</li> </ul>                                                                                               | April, 1982     |
| Summary Report on the Demonstration                                                      | -----                                                                                                                                                                                          | June, 1982      |