EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Congress set aside $13.1 million in the Department of Labor's Pilot and Demonstration budget in the 1998 Program Year for programs to address the needs of youth who were, had been, or were at risk of coming under juvenile justice supervision. The Department of Labor (DOL) Employment and Training Administration (ETA) collaborated with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in the Department of Justice (DOJ) in announcing solicitation SGA/DAA 98-015. The solicitation for grant proposals focused on projects designed to get youth at risk of criminal involvement, youth offenders, and gang members between the ages of 14 and 24 into long-term employment at wage levels that would prevent future dependency and would break the cycle of crime and juvenile delinquency.

In June 1999, DOL funded 14 sites for the Youth Offender Demonstration Project (YODP) proposed by governmental units, either cities or states. The projects fell into one of three categories:

C Category I - Model Community Projects were set in high-poverty neighborhoods where comprehensive, community-wide approaches to dealing with youth already had been established:

(1) Denver, Colorado;

(2) Houston, Texas;

(3) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

(4) Richmond, California; and

(5) Seattle, Washington.

C Category II - Education and Training for Youth Offenders Initiatives provided comprehensive school-to-work education and training within juvenile correctional facilities as well as follow-up services and job placement when youth left correctional facilities and returned to their home communities:

(1) Columbus, Ohio;

(2) Indianapolis, Indiana; and

(3) Tallahassee, Florida.
C Category III - Community-wide Coordination Projects worked with local youth service providers to develop linkages that strengthened the coordination of prevention and aftercare services for youth in small to medium-size cities with high poverty and high crime:

(1) Clifton, New Jersey;
(2) Bakersfield, California;
(3) Knoxville, Tennessee;
(4) Minneapolis, Minnesota;
(5) Pensacola, Florida; and
(6) Rockford, Illinois.

The projects were to operate for 24 months from the time of contract negotiation, generally from summer 1999 until summer 2001. The first six months were for planning. The remaining 18 months were for implementation.

In May 1999, Research and Evaluation Associates received a task order from DOL/ETA to provide a process evaluation of 12 of the 14 projects. Two Category II sites, Tallahassee and Indianapolis, were to be evaluated under a separate DOJ agreement.

The goal of the process evaluation was to document the implementation process of the projects, noting achievements and challenges as project staff attempted to deliver integrated services to the target population. To the extent possible, the evaluation also was to report the outcomes of the projects’ efforts to transition youth offenders and youth at risk of becoming involved with the juvenile and criminal justice systems to full-time employment at livable wages in positions with career potential.

The social-development strategy assumed by the YODP design was based on understanding the concepts of risk and protective factors. Common risk factors, such as availability of drugs, lack of commitment to school, family management problems, and early academic failure, were useful in predicting behavior problems. Research revealed that the more risk factors present, the greater the risk of juvenile problem behavior. Protective factors included “healthy beliefs and clear standards for productive, law-abiding behavior, and bonding with adults who adhere to these beliefs and standards.” (Steiner, 1994)
Certain questions about the demonstration projects were included with the Scope of Work for the process evaluation. The evaluation team organized the questions into 10 major questions with general and category-specific sub-questions. The 10 questions were organized in a systems-flow model based on the work of Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (1985) that considered: Context, Inputs, Process, and Products (CIPP). The ordered set of questions became the Field Guide for structuring three evaluation site visits to each project. For the Final Report, evaluators compared the original proposals and reports of the three visits to each project site, analyzing the data according to the 10 questions developed for the Field Guide.

Summary findings are reported below for each category of projects. The final section lists the lessons learned during the demonstration project.

**Category I: Model Community Projects**

Category I grant awards were given to set up a combination of gang prevention and suppression projects; alternative sentencing and community service projects for youth offenders; and to support existing case management and job placement services for youth on probation or returning to the community from corrections facilities.

Some generalizations can be made about the five Category I Model Community Projects:

- **C** All five cities where the projects operated had alternative sentencing options for youth in place before the YODP project was funded.

- **C** The projects reported that the YODP funding opportunity fit their vision for the youth of their cities.

- **C** Gang activity meant different things in different communities, but all projects reported significant gang activity in target neighborhoods.

- **C** The economies where the projects were established were strong and diversified. There also was a strong demand for entry-level workers.

- **C** Political support for the projects in all five communities was good.
Findings for Category I Projects

Planning the Project

Each grantee had a project plan; yet not all plans included all dimensions of the integrated services demonstration. These included employment and training for youth offenders and youth at risk of court supervision, gang prevention and suppression, alternative sentencing and community service, and aftercare for youth returning from incarceration.

For several projects, the YODP funding opportunity fit into their community’s plan for youth employment. And, to some extent, all the cities saw the funding as a way to strengthen and supplement existing programs. Plans evolved considerably during the first two years of implementation as various aspects of the plans proved unworkable or as situations changed.

Establishment of Effective Linkages and Partnerships

The projects were designed to build onto and expand existing partnerships for serving target youth. At least some partners in each city had collaborated prior to the YODP. Over the duration of the projects, those partnerships changed and/or expanded. In several project communities, implementation of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and the award of other youth employment grants transformed their entire youth employment operation and processes.

Organizational Issues

Grantees varied in how they organized their projects. And, the role of the grantee agency appeared to make a crucial difference in the implementation process. Some organizations contracted out the entire operation while others kept service delivery inside the grantee organization. The projects seemed best served when the operation was handed off to contractors, but the grantee stayed involved for leadership, facilitation, and guidance.

The relationships that have been most mutually beneficial have been those between courts and probation officers, on the one hand, and employment and training agencies, on the other. Developing the trust of the courts and probation departments took time, however, and projects lacking that experience needed to devise and employ a strategy for winning their confidence.

The value of delivering youth employment services through partnerships was demonstrated in tangible, measurable ways and also in more subtle exchanges of resources and experience. Partners in several projects leveraged tangible exchanges that made their partnership mutually beneficial.
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For other projects, the mutual learning and the ability to benefit from a partner’s special strengths and experience led to less tangible but important resources to the partnership.

The least-developed relationships were with school districts and employers. The youth involved in the projects generally had not been successful in school and had been in trouble for behavior problems. Frequently schools did not want them to return, nor did the youth want to return to traditional schools. Several projects did, however, develop effective working relationships with schools during the demonstration period.

In general, employer networks were not used — even when employers had agreed to be part of the project network — because youth lacked work maturity and essential educational, life and vocational skills for all except the most low-skill level positions. Each project was asked to use the Federal Bonding Program, but virtually no Model Communities youth were bonded as part of the YODP.

Training, Employment, and Gang Suppression Activities

Training youth offenders and youth in danger of criminal activity with the goal of preparing them for the workforce was an innovation in the care of youth offenders in all five projects. The intensive case management the projects offered through the employment training delivery system was also an innovation in the services they offered them. Probation and court staff remarked that the demonstration project provided every youth a relationship with at least one additional supportive adult. Intensive case management and employment training were the principal components of the YODP aftercare model.

Services provided project participants, whether called by the same name or not, always included:

- intake and assessment;
- case management;
- support for earning a high school diploma or GED certificate;
- work readiness and soft skills training;
- barriers to work (child care, transportation, tattoo removal);
- subsidized work experience;
C job-search support;

C job development;

C job-placement support; and

C post-placement follow-up.

While gang activity was part of the projects’ awareness, the gang dimension rarely was an overt factor in project programming. Gang-reduction activity through the projects stemmed primarily from diversionary tactics. Youth were kept busy during the normal work week with a combination of schooling, work readiness classes, subsidized employment, and then unsubsidized employment.

Collateral Services

All projects appeared dismayed by the deep and varied needs of project clients. There were staffing and budget implications of realizing that maturity, academic standing, work skills and life skills needed to be developed before youth could hold jobs. Project staff made valiant efforts to obtain some of these services for project youth. The process of meeting multiple needs demonstrated, however, the need for a more-systematic collaboration between the projects and the health and mental health systems.

Staff Recruitment

None of the projects was without experience in serving youth, which provided an important boost for the projects. Hiring at the direct-service delivery level was needed, however, and retaining these new staff members was a problem faced by most projects. Training was reported to be helpful for the projects, but staff turnover meant that awareness of larger project goals was not always maintained.

Target Population Recruitment

With the exception of Seattle and Philadelphia, the projects planned to recruit youth for the entire age range, 14-24, in a single program of services. As the projects evolved, however, staff learned that the needs of youth varied considerably across those years. Furthermore, and to the surprise of the projects, a larger number of younger youth were recruited than older youth. Younger youth needed more support time before they were prepared for formal work settings, and there was a greater urgency to try to get them into and/or keep them in school. Seattle and Philadelphia had proposed different strategies for older and for younger youth.
Most youth in the majority of projects were referred by courts or by probation officers. All projects also recruited youth directly from target neighborhoods.

**Technical Assistance**

All project teams participated in two conferences sponsored by DOL and hosted by Research and Evaluation Associates. One conference was in Washington, DC, in September 1999, the other was in Tampa, Florida, in February 2000. Some sessions of the conferences were for projects from all three categories, others were held for category-specific projects. These sessions addressed common issues and questions raised by project staff.

Projects requested and received site-specific assistance to help them improve their operations. All projects found that organizational cultures impeded efforts for cross-agency partners to work as a team. Help clarifying roles, responsibilities, and accountability paths was important technical assistance provided to the staffs of all projects. Conference calls held for each category of projects generated peer-developed problem-solving among projects as well.

**Sustainability**

Aspects of each project were likely to continue after grant funding ended. Some partners would continue to collaborate. And, court-probation and employment training agency partnerships were likely to continue because they had become mutually beneficial. Court-supported services in every city would continue and could leverage some services for court-supervised youth in employment and training programs. The intensive case management provided project youth seemed the least likely to be maintained after grant funding ended.

**Category II: Education and Training for Youth Offender Initiatives**

Projects in this category were designed to provide comprehensive school-to-work (STW) education and training within juvenile correctional facilities. The projects also were designed to provide aftercare services and job placements for youth leaving the facilities and returning to their communities.

Research and Evaluation Associates evaluated only the Ohio project. The two other Category II projects, Avon Park, Florida, and Indianapolis, Indiana, were evaluated by another firm under a separate DOJ agreement.

The Ohio project comprised two youth offender correctional facilities that differed significantly. Mohican Juvenile Correctional Facility (MJCF) is for older youth who have both criminal and substance abuse problems; the Youth Development Center (YDC) is for younger youth who have committed less-serious offenses.
The Ohio Department of Youth Services (DYS) proposed its project to develop strong STW programs in the two correctional facilities and to support transition of youth back to their communities with model aftercare service programs. The project’s ultimate goal was to reduce recidivism.

**Findings for the Category II Project**

**Planning the Project**

A significant aspect of project planning was the focus on developing the capacity for Information Technology (IT) training in the two correctional facilities. The training was to prepare youth for the kind of employment opportunities that were growing in the Cuyahoga County area. Such a sharply focused approach to occupational training did not match skills and interests of many youth. The IT training for many youth, however, provided an introduction to computers and served to improve their computer literacy.

**Establishment of Effective Linkages and Partnerships**

After its proposal was funded, DYS prepared memoranda of understanding with the Cuyahoga County Department of Justice Affairs (CCDJA) to implement the project and to establish the IT program at YDC and at the Mohican facility. The Cuyahoga County Division of Treatment Services (DTS), a part of CCDJA, was to provide aftercare, IT training, and follow-up services to youth returning to the county after incarceration from YDC. Youth returning from the Mohican facility were under the supervision of the regional DYS parole officer. These youth received work readiness, IT training, and placement services from CCDJA contractors.

Staffs of CCDJA and DYS met monthly to exchange information and approaches to youth development. The partnership led to sharing resources in substance abuse treatment. Staffs also agreed to use a common risk-management instrument. And, they jointly developed an aftercare relapse prevention support group for youth from both Mohican and YDC. CCDJA also began developing an integrated case management planning process modeled on the DYS integrated case management approach.

**Organizational Issues**

The school at YDC, the Harry Eastman School, operated under the Cleveland Public Schools and used its mandated curriculum and standards. The YODP funded Eastman’s STW Information Technology (IT) program. The school at Mohican was a registered charter school under the auspices of DYS, but it was not accredited by the state. The IT program at the facility was designed to operate in three classes a day, each one and one-half hours long.
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The major innovation proposed by the Ohio project was implementation of a STW approach to learning, rather than the addition of the IT classes. While teachers and administrators reported they were pleased with the computers and the addition of a technology instructor, these new classes served as augmentations of traditional school approaches more than a reorganization of the curriculum to accommodate a STW design. The institutions were not accountable to CCDJA, which remained virtually powerless to insist that the correctional facilities rethink their curriculum.

The dismantling of the STW system in Cleveland and the lack of STW in East Cleveland essentially defeated implementation of the core component of the Category II model — a STW curriculum that would be supported when the youth returned to their home school districts.

Aftercare

The Division of Treatment Services of CCDJA provided eight assessment specialists (case managers), two job developers, two family therapists, and one anger management-probation specialist for youth returning from YDC. The agency had one additional staff person serving as a transition specialist at the YDC facility. None of these was supported directly with demonstration grant funds.

The assessment specialists met assigned youth one or two times a week at school. In addition, the specialists took turns visiting the Lutheran Metropolitan Ministries (LMM) and Youth Opportunities Unlimited (YOU) program sites on days activities were scheduled. Youth were observed, therefore, by a case manager three or four days a week; and assessment specialists knew the youth in the program. Youth received work readiness training in their first month and then staff hoped the youth would find a job and start work. LMM offered job placement services for older youth and two job developers at CCDJA offered job placement services for younger youth. (The job developers at CCDJA were also the IT instructors.)

Youth leaving the Mohican facility were returned to the care of the youth development specialist and job developer at the regional DYS office. Sixty days before a youth’s release, the case manager in Cleveland and the Mohican staff developed a unified case plan. Work readiness, job placement, and follow-up services were provided youth by the CCDJA program of services through community-based organizations.

Organizational innovations were primarily in the aftercare services offered by Cuyahoga County. This made the Ohio project function more like a Category I project than a Category II project.

Collateral Services

Youth received work clothing as needed as well as bus tokens for trips to program events. Youth received substance abuse interventions, but there did not appear to be relationships with providers.
of other services, such as mental health, tattoo removal, etc, which the youth might need. Through a grant procured by the head of the Division of Treatment Services, youth were beginning to receive personal counseling.

Staff Recruitment

The project manager’s background was in criminal justice. The two correctional facilities each hired an IT instructor. Each teacher had worked at her respective school before the YODP grant was awarded. These were the only staff hired through the demonstration grant. CCDJA hired additional assessment specialists, job developers/IT instructors, and personal counselors with grant funds it obtained after the demonstration grant award.

Target Population Recruitment

Youth were recruited into the project by virtue of their assignment to a residential facility. There were concerns about the pattern of service delivery occasioned by incarceration and release practices. Youth arrived on a rolling basis at the correctional facilities and were released into the community on a rolling basis — depending on behavior, grades, and other factors. As a result, teachers did not know how long a youth would remain in their classes. Similarly, aftercare classes and services also received youth on a rolling basis and staff did not know how long they would have them in their care. The effect, despite efforts to design a curriculum either at the residential facility or in the community, was that there was no provision for youth to complete training once their probation ended.

Technical Assistance

The Ohio project staff attended the September 1999 and the February 2000 technical assistance conferences sponsored by DOL. Two conference calls with all Category II site leaders were held in 2000. Another was held in early 2001. These calls allowed DOL, OJJDP, and site leaders to share what their experiences and to address challenges in a collegial setting.

Project leaders also received semi-weekly telephone or e-mail inquiries from the technical assistance team. Based on issues that surfaced during these telephone conferences, a special Category II workshop was scheduled for March 2001 in Lakeland, Florida. The workshop also included a visit to the Avon Park Youth Academy, another Category II project site, and to the offices of STREETSmart, the organization responsible for the aftercare component.

Three technical assistance site visits were made to the Ohio project, and a three-day training session was held in May 2001. Evaluations of workshops were positive.
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Sustainability

Elements of the Ohio project will continue after project funding ends. The two residential facilities will continue to operate and IT classes will continue to be taught because of the funding provided to initiate them. The aftercare portion of the program was being amplified and sustained through a combination of WIA and foundation grant funds.

Category III: Community-wide Coordination Projects

Category III grants were awarded to focus on high poverty and high crime areas in medium-sized cities. The design was for grantees to work with youth service providers to develop linkages that strengthened the coordination of prevention and recovery services for youth offenders. Grantees were tasked to consider ways to:

- build upon existing employment and training, recreation, conflict resolution, and other youth crime and gang prevention programs;
- establish alternative sentencing and community service options for youth offenders, especially those who have been gang members; and
- establish or continue gang suppression activities.

Findings for Category III Projects

Planning the Project

Planning for the projects was adequate in that grantees designed their projects to accomplish the goals specified by DOL. All projects included both public and private agencies and organizations as collaborating or supporting partners, although the level of involvement of the partners varied among the projects.

Establishment of Effective Linkages and Partnerships

With only minor exceptions, the six projects followed the original project designs they outlined in their grant applications. All attempted to establish linkages in support of goals and to build upon existing systems, which included both core and collateral services provided youth. Some existing systems, however, were more developed than others and, as a result, were able to progress more quickly toward meeting their objectives and goals. Several projects, especially those that were not well established, had difficulties recruiting both partners and clients.
Organizational Issues

The six projects generally had strong, clear, and consistent leadership from a central organization, even though some projects had difficulty building momentum and then sustaining it. It appeared, however, that success depended less upon the nature of leadership than the particularities of place and circumstance. One critical factor, for example, was whether the organization running the project was well established in the community.

Project facilities generally were adequate and situated near their target areas. The Pensacola facility, however, was an exception. Its location appeared to have caused some difficulties recruiting clients. The project, however, took steps to solve this problem by establishing a partnership with a charter school in a neighborhood targeted by the project.

Training, Employment, Gang Suppression Activities

Successful models for building competencies to prepare youthful offenders and those at risk of court involvement for life, worthwhile work, and transition into careers are those that have the proper mixture of several key elements. These elements include community-wide collaboration; employment and training programs; alternative sentencing and community service programs; and anti-gang initiatives. Evaluators found that the six projects made important strides toward creating significant and effective amalgams of these components. Evaluators found, however, that those projects that emphasized job placement, or delivery of services, at the expense of the more important task of building and enhancing partnerships generally were less successful than those that attempted to balance these efforts.

Evaluators found that all projects faced barriers as they attempted to provide employment and training programs to clients. Many youth needed remedial writing and mathematics training to make them more employable. This was compounded by the fact that many project clients rejected formal schooling and, apparently, sometimes were not interested in finding work.

The six projects served as alternative sentencing or community service programs in varying degrees. Also, the projects generally had difficulties establishing gang suppression activities in support of the projects. Two important reasons for this was the reluctance of youth to identify themselves as gang members and strong anti-gang efforts in some cities that drove gang activity underground.

Collateral Services

In the case of Category III projects, collateral services were those services for clients other than soft-skills, pre-employment, basic, vocational, and educational training. These services included tattoo removal, help in finding adequate work clothes, and counseling for personal and family problems.
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In general, the six projects were not prepared to provide collateral services and chose instead to refer clients who needed them to other more-specialized agencies.

Staff Recruitment

In general, staff members of all six projects were knowledgeable, energetic, and enthusiastic about their work. Grantees used YODP funds to add staff, usually one or two positions, to existing organizational structures.

Recruitment processes often were affected by local labor market conditions. In some instances, the low unemployment rate made it difficult to hire highly qualified personnel for the projects.

Evaluators found that older, experienced staff members working with well-established organizations that dealt with youth appeared to have less turnover and to be more effective in dealing with clients. Project coordinators at all six projects were seasoned and experienced. Staff turnover appeared to be a distraction for several projects.

Target Population Recruitment

Each project targeted clients differently and received them from a variety of sources. The juvenile justice system served as a primary provider of clients in Bakersfield, Clifton, Minneapolis, and Pensacola. Both Knoxville and Rockford focused on recruiting youth who were at risk of court involvement.

Three of the projects dealt primarily with younger youth. These were Bakersfield, Pensacola, and Minneapolis. This focus often meant that the projects had to compete with other youth-oriented programs for clients. Probation officers, who had power over clients, often weighed the advantages of assigning youth to the YODP instead of to other programs that provided similar services.

Technical Assistance

Research and Evaluation Associates initially was authorized to conduct an initial visit to Category III projects. Subsequently authorization was given for an additional technical assistance site visit to each project. The projects also received technical assistance during two conferences that were held in Washington, DC, and Tampa, Florida. The technical assistance team also held scheduled semi-weekly telephone conversations with projects. Additional help was provided via telephone and e-mail when projects requested it. In addition, the technical assistance team collaborated with the National Youth Employment Coalition (NYEC) to arrange for specialized technical assistance that was delivered by NYEC consultants. Consultants facilitated on-site sessions for Bakersfield, Clifton, Knoxville, and Rockford.
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The possibility that projects would be unable to obtain funds to continue their operations after YODP grant funding ended created anxiety among several staffs. By June 2001, DOL had announced that it would provide additional funds to four of the six Category III projects so that they could continue for another year. Sites selected were Bakersfield, Knoxville, Minneapolis, and Rockford. In addition, those sites that were not refunded were offered no-cost extensions. Although it was not funded for a second grant, Pensacola requested and received a one-year no-cost extension to continue operations through the summer of 2002. In the end, sustaining the project after grant funding ended posed a significant problem only for Clifton, which had used all of its funds and did not request a no-cost extension. By summer 2001, the project had not found additional funding sources.

Lessons Learned

The demonstration projects were still evolving when the final report was written. Only when the projects have ended and their long-term outcomes have been examined will it be possible to state more explicitly and confidently what lessons actually were learned from the demonstration project.

The process evaluation, nonetheless, identified several factors that appear to have contributed to the success of the projects. The factors identified were based upon an organizational model of public management developed by Research and Evaluation Associates and the DOL staff during the demonstration project. In general, the evaluation found that well-managed and organized projects are those that:

- have well-conceived plans;
- establish partnerships with the juvenile justice system;
- collect and maintain data;
- develop community support/network;
- have active grantee involvement;
- connect the workforce development and juvenile justice systems;
- leverage resources through collaboration and partnerships;
- have in place a continuous improvement system; and
- share leadership and information with stakeholders.
In addition, the evaluation found that contextual factors outside a project’s control or sphere of influence tended to either hamper or help a project’s staff as it attempted to implement the project. These factors included the presence or absence of supportive communities and the strength of local economies.

In summary, the evaluation concluded that the YODP served as a learning experience for all those who were involved in it — stakeholders, sponsors, evaluators, technical assistance providers, and others who supported the effort.

For the Departments of Labor and Justice, the demonstration project provided valuable experience working as collaborative partners. The sharing of information and responsibilities helped the departments identify gaps in theories and approaches that are used to address problems facing youthful offenders and those who are at risk of court involvement. This will be especially valuable for future demonstration projects in which the Departments of Labor, Justice, and Health and Human Services collaborate.

For the 12 grantees that participated in the process evaluation, an important lesson was that technical assistance is critical in helping them succeed. It appeared that over the course of the demonstration the projects, which initially were reluctant to ask for help, became more comfortable working with the technical assistance team. The projects learned how the team could assist them in identifying problem areas and strengthening their efforts to reach their objectives and goals. The lessons learned about the role and capabilities of technical assistance will be especially valuable for projects selected for future demonstrations.

Finally, for the evaluation and technical assistance teams, the demonstration project provided valuable insights and information as well as new tools to use during future demonstrations. More specifically, teams will be able to further refine the public management model they used to identify characteristics of well-managed and operated demonstration projects. This should aid the teams in their efforts to evaluate and provide technical assistance to projects that focus on youthful offenders and youth who are at risk of court involvement.

**Closing**

This evaluation report provides an assessment of the implementation process undertaken by each project and, to the extent possible, it reflects how effective the projects were in building upon existing programs and systems to serve targeted youth. Although the demonstration project continues with an additional group of projects through December 2003 — and perhaps beyond — the report’s major findings for the initial group of YODP grantees have indicated:

C Partnerships between youth offender agencies and workforce development agencies provide an important connection that can further each agency’s mission;
C The partnerships are likely to continue and the YODP was the instrument for this breakthrough;

C Youth indicated that the promise of jobs at a decent wage is what drew them to the local projects and it is what kept them engaged with the projects;

C Use of a crime prevention model that includes employment, training, and placement services appears critical for these youth;

C The project’s promise and ability to help youth transition to employment was a major feature that led many probation officers to refer youth to local projects; and

C It may take additional time to demonstrate that an investment in education and training will result in more youth offenders, or youth at risk of criminal involvement, successfully transitioning to full-time employment.