Decision Information Resources, Inc.

Youth Opportunity Grant Initiative: Impact and Synthesis Report

Appendixes

November 2007

APPENDIX 1

COMPARISON GROUP METHODOLOGIES

APPENDIX 1 – COMPARISON GROUP METHODOLOGIES

Two methodologies were employed to compare YO target area outcomes with those for a comparable non-YO community: comparing changes using Census Tract Groupings and comparing changes using Current Population Survey's Central City High-Poverty Neighborhoods. Each of these methodologies are described in this appendix.

Methodology 1– Comparing Changes in YO Target Areas and Census Tract Groupings

Estimating the impact of YO grants involves three conceptually distinct steps:

1. Estimating change in YO target areas,

2. Estimating what the YO target area change would have been without YO grants, and

3. Comparing observed change in the target areas to change estimates assuming no YO grants.

Steps 2 and 3 are needed because not all change observed at YO target areas can be attributed to the YO grants. Whatever changes might have occurred in the target areas while YO programs were operated could have been caused by a variety of factors, not just by the YO programs. Alternative explanations for changes coincidental with YO programs could include, for instance, changes in the local economic conditions related to regional or nationwide changes, and changes in target area demographics. The major challenge of the proposed impact analysis plan was to estimate how outcome measures would have changed in target areas had there been no YO programs. Since the target areas did have the YO programs, outcome measure change in the counterfactual situation of not having YO programs could not be measured directly; it could only be inferred from estimates of changes elsewhere, or predicted from detailed econometric models for local change. Unfortunately, detailed models for accurately predicting what might happen in local areas over a multi-year time horizon do not exist. A reasonable method for estimating what might have happened in the absence of YO programs is to estimate observed change in suitably selected comparison areas that are 'similar' to YO target areas, but which had no YO programs, and then to assume that the YO target area changes would have been similar. We opted for this approach. We had to face two challenges:

Appendix 1 – Comparison Group Methodologies

1. How to define comparison areas that had no YO programs yet were similar to YO program target areas?

2. What data to use for estimating change in the selected comparison areas? (Note that the YO surveys were conducted only in areas with YO programs.)

Had YO grants been randomly assigned to some areas selected from a pool of more-or-less similar potential target areas, it would have been legitimate to estimate YO target area change in the absence of the YO grants, by the observed change in potential target areas that were in fact not selected to receive grants. The awarding of YO grants was, however, not a random process: grants were awarded to high poverty communities as the result of a competitive application process.

Thus, comparison areas had to be chosen by methods other than randomization. Obviously, the comparison areas had to be high poverty. However, not all high poverty areas are alike in all factors that might influence change over time, and failure to adjust for the effects of whatever might influence change in the comparison areas could result in biased YO impact estimates. Had we had it, random assignment of YO and comparison status would have gone a long way towards assuring that initial area characteristics, as well as factors affecting change over time, would be all comparable between areas with and without a YO grant. This would legitimate the measurement of YO impact by comparing change estimates in Step 3. In the absence of randomization, and having no pre-selected pool of areas that were similar to YO areas but had no YO programs, we opted to use a statistical method for selecting the comparison areas.

The method we used was based on propensity scoring (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983 and 1984; Rosenbaum 1995). Propensity scoring was devised to help generate valid treatment effect estimates from data for treated and untreated (control) units in observational studies in which (1) treatment assignment is not random, (2) treatment is intended to affect an outcome that may also depend on several unit characteristics, the so-called confounders, and (3) there are too many potential confounders of the treatment to explicitly control their effect by regression analysis, or other statistical approaches.

In the YO evaluation, YO is the treatment, census tracts are the units, and factors that may have affected YO outcome measures at baseline are confounders. We obtained tract-level data from Census 2000 to measure confounders.

In general, propensity analysis is implemented by modeling the probability of having the treatment as a function of potential confounders. This can be done, for example, using logistic regression. Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) showed that under certain conditions, treatment assignment can be treated as if it had been random within propensity strata, that is, among units with approximately identical predicted probability of having the treatment. They also showed that a stratification with about 5 strata normally accounts for 95% of the effects of confounders on outcomes. In effect, under certain conditions, *propensity based stratifications can be used to justify analyzing data on outcomes from observational studies as if the outcome data had been collected from a random experiment provided that the analyses are performed within propensity strata*.

We implemented an approach based on propensity scoring to estimate the impact of YO programs. In broad terms, this was done as follows.

- We used Census 2000 long-form data to estimate at tract-level the 'propensity for having a YO program'. Specifically, a logistic regression model was fitted to tract-level data for estimating the probability of having a YO program as function of tract statistics.

- After excluding tracts with negligibly low YO propensity, we grouped the remaining tracts by YO propensity into 5 strata.

- Statistics for outcome variables were estimated by propensity strata for YO target areas from baseline and from follow-up YO surveys.

- Statistics for outcome variables with no YO programs were estimated by propensity strata from the American Community Survey (ACS). ACS estimates for years 2000 and 2001 were combined to match the baseline YO survey's time period. ACS for 2004 was used to match the YO follow-up survey's time period.

- Outcome statistics were combined across the propensity quintiles with equal weights to estimate baseline/follow-up statistics both in the YO target areas and in the comparison areas without YO programs.

- We estimated change in outcome statistics in YO target areas by differencing the YO-based baseline and follow-up estimates, and in the comparison areas by differencing the ACS-based baseline and follow-up estimates. Change estimates were calculated by propensity strata and overall.

- YO impact was estimated as the difference between change in comparable YO and non-YO estimates. Impact estimates were calculated overall, and by propensity strata.

- Design-based variance estimates and confidence intervals were generated for all statistics.

- Outcome and change statistics, and impact estimates were also calculated for outcome measures by selected demographic factors: age group, gender, and race/ethnicity.

- Impact estimates were assessed for statistically significant differences across propensity strata and by demographic factor.

Stratification of Year 2000 Census Tracts Based on Their YO Propensity

Census tracts in Native American reservations were excluded from the propensity based comparisons. The rest of the year 2000 tracts were classified based on the presence of YO programs, and those in a program area were assigned the value 1 of a 0/1 YO status flag. Probability of inclusion in a YO target area was estimated from 34 tract statistics using stepwise logistic regression. A total of 7 variables, representing log scale tract population, home ownership percentage, median contract rent, percent vacant housing units, percent Whites in the population, percent rural population, and labor force participation rate were retained in the final model.

An examination of predicted YO-inclusion probabilities revealed that many of the non-YO tracts had YO-inclusion probabilities very different from YO tracts. These tracts could not be directly compared to YO tracts, and would serve no useful purpose in estimating YO impact. To identify non-YO tracts without YO ‘neighbors’, we used predicted YO target area inclusion probabilities to form census tract groups (CTG) of size N = 500, and removed from further consideration all tracts in CTGs that included none of the YO tracts.

In a second step, we grouped on propensity score all tracts that were included in a CTG containing one or more YO tracts into 5 strata. Initially, that is before we had access to ACS data, strata were defined to include about the same number of YO tracts. This initial stratification assigned about 20% of all YO tracts to each of the five propensity strata. However, it assigned about 56% of all non-YO tracts to the lowest YO probability stratum (stratum = 1) and only 4.3% to the highest YO probability stratum (stratum= 5). This imbalance of non-YO tracts across the strata would have produced disproportionately high variances for ACS based estimates in stratum 1 relative to stratum 5. To reduce variance heterogeneity, we used a non-linear optimization procedure and re-grouped tracts on estimated YO-probability into 5 strata in a manner that roughly minimized a model-based estimate for the total variance of within-stratum estimates between YO and non-YO populations. (Stratum variance was estimated for the purpose of this exercise as being proportional to the sum of the reciprocals of the number of YO-tracts and the number of non-YO tracts in the stratum). In the resulting stratification, the number of YO and non-YO tracts both varied across strata. Between stratum 1 and stratum 5, YO tracts increased from 54 to 164, and non-YO tracts decreased from 4,731 to 1,123.

Finally, we assessed the 'balance' property of the final stratification by comparing predictor statistics within strata by YO status. Of the 7 variables in the final propensity model, 6 had no statistically significant interaction between YO status and propensity stratum ($0.09 < p < 0.95$), and one – percent rural population – exhibited some evidence for interaction ($p = 0.045$). We considered this adequate evidence of balance.

We note that the same 3-step process was performed with CTG group size of N = 300 and N = 100 in place of N = 500. We found that as we coarsened the initial stratification from N = 500 to N = 100, the number of retained tracts increased, but the potential for imbalance also increased. We opted for N = 500 as a trade-off between increased sample size and reduced balance.

Baseline and Follow-up Outcome Estimates

Outcome Measures

YO grants were funded primarily to improve education and employment opportunities among at-risk youths residing in the target areas. Three measures were defined to describe YO impact on labor force and employment status. These were labor force participation rate, employment to population ratio, and unemployment rate. All three were restricted to youths aged 16 to 21 because ACS does not collect employment related data for youths aged 14-15.

Impact on education was measured in terms of highest degree completed and school enrollment status by highest degree. Percent highest degree completed was estimated at 6 levels:

10-th grade or less, 11-th grade, 12-th grade, HS graduate, less than one year of college, and one or more years of college. School enrollment status was estimated at four levels: not in school, in secondary school, HS graduate not in college, and HS graduate in college.

A successful YO grant could increase the percent of youths who were employed, enrolled in school, or enrolled in college. However, being in school/college could reduce employment, so that the overall impact of YO could perhaps be best assessed by the combined change in the percent of youths who were employed, enrolled in school, or enrolled in college. A composite outcome measure was defined to reflect this observation:

Rate employed/enrolled = Employment to population ratio +
In secondary school +
HS graduate in college

The first component of this measure and the other two components are *not* mutually exclusive in that a person could be both employed and enrolled in school or college. However, double counting is not necessarily a disadvantage for the purpose of assessing the overall YO effect, since being both employed and enrolled might be thought to be preferable to just being one or the other. The variance of the relative change in this measure was calculated conservatively by summing its component's variances. This calculation assumed independence, disregarding correlations that surely existed.

Statistics for YO Target Areas: YO Surveys

Using the final raked weights, we estimated population percentages for each outcome measure from the baseline and follow-up surveys, and calculated the difference between the follow-up and baseline percentages to estimate YO target area change.

Baseline, follow-up, and change estimates were calculated separately for propensity quintiles, and for propensity quintile by (single-factor) demographic subgroups. Demographic subgroups were defined in terms of age (single year age groups), gender, and race/ethnicity (White, non-Hispanic; Black, non-Hispanic; Hispanic; and Other, non-Hispanic).

Overall YO estimates were obtained by taking the simple arithmetic average of the corresponding propensity-stratum specific estimates. Overall YO estimates by demographic subgroup were calculated by averaging propensity-stratum specific estimates in the subgroups.

For the purpose of estimating approximate design-based variances, we treated tracts as sampling units within propensity strata and used the with replacement option in SUDAAN procedures. Variances were calculated for overall YO estimates from the variances of the averaged quintile estimates.

Ninety-five percent upper and lower confidence limits were calculated from the corresponding standard errors.

Statistics for Non-YO Target Areas: American Community Surveys

For non-YO comparison areas, the U. S. Bureau of Census provided statistics for the outcome measures (percents, variances, and confidence limits) by propensity quintile, and by (single-factor) demographic group by propensity quintile. We received the estimates from census as special tabulations. The special tabulations also included overall estimates for the non-YO areas that were obtained by averaging the corresponding estimates across quintiles.

Baseline estimates for non-YO areas were derived as weighted estimates of AC surveys for calendar years 2000 and 2001. Respective weights of 0.17 and 0.83 were assigned to estimates for years 2000 and 2001; these weights were selected to match the mid-point, April of 2000, of the YO baseline survey. ACS for 2004 was used to estimate comparison statistics for the follow-up YO survey.

Estimating Outcome Changes and Program Impacts

The impact of YO programs on some outcome measure *Y* was estimated as the double difference calculated as the difference between the baseline to follow-up change estimate in YO target areas and the baseline to follow-up change estimate in non-YO areas. As noted earlier, impact was estimated by propensity stratum. In non-YO areas in propensity stratum g, change between surveys 1 and 2 was estimated by

$$DY_g^{non\_YO} = Y_{g2}^{non\_YO} - Y_{g1}^{non\_YO}, \; g = 1,...,G. \qquad (A)$$

The corresponding estimates for stratum g in YO target areas was estimated by:

$$DY^{YO}{}_g = Y^{YO}{}_{g2} - Y^{YO}{}_{g1}, \; g = 1,...,G. \qquad (B)$$

YO impact in stratum g was estimated by the double difference:

$$DDY^{YO}{}_{g} = DY^{YO}{}_{g} - DY_{g}^{non\_YO}\text{, } g = 1,...,G. \quad (C)$$

Equations (A)-(C) were also applied to subdomains defined by demographic factors.

The arithmetic average of YO impact across propensity strata was used to estimate the overall impact of YO, controlling for YO propensity.

Synthesizing Program Impact Estimates: Testing for Differences by Propensity Strata and Demographics

We followed a meta-analysis paradigm (Hedges, 1994), and treated overall and subdomain double difference estimates for sub-populations defined by propensity strata, as if they came from different studies. There are two steps. First, homogeneity by propensity level is tested, and if the homogeneity hypothesis is not rejected, estimates are aggregated across propensity strata. For overall estimates by sub-domain level, the second step is to test for homogeneity by the levels of a demographic characteristic (say by age level), and again, aggregate age-specific estimates if the homogeneity hypothesis is not rejected for the age factor. When estimates prove to be significantly heterogeneous, estimates are presented by factor level. We note that even heterogeneous estimates may be summarized into an overall estimate as long as the lack of homogeneity is described and interpreted.

Total heterogeneity (Q) equals the sum of between-domain (Q_w) and within-domain (Q_{wBET}) heterogeneities, $Q = Q_w + Q_{wBET}$. The within-domain component is, itself, the sum of the within-level heterogeneity components, $Q_{w1} + \ldots + Q_{wp}$. Table 1 displays heterogeneity statistics in a general form (see p. 290 in Hedges, 1995).

Table 1. Heterogeneity statistics

Source	Chi-square Statistic[1]	Degrees of freedom	p-value
Between domain levels	Q_{wBET}	p -1	
Within domain levels			
Within level 1	Q_{w1}	q -1	

-		
-		
-		
Within level p	Q_{wp}	q -1
Total within levels	Q_w	$p \times q - p$
Overall	Q	$p \times q - 1$

[1]/ Formulae for the statistics are given in Appendix 3.3.6.

In the double difference analysis, there are q = 5 propensity strata at every domain level. The number of domain levels is p = 2 for analyses by sex, p = 4 for analyses by race/ethnicity, and p = 6 or 8 for analyses by age (6 for labor force outcomes, and 8 for other outcomes.)

Tables like Table 1 need to be applied separately for outcome and demographic variable pairs. For example, to examine unemployment percent by age, we first test whether unemployment rate was overall homogeneous using the chi-square test statistic Q with 6 x 5 -1 = 29 degrees of freedom. If the hypothesis is rejected, heterogeneity may be in evidence between levels – this would be tested with the p-1 = 5 chi-square statistic, Q_{wBET}, and/or within levels – this would be tested with the 6 x 5 – 6 =24 df chi-square statistic, Q_w. Finally, within level heterogeneity across propensity quintiles may be age specific. This would be tested by age group using the 4 df. chi-square test statistics, Q_{w1}, Q_{w2}, etc.

More generally, we'll follow a parsimonious method for using heterogeneity tables to examine p values in the following sequence: overall, total within domain levels and between domain levels, and within domain levels.

If the overall p-value exceeds 0.05, we conclude that YO effects were overall homogeneous across the propensity quintiles, that is within levels of the domain variable and also between the domain variable levels.

If the overall p-value was statistically significant at the 0.05 level, we conclude that YO effects were not overall homogeneous. Next, we search for the source of heterogeneity. There are four theoretical possibilities.

Table 2. Identifying the Source of Heterogeneity

	Homogeneity hypothesis rejected	
Case	Between domain levels	Total within levels

1	Yes	No
2	No	No
3	Yes	Yes
4	No	Yes

In cases 1 and 2, the effect is homogeneous by quintile at every domain level. In case 1, between domain level heterogeneity can be interpreted with no further reference to propensity quintiles.

In case 2, the effect is also homogeneous between domain levels. It is probable that Case 2 is indicative of anomalous, or at least messy estimates: there is a lack of overall homogeneity, but the source can't be pinned to between or within site variability.

In Case 3, there is both within and between level heterogeneity. In this case, it may be necessary to construct a regression model for the effect that incorporates within level propensity effects. An alternative strategy would be to just summarize the estimates by domain level and accept the within-level variability as a limitation on the interpretation of the estimates.

In Case 4, there is within level heterogeneity, but there is between level heterogeneity. In this case, the estimates may need to presented by quintile. An alternative strategy would be to just present the overall estimates summarized across domain levels, and accept the within-level variability as a limitation on the interpretation of those estimates.

Chi-square test statistics for testing homogeneity

For the purpose synthesizing YO impact estimates, we treat propensity strata as a fixed effect with 5 levels. The specific assumptions are that impact estimates (i. e. the observed differences between YO and non-YO change estimates), d_k, k = 1,…,5, have the same expected value, δ_k,

$$\delta_1 = ... = \delta_5 = \delta \text{, where } E[d_k] = \delta_k, k = 1,...,5. \qquad (1)$$

We do not assume that impact estimates have the same variance, V_k . Note that in so far as sample sizes vary by propensity stratum, it would not be valid, nor is it necessary, to assume that the variances are the same.

Denoting by w_k the weight assigned to propensity level *k*, average effect size is estimated by

$$\bar{d}_{w\bullet} = \frac{\sum_{k=1,\ldots,5} w_k d_k}{\sum_{k=1,\ldots,5} w_k}, \qquad (2)$$

and the homogeneity test statistic can be calculated as

$$Q_w = \sum_{k=1,\ldots,5} [(\bar{d}_k - \bar{d}_{w\bullet})^2 / (V_k)] = \sum_{k=1\ldots,5} w_k d_k^2 - \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1,\ldots,5} w_k d_k\right)^2}{\sum_{k=1,,\ldots,5} w_k} \; . \qquad (3)$$

Weight may be calculated as the reciprocal of the variance, $w_k = 1/V_k$. (Shadish and Haddock, 1994). In this formulation, the homogeneity assumption is tested by treating Q_w as a chi-square with 4 degrees of freedom.

There are two reasonable choices for the weights:

- Option 1 $\quad w_k = 1/V(k)$.
- Option 2 $\quad w_k = 0.2$, and (4)

In Option 1, V(k) denotes the variance of the stratum-k impact estimator. According to statistical theory, Option 1 minimizes the variance of estimated total effect. Option 2 accords the same weight to each of the five impact estimates. For most analyses, we used Option 1.

The constancy hypothesis asserts that mean effect size is constant across sub domains,

$$H_0 = \delta_{w1\bullet} = \ldots = \delta_{wp\bullet} \qquad (5)$$

where $\delta_{wm\bullet}, m = 1,\ldots, p$ is mean effect size for the k-th level of a characteristic that has p levels. In this study, p = 2, 4 and 8 respectively, for sex, race/ethnicity and age. As in (2), mean effect size at level m, and for the whole population, are respectively estimated by

$$\bar{d}_{mw\bullet} = \frac{\sum_{k=1,\ldots,5} w_{mk} d_{mk}}{\sum_{k=1,\ldots,5} w_{mk}}, m = 1,\ldots, p\,, \qquad (6)$$

and

$$\bar{d}_{w\bullet\bullet} = \frac{\sum\limits_{k=1,\dots,5;m=1,\dots,p} w_{mk} d_{mk}}{\sum\limits_{k=1,\dots,5;m=1,\dots,p} w_{mk}}. \tag{7}$$

The between domain level heterogeneity statistic is

$$Q_{w,BET} = \sum_{m=1,\dots,p} w_{m\bullet} (\bar{d}_{m\bullet} - \bar{d}_{\bullet\bullet})^2, \tag{8}$$

where $w_{m\bullet}$ is the sum of the domain weights (equivalently, the reciprocal of the variance of $\bar{d}_{m\bullet}$ equals the reciprocal of the sum of the reciprocals of the within-propensity quintile variances of $\bar{d}_{mk}$),

$$w_{m\bullet} = \sum_{k=1,\dots,5} w_{mk}\ , \tag{9}$$

and w_{mk} was defined in (4).

Methodology 2 – Central City High Poverty Neighborhoods as Comparison Groups for the 24 Urban YOG Sites

In addition to using the 2000 Census data and the ACS household survey data for estimating YOG program impacts for Methodology 1, we have also used the findings of national Current Population Survey (CPS) data for 16- to 21-year old youth residing in high poverty neighborhoods in central cities across the nation to estimate the impacts of YOG programs on key educational and labor market outcomes. The poverty rate for the resident population was the primary criterion in the selection of YOG program sites. Therefore central city poverty census tracts would seem to be an appropriate comparison group for the urban YOG program sites. The YOG programs in central cities were dominated by high poverty neighborhoods, with person poverty rates in these neighborhoods falling in the 20 to 40 percent range. The 20 percent poverty cutoff for identifying the CPS high poverty census tracts is therefore a good match for the YOG sites.

The BLS data cannot be used as a comparison group for the rural YOG program sites since these sites are concentrated in the South and the West regions of the nation, whereas the CPS non-metropolitan high poverty data include all high poverty non-metropolitan areas across the nation. Moreover, our research on the classification of each of the counties in these YOG programs along the urban-rural continuum revealed that the urban-rural composition of these sites is mixed with one site (Albany, Georgia) being a city and the remaining five representing a mix of urban-rural populations thus making the CPS non-metropolitan high poverty tracts even less comparable to the rural YOG sites. The BLS high poverty data also cannot be used as a comparison group for Native American YOG sites since there are no BLS high poverty data for Indian reservations. They are not separately identified on the CPS tapes.

Labor force data from the CPS survey are restricted to individuals ages 16 or older. In addition, the CPS also restricts information on educational attainment and school enrollment status to those between the ages of 16 and 24. Hence, all estimates of educational outcomes, including school enrollment status, high school graduation rate, college enrollment rate, and labor force outcomes that are estimated from the CPS surveys will be restricted to the 16- to 21-year-old age group.

Due to relatively small monthly samples of youth in the monthly CPS, we have combined 12 months of CPS estimates to generate statistically reliable estimates of key labor force activity measures and educational measures for demographic and schooling subgroups. We have combined the same 12 months of data that most closely correspond to the time period when the YOG household surveys were conducted. We have used CPS high poverty data for the 12 months between April 2000-March 2001 and April 2003-March 2004. The CPS high poverty area boundaries were changed beginning with the monthly CPS survey of neighborhoods prevailing at the time of April 2004. Since the YOG program sites were initially selected based on poverty rates from the 1990 census, a more appropriate comparison group for these sites would be high poverty neighborhoods that were based on the poverty rates at the time of the 1990 census.

The key assumption underlying these impact estimates is that, in the absence of any YOG initiative, the observed changes in employment, earnings, and schooling outcomes for target area youth would be those observed for youth in the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) high poverty comparison sites. The impact methodology would be a difference-in-differences methodology based on changes in an array of labor market and educational outcomes for youth in the 24 YOG central city sites and 16-21 year olds in the high poverty central city neighborhoods over the 2000-01 to 2003-04 period. For example, the estimated impact of YOG programs on the change in the employment rate of out-of-school youth between the baseline survey and the follow-up survey would be derived as follows:

$$(\text{EMPRATE}_{\text{YOG, 2004}} - \text{EMPRATE}_{\text{YOG, 2001}}) - (\text{EMPRATE}_{\text{HPOV, 2004}} - \text{EMPRATE}_{\text{HPOV,2001}})$$

Where:

YOG = Youth Opportunity Grant target area

HPOV = High poverty central city neighborhoods in the entire U.S.

Similar analyses would be performed for key demographic and socioeconomic subgroups (with sufficient sample sizes) of 16- to 21-year-old youth to estimate the range of impact estimates across key subgroups.[1]

The Case for Using CPS High Poverty Neighborhoods as a Comparison Group

[1] As noted earlier, the labor force, educational attainment, and school enrollment status data from the CPS are restricted to individuals who are 16 or older. Hence, values for labor force and educational outcomes that are estimated from the CPS will be restricted to the 16- to 21-year-old age group.

The CPS data properly weighted are nationally representative and have many conceptual and measurement advantages relative to the ACS survey, providing more useful information on the specific, current schooling activities of youth and key characteristics of their jobs (hours of work, hourly wages, weekly wages, reasons for part-time employment, and job desires of those outside the labor force).

The use of data for youth in high poverty central city neighborhoods from the monthly CPS household surveys has a number of important advantages and a few potential limitations for estimating the impacts of the YO programs. The first advantage is that the findings of the YO household surveys (both baseline and follow-up) and the CPS monthly household surveys can be used to estimate values for each of the following key educational and labor market variables:

- The school enrollment status of 16- to 21-year-old respondents
- The incidence of school dropout problems among 16- to 21-year old youth
- The high school graduation rate of 16- to 21-year-old youth not enrolled in secondary school
- The college enrollment rate of high school graduates and GED holders
- The fraction of high school graduates/GED holders who completed some post-secondary schooling
- The employment rate of in-school and out-of-school youth
- The percentage of out-of-school youth holding a full-time job
- Average weekly hours worked among employed out-of-school youth
- Hourly earnings of employed out-of-school youth
- Weekly earnings of employed out-of-school youth
- Industries and occupations of jobs held by employed respondents

Second, the monthly CPS survey captures important information on the following educational and labor market variables that are not available from either the 2000 Census long form questionnaires or the ACS household questionnaires:

- Whether a respondent was enrolled in school at the time of the survey. The 2000 Census and ACS questionnaires only capture information on school enrollment status at any time in the prior three months.
- Whether a respondent has a regular high school diploma or a GED. The ACS questionnaire does not distinguish a diploma from a GED.

- The number and college enrollment status of family members temporarily living away from home. Neither the 2000 Census nor the ACS surveys are designed to capture any information on family members attending college away from home.
- The hours of work on jobs held during the reference week.
- The full-time nature of jobs currently held by employed respondents.
- The current hourly and weekly earnings of employed respondents.

From an outcome measurement vantage point, the CPS schooling and labor force data have a number of desirable features since the YO baseline and follow-up survey questionnaires were closely modeled on the CPS labor force questionnaires. Findings in Table 1 compare the types of schooling, labor force, and wage data available from the YO baseline and follow-up surveys and the monthly CPS household surveys.

Data from both the YO and CPS surveys would allow estimates to be made of school dropout rates and school enrollment rates for youth age 16 and older and of college enrollment rates among high school graduates. The YO surveys and the monthly CPS household surveys do distinguish youth holding a regular high school diploma from those holding a GED certificate.

Both the YO and CPS household surveys collect data on the current labor force status of persons 16 and older at the time of the survey, i.e., during the reference week. We, thus, can obtain estimates of employment rates for both in-school and out-of-school youth 16 and older from both surveys. The YO surveys and the monthly CPS surveys also collect data on the hours of work, hourly wages, and weekly earnings of the employed, while the 2000 Census and the ACS surveys do not do so.[2] The CPS survey, however, only collects hourly and weekly wage data on a monthly basis from one-fourth of the sample. However, 12 months of data would generate reasonable standard errors for these hourly and weekly earnings estimates.

Table 3. Data for Key Educational and Labor Market Outcome Measures Available from the YOG and CPS Household Surveys

	(A)	(B)
	YOG Baseline	CPS

[2] The monthly CPS surveys only collect data on hourly and weekly earnings from one-fourth of the employed sample, and this earnings information is only gathered for wage and salary workers while the YOG surveys also collect such data from the self-employed.

Educational or Labor Market Outcomes	and Follow-up Survey	Household Surveys
Percent of Youth 16-21 Not Enrolled in School and Not a High School Graduate or GED Holder	X	X
College Enrollment Rate Among High School Graduates 17-21 Years Old	X	X
Employment Rate Among In-School Youth 16 and Older	X	X
Employment Rate Among Out-of-School Youth 16 and Older	X	X
Mean Hours Worked Per Week by Employed Youth	X	X
Percent of Employed Out-of-School Youth Working Full-time at the Time of Survey	X	X
Weekly Earnings on Jobs Held at the Time of the Survey	X	X (Only 25% of Sample)
Industry of Job Held at Time of Survey	X	X
Occupation of Job Held at Time of Survey	X	X
Idleness Rate (Percent of Youth 16 and Older Neither Enrolled in School Nor Employed	X	X

Both the YOG and the CPS surveys collected data on the occupations and industries of the jobs held by respondents employed at the time of the survey. This information is used to track changes in the industrial and occupational characteristics of the jobs held by employed youth over the course of the demonstration to answer a key research question, “Do employed youth in the demonstration sites gain access to jobs in a wider array of industries and occupations”. Finally, the two household surveys capture information on the school enrollment and employment status of each youth respondent at the time of the survey, thereby allowing their idleness status to be identified. Conceptually identical, idleness rates can be estimated for youth with the YOG and CPS survey data.

Third, the estimated number of sample cases of 16- to 21-year old youth in central city high poverty areas over just a few months is large enough to allow potential matching of outcome data for a variety of demographic subgroups (men/women, Black/Hispanics, in-school vs. out-of-school). A review of population estimates from unpublished data for the first quarter 2004 CPS surveys for 16-19 and 20-24 year olds in the BLS high poverty, central city neighborhoods reveals that a total of nearly 1.5 million teens (16-19) resided in these central city, high poverty neighborhoods and another 2.18 million 20-24 year olds did so (Table 2). Just under 80 percent of the teens living in these high poverty, central city neighborhoods were either Black or Hispanic, and, of the 2.18 million 20-24 year old residents of high-poverty central city neighborhoods, 1.492 million or nearly 69% were Black or Hispanic.

Table 4. Estimated Population of 16-19 and 20-24 Year Olds in Central City, High Poverty Neighborhoods in the U.S., Total and for Selected Race-Ethnic Groups (in 1000's)

Group	Population
16-19, All	1,499
• Black	640
• Hispanic	545
20-24, All	2,180
• Black	704
• Hispanic	788

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Unpublished Estimates from the CPS Household Surveys, 2004 I."

We divided the population of 16-19 year olds and 20-21 year olds in central city high poverty neighborhoods by our estimates of the sample weights to derive estimates of the monthly number of sample cases.[3] For teens, there should be somewhat over 600 sample cases per month. For 20-21 year olds, there would be 348 cases per month of which 200 would be Black or Hispanic. For all 16-21 year olds combined, there would be nearly 1,000 cases per month of which approximately 620 would be either Black or Hispanic. By aggregating data for all 12 months, we would have nearly 12,000 sample observations for 16-21 year olds in central city, high poverty neighborhoods.[4] This is a very large set of sample cases with which to compare YOG outcomes over time.

Table 5. Estimated Monthly Sample Cases for 16-21 Year Olds in Central City High Poverty Neighborhoods in 2004 I

[3] For 20-21 year olds, we simply assumed that they would represent 40% of the sample cases for the 20-24 year olds in these neighborhoods.
[4] Due to the rotation group design of the CPS survey in which a household is interviewed for four consecutive months, these 12,000 observations do not represent 12,000 different individuals. Over each 12-month period, there will be 4,000 to 4,200 new individuals.

	(A) 16-19	(B) 20-21	(C) 16-21, Total
All	606	348	954
Black	220	99	319
Hispanic	202	97	299

Over a 12-month period, the CPS samples for 16-21 year olds in high poverty central city areas are much larger than the estimated ACS sample cases for the comparison group under the matched neighborhood and matched YOG/EZ/EC city methodologies. Due to the delay in full implementation, the 2003 and 2004 national ACS samples were much lower than originally expected. The large sample sizes makes the CPS urban high poverty areas a potentially desirable comparison group for the urban YOG sites. Moreover, the central city YOG sites are nationally representative and the macro economic environment faced by youth in BLS central city high poverty census tracts is very similar to the one faced by youth in urban YOG program sites.

There are a number of other important advantages from the use of these high poverty neighborhood data, including timeliness with the YOG household baseline and follow-up data, large sample sizes, potential matching of outcome data for a variety of demographic subgroups (men/women, Black/Hispanics, in-school vs. out-of-school) and comparability of key labor force and employment concepts and measures to those in the YOG household surveys. The CPS survey also captures data on hours of work, hourly wages, and weekly wages that are not captured in the ACS surveys. The 24 urban YOG sites are a fairly reasonable match for the nation's central city high poverty neighborhoods.

Potential Limitations to Using the CPS High Poverty Data for Estimating YOG Program Impacts

There are several potential limitations from the use of the monthly CPS data on youth in high poverty neighborhoods for estimating impacts of the YOG program. First, the national CPS household surveys will include some interviews with residents of the YOG target areas; thus, the national comparison group will include some residents of the target areas. The estimated overlap between these two groups, however, should be quite small. The estimated maximum combined resident population of the 36 YOG target areas in the Year 2000 was 1.640 million, which was equal to only 0.6 percent of the entire resident population of the nation in July 1999. The estimated number of 16- to 21-year-olds living in these YOG sites in the year 2000 was 138,000 while there were 4.8 million 16- to 21-year-olds living in high poverty urban and rural neighborhoods of the nation in early 2000.[5] Thus, all of the YOG target areas together likely contain less than 3 percent of the nation's young adult population living in high poverty areas in the Year 2000. This should alleviate concerns about overlaps between youth in the YOG target areas and the national high poverty central city areas.

A second possible concern over use of the BLS national high poverty neighborhood data as a "comparison group" for the impact analysis of YOG programs is that overall labor market conditions may have changed at different rates between these two groups of areas. The labor market situation for economically disadvantaged youth tends to be quite cyclically sensitive, especially for Black youth. Impact estimates that do not adjust for such changes in labor market conditions would confound true program impacts with differential labor market impacts. The bias could run in either direction, dependent on the comparative strength of labor market conditions in these two areas over the course of the demonstration. We believe that such concerns are likely exaggerated for several reasons. The YOG sites include a diverse array of cities across the nation, with some representation in all geographic regions and in nearly 30 states. It is quite unlikely that overall labor market conditions in these 24 areas combined would deviate to any significant degree from those in the nation's high poverty central city neighborhoods. To document changes in labor market conditions in the local labor markets containing the YOG areas over the demonstration period, we will collect data on local employment and unemployment conditions from the Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) system for each city in which a YOG program was operating. We then will compare changes in local employment levels and unemployment rates from the LAUS system for the cities in which the target areas existed with those for all working-age adults (16+) living in central cities throughout the country from 2001 through 2004.

[5] Our estimate of 138,000 was derived by multiplying the total resident population of the YOG areas by .084, the share of the nation's total resident population accounted for by 16- to 21-year-olds in July 1999.

APPENDIX 2

YOUTH SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Appendix 2 – Youth Survey Methodology

Sampling Design for Area Surveys

An important objective of this study was to control the sample sizes of in-school and out-of-school youth. It was determined that a sample size (completed youth interviews per site) of 300 interviews each from the in-school and out-of-school populations (a total of 600 youth interviews) was sufficient to detect a change in the employment rates before and after the intervention.[6] Except for two Native American sites, the dwelling units (DUs) in the sites were listed, a probability sample of DUs was selected in each site, and a random sample of age-eligible youth in the DU sample was interviewed either directly or using proxy method. At the baseline survey response rate at the DU level was better than 95% and at the youth level it was around 98%.

For the purposes of sampling, the 36 YO sites were divided into three separate groups, small, large, and Native American. Sites were classified as "small" if, in 1990, they had about 11,000 or less total dwelling units while sites that had more than 11,000 total DUs were classified as "large". There were 8 small sites and 22 large sites according to the 1990 Decennial Census. The Native American group consisted of 6 sites -- one Alaskan Native site and five Indian Reservations.

Table 1 contains the number of Census Block Groups, Census Tracts, total housing units, and total population in the 8 small sites (Birmingham, San Francisco, Imperial County, Molokai, Monroe, Brockton, Robeson County of NC, and Milwaukee). Note that the site definition of Milwaukee site was expanded by adding few more Census Tracts shortly after initial listing sampling. Additional tracts were in Milwaukee were also listed the sample was drawn proportional to the addition.

[6] We designed to a minimum power (the ability to statistically detect a change in the employment rates in a site due to the intervention) of 80 percent. The power depends on the minimum deviation to be detected, the statistical test used, and the variance. The variance of the difference between the youth employment rates in each site before and after intervention is a function of the initial employment rates, the number of completed interviews, and the intraclass correlation. For simplicity, we used the average number of completes (averaged over before and after in each site and not across the sites) and ignored the finite population correction.

Table 1. Small YO Sites with Approximately 11,000 or Fewer Total Housing Units as Per 1990 Decennial Census

Site	State	Number of Census Block Groups	Number of Census Tracts	Total Housing Units	Total Population
Birmingham	AL	23	4	7,820	16,766
San Francisco	CA	26	6	9,945	29,884
Imperial County	CA	10	2	3,476	10,647
Molokai	HI	10	3	2,875	6,717
Monroe	LA	23	5	8,170	18,412
Brockton	MA	27	6	9,439	22,617
Robeson County	NC	25	5	11,061	29,467
Milwaukee (before additional tracts were added)	WI	21	10	5,993	18,146

In the eight small sites all DUs were listed and single-stage equal probability samples of DUs were selected. After listing and keying, the frame of DUs for each site was sorted by census block group, blocks within block group, and listing order (we listed starting from the Northeast corner to Southwest corner of each site) and an equal probability systematic sample was drawn for the base year.

In the 22 large sites, DUs were sampled using a two-stage procedure. The first stage was to sample segments via a probability proportional to size scheme (measure of size was the relative size of the segment in term of total DUs as per 1990 Decennial Census). A segment is a census block or grouping of blocks within a census tract. By using a segment instead of a larger unit of geography, such as a tract or a block group, the size of the listing task was reduced. An algorithm was used to combine adjoining blocks with small populations such that the resulting segments had a minimum of 120 DUs in each. Segment sizes varied from site to site. In densely populated urban sites a segment was typically one or more adjoining census blocks, and in some cases a fraction of a single block randomly chosen such that the size of the chosen fraction (or "chunk") had about 120 DUs. Segment sampling rate was set such that 10,000 DUs were expected to be listed in each large site. Table 2 contains the distribution of number of segments formed and sampled along with expected segment size as per 1990 Decennial Census.

Table 2. Distribution of Segments and Sample Allocation for Larger YO Sites

City or County	State	Total Segments (N)	Minimum HUs per segment	Mean HUs per segment	Maximum HUs per segment	Total HUs	Segment Sample (n)
Washington	DC	64	120	225	755	14,409	55
Chicot & Desha City	AR	83	120	155	337	12,896	71
Tucson	AZ	136	120	171	480	23,300	80
Los Angeles	CA	102	120	206	721	20,971	74
San Diego	CA	115	120	195	722	22,441	79
Denver	CO	106	120	175	420	18,581	77
Hartford	CT	89	120	201	488	17,879	70
Tampa	FL	131	120	161	343	21,030	83
Albany	GA	92	120	169	346	15,574	72
Louisville	KY	119	120	185	706	22,059	80
Boston	MA	124	120	198	604	24,496	79
Baltimore	MD	168	120	183	480	30,808	82
Detroit	MI	248	120	195	887	48,479	83
Kansas City	MO	88	120	178	272	15,699	72
Buffalo	NY	130	120	194	737	25,180	78
Cleveland	OH	122	120	188	452	22,907	81
Portland	OR	80	120	171	347	13,700	67
Philadelphia	PA	94	120	179	416	16,815	72
Memphis	TN	141	120	171	520	24,065	82
Houston	TX	175	120	160	484	28,039	82
San Antonio	TX	198	120	163	398	32,288	83
Seattle	WA	88	120	185	451	16,254	70
Total		2,693	120	180	887	487,870	1,672

After listing and keying, the DU sampling frame was sorted by site, segment (or chunk), blocks within segment, and listing order and the within-segment sampling rate was set to proportional to the inverse of segment selection probability. This resulted in near equal probability of DUs for each site.

The samples were split into an original release of approximately 2000 cases and several smaller releases to be used depending on the number needed to obtain 600 interviews. Since the in-school and out-of-school domain sizes of youth ages 14-21 in YO grant sites were different, differential within DU sampling rates were used to control the sample size in each domain. To carry out the within DU sampling, we attached a randomly assigned, computer-generated sampling "message" to each screening questionnaire which designated who to interview in the household; (A) interview all youth (B) interview only the out-of-school youth (C) interview only the in-school youth. Based on the initial sample release yields the distribution of the message labels was altered in the subsequent sample releases in order achieve the interview targets.

Sampling in Native American sites

The sampling plan for each of the 6 Native American sites were formulated following consultation with grantees and after a series of telephone calls and meetings with representatives of the reservations being served by the grantees. A brief discussion of the sampling plan for each of the six sites follows.

California Indian Manpower Consortium (CIMC). This site had 21 villages or reservations. CIMC provided lists of age eligible youth, between the ages of 14 and 21, for 15 of the 21 reservations eligible for YO Grant services. The remaining 6 reservations, where lists were not available, were listed. A dual frame sampling methodology was developed.

Pine Ridge Oglala Sioux Reservation. This site was treated similarly to the non-Native American sites involved in the study. The entire reservation was listed and a sample of DUs was drawn.

Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa. The tribe provided interviewers with a complete list of youth living on the reservation. All youth were interviewed.

Navajo Nation. Only the area under the Chinle agency was surveyed. All chapters of the Chinle agency were listed and sampled similar to the typical "small" site.

Ute Reservation. This was a reservation with a very small population. Data collection on the Ute reservation involved combining the listing, screening and interviewing process into one step.

Alaska. The Alaska YO site consisted of 40 rural villages mostly in isolated areas accessible only by aircraft and waterways. Based on a cost-benefit analysis, a smaller number of regions were selected. Data collection in these villages involved combining the listing, screening and interviewing process into one step.

Table 3 contains the distribution of youth sample by PSU showing the number of DUs listed, DU sample size, number of youth found in the DUs, number of youth sampled, and number of youth responded.

Table 3. Distribution of youth sample by PSU

Site	Sampling Frame Size	DUs Sampled	No. of Youth	No. of Youth Sampled	No. of Youth Responded
Washington, DC	7167	6761	977	634	620
Cook Inlet Tribal, AK	1483	1483	688	514	514
Birmingham, AL	6144	5610	1042	630	627
SE Arkansas, AR	9366	4303	1042	603	601
Tucson, AZ	9559	2756	863	621	621
Navajo Nation	9271	3036	1054	684	679
Los Angeles, CA	8523	3498	1255	667	663
San Diego, CA	9258	3499	1090	625	622
San Francisco, CA	10383	5025	1009	607	603
Imperial County, CA	3312	3312	1264	628	626
CIMC	1699	1694	1183	551	537
Denver, CO	10170	3325	748	619	612
Ute Reservation	617	617	188	188	187
Hartford, CT	9009	3335	1025	654	643
Tampa, FL	10151	3718	939	658	650
Albany, GA	8982	3329	977	663	663
Molokai, HI	2532	2532	819	525	523
Louisville, KY	10338	5000	995	620	620
Monroe, LA	11362	5131	1326	596	595
Brockton, MA	7768	4444	1222	642	639
Boston, MA	10364	4380	1169	610	607
Baltimore, MD	9575	4084	725	614	614
Detroit, MI	8486	4528	916	653	649
Grand Traverse	79	79	116	116	116
Kansas City, MO	8442	5035	996	590	585
Robeson Co, NC	10114	4782	1060	641	639
Buffalo, NY	10598	6759	1265	667	653
Cleveland, OH	10242	6105	1173	611	608
Portland, OR	8997	7434	1071	619	610
Philadelphia, PA	8178	4044	981	630	627
Oglala Sioux	3692	2309	1100	639	638
Memphis, TN	10662	4614	1107	627	623
Houston, TX	10352	3533	946	643	635
San Antonio, TX	11058	2935	939	631	629
Seattle, WA	10610	9435	1361	590	568
Milwaukee, WI	10609	5350	1356	694	692
Total - YO sites	**289152**	**147814**	**35987**	**21504**	**21338**

Follow-up Sample

We did a dual-frame approach to select the sample for the follow-up survey. This approach involved contacting a sample of addresses that were sampled from the baseline listing sheets and screened in Year 1(frame 1), supplemented by non-sampled dwelling units from Year 1 together with newly constructed or newly identified dwelling units from the updated listing sheets (frame 2). These two frames were constructed so that over half of the hard-to-find out-of-school youth would be drawn from frame 1, requiring only a limited amount of screening. Most in-school youth would have come from frame 2. A brief description of the two frames follows:

- Frame 1 consisted of all addresses of housing units that had youth 14-18 years of age in Year 1. About 69% of these DUs would still have eligible youth (i.e. at least one 14-21 year old) if the survey is conducted in Year 4. Many of the DUs with youth ages 11-13 in Year 1 would have 17-21 year old youth in Year 4. Thus, screening rates required to obtain DUs with eligible youth from this frame would be relatively low.

- Frame 2 consisted of the lists of non-sampled DUs from the baseline survey, and any additional DUs identified during the listing update phase. By selecting some DUs from Frame 2, we ensured that any new addresses added to the neighborhood since baseline (Year 1) were represented in the sample. Screening rates was nearly as high as baseline screening rates for frame 2.

The sample size from Frame 1 was approximately 700 per site, and we expected to sample 1,500 a site from Frame 2, for a total sample size of 2,200. Given this frame structure, we expected to find close to two-thirds of the out-of-school youth interviews using Frame 1 and interview the remaining youth from Frame 2. The in-school interviews were allocated in proportion to the estimated size of the youth population in each frame.

We assumed all of the younger youth (11-13 years) were enrolled in school and almost all of them would still remain enrolled in school during the follow-up survey (Year 4). This is a fair assumption because almost all (98%) youth 14 to 15 years old were in school, based on our Year 1 data. However, for sample size calculation we assumed that all the Year 1, 11- to 13-year olds would still remain in school during Year 4. It was prudent to make this conservative assumption because the most difficult to locate population in Year 4 was out-of-school youth as was our experience in Year 1.

Appendix 2 – Youth Survey Methodology

Based on the data collection in the YO sites, there were, on average, about 700 housing unit addresses per site in our database for frame 1. We assumed 69% of these addresses would still have one or more age-eligible youth(s) in Year 4. This assumption was based on the following: During March 1999 to March 2000 (Source: March 2000 CPS) 15.3% of Americans in the 10 to 19 years of age range moved from their housing units. That is about 61% (= $(1 - 0.153)^3$) of the Year 1 residents in this age range remained in the same housing unit. In the remaining 39% of the housing units, about 21% would be units with age-eligible youth in Year 4. That is, a total of about 69% (0.61 + (0.21 x 0.39) of the Year 1 housing unit addresses would still have age-eligible youth.

Based on Year 1 data, we assumed that the housing unit response rate of 95% and expected about 459 (= 700 x 0.69 x 0.95) eligible and cooperating housing units per site.

Also, based on Year 1 data, we assumed the youth-level response rate of 98% and the youth yield of about 1.2 eligible youths per cooperating housing unit. On average, we expected about 35% of these youth to be out-of-school and the remainder to be in-school youth. (Note most of these 459 DUs had older youths in the 17-21 years of age.)

Based on these assumptions, we expected to complete about 190 (= 459 x 1.2 x 0.35 x 0.98) out-of-school interviews per site from frame 1. However, these numbers, varied from site to site. We believed there were about 350 (= 459 x 1.2 x 0.65 x 0.98) in-school youth in these DUs, however, not all of them would be interviewed. We expected to interview only a fraction (proportional to the population of all in-school youth represented by frame 1) of the in-school youth.

Sampling from Frame 2 was similar to our original design except that we expected to release enough cases to obtain 110 out-of-school youth interviews. On average, we expected to screen approximately 1,500 DUs. Therefore we planned to only interview a fraction of the in-school youth. This fraction was proportional to the estimated population of in-school youths represented by Frame 2.

In reality, there were on average 746 DUs were in Frame 1 and almost all were fielded except for Oglala Sioux, SD where 600 of the 683 were fielded. Of the DUs fielded, 89% were occupied DUs and among the occupied DUs only about 47% had age eligible youth. As a result we were able find and interview only about 126 out-of-school youth, on average, in a site from

Frame 1. On average we found 323 in-school youth and interviewed about 199 from Frame 1 DUs.

Table 4 contains the distribution of the DU and youth sample for each of the PSUs in Frame 1. The DU response rate for Frame 1 was about 98% and the youth response rate was about 99%.

Table 4. Distribution of DU and youth sample in Frame 1

PSU	DU fielded	Occupied DUs	Eligible DUs sampled	Eligible DUs not sampled	Ineligible DUs	Number of in-school youth available	In-school youth sampled	Not-in-school youth sampled
Birmingham, AL	800	659	217	60	370	302	218	99
Chicot/Desha Co., AR	786	690	253	55	378	300	228	99
Tucson, AZ	610	566	187	62	300	242	152	112
Los Angeles, CA	879	854	296	173	372	530	281	193
San Diego, CA	778	736	221	78	428	314	196	144
San Francisco, CA	742	671	233	91	332	313	197	136
Imperial Co., CA	916	882	272	197	404	551	261	129
CIMC	219	210	90	35	76	128	76	65
Denver, CO	555	478	146	34	298	175	127	83
Hartford, CT	730	612	194	55	362	258	182	95
Tampa, FL	673	599	191	61	337	254	166	114
Albany, GA	739	679	217	72	384	280	187	115
Maui/Molakai, HI	561	527	272	38	212	360	298	141
Louisville, KY	746	646	211	46	369	227	163	119
Monroe, LA	966	893	277	171	439	470	223	172
Brockton, MA	870	801	243	163	382	471	222	151
Boston, MA	864	806	223	131	431	338	201	117
Baltimore, MD	531	452	202	9	234	146	135	128
Detroit, MI	687	585	205	61	312	283	199	115
Kansas City, MO	718	601	167	69	354	258	166	85
Robeson Co., NC	845	738	258	121	359	353	191	165
Buffalo, NY	957	804	253	124	400	379	218	130
Cleveland, OH	860	682	255	87	333	339	218	161
Portland, OR	764	690	199	45	442	257	191	93
Philadelphia, PA	693	628	234	65	300	292	192	135
Oglala Sioux, SD*	600	543	250	91	178	352	207	221
Memphis, TN	840	648	222	84	342	311	204	119
Houston, TX	676	619	221	70	327	301	203	127
San Antonio, TX	664	604	213	97	291	322	186	137
Seattle, WA	908	842	225	168	434	485	231	86
Milwaukee, WI	961	806	233	114	453	435	257	127
Average	746	663	222	88	343	323	199	126

*600 of the available 683 DUs were fielded

As a result of the shortfall in the out-of-school youth sample a larger number of DUs was fielded from Frame 2. On average 2,221 listed DUs from Frame 2 were fielded and only about 1,797 or 81% were actually occupied DUs, the rest accounted for bad listing plus vacant DUs. DU response rate in Frame 2 was 97% and youth response rate was better than 98%. On average we completed 140 out-of-school interviews from Frame 2. On average we found 359 in-school youth and interviewed about 119 from Frame 2 DUs.

Table 5. Distribution of DU and youth sample in Frame 2

PSU	DU fielded	Occupied DUs	Eligible DUs sampled	Eligible DUs not sampled	Ineligible DUs	Number of in-school youth available	In-school youth sampled	Not-in-school youth sampled
Birmingham, AL	1146	708	83	60	560	129	54	47
Chicot/Desha Co., AR	3981	3255	247	380	2567	584	84	204
Tucson, AZ	2188	1945	255	167	1401	410	165	201
Los Angeles, CA	1200	1125	130	193	710	320	60	113
San Diego, CA	2300	2133	213	258	1531	483	119	164
San Francisco, CA	2084	1698	177	141	1268	292	121	116
Imperial Co., CA	615	474	81	59	333	152	75	37
CIMC	683	627	287	88	179	372	250	214
Denver, CO	4500	3785	275	309	3185	628	204	160
Hartford, CT	3780	2724	255	350	2118	634	135	209
Tampa, FL	2499	2069	245	191	1593	410	143	194
Albany, GA	2200	1846	257	173	1372	386	155	187
Maui/Molokai, HI	381	251	28	15	200	46	25	14
Louisville, KY	2595	2122	292	181	1597	429	187	184
Monroe, LA	2000	1673	170	207	1289	373	95	135
Brockton, MA	2274	1991	195	267	1468	477	101	152
Boston, MA	3500	3068	222	347	2437	550	115	182
Baltimore, MD	2502	1896	269	62	1521	258	184	181
Detroit, MI	3200	2615	242	293	2028	522	129	184
Ottawa/Chippewa, MI	76	69	47	0	20	69	69	10
Kansas City, MO	4302	2968	254	223	2410	460	165	173
Robeson Co., NC	2400	1902	213	196	1491	370	120	141
Buffalo, NY	2126	1550	168	184	1111	334	105	101
Cleveland, OH	2189	1621	187	159	1261	279	92	156
Portland, OR	2714	2407	123	62	2218	204	125	39
Philadelphia, PA	1800	1464	213	129	1054	288	118	166
Oglala Sioux, SD*	500	393	16	47	219	183	106	90
Memphis, TN	2596	1929	185	195	1548	371	109	132
Houston, TX	2500	2009	228	244	1516	425	107	192
San Antonio, TX	1700	1457	209	118	1114	282	126	170
Seattle, WA	2495	2104	131	167	1692	336	107	69
Milwaukee, WI	2032	1618	184	265	1168	440	65	170
Average	2221	1797	190	179	1381	359	119	140

Overall we were able to complete, on average, about 302 in-school and about 255 out-of-school youth interview per site. Note that there were no follow-up surveys on three sites – Washington D.C., Cook Inlet in Alaska, and Chinle Agency of the Navajo nation. Ute Tribe in Colorado was again listed and sampled as it was a tiny site; we were able find 129 in-school and 93 out-of-school youth in Ute.

Data Collection and Estimation Methods

This section describes the methodology used to conduct the household survey of youth and to provide estimates and comparisons of youth employment, school enrollment, graduation rates, wages, welfare enrollment and idleness rates for the 36 Youth Opportunity (YO) grants as part of the Evaluation of the Evaluation of the Youth Opportunities Grantee Program. These estimates were derived principally from the results of the baseline and one followup household survey of sampled youth ages 14-21 who resided in one of the census tracts served by one of 36 grantees included in the evaluation. Of the 36 sites, 6 of the sites were Native American sites. The methodology for conducting the surveys in these sites sometimes differed from that used in the other sites. These differences are pointed out, where applicable throughout this section.

One of DOL's objectives for this study was to control the sample sizes of in-school and out-of school youths. Previous studies did not distinguish between the in-school and out-of school population for sampling purposes. The data collection plan for conducting the surveys called for completing a total of 600 interviews (300 in-school and 300 out-of-school) with age-eligible youth at 3 points in time: Year 1 (baseline), Year 2 (1^{st} followup) and Year 3 (2^{nd} followup) over a 5-year period.

The baseline survey was conducted in Year 1 as planned, however, following completion of this data collection, due to budgetary constraints, DOL eliminated the second followup survey scheduled to occur in year 5. Due to the large size of many of the sites, the baseline data collection required a two-stage design in which segments were sampled and listed first with households selected within the sampled segments. This process was lengthy and resource intensive, consequently, only one followup survey took place. The followup survey was conducted during year 4 of the study. The methodology for sampling households across the sites is described in the prior section of this appendix.

The baseline survey was conducted between December 2000 and September 2001 with the majority of the surveys completed by July 2001. I The followup survey took place between December 2002 and July 2003. In most instances surveys were conducted simultaneously across the 36 sites, however, surveys extended through September 2001 in some sites including several of the Native American sites. Most of the Native American sites experienced delays in start-up because data collection could not begin until negotiations with the local tribal councils were completed and final approvals to conduct the survey were obtained.

DIR and Westat hired and supervised all field staff for the study. Direct supervision of the data collection across the 36 sites was provided by 4 assistant field managers who supervised 36 site supervisors. Each site supervisor managed activities in a specific site including hiring and supervising the listers and interviewers responsible for conducting the survey activities. The site supervisors provided the day-to-day supervision and case management for all listers and field interviewers during the lisitng and interviewing phases of the study.

Data Collection

Each of the activities undertaken in order to plan and conduct the baseline and followup surveys are described in the following section. While most of the activities completed during the baseline survey were replicated during the followup survey, there were areas where changes occurred. Any differences in data collection procedures are noted and described.

The distinct tasks that were completed as part of the data collection included:

- Obtain and verify census tracts within the 36 sites
- Identify overlap with prior YES study
- Prepare maps
- Develop and modify survey instruments

- Train Field Staff
- Conduct Household Listings
- Conduct youth interviews
- Process survey data

The methodology used to complete each of these activities is described below.

Obtain and verify census tracts. DOL provided the study team with the census tracts for the majority of the 36 grantee sites. The census tracts were received by the end of August 2000. Tract information was verified with the grantees and problems resolved prior to beginning the listing phase of the study The exception was Native American sites where the boundaries of the reservation s were used.

Prior to conducting the YO surveys, Westat had conducted similar DOL funded Kulick grant area surveys of youth between 1996 and 2001 in several cities that were also included in the YO evaluation. Census tracts where listing had taken previously been completed during the earlier studies were not re-listed. Only new census tracts that were not included in the prior studies we listed as part of the YO survey. The sites where earlier listing activity had taken place included Los Angeles, Houston, Boston, Oakland, Detroit, Baltimore, and San Diego. The listing was designed to avoid overlap in census tracts within these sites that were included in both studies.

Prepare Maps. Prior to beginning the listing phase of the data collection, Westat produced computerized maps for each designated YO areas in the 36 sites. These maps documented all roads in the targeted communities and defined the geographic boundaries of the targeted areas. Westat's Mapping Department used a computer program provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census to generate maps. This program, the Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing file (TIGER) enables Westat to generate accurate and precise maps for each of the grantee sites. Using the boundaries for each site, the Mapping Department generated census tract, segment, and block maps for each YO area in the 36 sites. Listers used these maps to find a specific segment within the site. The segment maps showed only the area to be listed. Interviewers used these maps in conjunction with city maps to locate dwelling units to screen for the presence of age-eligible youth.

Train Field Staff. Thirty six field supervisors were trained during a supervisor training that occurred August 22-24, 2000 in Rockville MD. The purpose of the training was provide supervisors with training on the study procedures including use of the computerized field management system (FMS) that designed to track of data collection progress in that sites they supervised. Each supervisor received a laptop that had been loaded with the FMS system for their site. The FMS system allowed supervisors to keep tract of the status of the cases being worked by the listers and field interviewers whom they supervision. Supervisors were able to enter a specific case status for each sampled case and transmit that status electronically to Westat.

The supervisor's training included a train-the-trainers format wherein supervisors were trained on the listing and interviewing procedures and then conducted local training in their sites for listers and interviewers.

Supervisors trained listers to conduct the household listing process during a two-day session conducted in each of their respective communities. Lister training involves viewing a listing video tape, completing written exercises and practicing listing. The field supervisor supplemented the tape with additional examples and explanations including the fundamental concepts and basic procedures of listing, some of the problematic aspects of listing, and the procedures for working in rural areas.

The training video covered sampling, definitions of dwelling units, and essential forms and materials. Part of the lister training included going out into the community to practice listing in part of a segment that was not in the sampled area.

The supervisors also trained the field interviewers within their site. Project staff participated in most of these trainings. The purpose of the trainings was to instruct interviewers on using the screener and the interview. Following the training the interviewers were skilled in screening sampled households for the presence of age-eligible youth, obtaining parental consent and youth assent to conduct the interviews and conducting the interview. All field staff were recruited, hired and supervised by DIR or Westat.

Listing and Interviewing Phases

The baseline and followup surveys were conducted in two distinct phases: the listing phase and the interviewing phase. A detailed description of each of these phases follows.

Conduct Household Listing. Listing procedures were used to identify and record addresses of households within a specified area, generally within the boundaries of a segment. Except for some of the Native American sites, field staff listed all DUs in the 36 YOA project sites. In the larger sites, only a sample of the dwelling units were listed. The Current Population Survey (CPS) defines a dwelling unit or housing unit as a house, apartment, group of rooms, or a single room, occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters.

To assist with the listing process listers were given segment folders that contained a tract map, a segment map, and other important forms such as the Special Instructions and General Comments Form. In addition, listers received computer-generated listing sheets in the segment folder. A copy of the Special Instructions and General Comments Form is provided in as appendix x.

Listers canvassed or "cruised" the segment to verify boundaries, correct the segment map, if necessary, and check the number of DUs in the segment, making sure that all units in the block were listed. A separate line on the listing sheet was used to record each dwelling unit encountered.

As a rule, only one side of the street was listed at a time to ensure that listers moved through the segment covering all the streets and alleys in a systematic way. Listers drew arrows on the maps to document the direction that he or she went. During the listing process, listers also updated segment maps, deleted roads, corrected inaccurate boundaries, and added or correctedg road or street designations. The listing sheet line numbers that corresponded to the first and last DUs on each street or boundary were also recorded on the map.

During the interviewing phase interviewers used theses maps and listing sheets to locate the sampled DUs that were sampled.

During the baseline survey, listing began in September 2000 in the first 8 sites and was completed by x date, 2001. Listing for the followup survey took place during the same months. A total of 360 listers across the 36 sites completed the household listing for both the baseline and followup surveys. Listers received extensive training on listing techniques as part of a training conducted by their local supervisor prior to beginning listing.

All housing units in sites with less than 10,000 housing units were listed. Based on the estimate of the size of the site (based on the number of listed units) we would appropriately adjust the sampling interval to draw a random sample of housing units large enough to complete 600 interviews on average.

Some sites due to their isolation required modifications to our generalized listing procedures. For example, the Alaska Native villages are in isolated areas without ground transportation, only accessible by aircraft and waterways. (Describe what we did)

The listing phase was supplemented with listing data that was previously collected by Westat as part of the evaluation of YOA demonstration projects. Based on the prior work in these sites Westat avoided duplication of the listing phase by generating computerized listing sheets for these sites. In situations where there were segments that had been previously listed, field staff updated the existing listing sheets. The procedure for making updates to the listing sheets are described in appendix x. All new Census tracts that were included in the YO Grants evaluation were listed prior to sampling the households to be included in the screening and interviewing phases of the YO Grants study. A more detailed description of the mapping and listing process can be found in appendix x.

Native American Sites. Project staff worked closely with the YO program office, the grantee sites, and the tribal councils for the Native American sites to plan data collection in the 6 Native American sites participating in the study. Several sites were visited by management staff from DIR and Westat to discuss and plan appropriate data collection strategies for theses sites. In addition, many conference calls took place between tribal leaders and DOL officials during the planning phase of the study. These contacts provided valuable insights as to geography, location of dwelling units, gaining access to tribal lists and determining if completing a tribal census was an appropriate option. In several of the Native American sites, local residents were hired as listers, interviewers or escorts. In some Native American sites listing was not required because the Tribal Councils or some other entity was able to provide a complete listing of households.

Develop Survey Instrument. The youth household survey instrument was designed to gather information about employment, educational enrollment and attainment, graduation rates, wages, welfare receipt, and to some extent, crime among youth residents in the YO areas. The same instrument used during the YOA Youth Opportunity Area Demonstration (YOA4) survey was used to conduct the YO Grants baseline survey. DOL chose to use this instrument because had been approved by OMB through December 2002. Having this approval facilitated an early start-up of the household survey in 2000. Creating a new instrument would have required a lengthy OMB approval process.

Since only minor formatting changes to clarify instructions and improve skip patterns were made, the questions remained unchanged and no additional OMB clearance was needed. DOL did however submit new burden statements and other documentation because different age ranges and additional sites were being surveyed. (A copy of the baseline survey is included as appendix 4).

Followup Survey Instrument. The followup survey instrument included several new questions that were not part of the baseline survey. Questions were added to address awareness of and participation in the Youth Opportunities initiative and ask more in-depth questions about the experiences youth.

The following sections describe the mapping, listing, and survey procedures used to complete the YO Grants surveys. Included is a description of the procedures used to conduct the screening and youth surveys. Data preparation is described next, followed by a brief description of the data collection challenges encountered and how they were resolved.

Sampling

This section provides an overview of the sampling plan that was used to draw the sample of youth in the 36 sites.

Within household sampling. Field interviewers were trained to complete the within-household subsampling of youth using a “message” system whereby a a pre-printed “message” was attached to the screening questionnaire. Computer-generated sampling patterns were used that conformed to pre-designated sampling rates. The “message” appearing on the screener questionnaire corresponded to a particular sampling pattern. The message was used to indicate to the field interviewer how to subsample youth residing in the household based on the number of youth classified as in-school or out-of-school in the household. Interviewers used a standardized definition to determine whether to classify a youth into as in-school or out-of-school.

After the screening process was completed and the screening sample was designated, the youth were classified into two subdomains, those in school and those not in school. The proportions of households to be designated for sampling youth in each domain were r_1, and r_2 respectively. (These proportions were referred to as the household subsampling rates.) The screening process was used to locate more than enough in-school youth who were subsampled in all households. The sample was designed to yield the required number of out-of-school youth. The only situation where subsampling of the out-of-school youth was used was when there were more than two out-of-school youth in the household.

When subsampling was needed, a random number between 0 and 1was generated and compared to the required subsampling rates. If the random number for a subdomain was less than or equal to the subsampling rate for that subdomain, then that subdomain was designated for sampling in the given household.

When there were more than two eligible youth in the subdomain designated for sampling, only two youth were selected from among the eligibles. The interviewer selected the youth to be interviewed after using worksheets designed for this purpose. The worksheets contained random numbers. The interviewer provided the number of eligible youth and used a formula specified on the worksheet to randomly determine which youth should be sampled.

Sample was split into three or more waves and fielded later waves were released to the field based on the yield from the initial waves. The sizes of the samples provided for the later waves were adjusted accordingly. Once sample was released to the field for interviewing, it was completed to avoid biases. During the data collection period, the senior statistician monitored key parameters such as habitation/occupancy rates, response rates, and the number of youth per screened household. We carefully monitored the household eligibility rate (households with any youth) and the number of eligible youth per eligible household.

The project statistician, data collection managers, and assistant field managers monitored the sample yield weekly, based on information provided by the field supervisors. Decisions about whether to release the remaining wave(s) or a random subsample of new cases were made at the midpoint of the data collection period.

YO Survey Data

A household survey instrument was used to gather information about employment, educational enrollment and attainment, graduation rates, wages, and welfare receipt among youth residents in the YO areas. The baseline survey was conducted between November 2000 and August 2001 and the followup survey was conducted between December 2003 and August 2004. The instrument is based on questions from the Current Population Survey (CPS), which is designed and used to provide official U.S. labor force statistics. The CPS questions were intended to determine whether a person is currently employed, actively looking for work, temporarily laid off from work, neither working nor looking for work, or unemployed. In addition to questions based in the CPS instrument, the YO instrument contained questions to gather basic demographic information on all respondents. The contents of the baseline survey are summarized below:

- Was the interview completed by a respondent or a proxy?
- Gender

- Ethnicity
- Language spoken at home
- Facility with English
- Age and birth date
- Country of birth
- Year of arrival in the U.S. if born elsewhere
- Marital status
- Parenthood status
- If receives public assistance, which type?
- Enrollment in school; type of school
- Highest grade completed in school
- Has high school diploma or GED?
- Activities last week, including working or not
- If absent from a job or business last week, why?
- Hours worked last week at all jobs; usual hours worked at main job
- Name of company or employer, and type of business
- Duties on the job
- Hourly earnings
- If looking for work: for how many weeks?; for full-time or part-time job?; search strategies
- If not employed and not looking for work, why not?

The survey asked youth if they were enrolled in school. However, because the survey period included summer months, a summer version of the instrument asked about school enrollment for the period prior to summer break. This was done to ensure comparability across months of the interview wave and to consistently identify youth as enrolled or not enrolled in school.

For the follow-up interview, several questions were added to the baseline instrument to capture information about youth participation in the YO program, and in any programs that assist them:

- In looking for a job
- With counseling for personal problems, or problems with alcohol or drugs
- In preparation for a GED exam

The survey also asked for the name of the program, how often attended, and a ranking of the usefulness of the program. A copy of the followup instrument is provided in Appendix 4.

The baseline data collection involved the 36 YO target areas that received YO grants. The areas were located in different parts of the country, most in urban areas, some in rural areas, and a few in Native American tribal areas or Alaskan villages. Data collection for the follow-up period was conducted in only 33 of the areas.

Participation in YO. Question 25 of the followup survey asked if the youth ever visited any of the named YO centers on a card used for the interview. If they answered yes, then Question 26 asked if the youth visited the YO center to participate in any of the listed activities. If the youth answered yes to any of the activities listed between 26a-26g, then they were asked additional questions (27-29) about the frequency of the participation and were asked to rank the helpfulness of the activities. If the answer to Question 25 was not yes, then questions 26-29 were skipped.

Participation in Programs. Questions 30, 31 and 32 asked if the youth received assistance from an organization in looking for a job, for counseling for personal or alcohol/drug problems, and for preparation for a GED exam. The organization identified could have been a YO center or any other organization that served youth in the community.

APPENDIX 3

WEIGHTING AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Appendix 3 – Weighting and Design Considerations

Weighting and Post-stratification of Survey Data

YO survey data were weighted to accomplish the following objectives:

- To make it possible to produce population estimates for each site;
- To compensate for the disproportionate sampling of in-school versus out-of-school youth;
- To reduce biases due to possible differences between non-respondents and respondents; and
- To compensate for possible non-coverage in the sample because of limitations in the sampling frame or for other reasons.

The samples were drawn independently in each site, using a multistage probability design. The weighting was also done by site. The process of weighting involved the calculation of base weights (the inverse of the overall probabilities of selection), non-response adjustments, and benchmark adjustments (by post-stratification).

Baseline Household Weights

Small sites

In small sites, housing units were selected with equal probability at the first stage. Youth were selected from eligible households at the second stage. A non-response adjusted household weight was applied to interviews completed by members of each household, using a household base weight and a non-response adjustment factor.

A household base weight (or inverse of selection probability) was calculated as N/n, where N is the total number of housing units listed and n is the number of housing units sampled.

The household base weight was inflated to account for non-response among the occupied dwelling units. In small sites it was assumed that non-response occurred at random across the site. Consequently, the non-response adjustment factor is the ratio of the total number of occupied households to the number of responding occupied households.

That is, if the sample of n households had n* occupied households and if among the occupied households n** responded, the non-response adjustment factor is n*/n**.

The non-response adjusted household weight is (n*/n**) x (N/n).

Note: a DU was not occupied due to either the DU did not exist because of listing error, out-of-scope, uninhabitable, or vacant. Retirement communities, dormitories and other group quarters, institutions such as prison were considered out-of-scope.

Large Sites

In large sites, the Census blocks were grouped together to form a cluster of neighboring blocks or "segments," such that each segment had at least 120 housing units according to 1990 Census data. As necessary, large blocks were evenly divided (or "chunked") into multiple pieces. An appropriate number of segments and chunks was selected to yield about 10,000 housing units per site.

In the first stage of selection, a sample of segments and chunks was chosen with a probability proportional to size (PPS). At the second stage, a PPS sample of housing units was selected from within the segments. At the third and final stage, youth were selected from the eligible households. The measure of size at each stage was designed such that all housing units in the target area had nearly equal probability of selection.

The sampling at each stage is conditionally independent. Therefore, the overall probability of selecting a particular household is the product of the conditional probability of selecting segments (and chunks) and households within segments. If P1 is the selection probability of a segment, P2 is the conditional probability of selecting a chunk within the segment, and P3 is the conditional probability of selecting a particular household within a chunk, then the household base weight is given by 1/(P1 x P2 x P3).

The household base weights were adjusted for non-response. Segments were chosen as the non-response adjustment cells. We assumed that non-response within a segment occurred at random. The total value of the base weights of non-responding occupied households were distributed among the responding occupied households.

Native American Sites

Native American sites were of two types (for weighting purposes) – small sites or sites where youth were directly sampled. The household weighting for small sites was same as before.

The sites where youth lists were used directly to get to the eligible household the household base weight was set to 1. Note that the sum of the base weights of the sample add up to estimated total eligible households.

Baseline Youth Weights

The survey was designed to obtain equal numbers of interviews with in-school and out-of-school youth. Given the relatively small numbers of out-of-school youth, all such youth in eligible households were chosen to be interviewed. Consequently, the youth base weight (or inverse of youth selection probability) for an out-of-school youth is same as the household weight adjusted for household non-response.

Only a fraction of the available in-school youth was needed. For in-school youth, the base weight is the household weight, after adjusting for non-response, multiplied by an "In-school Retention Factor" to account for the eligible youth not retained for the interview. The In-school Retention Factor is the ratio of the sum of the weights of all households with eligible youth to the sum of the weights of all households in which an in-school youth was asked to complete a questionnaire.

The youth base weights were adjusted for youth-level nonresponse. The weights of non-responding youth were distributed to the responding youth according to whether they were in school or out of school.

Baseline Under-coverage and Post-stratification

We compared the number of youth reported in Census 2000 data with similar estimates obtained from the youth surveys in YO sites, by age category. These comparisons revealed that, in most sites, estimates of population sizes obtained from the survey data were lower than Census counts, especially for youth ages 18 and older.

We then calibrated (or poststratified) the YO survey to match Census totals (non-institutionalized population only). In general, the average youth survey weight in a post-stratification cell was inflated by a factor approximately equal to the ratio of Census count to the survey weighted count.

Although poststratification helped to reduce any bias in survey estimates resulting from differential coverage and nonresponse, biases may still exist to the extent that missed persons have different characteristics from those of responding persons of the same age.

Poststratification was not done in few sites due to either there were no comparable population totals (control totals) from Census sources (mainly for Native American sites) or the study abandoned (in Washington D.C.) the follow-up survey. No poststratification was done for

7 sites -- Washington D.C., Cook Inlet of Alaska, Chinle Agency of Navajo Nation, CIMC, Ute Tribe, Grand Traverse, Oglala Sioux.

It was decided that weights be calibrated by gender, age, and race/ethnicity to the extent possible. In order avoid small[7] postratification cells it was necessary to form age groups instead of single ages. The sample was grouped into 3 age groups -- 14-15, 16-18, and 19-21 years of age.

There were 9 sites that had only one race/ethnicity or not enough sample size to form more than one race category. For these sites race was not used in poststratfication. These sites were Birmingham, Tucson, San Diego, Imperial Valley, Albany, Baltimore, Cleveland, Memphis, San Antonio.

There were 20 sites that had sizeable sample to form two race categories. But, none had enough sample to form more than two race categories in both baseline and follow-up samples. The two-race category varied from site to site, as follows:

- In Molakai, HI a youth was categorized as either AHPI mixed race or not.
- In Los Angeles, San Francisco, Denver, and Houston a youth was either Hispanic or non-Hispanic,
- In the remaining 15 sites a youth was either Black or non-Black.

[7] Poststratification cells should be large to allow the algorithm to converge, avoid large weights and hence improve precision. The suggested cell size is at least 30. However, in some homogeneous sites (i.e. sites with small variation in weights before poststratification) the minimum cell size was lowered to as small as 10. The final weights were checked to see there was no loss in precision due to poststratification.

Development of control totals for poststratification

Most YO sites were defined by census tracts based on 1990 decennial census. We mapped the 1990 tracts into 2000 tracts. Between the two decennial censuses there were many changes – merges, splits, revisions, and renumbering. It was a challenge to cleanly define the YO sites in terms of the 2000 tracts. There were about 500 tracts among the 29 sites that needed poststratification. Except for 42 tracts there was a clear relationship between 1990 and 2000 tracts. Of the 42 "contaminated" tracts a decision was made to treat a 2000 census tract as in-scope only if about 95% of the tract population was deemed to be YO population. Based on this decision about 19 of the 42 contaminated tracts were found to be in-scope.

The baseline control totals were constructed from the 2001 population estimates by the Census Bureau. Their estimates were available at county-level and the YO sites were defined by sub-county (tract) level. The sub-county estimates were derived by the synthetic ratio method as described in Oosse (2004)[8]. That is, ratios were derived for the sub-county population to county population based on the 2000 decennial census[9] and applied to the 2001 county population estimates.

There were some challenges due to not-so-clear definition of race/ethnicity between the YO and Census Bureau, and the age groupings for 2001 census estimates were slightly different from the YO age groupings. We made some assumptions to bridge the race categories and age groupings. For example, we grouped native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders with Asian, grouped "some other race" and "two or more races" with "other" and reallocated "other" among the four non-Hispanic race categories.

There was one other wrinkle in developing the control totals, namely, the adjustment for group quarters and institutional population which was out of scope. We assumed that the difference between total population and household population as the out of scope for YO study although in the fielding we treated retirement communities as out-of-scope. Again synthetic ratios of household population to total population were developed from 2000 census for the bridged age and race groupings. These ratios were applied to the control totals to correct for out-of-scope population.

[8] Oosse, M. 92004) Evaluation of April 1, 2000 School District Population Estimates based on the Synthetic ratio methods. U.S. Bureau of Census. Population Division Working Paper no. 74, June 2004.
[9] Census Bureau's SF-1 provided 2000 census data by tract, single year of age, race, and Hispanic origin.

Follow-up Household Weights

A dual-frame approach was used to draw the follow-up sample – Frame 1 containing eligible responding households (either youth sampled or not) from baseline Frame 2 containing both non-sampled DUs from baseline and new constructions.

In Frame 1 the household base weight was simply the baseline non-response adjusted weight. In Frame 2, the household base weight was the inverse of the probability of selection. The non-response adjustment for base weight was separately done for the two samples. The process of nonresponse adjustment was similar to baseline.

Follow-up Youth Weights and Poststratification

The follow-up youth weighting was also similar to baseline. The Main difference was in usage of a different data source (2003 sub-county population estimates were used instead of 2001) for control total development.

APPENDIX 4

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

OMB No. 1205-0373
Approval expires 12/31/02

YO GRANTS SURVEY SCREENER

SCREENER LABEL GOES HERE

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is _________________. I'm working for DIR and WESTAT on a study of Youth Employment for the US Department of Labor. (I'd like to speak to someone living here who is at least 14 years old).

First, I need to list all the people who live here, including any who stay here only once in a while and have no other home or are away at school, in the military, in prison; or in a youth detention center. Any responses to this survey will remain strictly confidential. Your name will not be released.

Please tell me each person's first and last name.

Lets start with you. What's your first and last name? ENTER REFERENCE PERSON'S NAME ON LINE 1. (And what is the name of the next oldest person who lives here?)

1. LIST ALL PERSONS IN COLUMN B AND ASK C, D, AND E FOR EACH PERSON.
   - IF NO ONE IN HOUSEHOLD IS AGED 14 –21, CIRCLE "0" IN Q. 2 BELOW, THANK AND TERMINATE.

A	B	C	D	E
Per s #	**Name**	**Age at Last Birthday**	**Relationship to Reference Person**	**Living Here or Elsewhere**
		How old (were you/was NAME) on (his/her) last birthday?	What is (NAME's) relationship to you? (USE CODES BELOW.)	Does (NAME) live here or somewhere else? (Where does (Name) live? (USE CODES BELOW.)
01			Reference Person	Here…………..1
02				Here…………... 1 __________ 2
03				Here…………... 1 __________ 2
04				Here…………... 1 __________ 2
05				Here…………... 1 __________ 2
06				Here…………... 1 __________ 2
07				Here…………... 1 __________ 2

COLUMN D RELATIONSHIP CODES

Person #01 is always the Reference Person (Respondent)

HUS = Husband
WIF = Wife
CHD = Child or Stepchild
GCH = Grandchild
PAR = Parent
SIB = Brother or Sister

COLUMN E LOCATION CODES

Person #01, the Reference Person, will always be living "here" in the household

COL = College
MIL = Military
PRI = Prison
DET = Youth Detention Center
OTH = Other (SPECIFY)

ORE = Other Relative
NRE = Non-Relative

TOTAL ELIGIBLE YOUTH

2. HOW MANY PERSONS ARE AGE-ELIGIBLE FOR ADMINISTRATION OF A YOUTH SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE?

   NONE …………………..…. 0 ONE …………………..…. 1 TWO ………………… 2

   THREE …..………………..… 3 FOUR …………………4 FIVE …………………5

3. OBTAIN TELEPHONE # ________________________

OFFICIAL USE ONLY *ELIGIBLE IN **ELIGIBLE OUT
TOTALSAMP (Circled) ___ ___ ___

PROBE: IN SCHOOL/OUT OF SCHOOL?

4. REFER TO THE **HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION** TABLE ON PAGE 2. RECORD ALL AGE ELIGIBLE YOUTH UNDER THE **IN SCHOOL BOX** OR THE **OUT OF SCHOOL BOX** LISTED BELOW. ASK:

   IS YOUTH # _____ ENROLLED IN SCHOOL?
   YES………..1 IF YES, PROBE: WHAT TYPE OF SCHOOL (REFER TO "**SCHOOL TYPE**" **CARD**, THEN RECORD IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX)
   NO…………2 (RECORD IN THE **OUT OF SCHOOL BOX**)

TABLE OF AGE ELIGIBLE YOUTH

IN SCHOOL BOX			OUT OF SCHOOL BOX	
YOUTH #	**YOUTH'S FULL NAME**		**YOUTH #**	**YOUTH'S FULL NAME**

AFTER COMPLETING TABLE ABOVE, CHECK THE LABEL IN FRONT AND VERIFY WHO SHOULD BE INTERVIEWED:

ELIGIBILITY BOX MESSAGE ON LABEL STATES
(CIRCLE ONE)
1. INTERVIEW ALL YOUTH ………………………..…1

2. INTERVIEW IN SCHOOL YOUTH ………..………..2
3. INTERVIEW OUT OF SCHOOL YOUTH ………….3

5. IF **1** IS CIRCLED IN THE **ELIGIBILITY BOX** ABOVE, ARRANGE TO CONDUCT AN INTERVIEW WITH EACH YOUTH LISTED ABOVE.

   IF **2** IS CIRCLED IN THE **ELIGIBILITY BOX** ABOVE, ARRANGE TO CONDUCT AN INTERVIEW WITH EACH YOUTH LISTED IN THE IN SCHOOL BOX.

   IF **3** IS CIRCLED IN THE **ELIGIBILITY BOX** ABOVE, ARRANGE TO CONDUCT AN INTERVIEW WITH EACH YOUTH LISTED IN THE OUT OF SCHOOL BOX.

IF YOUTH NOT AVAILABLE, ARRANGE TO INTERVIEW A HOUSEHOLD MEMBER PROXY. BE SURE TO INCLUDE THOSE WHO ARE AWAY AT COLLEGE, IN THE MILITARY, IN PRISON, IN A YOUTH DETENTION CENTER, AWAY ON BUSINESS, ETC.

SCREENER LABEL GOES HERE

6. ENTER RESULT CODE(S) ON SCREENER. RECORD ALL CALLS.

CONTROL CARD

Result of Contacts

	DAY	DATE	TIME	RESULT CODES	COMMENTS
SCREENER					
QUEX # 1 R's 1st NAME					
QUEX #2 R's 1st NAME					

QUEX #3 R's 1st NAME					
QUEX #4 R's 1st NAME					

Interim Result Codes		Final Result Codes	
02	No Action	30	Complete – no youth selected
03	Appointment	31	Complete – youth selected
04	Not home	32	Not home (max calls)
05	DU not located	33	Final Refusal
06	Unavailable	35	Final Vacant
07	Refusal	36	Age ineligible
08	Broke Appt.	37	Not a DU
09	Language Problem	38	Other (specify in comments)
10	Vacant		
13	Other (Specify in comments)		

"SCHOOL TYPE" CARD

	IN SCHOOL	**OUT OF SCHOOL**
MIDDLE SCHOOL	X	
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	X	
HIGH SCHOOL	X	
2-YEAR COLLEGE	X	
4-YEAR COLLEGE	X	
GED	X	
SCHOOL FOR DEAF	X	
SPECIAL EDUCATION	X	
HOME SCHOOL	X	
PROBATION SCHOOL/ WORK RELEASE	X	
COLLEGE TYPE NOT KNOWN; COULD BE BUSINESS SCHOOL	X	
VOCATIONAL OR TECHNICAL SCHOOL: YOUTH DOES NOT HAVE HIGH SCHOOL	X	

DIPLOMA		
VOCATIONAL OR TECHNICAL SCHOOL: YOUTH HAS HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA		X
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE		X
JOB TRAINING (e.g., JTPA, STRIVE, etc.)		X
LIFE SKILLS		X

HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION TABLE (CONTINUED)

A	B	C	D	E
Pers #	**Name**	**Age at Last Birthday**	**Relationship to Reference Person**	**Living Here or Elsewhere**
		How old (were you/was NAME) on (his/her) last birthday?	What is (NAME's) relationship to you? (USE CODES BELOW.)	Does (NAME) live here or somewhere else? (Where does (Name) live? (USE CODES BELOW.)
08				Here…………... 1 ______________
09				Here…………….. ______________ 2
10				Here…………... 1 ______________ 2
11				Here…………... 1 ______________ 2
12				Here…………... 1 ______________ 2
13				Here…………... 1 ______________ 2
14				Here…………... 1 ______________ 2
15				Here…………... 1 ______________ 2
16				Here…………... 1 ______________ 2

17				Here………….. 1 ______________ 2
18				Here………….. 1 ______________ 2
19				Here………….. 1 ______________ 2
20				Here………….. 1 ______________ 2

TOTAL ELIGIBLE YOUTH (CONTINUED)

3. HOW MANY PERSONS ARE AGE-ELIGIBLE FOR ADMINISTRATION OF A YOUTH SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE?

SIX ………………………….. 6   SEVEN ………………..… 1   EIGHT ……………… 8

NINE ……..…………….…. 3   TEN ……………………..4   OTHER ………… _____

SCREENER LABEL GOES HERE

CONTROL CARD (CONTINUED)

Result of Contacts

	DAY	DATE	TIME	RESULT CODES	COMMENTS
QUEX # 5 R's 1st NAME					
QUEX # 6 R's 1st NAME					

QUEX #7 R's 1st NAME					
QUEX #8 R's 1st NAME					
QUEX #9 R's 1st NAME					

Interim Result Codes		Final Result Codes	
02	No Action	30	Complete – no youth selected
03	Appointment	31	Complete – youth selected
04	Not home	32	Not home (max calls)
05	DU not located	33	Final Refusal
06	Unavailable	35	Final Vacant
08	Refusal	36	Age ineligible
08	Broke Appt.	37	Not a DU
11	Language Problem	38	Other (specify in comments)
12	Vacant		
13	Other (Specify in comments)		

OMB No. 1205-0373
Approval expires 12/31/02

Label goes here

BASELINE YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SURVEY

conducted by

Decision Information Resources, Inc.
2600 SW Freeway, Suite 900
Houston, TX 77098

Westat, Inc.
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

for

Employment and Training Administration
United States Department of Labor

am
Time start________pm

YO GRANT'S HOUSEHOLD YOUTH SURVEY

COMPLETE ONE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EACH SAMPLED PERSON IN THIS HOUSEHOLD AGES 14-21, INCLUDING THOSE TEMPORARILY AWAY AT COLLEGE, ON BUSINESS, ON VACATION, OR IN A LOCAL JAIL/JUVENILE INSTITUTION.

SURVEY WAS COMPLETED BY: (CHECK BOX)

☐ DIRECT INTERVIEW WITH YOUTH

☐ PROXY INTERVIEW - WHAT IS THE YOUTH'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE PROXY (USE RELATIONSHIP CODE FROM HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION)

____
YOUTH'S RELATIONSHIP TO PROXY

1. GENDER (FROM OBSERVATION):

ELIGIBLE YOUTH IS MALE.. 1

ELIGIBLE YOUTH IS FEMALE 2

2. (Do you consider yourself/Does YOUTH consider him/herself):

American Indian or Alaska Native,.............................. 5

Asian,.. 4

Black or African American,... 2

Hispanic or Latino, ... 3

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,................... 7

White?... 1

OTHER (SPECIFY) __________________________ 6

3. What language (do you/does YOUTH) usually speak at home?

ENGLISH... 1 (4)
SPANISH... 2
CHINESE 3
VIETNAMESE 4
OTHER (SPECIFY) _________________________ 5

(a)

a. How well (do you/does YOUTH) speak English?

Very well, ... 1

Well, ... 2

Not very well, or... 3

Not at all? 4

4. What is (your/YOUTH'S) age and birth date? |___|___| |___|___| |___|___|19|___|___|
AGE MO DAY YR

5. In what country (were you/was YOUTH) born? _______________ (If born in USA, record USA here and go to Q.7)
COUNTRY OF BIRTH

6. When did (you/YOUTH) first arrive in the U.S? |___|___|___|___|
YR

7. What is (your/YOUTH'S) marital status?
(IF LIVING TOGETHER, OBTAIN FORMAL MARITAL STATUS.

Single and never married,.. 1

Married (living with spouse),... 2

Married (spouse temporarily living elsewhere) 3

Separated, ... 4

Divorced, or 5

Widowed?.. 6

OTHER (SPECIFY) ____________________________ 7

8. (Do you/Does YOUTH) have any children, including children not living with (you/him/her)?

YES 1

NO 2

9. (Are you/Is YOUTH) currently enrolled in school?

YES 1

NO 2 (10)

a. What type of school?

Middle school, junior high school, ... 1
High school, ... 2
GED program, ... 3 (11)
Two-year community college, ... 4
Four-year college or university? 5
OTHER (SPECIFY)________________________________ 6

10. (Do you/Does YOUTH) have a high school diploma?

YES 1 (10.b)

NO 2

a. (Do you/Does YOUTH) have a GED?

YES 1

NO 2

b. (Have you/Has YOUTH) ever attended college?

YES 1

NO 2

11. What is the highest grade (you/YOUTH) <u>completed</u> in school?

8TH GRADE OR LESS..............01
9TH GRADE 02
10TH GRADE 03
11TH GRADE 04
12TH GRADE 05

1 YEAR OF COLLEGE...................06
2 YEARS OF COLLEGE 07
3 YEARS OF COLLEGE 08
4 YEARS OF COLLEGE 09
MORE THAN 4 YEARS OF
COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY..........10

12. What (were you/was YOUTH) doing most of last week: (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

IF ANSWER INCLUDES “a. Working”, SKIP TO Q.16.

a. Working, ... 01

b. With a job but not working, ... 02

c. Looking for work, ... 03

d. Keeping house, ... 04

e. Going to school, or 05

f. Unable to work? 06

g. OTHER (SPECIFY) ______________________________ 07

____

13. Did (you/YOUTH) do any work at all last week not counting work around the house?

YES 1 (16)

NO 2

14. Did (you/YOUTH) have a job or business from which (you were/YOUTH was) temporarily absent or on layoff last week?

YES 1

NO 2 (23)

15. Why (were you/was YOUTH) absent from work last week?

$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text{(Your own/YOUTH'S) illness, ... 01}\\ \text{On vacation, ... 02}\\ \text{Bad weather, ... 03}\\ \text{Labor dispute, ... 04}\\ \text{New job to begin within 30 days, ... 05}\\ \text{Temporary layoff (under 30 days), ... 06}\\ \text{Indefinite layoff (30 days or more, or no definite recall date)? .... 07}\\ \text{OTHER REASON (SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 08}\end{array}\right\}\text{(17)}$

____

Appendix 4 – Survey Questionnaires

16. How many hours did (you/YOUTH) work last week at all jobs?

______________ # HOURS WORKED

17. For whom (do you/does YOUTH) work? (Name of company, business, organization or other employer.)

______________ EMPLOYER/COMPANY NAME

18. What kind of business or industry is this? (For example: TV and radio mfg., retail shoe store, State Labor Dept.)

______________ BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY

19. What kind of work (are you/is YOUTH) doing? (For example: nurse, stock clerk, typist, farmer.)

______________ KIND(S) OF WORK

20. What (are your/is YOUTH'S) most important activities or duties at this job? (For example: types, keeps account books, files, sells cars, operates printing press, finishes concrete.)

____

____

______________ MOST IMPORTANT DUTIES

21. How many hours (do you/does YOUTH) usually work in a week at this job?

______________ # HOURS WORKED

22. How much (do you/does YOUTH) earn per hour?

$______________ HOURLY WAGE

23. (Have you/Has YOUTH) also been looking for work in the past 4 weeks?

YES 1

NO .... 2 (23.d, top of page 7)

a. (Have you/Has YOUTH) been looking for full-time or part-time work?

PART-TIME 1

FULL-TIME 2

b. For how many weeks (have you/has YOUTH) been looking?

____
WEEKS LOOKING

c. What (have you/has YOUTH) been doing in the last 4 weeks to find work?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

CHECKED WITH:

1. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AGENCY 1
2. PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCY................................ 2
3. EMPLOYER DIRECTLY 3
4. FRIENDS OR RELATIVES 4
5. PLACED OR ANSWERED ADS 5
6. OTHER (SPECIFY) ________________________________ 6

____

(24)

23. (continued)

d. What are the reasons (you are /YOUTH is) not looking for work? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. Do not believe there is any work available in the line or work or area, ... 01
2. Couldn't find any work, ... 02
3. Lack necessary schooling, training, or experience, 03
4. Employers think (you are/YOUTH is) too young to get a job, ... 04
5. Ill health or physical disability, ... 05
6. Can't arrange child care, ... 06
7. Family responsibilities, ... 07
8. In school or other training? 08
9. OTHER (SPECIFY) 09
10. Currently employed……………………………………….10
11. DON'T KNOW 98

24. Does (your/YOUTH'S) family receive any form of public assistance, such as food stamps, unemployment benefits, or AFDC or TANF benefits?

YES.. 1

NO .... 2 (Thank and end)

a. Which type: (INDICATE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. AFDC or TANF (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families),.. 01
2. Food Stamps,.. 02
3. Unemployment Compensation,.............................. 03
4. SSI,... 04
5. General assistance or home relief, or 05
6. Energy assistance?... 06
7. OTHER (SPECIFY) ________________________ 07

Thank you very much. These are all the questions I have. My supervisor may want to get in touch with you to check on my work. May I have your telephone number?

____

am

RESPONDENT'S TELE. # **Time Ended**_______**pm**

_____/_____/______ ______________________

INTERVIEWER'S INITIALS DATE COMPLETED

OMB No. 1205-0373
Approval expires 10/31/06

Label goes here

FOLLOWUP YOUTH EMPLOYMENT SURVEY

conducted by

Decision Information Resource, Inc.
2600 SW Freeway, Suite 900
Houston, TX 77098

Westat, Inc.
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

for

Employment and Training Administration
United States Department of Labor

What you tell us will remain strictly confidential and you don't have to answer any questions that you don't want to answer. This voluntary information has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget under OMB approval number 1205-0373, expiring 10/31/2006. The estimated burden time for the survey is 15 minutes. Without this approval, we would not be able to conduct this survey. If you have any questions regarding this estimate or any other aspect of this data collection, including suggestions for reducing this burden please contact the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Policy Development, Evaluation and Research, Room S-4231, Washington, D.C. 20210 (Paperwork Reduction Project 1205-0373).

Time start________am / pm

YO GRANT'S HOUSEHOLD YOUTH SURVEY

COMPLETE ONE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EACH SAMPLED PERSON IN THIS HOUSEHOLD AGES 14-21, INCLUDING THOSE TEMPORARILY AWAY AT COLLEGE, ON BUSINESS, ON VACATION, OR IN A LOCAL JAIL/JUVENILE INSTITUTION.

SURVEY WAS COMPLETED BY: (CHECK BOX)

- ☐ DIRECT INTERVIEW WITH YOUTH
- ☐ PROXY INTERVIEW - WHAT IS THE YOUTH'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE PROXY (USE RELATIONSHIP CODE FROM HOUSEHOLD ENUMERATION)

____
YOUTH'S RELATIONSHIP TO PROXY

1. GENDER (FROM OBSERVATION):

   ELIGIBLE YOUTH IS MALE 1

   ELIGIBLE YOUTH IS FEMALE 2

2. (Do you consider yourself/Does YOUTH consider him/herself):

American Indian or Alaska Native, ... 5

Asian, ... 4

Black or African American, ... 2

Hispanic or Latino, ... 3

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, ... 7

White? 1

OTHER (SPECIFY) ____________________________ 6

3. What language (do you/does YOUTH) usually speak at home?

ENGLISH	1	(Go to Q4)
SPANISH	2	(Go to Q3a)
CHINESE	3	
VIETNAMESE	4	
OTHER (SPECIFY) ____________________________	5	

3a. How well (do you/does YOUTH) speak English?

Very well, ... 1

Well, ... 2

Not very well, or 3

Not at all? 4

4. What is (your/YOUTH'S) age and birth date? |___|___| |___|___| |___|___|19|___|___|
AGE MO DAY YR

5. In what country (were you/was YOUTH) born? _______________ (If born in USA, record USA here and go to Q7)
COUNTRY OF BIRTH

6. When did (you/YOUTH) first arrive in the U.S? |___|___|___|___|
YR

7. What is (your/YOUTH'S) marital status?
(IF LIVING TOGETHER, OBTAIN FORMAL MARITAL STATUS.

Single and never married, ... 1

Married (living with spouse), ... 2

Married (spouse temporarily living elsewhere) 3

Separated, ... 4

Divorced, or 5

Widowed? 6

OTHER (SPECIFY) ____________________________ 7

8. (Do you/Does YOUTH) have any children, including children not living with (you/him/her)?

YES 1

NO 2

9. (Are you/Is YOUTH) currently enrolled in school?

YES 1

NO .... 2 (Go to Q10)

9a. What type of school?

Middle school, junior high school, ... 1

High school, ... 2

GED program, ... 3 (Go to Q11)

Two-year community college, ... 4

Four-year college or university? 5

OTHER (SPECIFY)________________________________ 6

10. (Do you/Does YOUTH) have a high school diploma?

YES .... 1 (Go to Q10b)

NO 2

10a. (Do you/Does YOUTH) have a GED?

YES 1

NO 2

10b. (Have you/Has YOUTH) ever attended college?

YES 1

NO 2

11. What is the highest grade (you/YOUTH) <u>completed</u> in school?

8TH GRADE OR LESS..............01
9TH GRADE 02
10TH GRADE 03
11TH GRADE 04
12TH GRADE 05
1 YEAR OF COLLEGE...................06
2 YEARS OF COLLEGE 07
3 YEARS OF COLLEGE 08
4 YEARS OF COLLEGE 09
MORE THAN 4 YEARS OF
COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY..........10

12. What (were you/was YOUTH) doing most of last week: (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

IF ANSWER INCLUDES “a. Working”, SKIP TO Q.16.

a. Working,.. 01

b. With a job but not working,.. 02

c. Looking for work,.. 03

d. Keeping house,.. 04

e. Going to school, or... 05

f. Unable to work? 06

g. OTHER (SPECIFY) ________________________________ 07

____

13. Did (you/YOUTH) do any work at all last week not counting work around the house?

YES .... 1 (Go to Q16)

NO 2

14. Did (you/YOUTH) have a job or business from which (you were/YOUTH was) temporarily absent or on layoff last week?

YES 1

NO .... 2 (Go to Q23)

15. Why (were you/was YOUTH) absent from work last week?

(Your own/YOUTH'S) illness, ... 01

On vacation, ... 02

Bad weather, ... 03

Labor dispute,... 04

New job to begin within 30 days, ... 05 (Go to Q17)

Temporary layoff (under 30 days),...................................... 06

Indefinite layoff (30 days or more, or no definite recall date)? 07

OTHER REASON (SPECIFY) ________________________ 08

Appendix 4 – Survey Questionnaires

16. How many hours did (you/YOUTH) work last week at all jobs?

____
HOURS WORKED

17. For whom (do you/does YOUTH) work? (Name of company, business, organization or other employer.)

____
EMPLOYER/COMPANY NAME

18. What kind of business or industry is this? (For example: TV and radio mfg., retail shoe store, State Labor Dept.)

____
BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY

19. What kind of work (are you/is YOUTH) doing? (For example: nurse, stock clerk, typist, farmer.)

____
KIND(S) OF WORK

20. What (are your/is YOUTH'S) most important activities or duties at this job? (For example: types, keeps account books, files, sells cars, operates printing press, finishes concrete.)

____

____

____
MOST IMPORTANT DUTIES

21. How many hours (do you/does YOUTH) usually work in a week at this job?

____
HOURS WORKED

22. How much (do you/does YOUTH) earn per hour?

$________________________
HOURLY WAGE

23. (Have you/Has YOUTH) also been looking for work in the past 4 weeks?

YES 1

NO .... 2 (Go to Q23d, top of page 7)

23a. (Have you/Has YOUTH) been looking for full-time or part-time work?

PART-TIME 1

FULL-TIME 2

23b. For how many weeks (have you/has YOUTH) been looking?

____
WEEKS LOOKING

23c. What (have you/has YOUTH) been doing in the last 4 weeks to find work?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

CHECKED WITH:

1. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AGENCY 1
2. PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCY................................. 2
3. EMPLOYER DIRECTLY 3
4. FRIENDS OR RELATIVES 4
5. PLACED OR ANSWERED ADS 5
6. OTHER (SPECIFY) ________________________________ 6

____

(Go to Q24)

23. (continued)

23d. What are the reasons (you are /YOUTH is) not looking for work? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. Do not believe there is any work available in the line or work or area, ...01
2. Couldn't find any work, ...02
3. Lack necessary schooling, training, or experience, 03
4. Employers think (you are/YOUTH is) too young to get a job,...04
5. Ill health or physical disability, ...05
6. Can't arrange child care, ...06
7. Family responsibilities, ...07
8. In school or other training? 08
9. OTHER (SPECIFY) 09
10. Currently employed……………………………………..10
11. DON'T KNOW 98

24. Does (your/YOUTH'S) family receive any form of public assistance, such as food stamps, unemployment benefits, or AFDC or TANF benefits?

YES 1

NO...2

24a. Which type: (INDICATE ALL THAT APPLY)

1. AFDC or TANF (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families), ..01
2. Food Stamps, ...02
3. Unemployment Compensation, ...03
4. SSI,...04
5. General assistance or home relief, or....................05
6. Energy assistance? 06
7. OTHER (SPECIFY)________________________ 07

Now I would like to ask you a few questions about activities you may have participated in during the last 12 months.

25. (Have you/ HAS YOUTH) ever visited any of the following centers? (READ YO CENTER NAMES FROM CARD)

YES..................1 (Go to Q26)	
NO ....2 (Go to Q30)	
DON'T KNOW..3 (Go to Q30)	

26. Did you visit (NAME OF YO CENTER) to participate in any of the following activities:

Activity	Yes	No
a. Sports/recreation activities	1	2
b. A mentoring program	1	2
c. Life skills training (PAYING BILLS, GROCERY SHOPPING, HOW TO GET A TELEPHONE SERVICE)	1	2
d. After school tutoring	1	2
e. Job Readiness Training (JRT) (HOW TO APPLY F WITH APPLICATIONS, WHAT CLOTHES TO WEAR INTERVIEW, OR HOW TO RELATE TO PEOPLE ON	1	2
f. A college prep or SAT prep program	1	2
g. To get a referral for an internship, or job shadowing	1	2
h. To get a referral for some other services SPECIFY ______________________________	1	2
i. For some other reason SPECIFY _______________________________	1	2

IF NO TO ALL, GO TO Q30

IF YES TO QUESTIONS 26A THROUGH 26G, ASK QUESTIONS 27a – 27g, 28a – 28g and 29a-29g FOR EVERY ACTIVITY IN WHICH RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED.

IF YES ONLY TO 26h OR 26i, GO TO Q30.

27. On average, how many times a week did you participate (at YO center) in:

ACTIVITY	ONE PER WEEK	TWO PER WEEK	THREE PER WEEK	FOUR PER WEEK	FIVE PER WEEK
a. Sports/recreation activities	1	2	3	4	5
b. A mentoring program	1	2	3	4	5
c. Life skills training	1	2	3	4	5
d. After school tutoring	1	2	3	4	5
e. Job Readiness Training (JRT)	1	2	3	4	5
f. A college prep or SAT prep program	1	2	3	4	5
g. An internship, or job shadowing	1	2	3	4	5

28. In the last 12 months, about how many months did you visit this Center to participate in:

ACTIVITY	1-3 MONTHS	4-6 MONTHS	7-9 MONTHS	10-12 MONTHS
a. Sports/recreation activities	1	2	3	4
b. A mentoring program	1	2	3	4
c. Life skills training	1	2	3	4
d. After school tutoring	1	2	3	4
e. Job Readiness Training (JRT)	1	2	3	4
f. A college prep or SAT prep program	1	2	3	4
g. An internship, or job shadowing	1	2	3	4

29. Were these activities very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not helpful at all?

ACTIVITY	VERY HELPFUL	SOMEWHAT HELPFUL	NOT HELPFUL AT ALL
a. Sports/recreation activities	1	2	3
b. A mentoring program	1	2	3
c. Life skills training	1	2	3
d. After school tutoring	1	2	3
e. Job Readiness Training (JRT)	1	2	3
f. A college prep or SAT prep program	1	2	3
g. An internship, or job shadowing	1	2	3

30. In the last 12 months, did any organization or program assist (you/YOUTH) in looking for a job?

YES	1 (Go to Q30a)
NO	2 (Go to Q31)
DON'T KNOW	3 (Go to Q31)

30a. What is the name of the organization or program that helped you?

____
NAME OF ORGANIZATION

30b. Did you find a job with the help of this organization or program?

YES	1 (Go to Q30c)
NO	2 (Go to Q31)

30c. Was the job paid employment?

YES	1
NO	2

31. In the last 12 months, did (you/YOUTH) participate in any counseling sessions to help (you/YOUTH) with personal problems, or with problems related to the use of alcohol or drugs?

YES	1 (Go to Q31a)
NO	2 (Go to Q32)
DON'T KNOW ..	3 (Go to Q32)

31a. How many counseling sessions did you have, in the last 12 months?

____
NUMBER

31b. What organization or program provided these counseling sessions?

____
NAME OF ORGANIZATION

31c. Were these sessions very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not helpful at all?

VERY HELPFUL..............	1
SOMEWHAT HELPFUL ...	2
NOT HELPFUL AT ALL	3

32. In the last 12 months, did (you/YOUTH) attend any classes or tutoring sessions to prepare for a GED exam?

YES	1 (Go to Q32a)
NO	2 (End interview)
DON'T KNOW	3 (End interview)

32a. On average, how many times a week did you attend classes or tutoring sessions?

Once a week	1
Twice a week	2
Three times a week	3
Four times a week	4
Five times a week	5

32b. In the last 12 months, for how many weeks did you attend classes or tutoring sessions?

____
NUMBER OF WEEKS

32c. What organization or program provided these classes or sessions?

____
NAME OF ORGANIZATION
(SEE CARD WITH LIST OF YO CENTERS)

32d. Were these classes/sessions very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not helpful at all?

VERY HELPFUL	1
SOMEWHAT HELPFUL	2
NOT HELPFUL AT ALL	3

Thank you very much. These are all the questions I have. My supervisor may want to get in touch with you to check on my work. May I have your telephone number?

________________________ **am**

RESPONDENT'S TELE. # **TimeEnded________pm**

________________________ ______/_____/______
INTERVIEWER'S INITIALS DATE COMPLETED

APPENDIX 5

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED USING ACS DATA AND DECENNIAL CENSUS DATA FOR TWO ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON GROUP APPROACHES

Appendix 5—Problems Encountered in Using ACS Data and Decennial Census Data for Two Alternative Comparison Group Approaches

Two additional comparison groups were selected by the Center for Labor Market Studies for use in estimating the impacts of the YOG programs. The first consists of matched neighborhoods within the same cities as the urban YO sites and the second consists of matched Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Communities (EZ/EC) that were not operating a YO program to serve as comparison sites. Similar to the central city high poverty neighborhood and the matched national census tract comparison group methodologies, the YO program impacts were to be estimated utilizing the double difference approach. Changes in key education and labor market outcome variables in the comparison sites between 2000 (T1) and 2003-2004 (T2) were to be estimated by a comparison of ACS findings for the years 2003 and 2004 combined with those prevailing at the time of the 2000 Census. These changes would then be compared with those from the baseline (T1) and follow-up (T2) surveys for the YO program sites. Impact estimates for each outcome variable would be calculated as follows, using the employment rate for out-of-school 16- to 21-year-olds as an example:

$$\text{Impact} = (\text{EMPRATE}_{\text{YO T2}} - \text{EMPRATE}_{\text{YO T1}}) - (\text{EMPRATE}_{\text{COMP T2}} - \text{EMPRATE}_{\text{COMP T1}})$$

Where:

$_{\text{YO T1}}$ = the YO sites in the Year 2000-2001 (YO baseline survey)
$_{\text{YO T2}}$ = the YO sites in the Year 2003-2004 (YO follow-up survey)
$_{\text{COMP T1}}$ = the comparison sites in the Year 2000 (2000 decennial census)
$_{\text{COMP T2}}$ = the comparison sites in the years 2003 and 2004 (2003 and 2004 ACS combined).

Although the comparison groups that were selected for the analysis using the within city and the EC-EZ approach were very closely matched with the YO sites, we could not estimate the impacts of YO programs using these comparison groups because of a series of problems with the ACS and the decennial census data. A description of the underlying problems with these two data sources is presented in this section. There are three major problems with the 2000 decennial census and 2003-2004 ACS special tabulations data. A summary of the number of census tracts with each problem and the total number of problems in the census tracts that compose the within-city comparison groups and the EC/EZ comparison groups is presented in Table 1.

1. Suppression of the 2000 decennial census data for some youth groups that failed to meet the minimum population threshold set by the Disclosure Review Board to protect confidentiality of respondents.

The 2000 decennial census data and the 2003-2004 combined ACS data were obtained by CLMS staff as special tabulations from the U.S. Census Bureau since the data for many of the tabulations and subgroups were not available on the public use data files. Separate requests for special tabulations were made for the decennial census data and the ACS data. The special tabulations request from the 2000 decennial census data was made prior to the selection of the within-city and the EC-EZ matched comparison group tracts. As a result, the special tabulations request was made at the census tract level and not for the entire comparison area. If any cell in a special tabulation did not meet the direct minimum population threshold or the population threshold that is set to prevent identification of data for small subgroups of the population, then the data for that census tract were suppressed to protect the confidentiality of the respondents to the decennial census. This criterion resulted in the suppression of data for 11 out of the 389 census tracts that composed the within-city comparison groups and 56 out of the 546 census tracts that compose the EC/EZ comparison groups for 23 urban YO sites. In other words, no data were made available for those census tracts that failed to meet the suppression thresholds.

In addition to the loss of data for certain census tracts, the suppression of the decennial census data for certain census tracts also made the decennial census data less comparable with the ACS data. The ACS special tabulations request was made after the comparison sites were selected. As a result, the ACS data were requested for the entire comparison neighborhoods and not for individual census tracts. Consequently, the ACS special tabulations data, that are subject to the same suppression criteria, [10] were not suppressed because of the larger geographic areas for which the special tabulations were requested.

2. Inconsistencies in the definition of census tracts that straddle city boundaries.

In our request for special tabulations data for the within city comparison groups, we had asked the Census Bureau to restrict the data to the city in which the YOG sites are located. In cases where a census tract straddled the boundary of the city, the decennial census special tabulations staff only included the portion of the census tract that was within the city boundary whereas the ACS special tabulations staff included data for the entire census tract. There were 13 census tracts that straddled the boundaries of the YO cities for which we requested special tabulations. These 13 tracts were located in 6 YO cities. As a result of the inclusion of the entire census tract for the 13 straddling tracts, we estimated that the number of 14-21 year olds included in these tracts based upon the ACS definition (including the entire census tract) was about 60 percent higher than the number from the decennial census definition (including only that portion of the census tract that lies within the city boundary).

3. Census tracts with zero sample observations in the ACS data.

The original research design was based upon the scheduled full implementation of the ACS in 2003 which was subsequently delayed until 2005. Consequently, the ACS data for 2003 and 2004 were based upon a much smaller than expected sample, and some census tracts were entirely excluded from the survey sample. The existence of zero sample census tracts was yet another factor that further reduced the degree to which the ACS data were comparable with the decennial census data. Out of the 546 census tracts that composed the EC/EZ comparison sites, 29 census tracts had no data because they were excluded from the sample for the 2003 and 2004 ACS. Our special tabulations request for the 23 within-city comparison sites was based upon the sum of 389 census tracts out of which 5 census tracts were excluded from the ACS sample during the two years.

[10] A request of ACS special tabulations data at the census tract level would have led to more widespread suppression of the data because of the smaller sample sizes of the ACS surveys for 2003 and 2004.

Table 1:
A Summary of the Problems Encountered in the Special Tabulations Data from the 2000 Decennial Census and the 2003-2004 ACS Surveys

	Within-City Comparison Group Data	EC/EZ Comparison Group Data
Total number of census tracts in comparison areas for 23 urban YO sites	389	546
1. Census tracts with suppressed data from the 2000 decennial census	11 (2.8%)	56 (10.3%)
2. Census tracts that straddle the boundaries of cities with YO programs	13 (3.3%)	Not applicable (not required to be within city boundaries)
3. Census tracts with a zero sample in the 2003-2004 ACS	5 (1.3%)	29 (5.3%)
Total number of problems in comparison group census tracts	29 (7.5%)	85 (15.6%)

Potential Solutions

The first problem of suppression of the 2000 decennial census data could be addressed by placing another request for special tabulations data with a more aggregated geography similar to the one that we submitted for special tabulations from the 2003-2004 ACS. Unfortunately, there is a possibility of suppression of the 2000 Census data even at the aggregate level. This could happen if the Disclosure Review Board determines that our possession of the tract level data for the same areas could violate the confidentiality requirements because it is possible to use the two data sources to deduce data for small subgroups of the population. We are unable to determine the extent to which such data suppression problems will arise until the DRB actually reviews the new special tabulations request. If some additional suppression of data is imposed, then we would have to revisit the problem and estimate the extent of data suppression and determine whether it would require another request of special tabulations data from the 2003-2004 ACS that would exclude the census tracts that are subject to the new data suppression decisions.

A solution to the second problem would involve resubmitting the ACS special tabulations data request so that they provide us with data for only the portion of the census tract that lies within the city boundaries. The other option would be to bundle into the resubmitted request from the 2000 decennial census, the new definitions of census tracts that straddle city boundaries to match the definitions used in the 2003-2004 ACS special tabulations data, i.e., include the entire census tract and not just the portion that lies within the city boundary.

The third problem involves census tracts that were not sampled in the 2003-2004 ACS. The only solution to this problem is to modify the request that we would resubmit for special tabulations from the 2000 decennial census data. The new request would exclude all the census tracts that were excluded from the 2003-2004 ACS samples.

The tasks needed to carry out the above assignments would require significant time and financial resources. Moreover, the removal of some of these census tracts could compromise the quality of the comparison groups, particularly in some sites since the problems are not evenly distributed across all sites. In addition, the removal of some census tracts will further reduce the already small ACS samples upon which our analysis and estimates of program impacts would be based. This would reduce the precision of the estimates and remove the possibility to perform some of the subgroup level analysis. We unfortunately cannot determine the true extent of these problems until the Census Bureau had carried out the above requested tasks.

APPENDIX 6

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR CENSUS TRACT GROUP PROPENSITY ANALYSIS

Appendix 6 – Technical Specifications for Census Tract Group Propensity Analysis

Appendix A. Methodology for Combining Single Ages into Combined Age Groups

The propensity group analysis was done by individual age. This ensured that age was controlled for in the estimates of YO effect. It was considered important to do this, due to the difference in the age distributions of the baseline and follow-up YO samples that resulted from the sample selection methodology. For example, re-visiting households in 2004 that were surveyed in 2001 would result in an older group of young people in the sample, if the same family resided there in 2001 and 2004.

However in order to facilitate comparison with the results of other analyses, the YO effects were also calculated for the following age groups: 14-15 years, 16-18 years, and 19-21 years. The grouped age estimates of YO effect were derived from the individual age effects, by weighting these effects by the proportion of the age group falling into each individual age. This proportion varied for ACS and YO, and baseline and follow-up surveys, so the proportion used was the average of these four distributions.

The table below shows the calculation of the YO effect on the percentage Not in School, for 16-18 year olds. The YO effect for individual ages is weighted by "Avge Propn" to get an average effect for this age group. That is,

$$Average\_effect = (p_1 A + p_2 B + p_3 C),$$

where p_1= average proportion aged 16 years,
p_2= average proportion aged 17 years,
p_3= average proportion aged 18 years,
A = YO Effect for 16 year olds,
B = YO Effect for 17 year olds, and
C = YO Effect for 18 year olds.

	YO Effect					Proportions				
AGE	on Not in School	Variance	95% CI	CI Low	CI High	YO W1	YO W2	ACS W1	ACS W2	Avge Propn
16	0.84	7.23	5.27	-4.43	6.11	0.35	0.30	0.34	0.34	0.33
17	2.94	7.40	5.33	-2.39	8.27	0.33	0.36	0.34	0.34	0.34
18	0.17	7.36	5.32	-5.15	5.49	0.32	0.34	0.32	0.32	0.33
16-18	1.34	2.45	3.06	-1.73	4.40					

The average effect, along with its variance and 95% confidence interval and upper and lower confidence interval limits, are shown in the last row of the table. The age group variance is calculated assuming independence of the individual age estimates, using the following formula:

$$Var(p_1 A + p_2 B + p_3 C) = p_1^{\,2} Var(A) + p_2^{\,2} Var(B) + p_3^{\,2} Var(C)$$

Appendix B. YO Effect Estimates by Individual Age

Table B1 YO Effect Estimates by Individual Age

	Age group							
Outcome Measure[2]	**14**	**15**	**16**	**17**	**18**	**19**	**20**	**21**
Rate employed or enrolled	-0.24	0.46	5.35 *	5.89 *	3.68	6.76	-11.50 *	5.60
Labor force participation rate	N/A	N/A	0.84	2.94	0.17	1.03	-3.47	0.54
Employment to population ratio	N/A	N/A	0.84	-1.30	-1.56	-0.02	-8.80 *	-1.19
Unemployment Rate	N/A	N/A	-4.04	3.21	2.02	0.26	8.52 *	2.14
10th grade or less	N/A	N/A	1.44	0.63	-2.40	-2.72	-1.51	-5.09 *
11th grade	N/A	N/A	0.24	2.23	7.65 *	5.41 *	-0.34	0.21
12th grade	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-0.25	-0.25	0.83	1.45
HS Graduate with Less than 1 year of college	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-2.69	0.18	-0.71	-4.40
One or more years of college	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-2.03	2.15	7.19 *
Not in school	0.09	0.56	-3.14 *	-5.39 *	-6.53 *	-5.47 *	-4.21	-5.89 *
In secondary school	-0.24	0.46	4.65 *	7.36 *	10.49 *	4.44 *	N/A	N/A
HS graduate not in college	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.77	-0.88	1.25	-1.07
HS graduate in college	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-4.83 *	2.17	0.43	6.55 *

Appendix 6B

Appendix C. YO Sample Sizes for baseline and follow-up, by propensity group and demographic subgroup

Table C1 YO sample size at baseline

		Propensity group					
Domain Variable	Variable Level	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Age	Age 14	275	376	295	465	504	1,915
	Age 15	288	429	307	424	468	1,916
	Age 16	307	418	332	441	510	2,008
	Age 17	322	407	343	469	544	2,085
	Age 18	373	523	470	578	597	2,541
	Age 19	380	514	438	558	614	2,504
	Age 20	418	515	445	580	642	2,600
	Age 21	379	449	420	526	524	2,298
Race/ethnicity	White[1]	916	477	187	156	99	1,835
	Black[1]	901	1,271	1,509	2,478	3,343	9,502
	Hispanic	692	1,130	1,256	1,233	833	5,144
	Other	233	753	98	174	128	1,386
Sex	Male	1,415	1,802	1,485	1,985	2,057	8,744
	Female	1,327	1,829	1,565	2,056	2,346	9,123
All		2,742	3,631	3,050	4,041	4,403	17,867

[1]Hispanics excluded

Appendix 6C

Table C2 YO sample size at follow-up

		Propensity group					
Domain Variable	**Variable Level**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Total**
Age	Age 14	218	278	272	391	418	1,577
	Age 15	206	289	270	369	398	1,532
	Age 16	216	321	270	390	443	1,640
	Age 17	321	420	380	471	567	2,159
	Age 18	338	475	413	562	672	2,460
	Age 19	345	432	417	558	579	2,331
	Age 20	338	369	367	456	536	2,066
	Age 21	307	369	338	418	506	1,938
Race/ethnicity	White[1]	728	336	122	109	92	1,387
	Black[1]	844	1,061	1,316	2,219	3,087	8,527
	Hispanic	554	878	1,184	1,111	797	4,524
	Other	163	678	105	176	143	1,265
Sex	Male	1,223	1,482	1,346	1,828	2,024	7,903
	Female	1,066	1,470	1,381	1,787	2,095	7,799
All		2,289	2,953	2,727	3,615	4,119	15,703

[1]***Hispanics excluded***

Appendix D. Population Size Estimates for YO and ACS, at baseline and follow-up, by propensity group and demographic subgroup

Table D1 YO population size estimates at baseline

		Propensity group					
Domain Variable	**Variable Level**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Total**
Age	Age 14	2,268	3,399	4,204	5,317	5,536	20,724
	Age 15	2,352	3,533	4,298	5,038	5,285	20,507
	Age 16	2,316	3,401	4,133	4,762	5,421	20,033
	Age 17	2,168	3,120	3,873	4,747	5,069	18,977
	Age 18	2,111	3,252	4,279	4,464	4,608	18,714
	Age 19	2,558	3,422	4,348	4,632	5,122	20,084
	Age 20	2,656	3,540	4,210	4,218	5,217	19,840
	Age 21	2,331	2,634	3,810	3,639	3,815	16,229
Race/ethnicity	White[1]	6,715	3,408	1,396	1,407	976	13,901
	Black[1]	5,048	9,286	13,255	21,042	28,028	76,658
	Hispanic	5,186	10,693	17,559	12,989	9,872	56,299
	Other	1,811	2,916	945	1,380	1,199	8,250
Sex	Male	9,553	13,005	16,802	18,585	19,038	76,985
	Female	9,206	13,297	16,352	18,231	21,036	78,123
All		18,760	26,302	33,155	36,817	40,075	155,108

[1]Hispanics excluded

Appendix 6D

Table D2 YO population size estimates at follow-up

		Propensity group					
Domain Variable	**Variable Level**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Total**
Age	Age 14	2,315	3,544	4,785	5,540	6,303	22,488
	Age 15	2,076	3,385	4,873	5,411	5,781	21,525
	Age 16	1,809	2,887	3,866	4,190	5,403	18,154
	Age 17	2,453	3,415	5,026	4,601	6,487	21,982
	Age 18	2,211	3,256	4,459	4,813	6,141	20,880
	Age 19	2,259	3,244	4,450	4,994	5,509	20,456
	Age 20	2,080	2,437	3,580	3,731	4,760	16,588
	Age 21	1,908	2,405	3,266	3,289	4,127	14,994
Race/ethnicity	White[1]	5,895	2,423	1,213	970	994	11,495
	Black[1]	5,334	8,914	13,386	21,925	31,069	80,628
	Hispanic	4,613	10,438	18,575	12,151	11,169	56,946
	Other	1,271	2,798	1,130	1,521	1,278	7,998
Sex	Male	8,954	11,832	17,077	18,505	22,009	78,377
	Female	8,159	12,729	17,226	18,062	22,501	78,678
All		17,113	24,572	34,303	36,567	44,510	157,067

[1]Hispanics excluded

Table D3 ACS population size estimates at baseline

		Propensity group					
Domain Variable	**Variable Level**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Total**
Age	Age 14	281,340	199,805	112,835	65,075	40,510	699,570
	Age 15	271,260	210,665	117,895	66,865	42,155	708,835
	Age 16	275,270	200,575	109,215	59,970	38,705	683,740
	Age 17	264,860	208,155	108,520	66,870	40,985	689,385
	Age 18	252,625	188,225	109,210	55,080	39,525	644,665
	Age 19	267,415	208,020	93,890	56,460	40,435	666,225
	Age 20	343,515	209,665	112,525	49,465	38,315	753,480
	Age 21	339,980	212,110	122,870	50,330	51,305	776,595
Race/ethnicity	White[1]	872,575	252,120	76,630	32,155	10,605	1,244,085
	Black[1]	533,170	528,595	382,290	251,175	211,340	1,906,565
	Hispanic	681,085	721,110	361,490	159,890	89,035	2,012,610
	Other	209,440	135,395	66,550	26,895	20,960	459,235
Sex	Male	1,173,165	821,505	435,290	238,290	172,820	2,841,075
	Female	1,123,105	815,715	451,670	231,820	159,115	2,781,425
All		6,888,805	4,911,660	2,660,880	1,410,340	995,810	16,867,490

[1]Hispanics excluded

Appendix 6D

Table D4 ACS population size estimates at follow-up

		Propensity group					
Domain Variable	**Variable Level**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**Total**
Age	Age 14	303,258	223,981	117,993	65,628	44,259	755,119
	Age 15	281,654	195,645	110,345	73,982	46,687	708,313
	Age 16	257,889	207,438	109,835	57,655	43,977	676,789
	Age 17	265,517	198,876	103,000	54,571	47,462	669,425
	Age 18	249,077	193,704	110,974	48,591	38,145	640,492
	Age 19	252,557	195,379	99,076	49,469	30,054	626,536
	Age 20	322,883	220,170	106,117	58,457	38,721	746,348
	Age 21	335,514	222,382	104,131	57,498	35,658	755,179
Race/ethnicity	White[1]	841,718	231,485	70,993	25,025	8,371	1,177,592
	Black[1]	545,179	567,299	368,826	221,100	197,438	1,899,842
	Hispanic	702,142	742,675	348,582	186,934	100,442	2,080,770
	Other	179,315	116,110	73,074	32,789	18,713	420,001
Sex	Male	1,170,354	835,580	423,833	238,558	155,495	2,823,818
	Female	1,097,996	821,990	437,643	227,289	169,468	2,754,382
All		6,805,053	4,972,714	2,584,422	1,397,546	974,890	16,734,606

[1]Hispanics excluded

Appendix E. YO Effect Estimates for each outcome, by propensity group and demographic subgroup

Table E1 YO Effect Estimates for the Rate Employed or Enrolled

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 14	0.04	-0.16	-0.65	-0.53	-0.05
	Age 15	-1.26	2.64	1.67	-1.16	-2.47
	Age 16	2.50	-1.97	11.07 *	14.82 *	3.93
	Age 17	11.76	4.67	-0.90	-3.06	20.62 *
	Age 18	1.78	-0.51	4.72	6.27	8.37
	Age 19	-3.53	10.80	19.28 *	-3.22	6.83
	Age 20	7.58	-7.74	-30.82 *	-3.94	-7.79
	Age 21	8.42	9.83	0.84	9.11	-2.72
Race/ethnicity	White[2]	4.36	-16.93	-8.09	-27.67	-20.96
	Black[2]	-3.91	6.62	-0.05	8.98	2.27
	Hispanic	10.65	4.14	2.87	-3.42	5.26
	Other	-10.64	-1.61	13.03	4.82	-7.15
Sex	Male	9.37	6.57	4.14	2.19	-0.17
	Female	-5.03	-2.54	-2.47	1.08	3.12

*[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.*
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Appendix 6E

Table E2 YO Effect Estimates for Labor Force Participation Rate

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	Level of Domain variable					
Age	Age 16	-4.48	-3.55	0.10	18.61 *	-0.39
	Age 17	2.70	6.16	-3.27	7.24	0.62
	Age 18	-0.14	1.92	-6.01	4.31	3.85
	Age 19	1.67	-1.65	5.00	-5.02	4.48
	Age 20	-2.27	-0.73	-10.11	-1.00	-1.49
	Age 21	2.48	-2.53	2.23	-3.17	-0.36
Race/ethnicity	White²	-2.70	-11.48	-10.78	-3.33	-42.08 *
	Black²	2.15	4.59	2.88	4.94	8.94 *
	Hispanic	0.14	0.03	-7.47	0.58	-4.85
	Other	-0.63	-11.50	8.73	-17.23	6.74
Sex	Male	3.45	3.73	-2.43	3.79	5.43
	Female	-4.39	-5.26	-2.54	0.96	0.56

[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Appendix 6E

Table E3 YO Effect Estimates for Employment to Population Ratio

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 16	-1.67	-3.31	0.94	11.06 *	1.40
	Age 17	-2.20	0.53	-5.66	-1.87	4.20
	Age 18	-8.28	-6.19	-1.62	5.11	8.50
	Age 19	-1.97	-0.35	7.83	-6.83	2.36
	Age 20	3.44	-8.12	-21.91 *	-10.23	-17.62 *
	Age 21	-2.06	0.28	-1.31	2.79	-7.04
Race/ethnicity	White²	-3.42	-14.41 *	-13.62	-11.56	-45.34 *
	Black²	-0.54	4.35	0.38	3.68	5.33
	Hispanic	-0.80	-5.51	-7.46	-2.81	-5.72
	Other	-6.58	-13.01 *	-0.54	-6.83	6.76
Sex	Male	2.48	0.36	-4.20	-1.30	-1.15
	Female	-7.95 *	-8.20 *	-4.25	-0.49	1.32

[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Table E4 YO Effect Estimates for Unemployment Rate

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 16	0.98	2.68	-4.75	-22.80 *	-9.10
	Age 17	3.67	3.24	8.48	12.93	-17.98
	Age 18	11.39	11.49	-5.57	-6.64	-16.47
	Age 19	4.13	-2.51	-6.37	4.80	0.53
	Age 20	-7.29	9.92	20.85 *	13.10	25.99 *
	Age 21	4.93	-1.90	3.33	-8.89	9.62
Race/ethnicity	White[2]	1.92	10.42	8.06	14.14	31.02
	Black[2]	1.94	-4.93	1.17	-5.62	-3.97
	Hispanic	0.57	9.48 *	4.11	5.78	4.41
	Other	11.85	10.15	10.02	-11.12	-2.15
Sex	Male	-0.12	3.54	4.66	4.66	7.26
	Female	6.09	7.90	3.65	-0.59	-4.17

[1]*Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.*
[2]*Hispanics excluded.*

Appendix 6E

Table E5 YO Effect Estimates for the percentage with highest education of 10th Grade or less

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 16	-1.97	1.11	-0.07	5.19	6.16
	Age 17	8.97	-4.90	0.12	3.45	-6.60
	Age 18	0.91	-2.78	-5.31	-2.19	-1.87
	Age 19	-6.77	-0.76	-2.07	-2.08	-0.65
	Age 20	-1.80	-4.28	0.56	7.56	-10.17
	Age 21	-6.38	-6.43	-0.12	-5.03	-9.74
Race/ethnicity	White²	0.68	0.81	-2.40	18.41	1.50
	Black²	-4.52	-2.02	-2.88	0.31	-9.08 *
	Hispanic	-1.77	-0.50	3.74	3.46	-5.37
	Other	3.14	5.57	-3.68	-16.77	4.94
Sex	Male	-4.07	0.21	4.67	3.33	-7.08
	Female	1.33	-1.22	-3.57	-1.50	-7.31

[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Appendix 6E

Table E6 YO Effect Estimates for the percentage with 11th Grade as highest education

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 16	2.42	-0.64	2.23	-1.13	-4.50
	Age 17	-1.49	4.82	2.29	-2.29	8.65
	Age 18	13.53 *	8.90	3.39	6.99	3.50
	Age 19	3.37	8.34 *	6.17	-2.81	10.60
	Age 20	-5.65	-1.60	10.88 *	-6.91	2.02
	Age 21	-0.34	1.35	-2.33	-3.72	8.60
Race/ethnicity	White[2]	2.19	6.05 *	2.54	-5.46	4.51
	Black[2]	2.63	3.38	2.05	0.00	4.01
	Hispanic	4.33	2.70	6.51 *	-0.37	6.03
	Other	-2.94	4.21	-0.93	13.25	0.11
Sex	Male	4.70 *	2.76	2.05	1.51	3.13
	Female	1.12	4.28 *	4.68 *	-0.46	5.49

[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Appendix 6E

Table E7 YO Effect Estimates for the percentage with 12th Grade as highest education

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	Level of Domain variable					
Age	Age 18	0.20	0.53	0.38	-3.80	-1.71
	Age 19	1.99	-0.16	-6.02 *	4.17	-2.96
	Age 20	3.67 *	1.26	-1.28	-1.61	-3.98
	Age 21	3.03 *	0.76	-3.96	3.52	3.74
Race/ethnicity	White²	0.47	-0.89	1.92	-0.80	-13.82
	Black²	0.21	0.08	-0.08	1.14	-0.05
	Hispanic	2.52	0.45	-3.64 *	-0.01	4.60
	Other	0.46	-0.20	0.19	-2.25	-1.96
Sex	Male	1.43	0.33	-2.52 *	0.16	-0.01
	Female	0.55	-0.23	-0.48	0.59	1.44

¹Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
²Hispanics excluded.

Table E8 YO Effect Estimates for the percentage HS Graduates or those with some college, but less than one year

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 18	-10.93	-6.25	3.11	-0.66	3.73
	Age 19	3.92	-2.51	-1.02	3.16	-3.99
	Age 20	-2.02	1.64	-1.44	-2.98	0.92
	Age 21	-10.67	-5.20	-0.12	-2.22	-2.32
Race/ethnicity	White[2]	-3.87	1.80	3.09	-9.27	2.75
	Black[2]	0.91	-0.68	1.49	-3.17	2.55
	Hispanic	-5.38	-3.50	-5.10	0.13	-4.96
	Other	-0.73	-9.31	-1.62	2.68	10.46
Sex	Male	-3.41	-2.17	-4.00	-5.09	1.29
	Female	-2.45	-2.55	1.83	2.51	0.47

[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Appendix 6E

Table E9 YO Effect Estimates for the percentage with one or more years of college education

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 19	-2.50	-4.90	2.96	-2.45	-3.00
	Age 20	5.81	2.97	-8.72	3.94	11.18
	Age 21	14.36	9.51	6.52	7.47	-0.27
Race/ethnicity	White[2]	0.53	-7.77	-5.14	-2.89	5.12
	Black[2]	0.77	-0.77	-0.58	1.72	2.57
	Hispanic	0.30	0.85	-1.50	-3.19	-0.29
	Other	0.08	-0.26	6.03	3.08	-13.57
Sex	Male	1.35	-1.13	-0.20	0.10	2.68
	Female	-0.55	-0.29	-2.46	-1.14	-0.09

[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Appendix 6E

Table E10 YO Effect Estimates for the percentage not in school

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 14	-0.37	0.16	0.65	0.53	0.06
	Age 15	1.95	-1.24	-1.77	2.26	4.54
	Age 16	-3.70	-0.87	-7.99 *	-0.89	-0.35
	Age 17	-8.66 *	-5.47	-5.04	2.19	-10.72 *
	Age 18	-7.75	-2.92	-8.86	-5.59	-7.67
	Age 19	-5.03	-6.70	-8.84	-3.38	-1.84
	Age 20	-3.57	-8.01	6.16	-0.27	-20.46 *
	Age 21	-5.72	-6.82	-6.30	-8.51	-0.12
Race/ethnicity	White²	-6.57	0.50	-5.70	15.20	-18.14
	Black²	2.32	-3.10	-3.80	-3.37	-2.46
	Hispanic	-9.31 *	-6.17	-5.51	0.73	-5.47
	Other	2.26	-4.88	-12.11	-6.66	14.47 *
Sex	Male	-5.82 *	-4.19	-4.77	-0.30	-1.38
	Female	-2.65	-4.52	-5.23 *	-2.78	-4.90

¹Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
²Hispanics excluded.

Appendix 6E

Table E11 YO Effect Estimates for the percentage in secondary school

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 14	0.04	-0.16	-0.65	-0.53	-0.05
	Age 15	-1.26	2.64	1.67	-1.16	-2.47
	Age 16	4.16	1.35	10.13 *	3.76	2.53
	Age 17	13.96 *	4.14	4.77	-1.19	16.43 *
	Age 18	19.88 *	8.63	8.80	5.60	5.37
	Age 19	0.17	9.56 *	4.36	1.28	6.15
Race/ethnicity	White[2]	7.06	4.15	7.41	-4.95	13.58
	Black[2]	-4.22	3.27	2.05	4.02	-3.99
	Hispanic	13.52 *	8.14 *	11.56 *	1.93	8.85
	Other	0.12	13.57 *	6.19	-0.17	-10.46
Sex	Male	6.01	6.35 *	8.82 *	4.83	-4.08
	Female	5.12	6.34 *	4.58	0.50	3.44

[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Table E12 YO Effect Estimates for the percentage of HS graduates not in college

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	Level of Domain variable					
Age	Age 18	-2.31	-2.76	2.51	4.42	7.79
	Age 19	6.58	-4.45	-2.61	-0.22	-2.64
	Age 20	-0.01	5.30	-0.49	-4.64	4.66
	Age 21	-5.08	-1.81	4.93	1.43	-6.25
Race/ethnicity	White[2]	-1.21	2.02	0.17	0.88	-6.20
	Black[2]	1.05	0.82	4.24	-1.93	5.51 *
	Hispanic	-2.15	-3.48	-4.82 *	-0.11	-5.51
	Other	1.79	-6.52	-1.45	-4.99	-0.60
Sex	Male	-1.07	-2.02	-3.57	-3.19	0.40
	Female	-0.27	-1.14	3.45	1.21	3.10

[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Appendix 6E

Table E13 YO Effect Estimates for the percentage of HS graduates in college

		Propensity Group				
		1	2	3	4	5
Domain Variable	**Level of Domain variable**					
Age	Age 18	-9.83	-2.96	-2.46	-4.44	-5.50
	Age 19	-1.73	1.59	7.09	2.33	-1.68
	Age 20	4.15	0.38	-8.91	6.29	9.83
	Age 21	10.48	9.55	2.15	6.32	4.32
Race/ethnicity	White²	0.72	-6.68	-1.88	-11.16	10.81
	Black²	0.86	-0.99	-2.48	1.27	0.94
	Hispanic	-2.06	1.50	-1.22	-2.55	2.13
	Other	-4.17	-2.17	7.38	11.82	-3.46
Sex	Male	0.88	-0.14	-0.48	-1.34	5.07
	Female	-2.20	-0.68	-2.80	1.07	-1.64

[1]Estimates with a 95% confidence interval that excludes 0.0 are marked by *.
[2]Hispanics excluded.

Appendix F. YO and ACS outcome estimates, at baseline and follow-up, by propensity group and demographic subgroup

Table F1.1 YO estimates of Labor Force Participation Rate, at baseline\

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 16	54.84	51.58	48.85	42.88	55.91	50.81	50.50
	Age 17	59.44	49.50	57.37	59.04	62.57	57.58	58.12
	Age 18	66.93	67.23	71.98	64.38	74.76	69.06	69.46
	Age 19	77.29	77.02	75.73	74.76	72.86	75.53	75.19
	Age 20	76.28	77.71	84.00	77.25	77.18	78.48	78.61
	Age 21	81.20	79.94	80.49	77.44	79.38	79.69	79.56
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	71.72	73.42	77.83	64.61	77.25	72.97	72.39
	Black[3]	66.98	65.30	72.89	65.62	70.83	68.32	68.84
	Hispanic	70.87	68.01	67.07	64.39	67.70	67.61	67.13
	Other	66.43	60.42	68.42	67.31	58.02	64.12	63.57
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	66.27	62.93	65.42	64.28	68.35	65.45	65.61
	Female	73.12	71.11	74.29	66.16	71.49	71.23	71.00
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		69.79	67.00	69.84	65.22	69.85	68.34	68.28

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F1.2 ACS estimates of Labor Force Participation Rate, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 16	25.19	20.70	21.94	25.37	17.56	22.15	22.94
	Age 17	38.30	31.70	30.56	31.85	29.13	32.31	33.92
	Age 18	55.65	52.55	46.09	44.57	50.77	49.93	51.88
	Age 19	67.58	60.44	61.45	54.65	59.32	60.69	62.89
	Age 20	68.58	68.04	65.45	65.17	57.62	64.97	67.18
	Age 21	74.32	76.20	70.33	60.17	66.32	69.47	72.76
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	62.41	60.31	59.80	50.05	39.20	54.35	61.30
	Black[3]	52.09	50.55	49.82	45.04	47.46	48.99	49.76
	Hispanic	54.24	51.87	48.95	46.97	49.40	50.29	51.71
	Other	46.26	39.71	39.47	39.12	47.26	42.36	43.02
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	59.44	56.33	50.93	47.23	51.37	53.06	55.81
	Female	52.88	47.38	48.29	44.10	43.93	47.32	49.30
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		56.22	51.88	49.56	45.67	47.70	50.21	52.57

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F1.3 YO estimates of Labor Force Participation Rate, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 16	46.58	44.16	43.19	52.99	52.43	47.87	48.69
	Age 17	60.60	50.64	51.65	59.76	58.35	56.20	56.16
	Age 18	66.31	69.24	65.92	67.35	66.66	67.10	67.03
	Age 19	76.07	71.90	73.46	70.32	67.72	71.89	71.19
	Age 20	76.38	76.21	73.64	77.51	73.38	75.42	75.16
	Age 21	82.68	72.16	81.36	78.37	78.27	78.57	78.55
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	68.60	62.28	62.01	70.89	47.05	62.16	64.87
	Black[3]	67.41	64.85	72.19	71.23	69.10	68.95	69.58
	Hispanic	70.20	64.27	57.76	61.47	57.46	62.23	60.71
	Other	62.35	56.57	70.65	51.71	54.77	59.21	58.06
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	66.69	62.63	61.88	67.40	66.56	65.04	65.12
	Female	69.69	64.19	66.11	66.82	63.88	66.14	65.78
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		68.24	63.38	63.98	67.11	65.27	65.60	65.44

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F1.4 ACS estimates of Labor Force Participation Rate, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 16	21.41	16.83	16.18	16.87	14.47	17.15	18.31
	Age 17	36.76	26.68	28.11	25.33	24.29	28.24	30.63
	Age 18	55.17	52.64	46.05	43.23	38.81	47.18	50.96
	Age 19	64.68	56.98	54.19	55.23	49.70	56.15	59.17
	Age 20	70.94	67.28	65.21	66.43	55.30	65.03	67.87
	Age 21	73.32	70.95	68.96	64.28	65.57	68.61	70.97
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	61.99	60.65	54.76	59.65	51.07	57.62	61.14
	Black[3]	50.37	45.51	46.23	45.70	36.79	44.92	46.18
	Hispanic	53.43	48.09	47.12	43.47	44.02	47.23	49.14
	Other	42.81	47.37	32.97	40.75	37.26	40.23	41.92
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	56.41	52.31	49.82	46.57	44.15	49.85	52.76
	Female	53.84	45.70	42.64	43.80	35.77	44.35	47.69
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		55.16	49.03	46.19	45.26	39.54	47.04	50.26

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F2.1 YO estimates of Employment to Population Ratio, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 16	20.23	19.69	16.47	13.16	14.31	16.77	16.08
	Age 17	33.94	25.32	27.73	27.60	25.54	28.03	27.43
	Age 18	45.69	38.24	41.15	32.20	34.94	38.44	37.49
	Age 19	53.12	51.36	47.43	44.35	37.63	46.78	45.61
	Age 20	51.46	56.84	60.92	50.32	45.80	53.07	52.69
	Age 21	63.87	55.37	59.94	50.59	52.50	56.45	55.92
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	51.16	50.66	61.23	48.37	57.80	53.84	52.19
	Black[3]	34.40	33.31	35.64	29.52	30.38	32.65	31.68
	Hispanic	46.05	44.77	45.52	42.92	42.42	44.33	44.30
	Other	47.80	38.96	44.34	42.85	30.50	40.89	41.09
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	40.37	38.28	37.89	34.54	33.41	36.90	36.29
	Female	49.67	43.64	46.73	36.46	35.03	42.30	41.27
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		45.14	40.95	42.29	35.49	34.19	39.61	38.76

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Appendix 6F

Table F2.2 ACS Estimates of Employment to Population Ratio, at Baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 16	16.78	12.55	12.59	17.93	7.27	13.42	14.43
	Age 17	27.68	22.05	16.82	15.07	22.44	20.81	22.74
	Age 18	42.91	34.87	31.93	29.17	29.35	33.64	36.69
	Age 19	53.19	48.29	47.67	37.48	42.55	45.84	48.91
	Age 20	57.83	53.59	43.45	41.52	36.02	46.48	52.32
	Age 21	63.73	62.81	57.39	43.00	41.80	53.75	59.68
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	53.14	47.05	48.27	35.92	24.72	41.82	50.91
	Black[3]	34.71	35.38	31.31	25.88	27.52	30.96	32.22
	Hispanic	45.46	41.09	37.91	35.17	36.84	39.29	41.41
	Other	34.36	29.03	27.59	26.17	36.79	30.79	31.47
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	46.70	43.62	35.64	28.97	30.11	37.01	41.75
	Female	43.32	35.03	34.80	30.32	30.93	34.88	37.75
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		45.05	39.35	35.21	29.64	30.52	35.95	39.76

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F2.3 YO estimates of Employment to Population Ratio, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 16	15.41	13.05	12.59	13.41	12.98	13.49	13.25
	Age 17	27.84	20.25	20.87	24.41	20.09	22.69	22.06
	Age 18	33.76	34.70	35.16	33.26	28.72	33.12	32.61
	Age 19	47.23	42.77	46.41	36.89	28.20	40.30	38.70
	Age 20	54.24	47.54	44.91	44.37	33.71	44.95	43.13
	Age 21	61.13	51.17	55.64	48.04	47.94	52.78	51.84
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	45.22	38.23	41.75	48.00	31.18	40.88	42.37
	Black[3]	30.92	29.07	32.57	29.20	26.17	29.59	28.68
	Hispanic	42.51	36.45	35.78	37.75	30.60	36.62	35.87
	Other	41.25	36.30	39.77	30.47	28.49	35.26	35.12
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	39.12	33.72	32.75	32.33	28.66	33.32	32.30
	Female	40.54	34.01	37.02	32.96	26.17	34.14	33.00
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		39.86	33.86	34.87	32.65	27.46	33.74	32.64

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F2.4 ACS estimates of Employment to Population Ratio, at Follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 16	13.62	9.22	7.77	7.12	4.54	8.45	10.17
	Age 17	23.79	16.45	15.63	13.74	12.78	16.48	18.76
	Age 18	39.25	37.52	27.56	25.11	14.63	28.81	34.17
	Age 19	49.28	40.05	38.82	36.85	30.76	39.15	42.89
	Age 20	57.18	52.41	49.35	45.81	41.55	49.26	52.94
	Age 21	63.05	58.33	54.40	37.65	44.27	51.54	57.63
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	50.63	49.03	42.40	47.10	43.45	46.52	49.66
	Black[3]	31.77	26.79	27.85	21.88	17.99	25.26	26.96
	Hispanic	42.72	38.28	35.64	32.81	30.74	36.04	38.50
	Other	34.40	39.37	23.56	20.62	28.02	29.19	32.57
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	42.97	38.71	34.70	28.06	26.51	34.19	38.39
	Female	42.15	33.59	29.34	27.32	20.75	30.63	35.05
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		42.57	36.16	31.99	27.71	23.37	32.36	36.74

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F3.1 YO Estimates of Unemployment Rate, at Baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age6	Age 16	63.10	61.83	66.29	69.31	74.40	66.99	68.15
	Age 17	42.90	48.84	51.67	53.25	59.18	51.17	52.81
	Age 18	31.73	43.12	42.83	49.98	53.27	44.19	46.02
	Age 19	31.28	33.31	37.37	40.67	48.36	38.20	39.34
	Age 20	32.54	26.86	27.48	34.86	40.65	32.48	32.97
	Age 21	21.34	30.73	25.54	34.67	33.86	29.23	29.71
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	28.67	31.00	21.33	25.14	25.18	26.26	27.91
	Black[3]	48.64	48.99	51.10	55.01	57.11	52.17	53.98
	Hispanic	35.03	34.18	32.13	33.34	37.34	34.40	34.01
	Other	28.05	35.51	35.19	36.35	47.44	36.51	35.37
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	39.08	39.16	42.08	46.27	51.12	43.54	44.68
	Female	32.07	38.63	37.10	44.90	51.00	40.74	41.88
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		35.31	38.88	39.45	45.58	51.06	42.05	43.24

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F3.2 ACS Estimates of Unemployment Rate, at Baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age6	Age 16	33.40	39.39	42.63	29.37	58.57	40.67	37.10
	Age 17	27.72	30.44	44.96	52.69	22.96	35.75	32.96
	Age 18	22.90	33.64	30.73	34.56	42.19	32.81	29.27
	Age 19	21.29	20.11	22.44	31.42	28.27	24.70	22.24
	Age 20	15.67	21.25	33.62	36.27	37.49	28.86	22.12
	Age 21	14.26	17.57	18.39	28.53	36.98	23.15	17.97
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	14.84	21.98	19.29	28.24	37.03	24.28	16.96
	Black[3]	33.37	30.01	37.15	42.53	42.01	37.01	35.24
	Hispanic	16.19	20.78	22.57	25.12	25.43	22.02	19.91
	Other	25.72	26.92	30.10	33.11	22.15	27.60	26.85
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	21.43	22.56	30.03	38.68	41.39	30.81	25.19
	Female	18.07	26.07	27.93	31.25	29.59	26.58	23.43
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		19.88	24.15	28.96	35.10	36.02	28.82	24.37

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F3.3 YO Estimates of Unemployment Rate, at Follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age6	Age 16	66.91	70.45	70.84	74.69	75.25	71.63	72.79
	Age 17	54.07	60.00	59.59	59.15	65.57	59.68	60.72
	Age 18	49.08	49.88	46.67	50.62	56.92	50.63	51.35
	Age 19	37.91	40.51	36.82	47.54	58.36	44.23	45.64
	Age 20	28.98	37.62	39.02	42.75	54.05	40.49	42.61
	Age 21	26.06	29.08	31.61	38.71	38.75	32.84	34.01
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	34.08	38.61	32.67	32.29	33.72	34.28	34.68
	Black[3]	54.12	55.18	54.88	59.01	62.12	57.06	58.78
	Hispanic	39.45	43.28	38.05	38.58	46.75	41.22	40.92
	Other	33.84	35.83	43.71	41.08	47.98	40.49	39.50
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	41.34	46.16	47.08	52.04	56.94	48.71	50.40
	Female	41.82	47.01	43.99	50.68	59.03	48.51	49.83
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		41.59	46.57	45.50	51.35	57.93	48.59	50.12

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F3.4 ACS Estimates of Unemployment Rate, at Follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age6	Age 16	36.23	45.33	51.93	57.56	68.52	51.91	44.44
	Age 17	35.21	38.36	44.40	45.66	47.33	42.19	38.76
	Age 18	28.86	28.91	40.14	41.83	62.31	40.41	32.95
	Age 19	23.79	29.81	28.26	33.50	37.73	30.62	27.51
	Age 20	19.40	22.09	24.31	31.06	24.89	24.35	22.00
	Age 21	14.04	17.81	21.13	41.46	32.26	25.34	18.82
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	18.33	19.18	22.58	21.26	14.55	19.18	18.78
	Black[3]	36.92	41.13	39.77	52.15	50.99	44.19	41.61
	Hispanic	20.04	20.41	24.37	24.58	30.43	23.97	21.64
	Other	19.66	17.09	28.60	48.97	24.85	27.83	22.31
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	23.81	26.01	30.36	39.79	39.95	31.98	27.23
	Female	21.72	26.55	31.17	37.61	41.80	31.77	26.51
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		22.83	26.25	30.74	38.78	40.84	31.89	26.90

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F4.1 YO Estimates of the Percentage with 10th Grade Education or Less, at Baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	100.00	100.00	99.65	99.93	99.79	99.87	99.85
	Age 15	99.89	99.80	100.00	99.08	99.74	99.70	99.66
	Age 16	95.04	93.48	94.71	91.96	91.43	93.33	93.00
	Age 17	52.05	57.40	56.21	52.99	57.60	55.25	55.49
	Age 18	25.84	24.44	30.24	30.73	32.06	28.66	29.30
	Age 19	25.55	16.83	25.22	19.03	26.60	22.64	22.76
	Age 20	17.94	16.66	21.48	16.37	25.54	19.60	20.13
	Age 21	20.82	19.27	20.88	24.95	22.00	21.58	21.78
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	48.39	44.04	48.05	45.34	50.29	47.22	47.11
	Black[3]	57.93	53.94	53.78	55.92	58.36	55.98	56.33
	Hispanic	58.32	58.84	58.60	60.80	61.62	59.64	59.66
	Other	51.05	54.48	62.72	55.96	62.59	57.36	56.10
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	52.94	52.70	54.67	54.41	56.57	54.26	54.58
	Female	54.95	56.74	57.98	60.02	61.88	58.31	58.85
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		53.96	54.70	56.35	57.24	59.09	56.27	56.70

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F4.2 ACS Estimates of the Percentage with 10th Grade Education or Less, at Baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	99.98	99.91	99.16	98.62	100.00	99.53	99.70
	Age 15	98.29	98.74	97.13	95.98	98.54	97.74	98.03
	Age 16	86.35	88.75	87.78	88.28	85.75	87.38	87.42
	Age 17	41.58	45.13	46.74	46.58	45.69	45.14	44.19
	Age 18	15.97	24.90	24.38	23.66	25.58	22.90	21.25
	Age 19	13.23	17.82	23.01	17.54	20.22	18.36	16.83
	Age 20	13.74	14.72	16.15	23.91	13.00	16.30	15.00
	Age 21	11.47	16.58	17.02	19.38	19.25	16.74	14.77
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	40.94	40.89	47.23	48.72	49.93	45.54	41.60
	Black[3]	48.47	51.48	51.71	53.25	47.91	50.56	50.52
	Hispanic	50.84	53.39	54.34	59.64	54.71	54.58	53.25
	Other	45.68	51.20	45.12	45.32	56.61	48.79	47.71
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	48.44	52.03	57.30	57.98	54.34	54.02	52.00
	Female	43.57	49.30	46.69	51.25	46.00	47.36	46.54
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		46.06	50.67	51.90	54.66	50.34	50.73	49.29

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F4.3 YO estimates of the percentage with 10th Grade education or less, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	99.67	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.93	99.97
	Age 15	99.54	99.79	99.38	99.51	100.00	99.64	99.66
	Age 16	93.05	92.26	94.44	96.67	95.49	94.38	94.78
	Age 17	56.58	51.23	55.61	53.29	56.73	54.69	54.88
	Age 18	23.61	18.28	21.31	22.23	24.65	22.01	22.27
	Age 19	19.56	15.37	16.59	22.26	20.85	18.92	19.25
	Age 20	14.23	14.19	20.02	14.66	18.69	16.36	16.85
	Age 21	13.89	12.11	16.02	15.17	15.62	14.56	14.82
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	48.89	45.39	42.29	62.72	50.17	49.89	48.73
	Black[3]	53.79	50.94	53.53	56.01	57.06	54.27	55.30
	Hispanic	56.18	57.95	57.61	58.09	55.13	56.99	57.17
	Other	50.89	49.09	56.61	48.32	60.92	53.17	52.16
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	48.33	52.59	52.89	52.81	53.49	52.02	52.52
	Female	56.35	53.76	58.03	60.23	59.65	57.60	58.17
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		52.53	53.16	55.45	56.56	56.54	54.85	55.34

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F4.4 ACS estimates of the percentage with 10th Grade education or less, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	99.54	99.80	98.92	97.66	98.71	98.93	99.31
	Age 15	97.42	95.10	97.95	97.10	98.06	97.13	96.88
	Age 16	86.33	86.42	87.58	87.79	83.65	86.35	86.50
	Age 17	37.15	43.86	46.03	43.43	51.41	44.37	42.03
	Age 18	12.82	21.52	20.77	17.34	20.04	18.50	17.60
	Age 19	14.00	17.13	16.45	22.85	15.12	17.11	16.13
	Age 20	11.84	16.54	14.14	14.63	16.31	14.69	14.03
	Age 21	10.91	15.84	12.29	14.63	22.61	15.26	13.38
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	40.76	41.43	43.88	47.69	48.31	44.41	41.29
	Black[3]	48.85	50.51	54.34	53.04	55.69	52.49	51.61
	Hispanic	50.46	53.00	49.61	53.47	53.60	52.03	51.65
	Other	42.40	40.25	42.68	54.45	50.00	45.95	43.14
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	47.90	51.71	50.85	53.05	58.35	52.37	50.49
	Female	43.64	47.54	50.31	52.96	51.08	49.10	47.09
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		45.84	49.64	50.58	53.01	54.55	50.72	48.81

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F5.1 YO estimates of the percentage with 11th Grade as highest education, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.07	0.00	0.09	0.09
	Age 15	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.92	0.00	0.21	0.24
	Age 16	4.96	6.34	4.89	7.75	7.78	6.34	6.60
	Age 17	40.47	37.61	39.62	42.10	38.24	39.61	39.64
	Age 18	33.35	38.64	39.68	41.17	37.83	38.13	38.69
	Age 19	14.16	17.52	20.33	24.50	22.99	19.90	20.71
	Age 20	12.82	13.88	9.62	15.40	15.36	13.42	13.55
	Age 21	9.20	9.23	10.23	14.35	13.82	11.37	11.68
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	11.26	9.51	6.82	12.79	7.61	9.60	10.28
	Black[3]	15.68	17.91	17.15	19.95	16.89	17.52	17.82
	Hispanic	15.03	15.18	15.07	15.20	16.58	15.41	15.38
	Other	15.72	12.64	11.69	15.42	13.96	13.89	13.86
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	14.24	15.30	15.55	17.71	17.27	16.01	16.32
	Female	13.62	14.94	15.37	17.95	15.66	15.51	15.77
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		13.92	15.12	15.46	17.83	16.50	15.77	16.05

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F5.2 ACS estimates of the percentage with 11th Grade as highest education, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.02	0.09	0.84	1.38	0.00	0.47	0.30
	Age 15	1.00	0.30	1.49	3.34	1.46	1.52	1.12
	Age 16	10.69	8.32	10.43	10.60	12.63	10.54	10.06
	Age 17	44.65	40.11	40.41	40.50	44.74	42.08	42.21
	Age 18	31.46	29.07	33.48	26.21	24.86	29.02	30.25
	Age 19	11.68	13.64	17.36	14.62	17.75	15.01	13.71
	Age 20	6.56	6.57	12.57	10.99	8.42	9.02	7.84
	Age 21	5.14	7.45	8.36	6.06	12.35	7.87	6.82
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	13.10	9.90	9.62	8.94	4.67	9.25	12.06
	Black[3]	13.07	14.23	16.68	15.58	16.19	15.15	14.79
	Hispanic	13.53	13.59	15.91	12.60	14.43	14.01	13.94
	Other	11.96	11.49	9.88	20.79	13.60	13.54	12.11
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	12.61	13.72	15.62	12.96	13.86	13.76	13.50
	Female	13.64	12.38	14.89	15.90	16.62	14.69	13.83
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		13.12	13.05	15.25	14.41	15.18	14.20	13.66

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F5.3 YO estimates of the percentage with 11th Grade as highest education, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.46	0.21	0.27	0.37	0.00	0.26	0.23
	Age 16	6.85	7.53	5.37	3.33	4.16	5.45	5.03
	Age 17	39.94	44.54	41.68	44.06	40.70	42.18	42.14
	Age 18	43.41	45.01	43.33	51.01	48.21	46.19	46.80
	Age 19	16.56	24.15	21.19	22.63	22.96	21.50	21.97
	Age 20	6.62	13.85	15.13	13.76	21.30	14.13	15.34
	Age 21	9.18	9.51	11.14	13.91	16.20	11.99	12.62
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	11.87	18.70	12.32	5.51	12.64	12.21	12.89
	Black[3]	19.37	20.95	19.03	19.45	19.07	19.57	19.39
	Hispanic	18.20	16.78	17.26	17.25	22.43	18.39	18.26
	Other	15.01	17.61	17.41	21.30	16.85	17.64	17.75
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	19.72	17.61	17.06	20.08	19.75	18.84	18.89
	Female	12.89	19.63	18.51	16.81	19.67	17.50	17.96
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		16.14	18.58	17.78	18.43	19.71	18.13	18.43

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F5.4 ACS estimates of the percentage with 11th Grade as highest education, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.47	0.20	1.08	2.34	1.29	1.07	0.69
	Age 15	1.12	1.86	0.88	1.11	0.05	1.00	1.21
	Age 16	10.16	10.15	8.69	7.31	13.51	9.97	9.89
	Age 17	45.59	42.22	40.18	44.75	38.56	42.26	43.18
	Age 18	27.99	26.54	33.74	29.06	31.73	29.81	28.86
	Age 19	10.72	11.94	12.05	15.56	7.11	11.48	11.53
	Age 20	6.00	8.13	7.20	16.26	12.33	9.99	7.93
	Age 21	5.46	6.38	11.59	9.35	6.14	7.78	6.90
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	11.53	13.04	12.59	7.13	5.18	9.89	11.75
	Black[3]	14.13	13.89	16.51	15.08	14.35	14.79	14.65
	Hispanic	12.37	12.49	11.60	15.03	14.25	13.15	12.61
	Other	14.19	12.26	16.53	13.41	16.38	14.55	14.10
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	13.39	13.26	15.07	13.83	13.21	13.75	13.62
	Female	11.80	12.78	13.35	15.22	15.15	13.66	12.83
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		12.62	13.02	14.19	14.51	14.20	13.71	13.23

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Appendix 6F

Table F6.1 YO estimates of the percentage with 12th Grade as highest education, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 16	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.30	0.09	0.11
	Age 17	2.70	2.16	0.93	2.52	1.58	1.98	1.91
	Age 18	4.20	2.39	2.82	4.21	3.10	3.34	3.30
	Age 19	0.92	1.45	2.98	1.68	2.54	1.91	2.05
	Age 20	1.46	1.26	1.71	1.45	3.04	1.78	1.89
	Age 21	1.01	2.56	0.98	1.95	2.41	1.78	1.79
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	0.87	0.81	0.00	1.09	2.97	1.15	0.94
	Black[3]	1.40	2.00	1.59	1.69	1.60	1.65	1.66
	Hispanic	1.92	0.74	1.08	0.97	1.34	1.21	1.11
	Other	0.18	0.49	0.00	1.53	0.83	0.61	0.59
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	1.35	1.01	1.47	1.70	1.75	1.45	1.51
	Female	1.14	1.33	0.96	1.11	1.32	1.17	1.17
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		1.24	1.16	1.21	1.41	1.55	1.31	1.34

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F6.2 ACS estimates of the percentage with 12th Grade as highest education, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.09	0.03	0.70	0.28	0.00	0.22	0.19
	Age 16	0.89	0.52	1.41	0.36	1.50	0.94	0.85
	Age 17	6.20	5.84	3.90	7.56	7.66	6.23	5.95
	Age 18	8.75	8.77	9.38	11.99	7.35	9.25	9.05
	Age 19	7.04	6.71	5.96	13.18	7.23	8.03	7.32
	Age 20	6.95	6.25	6.79	4.37	5.18	5.91	6.47
	Age 21	7.01	6.68	4.35	10.59	13.13	8.35	7.13
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	3.41	3.26	4.27	3.31	2.03	3.26	3.42
	Black[3]	4.47	4.77	3.80	6.59	4.82	4.89	4.74
	Hispanic	6.96	4.46	4.17	5.53	8.64	5.95	5.52
	Other	3.25	3.99	3.82	2.05	0.84	2.79	3.37
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	5.39	4.41	4.12	6.17	5.82	5.18	5.00
	Female	3.97	4.26	3.87	5.30	5.17	4.51	4.22
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		4.69	4.34	3.99	5.74	5.51	4.85	4.61

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F6.3 YO estimates of the percentage with 12th Grade as highest education, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 17	0.21	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.08	0.06
	Age 18	1.36	0.48	0.00	0.29	0.09	0.44	0.31
	Age 19	1.05	0.59	0.47	0.90	1.18	0.84	0.85
	Age 20	1.84	0.94	1.08	1.21	0.56	1.13	1.03
	Age 21	0.00	0.35	0.94	0.43	0.73	0.49	0.55
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	0.49	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.29
	Black[3]	0.58	0.43	0.37	0.36	0.37	0.42	0.39
	Hispanic	0.81	0.27	0.14	0.32	0.13	0.34	0.26
	Other	0.00	0.00	1.25	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.18
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	0.51	0.36	0.19	0.22	0.22	0.30	0.27
	Female	0.62	0.21	0.34	0.42	0.36	0.39	0.38
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		0.57	0.29	0.26	0.32	0.29	0.35	0.32

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F6.4 ACS estimates of the percentage with 12th Grade as highest education, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.15	0.92	0.24	0.15	0.07	0.31	0.37
	Age 16	0.88	0.53	1.18	1.25	0.44	0.86	0.83
	Age 17	6.22	5.54	4.53	4.97	1.86	4.63	5.35
	Age 18	5.71	6.32	6.19	11.87	6.05	7.23	6.46
	Age 19	5.18	6.01	9.48	8.22	8.83	7.54	6.55
	Age 20	3.66	4.68	7.44	5.73	6.69	5.64	4.81
	Age 21	2.96	3.71	8.27	5.55	7.70	5.64	4.32
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	2.55	3.50	2.35	3.02	12.89	4.86	2.81
	Black[3]	3.44	3.12	2.66	4.12	3.65	3.40	3.29
	Hispanic	3.33	3.55	6.87	4.89	2.83	4.29	4.11
	Other	2.61	3.70	4.87	2.76	1.96	3.18	3.29
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	3.11	3.44	5.36	4.52	4.30	4.15	3.73
	Female	2.91	3.37	3.73	4.02	2.78	3.36	3.26
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		3.01	3.41	4.53	4.28	3.51	3.75	3.50

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F7.1 YO estimates of the percentage of HS Graduates or those with some college, but less than one year, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.03
	Age 16	0.00	0.18	0.24	0.29	0.49	0.24	0.28
	Age 17	3.97	2.83	2.87	2.39	2.43	2.90	2.75
	Age 18	30.09	30.41	25.47	20.64	24.52	26.23	25.46
	Age 19	39.54	46.82	39.02	39.09	37.11	40.32	39.94
	Age 20	36.34	39.52	39.69	40.81	35.00	38.27	38.21
	Age 21	36.53	40.94	43.54	35.33	39.22	39.11	39.27
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	21.26	25.52	24.81	23.41	25.07	24.01	23.15
	Black[3]	17.95	18.30	19.38	16.40	16.70	17.75	17.36
	Hispanic	16.50	18.03	17.89	14.34	14.85	16.32	16.44
	Other	19.35	22.65	18.55	15.03	9.40	17.00	18.25
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	18.78	20.10	19.05	17.68	16.38	18.40	18.16
	Female	18.96	19.11	18.55	14.14	16.07	17.37	17.02
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		18.87	19.61	18.79	15.89	16.23	17.88	17.59

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F7.2 ACS estimates of the percentage of HS Graduates or those with some college, but less than one year, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.62	0.92	0.68	0.40	0.00	0.52	0.66
	Age 16	1.96	1.80	0.34	0.77	0.12	1.00	1.45
	Age 17	7.06	8.78	8.96	5.00	1.71	6.30	7.36
	Age 18	38.25	34.67	30.57	35.15	38.94	35.52	35.68
	Age 19	50.18	46.46	42.56	44.08	43.06	45.27	47.00
	Age 20	40.01	47.24	48.32	42.73	49.24	45.51	43.91
	Age 21	41.22	40.04	48.02	36.58	35.65	40.30	41.31
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	25.19	27.63	28.34	28.19	30.41	27.95	26.00
	Black[3]	24.65	22.14	22.19	17.80	22.39	21.83	22.31
	Hispanic	20.31	21.89	19.58	17.40	17.70	19.38	20.40
	Other	21.32	18.62	30.50	23.31	21.02	22.95	21.96
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	22.20	22.48	17.78	17.71	20.15	20.06	21.10
	Female	24.37	22.69	26.62	19.69	22.55	23.18	23.75
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		23.26	22.58	22.28	18.69	21.30	21.62.	22.41

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F7.3 YO estimates of the percentage of HS Graduates or those with some college, but less than one year, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.03
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.13	0.00	0.10	0.11
	Age 16	0.10	0.21	0.18	0.00	0.36	0.17	0.19
	Age 17	3.28	3.71	2.49	2.66	2.51	2.93	2.81
	Age 18	29.45	31.82	31.42	24.64	24.99	28.46	27.83
	Age 19	42.81	43.85	44.48	41.59	41.99	42.94	42.82
	Age 20	39.48	38.76	37.33	39.33	32.77	37.53	36.95
	Age 21	27.26	37.63	37.04	37.38	40.67	36.00	36.96
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	19.39	23.81	20.39	10.60	19.40	18.72	19.69
	Black[3]	17.55	18.17	19.22	17.37	16.72	17.81	17.53
	Hispanic	15.49	16.02	16.77	15.85	15.21	15.87	16.03
	Other	19.63	20.40	11.69	15.55	12.15	15.88	16.82
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	17.66	17.56	18.86	16.76	17.87	17.74	17.76
	Female	17.90	18.62	16.51	16.46	14.63	16.82	16.45
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		17.78	18.07	17.69	16.61	16.26	17.28	17.10

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F7.4 ACS estimates of the percentage of HS Graduates or those with some college, but less than one year, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	1.31	2.13	0.93	1.64	1.80	1.56	1.54
	Age 16	2.55	2.50	2.36	3.65	2.41	2.69	2.60
	Age 17	9.19	7.49	8.00	5.67	7.75	7.62	8.12
	Age 18	48.54	42.32	33.39	39.82	35.69	39.95	42.60
	Age 19	49.54	45.99	49.05	43.41	51.93	47.98	47.95
	Age 20	45.18	44.85	47.40	44.23	46.09	45.55	45.37
	Age 21	42.62	41.92	41.64	40.84	39.42	41.29	42.00
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	27.18	24.12	20.83	24.65	21.99	23.75	26.10
	Black[3]	23.34	22.69	20.55	21.93	19.85	21.67	22.08
	Hispanic	24.68	23.38	23.56	18.78	23.02	22.68	23.41
	Other	22.34	25.68	25.25	21.15	13.31	21.55	23.27
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	24.49	22.11	21.59	21.89	20.35	22.09	22.91
	Female	25.76	24.74	22.75	19.51	20.65	22.68	24.14
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		25.10	23.41	22.18	20.73	20.51	22.39	23.51

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F8.1 YO estimates of the percentage with one or more years of college, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.04	0.06
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.05	0.07
	Age 16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 17	0.81	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.15	0.27	0.21
	Age 18	6.52	4.11	1.79	3.26	2.50	3.64	3.25
	Age 19	19.84	17.39	12.45	15.70	10.76	15.23	14.54
	Age 20	31.45	28.68	27.51	25.97	21.06	26.93	26.22
	Age 21	32.43	27.99	24.37	23.42	22.56	26.15	25.48
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	18.21	20.12	20.32	17.37	14.05	18.02	18.52
	Black[3]	7.04	7.86	8.10	6.04	6.45	7.10	6.83
	Hispanic	8.23	7.22	7.36	8.69	5.61	7.42	7.41
	Other	13.70	9.74	7.03	12.05	13.22	11.15	11.19
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	12.69	10.89	9.27	8.50	8.03	9.88	9.44
	Female	11.34	7.88	7.14	6.78	5.09	7.64	7.19
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		12.00	9.40	8.19	7.63	6.63	8.77	8.32

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F8.2 ACS estimates of the percentage with one or more years of college, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 16	0.11	0.61	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.23
	Age 17	0.50	0.15	0.00	0.35	0.20	0.24	0.28
	Age 18	5.57	2.59	2.19	3.00	3.28	3.33	3.77
	Age 19	17.87	15.37	11.11	10.57	11.75	13.33	15.15
	Age 20	32.75	25.21	16.17	18.01	24.17	23.26	26.77
	Age 21	35.17	29.25	22.25	27.40	19.63	26.74	29.98
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	17.36	18.33	10.54	10.84	13.01	14.02	16.93
	Black[3]	9.35	7.38	5.62	6.79	8.70	7.57	7.65
	Hispanic	8.37	6.68	6.00	4.84	4.53	6.08	6.89
	Other	17.78	14.69	10.69	8.52	7.92	11.92	14.85
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	11.36	7.36	5.18	5.18	5.84	6.98	8.40
	Female	14.45	11.38	7.93	7.86	9.66	10.26	11.67
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		12.87	9.36	6.58	6.50	7.67	8.60	10.02

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F8.3 YO estimates of the percentage with one or more years of college, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 17	0.00	0.37	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.11
	Age 18	2.17	4.42	3.95	1.83	2.06	2.89	2.79
	Age 19	20.02	16.05	17.27	12.63	13.02	15.80	15.11
	Age 20	37.84	32.25	26.43	31.05	26.68	30.85	29.83
	Age 21	49.67	40.41	34.86	33.11	26.77	36.97	35.05
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	19.35	11.94	25.00	21.17	17.79	19.05	18.40
	Black[3]	8.71	9.51	7.85	6.81	6.78	7.93	7.40
	Hispanic	9.32	8.97	8.21	8.49	7.09	8.42	8.28
	Other	14.47	12.90	13.05	14.83	10.08	13.06	13.09
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	13.79	11.88	11.01	10.13	8.67	11.09	10.57
	Female	12.24	7.78	6.62	6.08	5.68	7.68	7.05
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		12.98	9.90	8.82	8.08	7.19	9.40	8.81

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F8.4 ACS estimates of the percentage with one or more years of college, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 16	0.08	0.40	0.18	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.18
	Age 17	1.85	0.89	1.26	1.18	0.42	1.12	1.32
	Age 18	4.94	3.30	5.91	1.90	6.47	4.50	4.48
	Age 19	20.55	18.93	12.98	9.96	17.01	15.89	17.84
	Age 20	33.32	25.81	23.81	19.15	18.60	24.14	27.87
	Age 21	38.06	32.15	26.21	29.63	24.12	30.03	33.40
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	17.97	17.91	20.35	17.53	11.63	17.08	18.06
	Black[3]	10.25	9.79	5.95	5.83	6.46	7.66	8.37
	Hispanic	9.16	7.59	8.36	7.83	6.30	7.85	8.21
	Other	18.48	18.11	10.67	8.21	18.35	14.76	16.20
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	11.10	9.48	7.12	6.71	3.79	7.64	9.25
	Female	15.90	11.57	9.87	8.30	10.35	11.20	12.69
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		13.43	10.52	8.52	7.49	7.24	9.44	10.95

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F9.1 YO estimates of the percentage Not In School, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	1.87	1.76	1.97	1.89	2.56	2.01	2.06
	Age 15	5.98	3.76	4.40	2.90	4.40	4.29	4.10
	Age 16	14.08	11.17	10.77	10.58	12.42	11.81	11.62
	Age 17	26.53	20.66	22.97	19.09	24.38	22.73	22.41
	Age 18	37.39	30.63	37.19	30.48	39.17	34.97	34.96
	Age 19	37.87	36.12	40.80	35.07	47.25	39.42	39.95
	Age 20	37.20	33.47	38.05	34.30	47.91	38.19	38.91
	Age 21	35.98	36.45	38.75	47.00	44.51	40.54	41.18
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	24.69	21.97	29.51	20.34	28.78	25.06	24.35
	Black[3]	17.24	19.07	20.45	20.14	24.93	20.36	21.62
	Hispanic	36.46	24.82	26.76	23.25	33.60	28.98	27.68
	Other	13.83	14.44	24.24	18.46	10.10	16.21	15.47
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	22.85	18.60	22.88	20.16	26.03	22.10	22.36
	Female	26.86	24.01	25.64	22.18	27.48	25.23	25.13
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		24.89	21.27	24.28	21.18	26.72	23.67	23.74

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F9.2 ACS estimates of the percentage Not In School, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	1.37	1.93	2.92	1.79	4.91	2.59	2.03
	Age 15	3.90	3.24	1.97	3.31	6.11	3.71	3.46
	Age 16	5.14	7.18	4.09	5.63	7.42	5.89	5.74
	Age 17	9.57	13.36	11.98	15.87	12.33	12.62	11.87
	Age 18	18.19	24.19	25.63	26.35	23.35	23.54	22.21
	Age 19	22.18	25.60	33.26	28.76	31.53	28.26	25.93
	Age 20	23.85	22.47	28.54	32.15	22.43	25.89	24.64
	Age 21	21.83	29.09	27.55	30.89	39.66	29.80	26.48
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	10.50	12.11	18.12	17.49	5.99	12.84	11.44
	Black[3]	10.85	12.19	14.37	14.32	16.04	13.56	12.96
	Hispanic	21.60	21.63	20.86	21.79	27.46	22.67	21.75
	Other	8.93	7.08	6.04	11.68	21.14	10.97	8.68
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	14.79	18.29	18.61	16.63	20.99	17.86	16.92
	Female	12.63	13.52	14.89	17.24	17.05	15.07	13.89
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		13.73	15.91	16.72	16.93	19.10	16.48	15.42

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F9.3 YO estimates of the percentage Not In School, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	1.59	2.85	1.77	1.97	2.29	2.09	2.12
	Age 15	6.00	2.70	3.94	2.39	3.78	3.76	3.51
	Age 16	10.14	8.18	5.82	8.06	8.80	8.20	8.03
	Age 17	15.56	10.41	15.35	13.04	15.10	13.89	14.05
	Age 18	24.03	20.35	24.55	21.69	27.28	23.58	23.98
	Age 19	30.18	26.55	28.04	34.92	34.53	30.84	31.47
	Age 20	28.54	27.55	39.24	29.59	37.45	32.47	33.51
	Age 21	26.61	24.52	32.32	32.70	39.37	31.11	32.37
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	15.66	22.38	17.58	28.94	29.45	22.80	19.59
	Black[3]	16.88	12.47	15.27	15.86	19.73	16.04	16.95
	Hispanic	22.61	15.91	19.56	18.69	19.59	19.27	18.96
	Other	13.91	9.04	16.22	7.39	15.32	12.38	11.52
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	14.35	12.48	16.51	15.49	19.30	15.63	16.20
	Female	20.92	16.71	18.91	18.07	20.28	18.98	18.99
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		17.78	14.52	17.71	16.79	19.79	17.32	17.59

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F9.4 ACS estimates of the percentage Not In School, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	1.47	2.86	2.08	1.35	4.58	2.47	2.14
	Age 15	1.97	3.42	3.27	0.54	0.95	2.03	2.35
	Age 16	4.89	5.06	7.13	4.00	4.14	5.04	5.19
	Age 17	7.25	8.58	9.39	7.63	13.78	9.33	8.47
	Age 18	12.58	16.83	21.84	23.16	19.13	18.71	16.67
	Age 19	19.51	22.73	29.34	31.99	20.65	24.84	23.14
	Age 20	18.75	24.56	23.57	27.71	32.43	25.40	22.58
	Age 21	18.18	23.98	27.43	25.10	34.63	25.86	22.45
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	8.03	12.01	11.89	10.90	24.80	13.52	9.22
	Black[3]	8.18	8.69	12.99	13.41	13.30	11.32	10.41
	Hispanic	17.07	18.89	19.17	16.49	18.91	18.11	18.10
	Other	6.75	6.55	10.12	7.27	11.89	8.52	7.57
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	12.11	16.36	17.00	12.26	15.64	14.67	14.31
	Female	9.34	10.74	13.39	15.91	14.76	12.83	11.28
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		10.76	13.58	15.16	14.04	15.20	13.75	12.81

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F10.1 YO estimates of the percentage In Secondary School, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	98.13	98.24	98.03	98.11	97.44	97.99	97.94
	Age 15	94.02	96.03	95.60	97.10	95.34	95.62	95.79
	Age 16	85.92	88.83	89.08	89.42	87.45	88.14	88.31
	Age 17	69.97	78.02	75.25	79.13	74.30	75.33	75.82
	Age 18	31.02	37.79	37.45	47.83	37.49	38.32	39.27
	Age 19	7.73	7.32	11.25	14.24	10.72	10.25	10.68
	Age 20	2.18	2.71	1.05	2.44	1.97	2.07	2.04
	Age 21	1.10	0.94	0.40	1.12	1.21	0.95	0.94
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	40.77	37.85	32.08	41.27	35.01	37.40	38.83
	Black[3]	59.40	57.20	54.25	59.55	54.74	57.03	56.58
	Hispanic	41.82	51.97	50.35	55.28	49.22	49.73	50.81
	Other	53.82	55.85	52.64	55.92	68.85	57.42	56.94
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	48.72	52.72	50.59	55.19	52.52	51.95	52.32
	Female	46.00	52.11	51.80	59.19	54.21	52.66	53.51
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		47.33	52.42	51.20	57.21	53.32	52.30	52.91

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F10.2 ACS estimates of the percentage In Secondary School, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	98.63	98.07	97.08	98.21	95.10	97.42	97.97
	Age 15	95.49	95.83	97.35	96.28	93.89	95.77	95.88
	Age 16	92.80	90.40	95.53	93.61	92.47	92.96	92.58
	Age 17	82.87	77.72	79.06	78.77	85.76	80.84	80.49
	Age 18	37.99	38.55	41.62	35.50	34.43	37.62	38.34
	Age 19	9.77	12.58	13.07	16.59	13.66	13.13	11.93
	Age 20	3.39	5.08	6.97	7.10	4.16	5.34	4.68
	Age 21	1.78	1.62	2.19	5.15	5.08	3.16	2.24
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	46.96	41.94	43.00	43.48	50.64	45.20	45.64
	Black[3]	55.15	58.29	57.81	61.10	52.88	57.04	57.09
	Hispanic	49.72	49.81	53.56	55.97	50.32	51.88	50.97
	Other	51.96	59.61	52.77	56.48	49.91	54.15	54.51
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	51.65	51.88	58.43	60.49	53.04	55.10	53.58
	Female	48.56	52.41	50.56	55.21	50.73	51.50	50.69
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		50.14	52.15	54.42	57.89	51.93	53.30	52.15

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F10.3 YO estimates of the percentage In Secondary School, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	98.08	97.15	98.23	98.03	97.71	97.84	97.85
	Age 15	94.00	97.30	95.71	97.48	96.22	96.14	96.38
	Age 16	89.76	91.82	94.00	91.94	90.96	91.69	91.85
	Age 17	82.77	87.49	82.31	84.68	83.01	84.05	83.87
	Age 18	46.86	45.43	43.49	53.05	47.13	47.19	47.43
	Age 19	8.53	16.65	11.16	13.58	13.62	12.71	13.00
	Age 20	0.96	4.75	2.53	2.87	6.67	3.56	3.92
	Age 21	0.78	0.34	2.17	1.17	0.00	0.89	0.88
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	47.68	46.02	43.43	39.77	39.53	43.29	45.51
	Black[3]	58.26	61.01	58.99	61.30	58.27	59.56	59.51
	Hispanic	54.71	60.44	57.25	58.13	59.52	58.01	58.26
	Other	54.42	59.47	60.00	62.62	64.94	60.29	60.22
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	55.38	59.23	55.26	58.67	55.61	56.83	56.80
	Female	51.56	58.98	59.82	60.76	61.15	58.45	59.35
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		53.38	59.11	57.53	59.73	58.35	57.62	58.07

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F10.4 ACS estimates of the percentage In Secondary School, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	98.54	97.14	97.92	98.66	95.42	97.53	97.86
	Age 15	96.71	94.45	95.79	97.82	97.24	96.41	96.11
	Age 16	92.48	92.04	90.32	92.36	93.45	92.13	92.04
	Age 17	81.71	83.05	81.36	85.52	78.05	81.94	82.09
	Age 18	33.95	37.55	38.86	35.12	38.71	36.84	36.25
	Age 19	10.39	12.35	8.63	14.65	10.42	11.29	11.07
	Age 20	2.75	4.78	5.22	8.92	2.90	4.91	4.19
	Age 21	1.15	1.95	4.73	4.43	1.81	2.81	2.15
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	46.81	45.97	46.93	46.94	41.58	45.65	46.62
	Black[3]	58.24	58.82	60.51	58.83	60.39	59.36	59.15
	Hispanic	49.09	50.14	48.91	56.90	51.77	51.36	50.28
	Other	52.44	49.65	53.95	63.35	56.45	55.17	52.96
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	52.30	52.05	54.29	59.14	60.21	55.60	53.54
	Female	49.00	52.95	53.99	56.29	54.24	53.30	51.90
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		50.71	52.49	54.14	57.75	57.05	54.43	52.73

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F11.1 YO estimates of the percentage HS Graduates Not In College, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.03
	Age 16	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.13	0.06	0.07
	Age 17	1.15	0.71	1.40	0.19	1.10	0.91	0.88
	Age 18	12.17	12.34	12.13	9.20	11.65	11.50	11.35
	Age 19	27.20	27.94	27.08	23.72	23.98	25.99	25.68
	Age 20	28.32	34.25	36.53	36.45	29.11	32.93	33.06
	Age 21	36.59	37.73	37.27	32.24	37.42	36.25	36.15
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	15.14	16.40	20.46	16.30	20.96	17.86	16.51
	Black[3]	13.69	13.32	14.59	12.11	12.22	13.19	12.83
	Hispanic	13.10	12.60	13.47	10.56	10.83	12.11	12.14
	Other	10.79	15.46	13.81	5.79	6.09	10.39	11.26
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	13.63	13.20	14.72	13.03	12.43	13.40	13.32
	Female	13.90	14.14	13.74	9.97	11.34	12.62	12.32
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		13.77	13.67	14.22	11.49	11.91	13.01	12.83

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F11.2 ACS estimates of the percentage HS Graduates Not In College, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.32	0.42	0.49	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.33
	Age 16	1.28	1.33	0.21	0.77	0.00	0.72	1.01
	Age 17	2.07	3.15	3.72	1.29	0.06	2.06	2.46
	Age 18	14.63	11.46	11.08	15.77	16.26	13.84	13.30
	Age 19	30.22	28.15	26.64	24.65	25.44	27.02	28.31
	Age 20	34.82	39.99	38.78	32.28	40.57	37.29	36.97
	Age 21	40.43	39.92	44.54	33.83	29.71	37.69	39.81
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	18.58	19.41	21.07	20.91	10.47	18.09	18.89
	Black[3]	16.99	15.85	16.54	12.44	16.92	15.75	15.98
	Hispanic	15.63	15.32	13.15	10.22	10.11	12.89	14.40
	Other	12.21	11.50	20.17	9.69	7.87	12.29	12.81
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	16.48	16.35	13.16	12.24	13.32	14.31	15.38
	Female	17.04	15.25	18.39	11.97	15.40	15.61	16.22
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		16.75	15.81	15.82	12.11	14.32	14.96	15.80

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F11.3 YO estimates of the percentage HS Graduates Not In College, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.08
	Age 16	0.10	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.24	0.10	0.12
	Age 17	1.33	0.64	1.93	1.30	1.50	1.34	1.40
	Age 18	11.77	12.81	14.33	9.95	14.19	12.61	12.77
	Age 19	32.02	23.89	27.65	26.30	25.37	27.05	26.59
	Age 20	31.33	34.71	34.47	32.36	28.67	32.31	31.97
	Age 21	32.75	38.23	37.30	35.69	35.26	35.84	35.95
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	14.34	17.25	14.04	13.55	15.28	14.90	14.94
	Black[3]	13.41	13.06	14.59	12.15	12.60	13.16	12.91
	Hispanic	12.47	9.72	11.92	10.98	9.41	10.90	10.87
	Other	12.63	13.53	9.18	6.50	6.55	9.68	10.32
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	13.39	11.10	12.90	11.83	12.86	12.42	12.40
	Female	13.45	13.19	13.00	11.30	10.49	12.29	11.98
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		13.42	12.11	12.95	11.56	11.69	12.35	12.19

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F11.4 ACS estimates of the percentage HS Graduates Not In College, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.69	0.70	0.54	1.05	0.13	0.62	0.67
	Age 16	0.92	0.59	0.65	0.99	1.00	0.83	0.79
	Age 17	3.12	2.46	1.79	1.42	1.68	2.10	2.49
	Age 18	16.54	14.69	10.77	12.10	11.01	13.02	14.30
	Age 19	28.45	28.56	29.81	27.44	29.46	28.74	28.66
	Age 20	37.83	35.15	37.22	32.82	35.48	35.70	36.44
	Age 21	41.68	42.22	39.64	35.85	33.80	38.64	40.76
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	18.99	18.24	14.48	17.28	10.98	16.00	18.48
	Black[3]	15.67	14.78	12.30	14.40	11.79	13.79	14.20
	Hispanic	17.14	15.91	16.43	10.75	14.20	14.89	15.87
	Other	12.25	16.09	16.98	15.39	8.93	13.93	14.24
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	17.30	16.27	14.91	14.22	13.34	15.21	16.16
	Female	16.86	15.45	14.20	12.10	11.46	14.01	15.28
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		17.09	15.86	14.55	13.18	12.35	14.61	15.73

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F12.1 YO estimates of the percentage HS Graduates In College, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.05	0.07
	Age 16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 17	2.35	0.60	0.38	1.59	0.22	1.03	0.90
	Age 18	19.43	19.23	13.22	12.49	11.69	15.21	14.42
	Age 19	27.19	28.62	20.87	26.97	18.05	24.34	23.68
	Age 20	32.30	29.57	24.37	26.81	21.01	26.81	26.00
	Age 21	26.34	24.88	23.58	19.65	16.85	22.26	21.72
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	19.40	23.78	17.95	22.09	15.25	19.69	20.31
	Black[3]	9.67	10.41	10.71	8.20	8.11	9.42	8.96
	Hispanic	8.62	10.61	9.42	10.91	6.35	9.18	9.38
	Other	21.56	14.25	9.30	19.84	14.96	15.98	16.33
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	14.80	15.48	11.81	11.61	9.03	12.55	11.99
	Female	13.25	9.75	8.82	8.67	6.98	9.49	9.03
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		14.01	12.65	10.29	10.13	8.05	11.03	10.52

[1] ***Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.***
[2] ***Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.***
[3] ***Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.***

Table F12.2 ACS estimates of the percentage HS Graduates In College, at baseline

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.30	0.50	0.20	0.40	0.00	0.28	0.33
	Age 16	0.78	1.09	0.17	0.00	0.12	0.43	0.67
	Age 17	5.50	5.77	5.23	4.06	1.84	4.48	5.18
	Age 18	29.20	25.80	21.68	22.37	25.95	25.00	26.15
	Age 19	37.84	33.67	27.03	30.01	29.36	31.58	33.84
	Age 20	37.94	32.47	25.71	28.47	32.83	31.48	33.71
	Age 21	35.96	29.37	25.73	30.14	25.55	29.35	31.48
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	23.97	26.55	17.81	18.10	32.96	23.88	24.04
	Black[3]	17.01	13.67	11.28	12.14	14.16	13.65	13.98
	Hispanic	13.05	13.25	12.43	12.02	12.11	12.57	12.88
	Other	26.90	21.82	21.03	22.16	21.06	22.59	24.01
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	17.09	13.48	9.81	10.65	12.66	12.74	14.12
	Female	21.78	18.82	16.16	15.58	16.81	17.83	19.20
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		19.38	16.14	13.04	13.08	14.65	15.26	16.63

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F12.3 YO estimates of the percentage HS Graduates In College, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1[1]	Avge 2[2]
Age	Age 14	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.03
	Age 15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.03	0.03
	Age 16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 17	0.34	1.46	0.42	0.98	0.38	0.71	0.68
	Age 18	17.35	21.41	17.62	15.31	11.40	16.62	15.82
	Age 19	29.27	32.90	33.15	25.20	26.48	29.40	28.95
	Age 20	39.18	32.99	23.75	35.18	27.21	31.66	30.60
	Age 21	39.86	36.91	28.21	30.44	25.37	32.16	30.80
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	22.32	14.34	24.95	17.73	15.74	19.02	19.96
	Black[3]	11.45	13.45	11.14	10.70	9.40	11.23	10.63
	Hispanic	10.21	13.93	11.26	12.20	11.49	11.82	11.91
	Other	19.04	17.96	14.60	23.50	13.19	17.66	17.95
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	16.89	17.18	15.33	14.01	12.23	15.13	14.60
	Female	14.08	11.12	8.27	9.87	8.07	10.28	9.68
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		15.42	14.26	11.81	11.92	10.17	12.72	12.15

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Table F12.4 YO estimates of the percentage HS Graduates In College, at follow-up

Domain Variable	Variable level	Propensity 1	Propensity 2	Propensity 3	Propensity 4	Propensity 5	Avge 1	Avge 2
Age	Age 14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Age 15	0.62	1.43	0.39	0.59	1.68	0.94	0.87
	Age 16	1.71	2.31	1.90	2.66	1.41	2.00	1.99
	Age 17	7.92	5.92	7.47	5.43	6.49	6.64	6.96
	Age 18	36.94	30.94	28.54	29.63	31.16	31.44	32.78
	Age 19	41.65	36.37	32.22	25.92	39.48	35.12	37.14
	Age 20	40.68	35.51	34.00	30.55	29.20	33.99	36.80
	Age 21	38.99	31.85	28.21	34.62	29.75	32.68	34.65
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Race/ethnicity	White[3]	26.17	23.79	26.70	24.90	22.64	24.84	25.69
	Black[3]	17.92	17.70	14.19	13.36	14.52	15.54	16.25
	Hispanic	16.71	15.06	15.49	15.86	15.13	15.65	15.76
	Other	28.56	27.71	18.95	13.99	22.75	22.39	25.23
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sex	Male	18.29	15.32	13.80	14.39	10.80	14.52	16.00
	Female	24.81	20.86	18.42	15.71	19.54	19.87	21.54
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
All		21.45	18.07	16.15	15.03	15.40	17.22	18.73

[1] Avge 1 is the average percentage when equal weighting is given to each propensity group estimate.
[2] Avge 2 is the average percentage when propensity group estimates are weighted by their population sizes.
[3] Hispanics excluded in race/ethnicity = White, Black.

Appendix G. List of Potential Confounders Entered into the Logistic Model

The following 22 variables from Census 2000 were included in the stepwise logistic regression model for predicting the probability that a Census tract participated in a YO program. Only the seven variables highlighted were included in the final model.

Variable
Log(Tract population)
Percentage of Whites in the population
Percentage of Blacks in the population
Percentage of Hispanics in the population
Percentage of Other Ethnicities in the population
Percentage of the population that are foreign-born
Percentage of the population that are foreign-born and in the US no more than 5 years
Percentage with less than a High School Diploma
Percentage of Unemployed among those in the Labor Force
Labor Force Participation Rate
Percentage of households receiving public assistance
Percentage of housing units that are Owner-occupied
Percentage of rural housing units
Percentage of households with four or more persons
Median contract rent
Median gross rent as a percentage of income
Percentage of households in poverty, out of all households for which poverty status was determined
Percentage of population 25 years and older with Bachelor’s degree or higher
Percentage of vacant housing units
Percentage of the population aged 14-21 years
Percentage of the population that are 14-21 year old males
Total number of housing units

Appendix H. Testing for Balance of the Confounders Entered into the Logistic Model

A linear model was fitted to the (dependent) outcomes that tested for the presence of interaction between propensity group (a 5-level categorical variable) and being included in a YO site (a 2-level binary variable). The variables included in the propensity model were balanced as per the interaction test, except for the percentage of rural housing units, that marginally failed the balance test:

Variable	**P-Value**
Log(Tract population)	0.0925
Percentage of Whites in the population	0.7541
Labor Force Participation Rate	0.5193
Percentage of housing units that are Owner-occupied	0.2508
Percentage of rural housing units	0.0448
Median contract rent	0.9498
Percentage of vacant housing units	0.6435

APPENDIX 7

ESTIMATED STANDARD ERRORS OF DIFFERENCES IN KEY LABOR MARKET AND EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES FOR 16-21 YEAR OLDS IN THE NATION'S CENTRAL CITY, HIGH POVERTY NEIGHBORHOODS

Appendix 7— Estimated Standard Errors of Differences in Key Labor Market and Educational Outcomes for 16-21 Year Olds In the Nation's Central City, High Poverty Neighborhoods

In the main body of this report, we presented estimates of labor market and educational outcomes for 16-21 year old youth residing in the nation's central city, high poverty neighborhoods in the April 2000-March 2001 and April 2003-March 2004 time periods. Findings were presented for all 16-21 year olds and for an array of selected demographic and school enrollment subgroups.

In that set of tables, estimates of the values of each labor market and educational outcome were displayed along with their associated standard errors. To improve the readability of these tables, we put the standard errors of the differences in each of these outcomes between the above two time periods in a separate set of tables in this appendix. For each of the thirteen labor market and educational outcomes, we have displayed estimates of the standard errors of the difference in outcomes for all 16-21 year old youth and for those in nine demographic and two school enrollment subgroups. These standard errors were used to calculate the values of the t-statistics for the estimated differences in each labor market and educational outcome and their level of statistical significance.

Appendix 7 – Standard Errors of Differences

Appendix Table A-1:

Estimates of the Standard Errors of the Changes in Labor Market and

Educational Outcomes in the Central City, High Poverty Neighborhoods;

School Enrollment for all 16-21 Year Olds and Demographic Subgroups

Demographic Group	(A) Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate	(B) Unemployment Rate	(C) E/P Ratio	(D) Percent Of Employed Working Full-Time Hours	(E) Full-Time E/P Ratio	(F) Mean Weekly Hours	(G) Mean Hourly Wages
All	1.34	1.28	1.27	2.15	1.10	2.77	$.11
Men	1.91	1.70	1.84	2.94	1.65	4.05	$.18
Women	1.84	1.70	1.894	3.11	1.05	3.75	$.12
Black, not Hispanic	2.26	1.91	2.05	4.35	1.71	5.38	$.23
Hispanic	2.26	1.92	2.19	3.49	1.92	5.01	$.19
White, not Hispanic	2.97	1.86	3.04	4.20	2.71	5.03	$.21
16-19	1.70	1.92	1.49	3.25	1.13	3.73	$.16
20-21	2.05	1.50	2.19	2.76	2.08	4.01	$.16
Native Born	1.49	1.42	1.41	2.47	1.18	3.05	$.13
Foreign Born	3.04	2.22	2.97	4.14	2.75	6.27	$.25
Enrolled in school	1.77	1.98	1.63	3.03	.87	3.37	$.18
Not enrolled in school	1.84	1.50	1.91	2.39	1.89	4.01	$.14

Note: Standard errors for all outcomes except weekly hours of work, hourly wages, and weekly wages are in percentage points. Standard errors for hourly and weekly wages are in dollar terms.

Appendix Table A-1: Continued)

Demographic Group	(H) Weekly Wages	(I) School Enrollment Rate	(J) High School Enrollment Rate	(K) Postsecondary Enrollment Rate	(L) High School Dropout Rate	(M) Disconnection Rate
All	$9.44	1.35	1.27	1.98	1.13	1.13
Men	11.02	1.91	1.77	2.06	1.70	1.49
Women	14.59	1.84	1.77	2.76	1.56	1.56
Black, not Hispanic	16.16	2.33	2.19	3.60	1.98	2.05
Hispanic	10.36	2.26	2.19	3.75	2.12	1.84
White, not Hispanic	13.13	3.04	2.48	3.89	2.26	2.27
16-19	17.31	1.70	1.70	3.26	1.41	2.00
20-21	10.35	2.05	.78	2.55	1.84	3.65
Native Born	8.89	1.49	1.41	2.19	1.20	1.62
Foreign Born	33.02	2.97	2.62	4.67	2.76	5.80
Enrolled in school	22.54					
Not enrolled in school	8.47					

APPENDIX 8

Supplemental Site-Level Tables for Selected Variables

Appendix 8 – Supplemental Site-Level Tables for Selected Variables

Table 8.1. Employment to Population Ratio (Employment Rate) of 16- to 21-Year-Old Out-of-School Youths (in Percentage Points)—2001 and 2004 in Non-native American Target Areas

PSUNAME	2001	2004	Change
Buffalo, NY	40.1	51.2	11.0***
Maui & Molokai, HI	45.5	55.7	10.2**
Birmingham, AL	45.1	49.0	3.9
Milwaukee, WI	28.5	31.1	2.6
Boston, MA	39.1	41.4	2.3
San Diego, CA	59.5	61.8	2.3
Seattle, WA	54.1	54.9	0.9
Cleveland, OH	36.4	36.3	-0.1
Monroe, LA	39.8	39.5	-0.2
Houston, TX	49.0	48.2	-0.8
Tampa, FL	41.7	40.6	-1.0
Albany, GA	43.6	42.6	-1.0
Brawley/CalipatriaCA	41.3	40.3	-1.0
San Francisco, CA	50.3	49.0	-1.3
Detroit, MI	47.9	45.1	-2.8
Chicot/Desha Cty AR	47.8	44.9	-2.9
Brockton, MA	63.7	60.1	-3.6
Philadelphia. PA	39.6	36.0	-3.6
Tucson, AZ	55.9	51.9	-4.0
Baltimore, MD	36.6	31.7	-4.9
Denver, CO	53.4	47.2	-6.3
San Antonio, TX	53.1	46.3	-6.8*
Hartford, CT	38.6	31.6	-7.0*
Los Angeles, CA	43.6	36.3	-7.3*
Louisville, KY	40.7	33.0	-7.7**
Portland, OR	53.4	45.6	-7.8
Memphis, TN	39.6	29.3	-10.3***
Robeson County NC	57.5	46.8	-10.7***
Kansas City, MO	47.0	29.5	-17.5***
CPS High Poverty Census Tracts in Central Cities	56.8	48.7	-8.1***
ACS Census Tract Grouping (In-school and Out-of-school Youth combined:			
19-21 year olds	53.9	51.6	-2.3
16-18 year olds	24.4	20.8	-3.6

***Significant at .01 level; **significant at .05 level; *significant at .10 level.
(Sources: Youth Employment Surveys, 2001 and 2004. BLS High Poverty Comparison Group; American Community Survey special tabulations for YO-matched Census Tract Groupings)

Table 8.2. Percentage of High-School Graduates Enrolled in College—2001 and 2004 in 23 Urban YO Target Areas

YO Urban Site	2001	2004	Change
Denver – CO	22.8	45.1	22.3***
Detroit – MI	25.2	47.2	22.1***
San Antonio - TX	29.4	50.3	20.9***
Kansas City - MO	28.0	48.7	20.6***
Memphis - TN	27.4	46.5	19.1***
Hartford – CT	35.7	51.3	15.6**
Seattle – WA	53.9	68.1	14.3***
Brockton - MA	38.0	50.9	12.9**
Portland – OR	35.7	47.8	12.0*
Cleveland - OH	25.0	35.2	10.2*
Philadelphia - PA	21.6	29.1	7.5
Buffalo – NY	46.2	51.9	5.8
Birmingham - AL	42.5	45.4	2.8
Tucson – AZ	52.0	54.8	2.8
Houston – TX	43.3	45.8	2.5
Boston – MA	45.7	47.7	2.0
Baltimore - MD	28.1	27.2	-0.9
Los Angeles - CA	53.5	51.6	-1.9
San Diego - CA	51.4	49.3	-2.1
Louisville - KY	38.8	36.3	-2.5
Milwaukee – WI	34.7	31.8	-2.9
Tampa – FL	30.5	22.7	-7.8
San Francisco - CA	56.4	48.1	-8.3*
CPS High Poverty Census Tracts in Central Cities	44.1	47.8	3.67*

***Significant at .01 level; **significant at .05 level; *significant at .10 level.
(Sources: Youth Employment Surveys, 2001 and 2004. BLS High Poverty Comparison Group)

Table 8.3. Percentage of 14- to 21-Year-Old Youths, Not High School Graduates and Not Enrolled in School—2001 and 2004 in 23 Urban YO Target Areas

YO Urban Site	2001	2004	Change
Milwaukee – WI	55.0	56.8	1.9
Boston – MA	41.4	42.8	1.4
Kansas City - MO	50.6	51.9	1.3
Detroit – MI	50.3	49.5	-0.8
Memphis – TN	57.4	56.4	-1.0
Buffalo – NY	48.3	46.9	-1.3
Tucson – AZ	56.7	54.7	-2.0
Philadelphia - PA	44.4	41.6	-2.8
Denver – CO	57.2	54.2	-3.0
Cleveland – OH	54.5	51.5	-3.0
San Antonio - TX	56.9	53.8	-3.1
Baltimore - MD	57.1	53.9	-3.2
Birmingham - AL	49.6	46.0	-3.6
Brockton – MA	45.5	41.2	-4.3
Tampa – FL	59.5	54.1	-5.4
San Diego - CA	54.5	48.9	-5.6
Los Angeles - CA	60.6	52.4	-8.2**
Louisville – KY	55.7	47.1	-8.6
Seattle – WA	40.6	30.9	-9.7*
Portland – OR	44.5	34.6	-9.9*
Houston – TX	65.9	54.0	-11.9***
Hartford – CT	65.2	53.0	-12.2***
San Francisco - CA	63.8	38.6	-25.2***
CPS High Poverty Census Tracts in Central Cities	24.96	21.42	-3.54***

***Significant at .01 level; **significant at .05 level; *significant at .10 level.
(Sources: Youth Employment Surveys, 2001 and 2004. BLS High Poverty Comparison Group.)

Table 8.4. Percentage of 14- to 21-Year-Old Youths Who Were out of School and Out of Work—2001 and 2004 in 23 Urban YO Target Areas

YO Urban Site	2001	2004	Change
Memphis – TN	23.8	25.7	1.8
Louisville – KY	27.5	28.2	0.8
Kansas City - MO	24.3	25.1	0.8
Cleveland – OH	25.9	26.6	0.8
Philadelphia - PA	28.8	29.2	0.4
Baltimore – MD	36.9	36.7	-0.1
San Antonio - TX	21.5	20.7	-0.8
Tampa – FL	28.9	27.9	-1.0
Los Angeles - CA	21.8	20.8	-1.1
Brockton – MA	14.7	13.7	-1.1
Milwaukee - WI	29.3	27.6	-1.7
Birmingham - AL	22.3	20.2	-2.1
Tucson – AZ	19.7	17.5	-2.3
San Francisco - CA	21.2	18.6	-2.6
San Diego - CA	15.9	13.1	-2.7
Hartford – CT	29.0	25.9	-3.1
Portland – OR	20.6	17.0	-3.6
Boston – MA	22.6	17.4	-5.2**
Houston – TX	24.7	18.9	-5.9**
Detroit – MI	26.3	19.7	-6.6**
Denver – CO	26.0	19.3	-6.7**
Seattle – WA	16.5	8.7	-7.8***
Buffalo – NY	24.0	15.0	-9.0***
CPS High Poverty Census Tracts in Central Cities	21.55	23.01	+1.46

***Significant at .01 level; **significant at .05 level; *significant at .10 level.
(Sources: Youth Employment Surveys, 2001 and 2004. BLS High Poverty Comparison Group.)