



FOSTER YOUTH DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Chicago, Illinois Project Profile¹

July 2008

Submitted to:

Casey Family Programs
1300 Dexter Avenue North, Floor 3
Seattle, WA 98109-3542

Submitted by:

The Institute for Educational Leadership
4455 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 310
Washington, DC 20008

¹ Please see the main report at <http://www.casey.org/doleval> or <http://www.iel.org/programs/casey.html> for more information.

Chicago, Illinois Project Profile

State Grantee:

Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity

Local Awardee and Project Name:

Alternative Schools Network

Foster Youth Demonstration Project

Project New Futures

Chicago, IL

Background

The Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO) selected the Alternative Schools Network (ASN) as the main service provider for the youth from foster care demonstration project. ASN of Chicago is the largest and oldest association of non-public, community-based alternative schools in the country. The first year, DOL provided funding of \$400,000 for a grant period that ended June 30, 2006, and it subsequently provided second-year funding to cover the period through June 30, 2007. The matching funds for this project came equally from state Chafee funds and Workforce Investment Act funds. The project began in January of 2005, making Chicago the first of the five sites to become operational. Because ASN was identified in the original grant application to DOL, DCEO was able to enter into a contract with ASN and implement the project quickly.

In 1999, ASN, with the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, developed the Youth Skills Development and Training Program (YSDTP). YSDTP collaborates with 15 community-based alternative high schools in the Chicago area to serve youth from foster care age 16–21 that are out of school and have not obtained a diploma or a GED.

The federal demonstration project grant allowed ASN of Chicago to expand their existing services with the plan of enrolling 110 eligible current and former youth from care in the first year. The project was named Project New Futures. It provides assistance to youth from foster care who are already attending one of the ASN schools or have completed high school. Youth

receive intensive postsecondary school preparation and planning support while they are enrolled in school and for at least one year following completion of their secondary education. Of the 15 YSDTP schools, 13 participate in the Project New Futures program.

Program Design

Each of the 15 participating alternative schools offers a unique approach to providing youth with the opportunity to complete their high school education and move on to postsecondary education and employment. Although each school's programming is different, they all provide individualized and small-group approaches to learning. These alternative schools enroll youth who are among the city's most vulnerable, including those in the foster care system.

The YSDTP program provides educational, social service, and work-related services to provide the necessary social and educational skills that out-of-school youth need to earn a high school diploma and transition to employment, college, or further skill training (vocational training).

To build the employability and social and academic skills of the participating DCFS youth, the program includes an individualized, self-paced computer learning system called the EXTRA Learning Program, and a full-time paid mentor who works closely with students to support employment and college readiness, personal discipline, and academic achievement.

Project New Futures (PNF) is intended to help older youth from foster care, age 16–21, make the transition to adulthood. The project aims to strengthen and support general transition skills, such as life skills and job skills. Its focus, however, is on making a college education a reality.

To help youth realize this goal, staff helps them cultivate a skill-and-support set that goes beyond the basics. The project collaborates with 13 of the YSDTP community-based alternative high schools, using a mentor-based model, to promote college planning, preparation, and matriculation. Half-time school-based transition counselors work with youth during their junior and senior years in high school. The project offers continuing post-graduation services and support to participating youth to ensure college retention and success. In addition, for those youth who opt to engage in employment or vocational training, support services are provided that will ensure their success as well. These services are provided by four transition specialists located at ASN.

Through a series of pre- and post-exit services, youth are given the supports and skills necessary to ensure increased opportunities and positive future outcomes. The primary goal is to deliver the skill preparation through the creation of a social support network that includes a school-based mentor, other school staff, and peer mentors and transition counselors who build and bridge resources and services for a successful transition to adulthood and to independence.

Project New Futures had three main goals when launched:

1. College planning and employment readiness
2. Transition support
3. Social network/resource facilitation

Program Implementation (including highlights of practices and challenges)

YSDTP is a feeder program for PNF and is the primary method for recruitment. The target population is youth who are in the second semester of their junior year or seniors who have not previously enrolled in the program. Although the slots for the YSDTP are not usually completely filled, there has never been any difficulty recruiting youth to the PNF program.

The PNF project was envisioned as an extension of the YSDTP program. As one staff person explained, “The distinction between PNF and YSDTP is that PNF looks to the future—setting goals with the youth for employment and education—while YSDTP deals with the ‘here and now’ issues such as transportation.” Within basic guidelines, ASN gives the schools flexibility to use a curriculum that best fits the culture of the school community. The following case study provides an example of how this plays out at two ASN schools, Howard Alternative School and the Community Christian Academy.

Two Examples of ASN Schools and the PNF Project

Howard Alternative School began in 1996 as a GED program, but it expanded to offer a high school diploma and graduated its first class in 1999. In 2000, Howard joined the Alternative Schools Network. Howard has four counselors and seven full-time teachers. As of November 2006, there were 70 youth enrolled, all age 16–20, of whom 16 were in foster care and had been part of the PNF program. One Howard staff member is the PNF project mentor.

The Howard PNF counselor has relationships with local employers and with other programs such as Jobs for Chicago Youth, Shipping and Receiving Training Program, Chicago's Women in Trades, and Job Corps. In addition, there is an on-site employment center at Howard with health care, mental health care and summer job providers. All of these resources are available and used to serve the PNF youth.

Community Christian Academy has 180 slots available overall. Enrollment as of November 2006 was about 150 youth, of which 14 are YSDTP slots. Most of the youth come from the West Side of Chicago where the school is located. Caseworkers refer youth to YSDTP through their case workers, but the school also undertakes outreach through flyers. In 2005, there were mostly seniors in YSDTP, so it was appropriate to enroll them in the PNF program. In 2006, there were more freshmen and sophomores, limiting enrollments for that year.

This school has created a PNF resource area for youth to use. At the beginning of the year, the staff surveyed the youth to elicit their interests, and they have incorporated these interests into the materials provided at the resource center. They also provide employment activities, including résumé-building, job shadowing, job fairs, mock interviews, and referrals to jobs the youth hear about. The PNF transition counselor guides the students in using the Illinois Employment Commission Web site and other resources. As a result, the staff believes it has had fairly good success with placing youth in jobs. Students also participate in college trips, including trips to four-year schools and two-year vocational schools, and they have internships with community businesses.

Staff at the schools also found that one of the biggest challenges is that many of the youth do not stay at the schools for any extended period of time. Many are at the schools for only a few months; some drop out, some change their housing situation or are moved to a new location by DCFS, and some come in lacking only a few credits towards graduation. These factors make it difficult to provide a sequence of activities for all of the youth.

Program Progress and Continuing Issues

According to project staff, PNF initially was developed using something of a trial-and-error approach with a vision of exposing youth to a variety of options related to education and career preparation. Each youth had a portfolio that included such elements as mock interviews,

résumés, mock job applications, completion of the ACT test, and academic milestones. The flow of project activities was personalized to the individual youth and the particular school but has evolved as program experience develops, and as staff from the different schools exchange ideas with one another about what works and what does not. For example, initially most of the program activities were focused on college preparation, based on the fact that most youth coming in at the beginning expressed the desire to go to college. ASN staff saw there was little vocational and employment preparation occurring. This led them to think about a core set of minimum activities in which all youth should participate.

With all of these issues and challenges in mind, at the end of 2005, the project management circulated a survey among the PNF transition counselors. The survey was a self-evaluation of each school around four areas: college preparation, vocational preparation, life skills, and employment preparation. The PNF transition counselors were asked to look at what they had provided and what they would like to provide, and to assess what was successful and what was not. After staff completed the written survey, PNF leadership brought all the PNF staff together and divided them into small groups focusing on each of the four areas. These groups were asked to determine what they needed to provide and what would be conducive to each school.

The survey results showed that the project was just scratching the surface of employment preparation; they were doing activities such as résumé-writing and mock interviews, but they were not going beyond that to use local employment services or involve the youth with the business community. In addition, while the project helped youth find jobs, it did not focus on teaching them how to keep their jobs. Moreover, not enough of the PNF transition counselors understood all the career exploration and search tools that are available. This demonstrated a need for targeted training, which was then developed and provided.

The survey also indicated that the college preparation portions of the program, including college visits and college fairs, were consistently regarded as good. Survey results posed no major concerns and proposed no changes.

Life Skills Training

With respect to life skills, there are differing opinions regarding who should provide this service to the youth. These views came not only from the surveys but also from the interviews the evaluation team conducted with PNF staff, both staff located at the schools and at ASN. Some

staff felt that the life skills preparation should be a core component of the YSDTP's program, while others felt it was a responsibility of DCFS staff. One important note is that youth must have a life skills certificate to move on to transitional living, although it is estimated that 50 percent or more of the youth do not have one, suggesting that the current approach is not effective. ASN claims that they have been frustrated in their efforts to work with DCFS on resolving this issue. Given the importance of credible life skills training, this remains a troubling obstacle.

The point was also made that the PNF transition counselors are intended to focus on issues that relate primarily to preparation and exploration of college and careers and that they are not necessarily equipped or trained to provide the complete array of life skills services to youth. PNF project management acknowledges that life skills training is a long-term, ongoing process and that it needs to be a team effort among all of the agencies serving transition-age youth.

All agree that life skills training is a critical component of the preparation for adult living. Accordingly, the transition specialists at ASN went through the Casey Life Skills training curriculum and became certified. They have, in turn, provided training to the PNF transition counselors. ASN indicates that the central life skill they are building is the critical responsibility of coming to school daily: to build a day-to-day attendance record and to learn socialization skills.

Guidelines for school-based transition counselors

As a result of the survey and evaluation meeting, ASN created a curriculum for PNF school-based transition counselors that include written guidelines for each school to follow when serving these youth. ASN also created a policy and procedure manual for the schools and set specific standards and goals for each of the four target areas.

For the youth from foster care, services begin with an initial meeting with all those who have a role in the young person's life, including caseworkers. In the eyes of DCFS, PNF school-based transition counselors are secondary to DCFS caseworkers in terms of roles and responsibilities to the youth. In the eyes of the youth, however, the DCFS caseworker's role is marginal unless there is a problem. In contrast, the PNF transition counselors are much more engaged with the youth on a daily basis, and many continue these relationships after the official ending at graduation. The youth participate in a range of activities to build their portfolio in each of the four

areas. The ASN schools each have a constellation of relationships and partners within the communities they serve. These partnerships in turn provide resources and opportunities for the PNF youth.

Staff Considerations

There have been some staffing changes, particularly at ASN. Only one of the original ASN transition specialists, the project coordinator, remains with the project. Two of the three training specialists left the program in 2006 for personal reasons. These positions were refilled. The ASN administration added a fourth PNF transition specialist recently to reduce caseloads and to free up the time of the project coordinator. ASN caseloads have continued to increase as more youth complete their alternative schooling and are ready to move on to the postsecondary transition support provided by the ASN transition specialists. Previously, the project coordinator carried a full caseload of youth. In October 2006, an employment/internship specialist was hired through foundation funding to work with the PNF graduates. This individual works with the youth to enhance their work-readiness skills and helps with internships and job placements.

The primary vehicle for staff development is the monthly meeting of all the mentoring staff at ASN. A variety of information exchange, peer-to-peer learning, and brainstorming occurs at these meetings. In addition, when specific issues arise, such as the need for PNF mentors to receive training about employment search tools or life skills, the ASN management provides specific training on these issues. DCFS has indicated that it would like to see ASN and PNF staff become more knowledgeable about the impact of trauma on these youth, as well as on the importance of permanent families and lifelong relationships that go beyond the involvement of the child welfare system and mentors. In addition to these monthly meetings, ASN holds two staff retreats of 2.5 days for all of the PNF school staff. One is held in August and the other is held in late winter.

Project New Futures has been successful in providing youth with a paid internship or summer job. Most, if not all, youth in the project participate in summer jobs and other internship opportunities. ASN makes no efforts to engage employers or create an overall employer outreach strategy for PNF, however. Instead, the project relies on existing contacts at the schools as well as other programs that fall under the ASN umbrella. Individual staff members have responsibilities for identifying potential employers. Job placement support is provided through the Added Chance program, another DCFS-funded activity that is operated by ASN. There was a noticeable absence of employer recruitment efforts at the two schools the

evaluation team visited. The primary avenue for employer outreach is at the individual ASN school level and through the collaborative partner relationships.

Program Data

As seen in Table 1, Chicago had enrolled 214 participants. Of these participants, over 95 percent were 17 and older. In terms of racial and ethnic categories, over 85 percent were black, and 9 percent were Hispanic, with the remaining youth either white or in the other race/ethnic category. Approximately two-thirds of youth were female and one-third was male. Consistent with Chicago's program model of serving youth enrolled in alternative high schools, Chicago had a very high percentage of youth in high school at time of program entry, nearly 70 percent. Almost half of Chicago's youth lived in stable housing when they entered the program; just over one-quarter lived in independent living arrangements, and just under one-quarter lived in temporary housing or were homeless.

Ninety-one percent of Chicago's youth participants were in foster care at entry, and one in five had been adjudicated or incarcerated. Just over one-third of participants were custodial parents at entry, and an additional 9 percent were non-custodial parents.

In Chicago, most youth participating in the program were enrolled early in the program and have continued to participate for 7–9 quarters. Nearly four out of five of Chicago's youth fall into this category. Another 18 percent have participated in the program for 4–6 quarters, and only 3 percent have been enrolled for 1–3 quarters.

In terms of services received while in the program, over 80 percent of youth in Chicago received job preparation services, college preparation services, and life skills training. Over half received other services, such as transportation or childcare, and health services. Approximately 16 percent received GED/basic education training, parenting classes, and substance abuse services.

Higher percentages of Chicago's youth attained positive outcomes than youth in other sites. In total, two-thirds of youth served by Chicago received a positive outcome while in the program, compared to 45 percent for all sites combined. Approximately 44 percent of youth in Chicago received a GED or diploma while in the program, one-third entered postsecondary schooling, and 56 percent obtained employment.

Table 1. Youth Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes

Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes	Category	Chicago	Total for All Sites
Age	Under 17	4.3 %	19.0%
	17 & older	95.7%	81.0%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	0.5%	9.5%
	Black	87.3%	71.3%
	Hispanic	9.0%	14.4%
	Other	3.3%	4.8%
Gender	Male	35.5%	41.6%
	Female	64.5%	58.4%
School status at entry	In high school	69.6%	42.3%
	In postsecondary	2.3%	8.6%
	Dropout	4.7%	22.9%
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	23.4%	26.2%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	49.1%	51.9%
	Independent living	27.1%	29.0%
	Temporary/Homeless	23.8%	19.2%
Foster care at entry		91.5%	56.3%
Adjudicated/ Incarcerated		20.6%	21.9%
Parental status	Not a parent	56.9%	80.6%
	Non-custodial	8.7%	5.9%
	Custodial	34.4%	13.5%
Received public assistance and not in foster care		6.0%	7.1%
Quarters in program	1-3	3.2%	22.3%
	4-6	17.5%	31.9%
	7-9	79.4%	45.8%
Services and participation: Received the following			
Job prep		82.6%	76.3%
College prep		80.7%	31.3%
GED/Basic Education		16.1%	20.2%
Life skills		80.7%	41.1%
Parenting		15.6%	6.8%
Health		52.3%	34.8%
Income support		50.9%	33.0%
Substance abuse		13.8%	4.1%
Other		64.7%	45.9%
Attained the Following Outcomes			
GED or diploma		43.6%	23.0%
Postsecondary		33.5%	16.8%
Employment		56.4%	35.0%
Any positive outcome		66.1%	44.8%
Number of youth		214	1058

Note: Variable definitions can be found in Table 2 of the main report.

Collaborations and Partnerships

Interviews with the ASN administration and with the schools regarding collaborations and partnerships yielded a mixed picture of the relationships with key supporting organizations. There is an ongoing relationship with the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) who provides over \$4 million per year in funding for the YSDTP program. Both DCFS and Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO) indicated that they developed a closer working relationship because of the ASN project, and that they hoped to advance the model in other parts of the state.

ASN's strongest partner is the DCEO. This state agency has provided a significant amount of funding and program support to PNF. Senior managers at DCEO spoke highly of the PNF model. Program managers indicated that the population of young people leaving state custody is a priority for them. Though DCEO has been and remains a strong supporter of the ASN model, it is not likely that they will be able to continue to fund the program after the Casey Family Programs support ends. The state agency indicated their interest and need to fund similar projects in other parts of the state. In addition, they noted the fact that ASN has yet to develop a long-term plan for sustainability or to cultivate a more robust mix of public and private resources. One program administrator at DCEO is interested in an analysis of how serving this population would have an impact on the WIA performance measures. Having this information would increase the likelihood of ongoing DCEO support for this population of young people.

DCFS has held ongoing meetings with PNF and has been supportive of the PNF program and believes that it fits well within the larger context of the DCFS approach to transition services for youth preparing to leave foster care, which is housed within the DCFS Office of Service Intervention. DCFS has continued to provide significant funding for the core YSDTP program that feeds Project New Futures. In fact, over the life of this project, DCFS has significantly increased its investment from \$3.1 million to \$4 million. ASN staff acknowledges, however, that there is no real relationship between the PNF mentors and the child welfare case workers.

DCFS sees some duplication in these projects and is also aware that most ASN schools are geographically located in areas—the north and northwest corridor of Chicago—that do not encompass the area where most of the foster youth live. DCFS notes that ASN has not provided DCFS with any substantial information clarifying the differentiation of services provided by ASN basic programs, YSDTP, and PNF, nor have they produced data indicating the effectiveness of their approach in regards to job readiness or retention. ASN disagrees with this characterization

and indicates that it has provided regular reports and data regarding youth employment and education.

The Mayor's Office of Workforce Development (MOWD) operates the One-Stop Career Centers and, until July 2007, administered the WIA youth programs, which have about 30 youth service providers. None are exclusive providers to youth in foster care, although some do include these youth in their population.

Also in 2007, WIA youth programs were moved from MOWD to the newly created Department of Children and Youth Services. This transition was a move on the part of the mayor to have all youth funds under one department. The Department of Children and Youth Services includes Head Start and Community Development Grant funds. WIA youth services represents \$12 million of a budget that exceeds \$300 million. The Department of Children and Youth Services has extended the contracts of the existing service providers while it undertakes a strategic planning initiative on how to redesign the youth programs. Plans are underway to release new requests for proposals early next year and award new contracts effective July 2008. While the plans are not yet final, the agency leadership wants to make sure that youth development is an aspect of all programs and that service providers within the six regions of Chicago work closely together and with other community providers.

MOWD had little interaction with the Project New Futures program, and there was some resentment over the fact that the funds for this project went directly from the state workforce agency to ASN, bypassing the city, which is a different process than is typically used for other projects. Likewise, Children and Youth Services has had little involvement with the program until recently when the individual responsible for the WIA youth programs was invited to a meeting of all the sites sponsored by Casey Family Programs. It is not clear what role the agency will have with the program in the future although it is clearly the intent of DCEO for Children and Youth Services to be more involved.

ASN leadership identified the following additional agencies and organizations with whom they have relationships that can benefit the PNF youth.

- After School Matters (provides funds for internships and apprenticeships for youth and is funded by the city).

- Jobs for Youth (an employment-readiness program that is funded by both WIA and foundation dollars).
- CTA (Chicago Transit Authority, providing internship opportunities in areas of security, clerical, and operations).
- Added Chance (an employment-readiness agency funded by DCFS).
- Soldier Field (a stadium used for sporting events and concerts).
- Critical Skill Shortage Initiative (an initiative that began under state leadership and that targets jobs in critical skill areas; it is primarily adult-focused but is also applicable for older youth).
- Job Corps (a nationally recognized youth employment program)

In addition, several of the individual ASN schools have cultivated relationships with various community organizations and agencies. For example, Community Christian Academy has a partnership with the Alderman's Office that has led to internships for students. St. Mary's Catholic Church has sponsored clothing drives; and the Community Center hosts sporting events for youth enrolled in PNF.

Program Legacy and Sustainability

The public child welfare agency has undergone leadership changes since this program began. Leadership has focused on systems improvement including an emphasis on reducing the number of children and youth in state custody, an increased focus on permanence for all youth in care, and increasing the intensity of the services to those who are in foster care and group homes. This focus, which represented a major shift in the philosophy of the Department, began in the mid- to late 1990's. In 1997, there were over 60,000 children and youth in out-of-home care in Illinois. As of November 2006, there were about 15,000. Of those, about 40 percent are over 14 with minimal likelihood for adoption.

As previously noted, DCEO managers highlighted the fact that their relationship with DCFS has improved in the past year, and they attribute at least a portion of this enhanced relationship to the PNF project. The two state agencies are working together more closely on a variety of projects that emphasize a community-based and youth-oriented approach.

DCEO does not envision funding this project over the long term. It views the project as a demonstration and would like to see the lessons learned from this project replicated across the

state. DCEO noted that the current One Stop system, particularly in Cook County, is not youth-friendly. As a result, they foresee WIA youth providers taking on a larger role particularly with the higher-risk populations, including youth coming out of the foster care system. It was this thinking that led to encouraging the Children and Family Services agency to become more involved with the project due to the broad array of services needed by this population.

While ASN does not have a formal plan for sustaining this project, project leadership is committed to this model and, based upon its past record of success in fund-raising, believes that they will find the needed resources to continue this program once the demonstration funding ends. ASN champions the cause of out-of-school youth and advocates with public officials across the country, often staging events that involve the youth.

Lessons Learned

A number of responses were received from project staff when asked about what lessons have been learned from this project. Some of the lessons contribute to a better understanding of how to serve this population of youth, whereas others contribute to a better understanding how to implement a demonstration project that involves collaboration across multiple systems and levels of government.

There were many lessons learned about the obstacles and challenges these youth face when seeking to obtain and maintain work. Their lack of typical teen work experiences, coupled with the instability of their living situations and volatile neighborhoods, makes it more difficult to help these youth obtain jobs than is true for other similarly situated youth who do not have a foster care background.

Many of these youth have criminal records that add another set of hurdles to obtaining employment. Also, lack of family support keeps many of these youth from moving forward; these youth do not have the “safety net” of family that other youth have. Even those youth often classified as “at risk” typically have some degree of stability within family relationships and at least a modicum of family support.

Youth coming from foster care have had to make many changes and transitions in their young lives: changing homes, neighborhoods, and schools—often many times. For some youth, this has served to make them flexible and adaptable to new situations, important characteristics of job readiness. But for more youth, these multiple moves have made them distrustful, wary, and weary of change and thus less likely to adapt well to new school or employment environments.

Project staff believes that the youth would respond better to mentors who can provide peer-to-peer support. Staff recommends that mentors be recruited from among recent program graduates.

Several of those interviewed believe that for a project like PNF to be successful in the long term, there needs to be increased participation of DCFS directly with the program. Case workers need to visit the PNF participants on location and develop a checklist that will help them ensure that youth are taking advantage of all the services available to them under all the providers: DCFS, WIA, and ASN/PNF. ASN is frustrated in part by the high annual turnover of DCFS casework staff, which makes it very difficult to maintain consistency.

The first year's experience demonstrated the need for clearly designed programmatic goals, expectations, and structure. While flexibility is important, it must exist within a framework of shared goals and objectives. The team reflection and self-assessment approach is valuable and resulted in changes to the project designed to improve workforce outcomes.

The project at ASN highlights the value and importance of maintaining close contact with the youth to know where they are in terms of their progress. One person who was interviewed referred to this as “looking behind the numbers” and asking the question, “What difference has this program made in the lives of the youth?” The youth believe they can already provide the answer to that question. When they were asked for their “lessons learned,” their responses again came back to the critical role of the mentors and the intensive level of support they received from their mentors in the following areas:

- Stability
- Finding jobs
- Planning a future
- Setting career goals
- Understanding the importance of education and staying in school

- Obtaining specific resources such as financial aid for college

Appendix – Additional Data on Chicago

Table A. Services Received Based on Youth Characteristics at Entry and Quarters Enrolled in Program

Characteristics at Entry	Category	Job Prep	College Prep	GED/ Basic Ed	Life-Skills	Parenting	Health	Income	Substance Abuse	Other
Age	Under 17	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	75.0%
	17 & older	91.5%	88.4%	19.3%	88.7%	28.0%	59.3%	59.9%	15.8%	72.9%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Black	82.7%	79.0%	15.9%	79.5%	76.7%	51.9%	51.4%	12.4	64.3%
	Hispanic	89.5%	100%	--	100%	--	63.2%	52.6%	--	78.9%
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gender	Male	81.6%	84.2%	16.1%	81.6%	72.2%	56.6%	53.9%	22.4	60.5%
	Female	84.8%	79.7%	20.6%	81.9%	73.7%	51.4%	50.7%	9.4	68.8%
School status at entry	In high school	90.6%	89.3%	19.5%	89.9%	70.0%	59.7%	51.0%	18.8%	70.5%
	In a post-secondary institution	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Dropout	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	High school graduate but not enrolled in post-secondary education	72.0%	68.0%	--	66.0%	--	42.0%	56%	--	58.0%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	84.8%	83.7%	17.4%	84.8%	36.1%	57.1%	48.6%	20.0%	66.7%
	Independent living	89.7%	81.5%	20.7%	84.5%	28.6%	51.7%	63.8%	--	69.0%
	Temporary/homeless	74.5%	76.5%	21.1%	72.5%	--	47.1%	45.1%	--	60.8%
Foster care	In care at entry	84.6%	82.2%	18.2%	83.1%	28.4%	53.3%	50.3%	14.4%	66.7%
	Out of care	72.2%	70.6%	--	66.7%	--	--	66.7%	--	55.6%
Incarcerated/ Adjudicated	Yes	86.4%	88.6%	25.0%	90.9%	--	54.5%	56.8%	--	75.0%
	No	82.9%	79.4%	16.8%	79.4%	24.3%	52.9%	50.6%	12.9%	63.5%
Parental status	Not a parent	81.5%	81.4%	14.1%	79.0%	--	50.0%	42.7%	16.9	59.7%
	Non-custodial	94.7%	94.7%	--	89.5%	--	52.6%	68.4%	--	68.4%
	Custodial	81.3%	77.8%	21.6%	81.3%	28.0%	56.0%	60.0%	--	72.0%
Quarters in program	1–3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	4–6	90.9%	90.9%	--	87.9%	--	42.4%	51.5%	--	51.5%
	7–9	90.7%	86.9%	23.6%	88.0%	26.4%	62.0%	62.7%	16.9%	78.7%
Number of Youth		214	209	159	214	94	214	214	214	214

Notes: a) Variable definitions can be found in Table 2 of the main report; and b) cells containing fewer than 10 participants are suppressed, and marked with --.

Table B. Percentage of Youth with Specific Characteristics Who Obtain Different Outcomes

Characteristics at Entry	Category	Attained the Following Outcomes			
		Employment	GED or Diploma ^a	Postsecondary ^b	Any Positive Outcome
Age	Under 17	--	--	--	--
	17 & older	65.5%	51.1%	40.1%	76.3%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	--	--	--	--
	Black	56.2%	43.9%	35.4%	65.4%
	Hispanic	78.9%	--	--	84.2%
	Other	--	--	--	--
Gender	Male	56.6%	38.7%	35.5%	64.5%
	Female	58.0%	50.5%	33.8%	68.8%
School status at entry	In high school	57.7%	47.0%	34.9%	68.5%
	In postsecondary	--	--	--	--
	Dropout	--	--	--	--
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	56.0%	--	40.0%	66.0%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	58.1%	45.7%	30.8%	65.7%
	Independent living	60.3%	51.7%	40.7%	74.1%
	Temporary/homeless	52.9%	42.1%	35.3%	62.7%
Foster care at entry	Yes	58.5%	43.9%	33.5%	66.7%
	No	50.0%	--	--	72.2%
Incarcerated/ Adjudicated	Yes	54.5%	42.5%	45.5%	68.2%
	No	58.2%	47.1%	31.5%	67.1%
Parental status	Not a parent	57.3%	46.7%	33.1%	65.3%
	Non-custodial	52.6%	--	--	68.4%
	Custodial	56.0%	45.1%	33.3%	66.7%
Number of youth		214	159	209	214

Notes: a) Variable definitions can be found in Table 2 of the main report; and b) cells containing fewer than 10 participants are suppressed, and marked with --.

^a Only youth who were in high school or were high school dropouts at enrollment were considered for this outcome.

^b Only youth who were not in postsecondary school at enrollment were considered for this outcome.

Table C. Percentage of Youth with Various Services Who Attain Different Outcomes

Quarters in Program and Services Received		Attained the Following Outcome			
		Employment	GED or Diploma ^a	Postsecondary ^b	Any Positive Outcome
Quarters in program	1–3	--	--	--	--
	4–6	66.7%	58.1%	33.3%	75.8%
	7–9	65.3%	50.0%	40.0%	76.0%
Outcomes by Service Area and Number of Quarters Served (0-9)					
Job preparation	0	--	--	--	--
	1–3	37.7%	28.0%	19.0%	50.8%
	4–6	75.9%	62.9%	54.3%	89.2%
	7–9	100.0%	69.2%	44.1%	100.0%
College preparation	0	--	--	--	--
	1–3	53.8%	36.5%	33.3%	67.0%
	4–6	80.9%	63.8%	49.3%	91.2%
	7–9	88.2%	66.7%	62.5%	94.1%
GED/ Basic Education	0	55.2%	43.4%	34.3%	63.9%
	1–3	62.9%	56.7%	35.3%	77.1%
	4–6	--	--	--	--
	7–9	--	--	--	--
Life skills	0	--	--	--	--
	1–3	48.8%	41.3%	35.8%	65.5%
	4–6	79.7%	54.2%	43.7%	85.1%
	7–9	100.0%	73.3%	--	100%
Parenting	0	53.3%	42.1%	32.4%	63.0%
	1–3	70.0%	65.2%	48.3%	80.0%
	4–6	--	--	--	--
	7–9	--	--	--	--
Health	0	39.4%	44.9%	30.6%	52.9%
	1–3	69.5%	44.0%	37.0%	76.8%
	4–6	82.4%	53.8%	--	82.4%
	7–9	--	--	--	--
Income support	0	38.3%	21.8%	21.0%	43.9%
	1–3	75.0%	68.8%	47.7%	90.9%
	4–6	69.6%	70.6%	43.5%	73.9%
	7–9	--	--	--	--
Substance abuse	0	57.4%	45.8%	34.1%	66.0%
	1–3	50.0%	52.0%	--	65.4%
	4–6	--	--	--	--
	7–9	--	--	--	--
Other	0	38.8%	42.6%	23.9%	50%
	1–3	64.5%	38.6%	40.0%	73.1%
	4–6	92.6%	81.0%	51.9%	100.0%
	7–9	--	--	--	--
Number of youth		214	159	209	214

Notes: a) Variable definitions can be found in Table 2 of the main report; and b) cells containing fewer than 10 participants are suppressed, and marked with --.

^a Only youth who were in high school or were high school dropouts at enrollment were considered for this outcome.

^b Only youth who were not in postsecondary school at enrollment were considered for this outcome.