



FOSTER YOUTH DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Detroit, Michigan 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 <http://www.casey.org/doleval> or <http://www.iel.org/programs/casey.html> for more information.

Detroit, Michigan Project Profile

State Grantee:

Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (DLEG)

Local Awardee and Project Name:

Southeast Michigan Community Alliance (SEMCA); Detroit Workforce Development Department (DWDD) and Employment and Training Designs, Inc. (ETDI)

Foster Youth Demonstration Project

Creating Independence and Outcomes (CIAO)

Detroit, MI

Background

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) Employment and Training Administration (ETA) selected the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (DLEG) as one of five sites for the Foster Youth Demonstration Project. The selection carried a funding award totaling \$800,000, with a required match of state funds. The state used Chafee funds to provide the matching funds required by ETA. The ETA grant period began March 1, 2005 as a one-year demonstration project and was later extended for a second year, to end on June 30, 2007.

DLEG enlisted Michigan Works! (a group of federally funded Workforce Investment Act agencies), the Detroit Workforce Development Department (DWDD), and the Southeast Michigan Community Alliance (SEMCA) to develop the proposal. The latter two agencies serve the City of Detroit and the remainder of the cities in Wayne County, respectively. DLEG left the program design up to the local agencies. SEMCA was the lead agency in terms of issuing the solicitation. The two agencies selected Employment and Training Designs, Inc. (ETDI) as the service provider to operate the program; ETDI has operated the program from its inception to the present. ETDI is a for-profit organization that has provided services to youth since 1986. It is a current youth service provider in Highland Park and a One-Stop Career Center operator for the City of Wayne.

Program Design

Project youth, with guidance from staff, named the project “Creating Independence and Outcomes: CIAO.” The goal is to help youth who are leaving the foster care system and entering adulthood to develop the skills, tools, and resources necessary to live a successful and independent life. The youth begin the program with an orientation and assessment, which are then used to create an individualized package of services for each individual. A hallmark of the program is the presence of staff who were formerly in foster care. They are known as peer advocates. They help to create a “youth-friendly” atmosphere as they blend social services and employment services in one location.

Program Implementation (including highlights of practices and challenges)

The project was originally located at the Highland Park One-Stop Career Center in a relatively small space. Highland Park is a small community separate from but surrounded on all sides by Detroit. During the first year of the project, it became clear that the project location did not meet the needs of the program. Multiple break-ins and thefts occurred at the Highland Park location, including a shooting that occurred after business hours in which stray bullets penetrated the walls of the Highland Park office. While previous concerns about the location mostly centered on the lack of space for services and privacy, the shooting created a new sense of urgency. To serve youth, the youth needed to be safe and feel safe in their environment.

After exploring multiple options, the project was relocated to 1300 Rosa Parks Blvd. in the building formerly occupied by the Youth Opportunity (YO!) program. This location is also part of the DWDD facilities as a satellite Michigan Works! Center. It offers a larger space with more private offices that are conducive to private conversations between staff and youth.

Over the course of the program, there have been changes in personnel as well as a shift in the general philosophy and approach to services. Some of these changes were under consideration during the first year of operation. Several factors served as the catalyst for the changes, particularly the change in location, but also for staffing changes and programmatic outcomes.

The project’s original facilitator left the project, as did the first peer group facilitator (an alumnus of foster care). The peer group facilitator position was then filled. On close review of the project

data and outcomes and through consultation with the state and local agencies that oversee this project, a decision was made to shift from the largely “social work” approach initiated by the first project facilitator to a more employment-focused program. While holistic assessments and case plans are still in use, the mission of the program was refocused to help youth set and achieve educational goals, including attending college, and to obtain meaningful employment. The youth interviewed reflected this shift. More so than last year, when asked to describe the mission or purpose of CIAO, the youth said “To help us get a job.”

One of the most significant shifts was a move to a more individualized and flexible approach. For example, while participation in job-readiness workshops had previously followed a sequence and schedule, they moved toward a more individualized and flexible approach. A consequence of this change, however, may be that not all youth are receiving all of the components and thus are not well-prepared for work, a problem noted by one of the project staff.

Almost half of participants are high school dropouts. GED preparation continues to be a challenge. At the former location, CIAO employed the services of an on-site GED preparation teacher housed in the same building with the CIAO program. After moving locations and losing the on-site GED instructor, CIAO tried sending youth out to community-based GED preparation programs. They found that these services are not really appropriate for the youth they are serving. The spotty educational history and multiple moves that the youth experienced in foster care contribute to a different level of readiness and the need for a more individualized approach to GED preparation than is typically available in the community. Many youth were taking the GED test and failing. CIAO noted that the math portion of the GED is problematic for their youth. As a result, they moved back to the in-house model of GED preparation and have hired a retired principal and former special education teacher, who have restructured the program. Staff noted that they are now seeing youth make academic progress, although a number of them are still not ready to take the GED test.

Youth transitioning out of foster care in Michigan have the option to obtain services provided by the Youth in Transition (YIT) office of the Department of Human Services. YIT caseworkers, called “specialists,” provide a range of independent living and referral services to youth. This office also coordinates the federally funded Chafee Foster Care Independence program. The state match for the CIAO project is provided by the Chafee funds. For this reason, a close

relationship between CIAO and YIT was envisioned. YIT was one of the intended sources of referrals for youth to the CIAO project. YIT faced several challenges during the second year, however. The CIAO staff assisted youth with applications for YIT services, but not all were successful in obtaining the services.

The project has also experienced funding challenges. CIAO started operations in March 2005, and the project management believed that the budgeted period of performance was for one year forward from that date. Using this calculus, they operated the program on the budget year March 2005 through February 2006. They did have some funds remaining after February 2006 but did not have enough to cover the no-cost extension period that DOL had provided to all sites through June 30, 2006. The second-year funding provided by DOL was intended to cover operations from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007, which is the DOL program year of funding under WIA. The project again experienced a shortfall of funds, and the state had to step in and provide stopgap funding until the changeover to Casey Family Programs' funding along with the state's matching funds. The staff has stressed that these funding challenges never affected the youth enrolled in the program, although they did have an impact on continuing enrollments.

Program Progress and Continuing Issues

The project has had no problems attracting youth to the program. Many youth come through "word of mouth"; others are referred by agencies. Enrollments exceeded the target of 120 originally established by DOL. With the funding uncertainties, however, enrollments have slowed.

Another change that occurred this past year is that the project was informed by the child welfare agency that they no longer could serve youth past their 21st birthday. It is not clear what the impetus was for the change, but it caused the project to institute a hard exit point from the program. Prior to this, Detroit, like most of the other sites, exited few participants from the program. To ease the transition for the youth, the peer advocates established an alumni association. The alumni association offers a quarterly newsletter to provide information about resources that are available. The association's periodic meetings provide a forum for the youth to get together and provide peer support.

Detroit's economy presents challenges for long-term career placements. The city's unemployment rate is among the highest in the nation, and there has been considerable downsizing within the auto industry. In addition, the state has been experiencing severe budget problems. While these budget problems have not affected the state's ability to provide matching funds, it may well affect Michigan's ability to continue to support the program once Casey Family Program funding ends. Despite all this, the project staff reported that they are able to find entry-level jobs for youth, and the job placement specialist has developed relationships with some of the larger employers in Detroit, such as Target, CVS, and fast food chains. The bigger challenges the staff noted were how unprepared the youth were for work and how many had transportation difficulties—most youth do not live in proximity to the available jobs and Detroit has very limited public transportation.

Like other sites, Detroit has had difficulty with the data reporting and performance measures. CIAO began by using a data tracking system known as Kidsmart. A variety of Excel spreadsheets were created to track outcomes and activities because of gaps and weaknesses in the system. Another challenge was terminology. Terms that were used one way in the original project proposal were defined differently in the data system and in the performance measures, making it challenging to both record and actually meet the performance measures that DOL established for the demonstration projects. These concerns came from nearly all parties interviewed, at the state, city, and grantee level. The two most frequent concerns were that:

- The youth measures discourage the flexibility to experiment, try new approaches, and make changes based on lessons learned that are inherent in a demonstration project. This limits creativity, innovation, and risk-taking.
- Performance outcomes are also seen as too rigid for this population. Several staff expressed that the complexity of the needs of youth from foster care demand more time to achieve outcomes, and to expect certain job placement or educational outcomes in six months time is unrealistic for this population.

While the staff generally acknowledges that the use of the performance measures helped foster a programmatic focus on the five key areas—enrollment, retention, GED attainment, job placement, and recidivism—the staff also expressed concern that rigid adherence to performance measures sent a mixed message. As one staff member asked, “Is this a demonstration project where the objective is to try new things and learn from them, or to ‘teach

to the test' by focusing solely on activities geared to achieve the outcomes?" Another suggested, "We should be required to report how we are doing against these measures, but not [be] judged by them if this is truly a demonstration project."

CIAO staff believes they are seeing Detroit's "most challenging" and "most disconnected" youth. They believe this indicates that their program is filling a critical need in the community, but at the same time, they note the impact of the severe and complex needs of these youth on their outcomes. In particular, they are seeing a high level of unmet mental health needs in youth. Providing suitable referrals to mental health providers has been challenging, as has finding suitable housing. Many landlords do not want to rent to youth because they have no credit and instable incomes.

Program Data

The participant data in Table 1 show that Detroit had enrolled 152 youth by June 30, 2007. Nearly all of these youth were 17 or older; only 4 percent of youth were under 17 at the time of entry. Approximately 88 percent of youth served were black, 7 percent were white, and 5 percent were in other racial categories. Two-thirds of Detroit's participants were female and one-third was male.

Detroit enrolled a high percentage of youth who had dropped out of high school. Just under half of youth enrolled in Detroit fell into this category. Nearly one-third of youth had graduated high school but had not entered postsecondary schooling, and just under one-fifth were in high school when they entered the program.

In terms of housing status at entry, approximately two-thirds of youth lived in stable housing arrangements at entry, one-fourth lived in temporary housing or were homeless, and 9 percent lived in independent living arrangements.

Over half of the youth in Detroit's program were in foster care at entry. Just under one-third of Detroit's participants were parents when they entered the program, and approximately one-fourth of participants were custodial parents.

Nearly all youth in Detroit received job preparation services and other services, such as transportation or child care. Over half received life skills training, nearly half received GED or Basic Education training, and just over one-fourth received college preparation services.

In terms of outcomes, nearly half of youth in Detroit achieved a positive outcome while in the program, nearly 40 percent of youth got a job, 11 percent entered postsecondary school, and 5 percent obtained a GED or diploma.

Table 1. Youth Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes

Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes	Category	Detroit	Total for All Sites
Age	Under 17	3.9%	19.0%
	17 & older	96.1%	81.0%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	7.2%	9.5%
	Black	88.2%	71.3%
	Hispanic	0.0%	14.4%
	Other	4.6%	4.8%
Gender	Male	35.5%	41.6%
	Female	64.5%	58.4%
School status at entry	In high school	18.5%	42.3%
	In postsecondary	4.0%	8.6%
	Dropout	47.7%	22.9%
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	29.8%	26.2%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	65.6%	51.9%
	Independent living	8.6%	29.0%
	Temporary/ homeless	25.8%	19.2%
Foster care at entry		55.3%	56.3%
Adjudicated/Incarcerated		No data	21.9%
Parental status	Not a parent	69.7%	80.6%
	Non-custodial	7.2%	5.9%
	Custodial	23.0%	13.5%
Received public assistance and not in foster care		3.3%	7.1%
Quarters in program	1–3	2.0%	22.3%
	4–6	22.4%	31.9%
	7–9	75.7%	45.8%
Services and Participation: Received the Following			
Job prep		96.7%	76.3%
College prep		27.0%	31.3%
GED/Basic Education		46.7%	20.2%
Life skills		50.7%	41.1%
Parenting		3.3%	6.8%

Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes	Category	Detroit	Total for All Sites
Health		17.1%	34.8%
Income support		17.1%	33.0%
Substance abuse		2.0%	4.1%
Other		86.2%	45.9%
Attained the Following Outcomes			
GED or diploma		4.6%	23.0%
Postsecondary		10.5%	16.8%
Employment		38.8%	35.0%
Any positive outcome		45.4%	44.8%
Number of youth		152	1058

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

Collaborations and Partnerships

The move to the Rosa Parks Center has brought benefits to CIAO in terms of services. Youth have the opportunity there to participate in workshops and job fairs. At one point there were a number of other tenants in the building, including Vocational Rehabilitation and a GED testing center. Some of these tenants have left, as the Mayor’s Office of Employment and Training is restructuring its programs and operations. Last year, the city employment and training agency was becoming more involved with the program, but over the past year it has been a largely silent partner. SEMCA, the contracting agency, is more involved with the program, although it is not clear what support, other than financial, it has provided.

Some of the more useful linkages the transition specialists have developed include an agency called Crossroads. Crossroads helps the youth obtain their state IDs and birth certificates and provides support for prescription drug costs. Another link is an agency called Capuchin, which provides food and furniture through a soup kitchen and store. Program staff also makes referrals and list resources on their door for community-based services and events, ranging from job fairs and immunization fairs to a program called “Making it to the Finish Line.” This program supplies needs and enrichments like prom dresses for youth. This year a program located in the building, Step Up for Kids, provided mentoring services to the youth.

Program Legacy and Sustainability

This project was heralded as an unprecedented collaboration between the state and the two neighboring workforce areas, Highland Park and Detroit. A working committee was formed to advise on the design and development of the project. This group continued to meet on occasion in an advisory capacity to the project. It included most of the partners already mentioned, as well as the state juvenile justice agency, Wayne County Juvenile Justice Agency, local child welfare representatives, Wayne County alternative education agencies, and youth representatives. This group, along with representatives of state government, continued to meet periodically during the first two years but then disbanded during the second year.

The advisory committee never established a clear focus and mission and thus never made an impact on the program. The failure of this group was a lost opportunity for developing cross-agency relationships that would help address the many challenges that come with serving this population of youth. In addition, the Detroit Workforce Development Department has remained largely uninvolved this past year. The agency recently experienced a turnover in leadership and by all accounts, is undergoing a period of restructuring.

On a more positive note, Michigan is one of 16 states participating in an ETA-sponsored “Youth Vision” Initiative. This initiative focuses on improving services to targeted populations. Michigan was also selected as one of six states to participate in the National Governors Association’s national policy initiative on serving youth aging out of foster care. Foster youth are the target population for Michigan. The state is very interested in replicating models similar to CIAO across the state.

SEMCA also plans to continue to serve this population of youth after the grant ends. It has noted that these youth in some ways fit easily into the regular WIA model but at the same time have a higher or “more intensive” level of needs. SEMCA is struggling with how to integrate the lessons learned from this and other demonstration projects into its ongoing work without losing the uniqueness of the demonstration projects.

Everyone interviewed (including youth) agreed on the critical importance of using the workforce system to serve youth transitioning from foster care. All agreed that this effort must continue, even after the DOL funding for the demonstration project ends. Interviewees differ significantly, however, on what the vision for that continuation might look like. For example, some felt strongly

that youth from care need a discreet, distinct program that is specifically designed for them. In this view, CIAO should not only be sustained as a freestanding project, but should serve as a prototype for similar projects in other parts of the state. Others felt equally strongly that the strategies, approaches, and activities developed for CIAO should be disseminated to and embedded/integrated into existing WIA projects throughout the state. In this view, there will be no need for a standalone project after the project funding ends.

Lessons Learned

The “lessons learned” fall into two categories:

- (1) Lessons about the unique service needs of youth transitioning from foster care
- (2) Lessons about creating and implementing a successful cross-system demonstration project

In regard to the former, several of those interviewed stated that this project created a greater awareness of the needs of this population. While there are many categories of youth, and adults, who are considered “at risk” or “hard to serve,” this particular group poses some unique challenges. The first is that these youth truly have no home or family to provide any stability for them as they navigate the often rocky waters of the passage from childhood to adulthood. The multiple moves and traumas they have experienced create an inherent lack of trust, as well as very specific and concrete gaps in their learning and life experiences. “The system” that has cared for them has not typically provided them with the opportunities most youth have to “try and fail” at various activities within a safety net of home and family support.

The result of these factors is that these youth have developed street smarts and survival skills that are often at odds with success in the mainstream adult world. Many of these youth need a program that provides extra time to develop trust, and that takes into account the likelihood that they will move one or more times before completing any program. Employment services need to begin at a very basic level, such as providing necessary pre-work readiness skills related to nutrition, hygiene, punctuality, problem solving, and communication.

These youth may also have significant gaps in their education, particularly in mathematics, where missing a year or changing school three times in junior high can have a dramatic impact

on the young person's ability to obtain a high school diploma or GED, or to go on to college or careers that require any level of math proficiency.

Youth from foster care have often experienced medical neglect or inattention to their medical needs such that medical conditions can interfere with their ability to benefit from their education or to obtain and maintain employment. They need to have access to medical services, but they also need education about how to use those services in a preventative and proactive way rather than in a crisis-oriented fashion.

One of the strongest lessons learned was that these youth have needs that are served by multiple systems—health, mental health, juvenile justice, education, and others—in addition to the two systems, workforce and child welfare, brought together for this project. Thus, a successful project needs to open doors to all of these systems in order to work constructively on behalf of these young people.

While all of this is true, there needs to be a balance between creating a “youth-friendly” environment and focusing on high standards for all youth served. As one staff noted:

I believe it is wonderful to have good atmosphere, but we also need to have high expectations and service structure delivery. As a group, we need to move beyond the excuses that “youth are unreliable” or “youth aren't capable of coming to a meeting” and develop systematic plans to address the issues that are affecting success.

The Detroit project management team share a hope that these lessons will be applied more generally in workforce programs for youth, recognizing that youth transitioning from foster care are likely to be a subset of any larger youth population served. This grew out of a recognition that existing WIA services do not always meet the needs of populations with special needs and that WIA services were available not only to foster youth but also individuals with disabilities. The processes used to identify barriers and resources, the tracking of services, and staff training and supervision that have proven successful in serving adults with disabilities could, and should, be applied to serving youth transitioning from foster care.

The second focus of the “lessons learned” conversations had to do with the very nature of creating and implementing a demonstration project. Several interviewees believed that a demonstration project demands a greater level of flexibility and creativity than is typically found in other programs, and that it is incumbent on the project managers and program monitors to

foster and encourage flexibility, and then to look at the outcomes, rather than to structure a demonstration around a set of predetermined outcomes.

There was also concern that perhaps the staff was not fully aware of the demonstration nature of the project, and that this created some tensions and stresses in the early stages. It would be ideal, at the outset, to provide some staff training on the implications of managing a demonstration project with monitoring from three different agencies.

Appendix – Additional Data on Detroit

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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	17 & older	97.9%	28.1%	67.0%	52.7%	--	17.8%	17.8%	--	88.4%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	100.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	90.9%
	Black	97.8%	28.3%	64.8%	48.5%	--	16.4%	19.4%	--	87.3%
	Hispanic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gender	Male	98.1%	26.9%	62.2%	48.1%	--	18.5%	--	--	79.6%
	Female	95.9%	26.9%	68.3%	52.0%	--	16.3%	20.4%	--	89.8%
School status at entry	In high school	96.4%	--	--	46.4%	--	--	--	--	78.6%
	In post-secondary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Dropout	97.2%	22.2%	86.1%	50.0%	--	19.4%	15.3%	--	84.7%
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	95.6%	42.2%	--	55.6%	--	--	26.7%	--	91.1%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	98.0%	31.3%	62.9%	49.5%	--	16.2%	14.1%	--	84.8%
	Independent living	92.3%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	84.6%
	Temporary/ homeless	94.9%	--	72.0%	51.3%	--	--	--	--	89.7%
Foster care	In care at entry	96.4%	27.5%	57.4%	46.4%	--	13.1%	13.1%	--	82.1%
	Out of care	97.1%	26.2%	79.5%	55.9%	--	22.1%	22.1%	--	91.2%
Incarcerated/ Adjudicated	Yes	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
	No	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
Parental status	Not a parent	97.2%	26.7%	42.5%	--	--	16.0%	15.1%	--	85.7%
	Non-custodial	90.9%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	90.9%
	Custodial	97.1%	--	69.6%	57.1%	--	--	--	--	85.7%
Quarters in program	1–3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	73.5%
	4–6	97.1%	--	69.2%	44.1%	--	--	--	--	--
	7–9	99.1%	28.7%	66.7%	53.9%	--	17.4%	16.5%	--	92.2%
Number of Youth		152	145	100	152	46	152	152	152	152

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 Attain 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	40.4%	--	10.1%	47.3%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	--	--	--	--
	Black	37.3%	--	9.4%	44.8%
	Hispanic	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--
Gender	Male	40.7%	--	--	48.1%
	Female	37.8%	--	--	43.9%
School status at entry	In high school	42.9%	--	--	50.0%
	In postsecondary	--	--	--	--
	Dropout	36.1%	--	--	38.9%
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	35.6%	--	--	46.7%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	40.4%	--	10.4%	46.5%
	Independent living	38.5%	--	--	--
	Temporary/homeless	33.3%	--	--	35.9%
Foster care at entry	Yes	36.9%	--	12.5%	45.2%
	No	41.2%	--	--	45.6%
Incarcerated/ Adjudicated	Yes	No data	No data	No data	No data
	No	No data	No data	No data	No data
Parental status	Not a parent	34.9%	--	--	41.5%
	Non-custodial	--	--	--	--
	Custodial	54.3%	--	--	60.0%
Number of youth		152	100	145	152

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	--	--	--	35.3%
	7-9	43.5%	--	10.2%	49.6%
Outcomes by Service Area and Number of Quarters Served (0-9)					
Job preparation	0	--	--	--	--
	1-3	38.3%	--	8.9%	44.5%
	4-6	44.4%	--	--	55.6%
	7-9	--	--	--	--
College preparation	0	41.4%	--	--	45.9%
	1-3	30.8%	--	--	43.6%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	43.3%
GED/ Basic Education	0	38.3%	--	16.2%	48.1%
	1-3	40.3%	--	--	43.1%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Life skills	0	36.0%	--	--	42.7%
	1-3	41.7%	--	--	47.2%
	4-6	40.0%	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Parenting	0	38.1%	--	10.0%	44.9%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Health	0	34.9%	--	10.9%	42.1%
	1-3	60.0%	--	--	64.0%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Income support	0	38.1%	--	9.2%	43.7%
	1-3	42.3%	--	--	53.8%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Substance abuse	0	38.3%	--	9.9%	45.0%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Other	0	--	--	--	--
	1-3	40.9%	--	10.9%	47.0%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Number of youth		152	100	145	152

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.