



FOSTER YOUTH DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

New York, New York 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.

New York, New York Project Profile

State Grantee: New York State Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS)

Local Awardee: New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS)

Service Provider: Arbor Employment and Training; Subcontractor: The Door, Inc.

Project Name: Passport to Success (P2S)

Background

The New York State Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) Office of Youth Development was awarded \$400,000 by the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) for the first year of the Foster Youth Demonstration Project. OCFS selected its largest social service delivery district, New York City, as the site for the project. A year later, DOL provided a second year of funding for an additional \$400,000 and extended the grant period to June 30, 2007. The matching funds for this project came from a combination of state Chafee funds (65%) and local ACS (35%) funding.

New York City's Administration for Children's Services (ACS) Office of Youth Development serves as the administrator of the grant. NYC ACS has contracted with Arbor Employment and Training to act as the managing partner. Arbor is a nationally recognized for-profit company that operates employment programs in many states, including a model program in Philadelphia serving youth aging out of foster care, which is known as the Achieving Independence Center (AIC). Arbor, in turn, has subcontracted with The Door, a nonprofit youth service organization in New York City, which operates a youth center that provides a range of comprehensive programs and services to over 7,000 youth per year, approximately 25 percent of whom have foster care in their background.

Program Design

The program is located at The Door, 121 Avenue of the Americas, a location easily accessible by public transportation within New York City. All youth currently or formerly in care between age 16 and 21, as well as youth on probation, leaving correctional facilities, or receiving ACS services in their own homes throughout New York City, are eligible for the program.

Prior to issuing the solicitation for the project, New York City ACS convened a project design team in October 2004. This team consisted of a diverse group of members, including youth (the Peer Leadership Council), public and private foster care and independent living service providers, high school and postsecondary educators, members of the employment and training community, and other community agencies. Members of this team visited the AIC in Philadelphia and came away determined to use this model in the New York City project design. While they particularly appreciated the “one-stop” model employed in Philadelphia, they quickly recognized that bringing all the services under one roof in New York City would be unrealistic, particularly in the timeframe allowed for the demonstration. Members adjusted the scale of their vision to a model that would provide a “seamless, integrated” approach to services, even if the project design team was housed at multiple sites (ACS, Arbor, and The Door). Creating new linkages and collaborations between agencies that had no prior history of successful collaboration on behalf of this particular population remains a significant goal of the project.

Program Implementation (including highlights of practices and challenges)

The process of awarding the contract was a lengthy one. The contract was not finalized until early 2006, delaying the opening of the program. In February 2006, the program, named Passport to Success (P2S), opened at The Door.

The long process not only affected the start of The Door’s operations, it also had an impact on the overall program implementation and design. First, most of the team of people at ACS who developed the proposal for P2S project and carried the vision, history, and passion for the project had left ACS or were redeployed to other assignments within the agency. Some of those interviewed felt that this staff turnover caused the project to lose momentum and some of its passion and vision, particularly the vision for The Door’s life coaches and the ACS foster care caseworkers to function as a team. One interviewee went so far as to say “the baby got thrown out with the bathwater” during this transition period.

During the transition, ACS began providing services to 30 youth, with the intention of transferring these youth to P2S once programming began. Also, in the original plan, three of the five ACS-provided life coaches were going to be co-located at The Door. Co-location would have provided continuity to the first group of youth served and would have solidified the partnership between ACS, The Door, and Arbor. However, for a variety of reasons described as

“political,” “related to the union,” and other factors, the co-location did not take place. Consequently, The Door had to bring on a completely new cadre of life coaches.

The transition shifted ACS into the role of being a source of referrals and a provider of technical assistance. P2S staff found they had trouble locating some of the original 30 youth and were uncertain as to the level of services they had been receiving under ACS. Also, they found that some of the original youth were not within the 16–21 age range of youth served under this project. The P2S project staff consider February 2006 as their start date. That is when the program began to be fully operational at The Door.

P2S staff believes that The Door is the ideal location for a demonstration such as this for a number of reasons. First, it takes a strong youth development approach to all of its services, and the word on the street is that The Door is a safe and comfortable environment for youth. Many of the youth coming to P2S have had some level of gang involvement, and they appreciate the fact that The Door is a gang-free zone. Youth who have grown tired of being part of a “system” and who resist being tied to the bureaucracies of ACS and the other foster care agencies also appreciate the opportunity to come to a youth-focused neutral location such as The Door. Further, they value the staff’s commitment to confidentiality. Lastly, P2S youth who come to The Door have full access to the array of other services provided within the building.

In addition to the project director, the P2S project has a staff of four: two life coaches, a program assistant, and a job developer. All of the staff is physically located at The Door. Staffing has remained fairly stable. The Door management has worked to ensure that staff members employed by Arbor and located at The Door are fully integrated into The Door, and it has succeeded in convincing them to serve on internal committees, work on program design, and take on other functions. Over the last year, the youth served by the P2S program have become even more integrated into The Door and are availing themselves of the many services that The Door has to offer. One of the more recent services added is an attorney who works in the services department and assists youth with housing and information on other programs.

The youth interviewed truly valued the role of the life coaches. One young woman who participated in focus groups said that, when the life coaches were not located at The Door, she was “in and out” of the program, rarely coming in for specific workshops or activities. Once the life coaches were located at The Door, however, she began coming nearly every day. All the

youth in the focus groups noted that they feel more comfortable discussing personal concerns and future goals with their life coaches than they ever did with their ACS caseworkers. Most had experienced significant turnover with their caseworkers, and they were also concerned with what they perceived as “no confidentiality.” Their caseworkers, they say, “have to write everything down and tell everything to their boss.” At the same time, the youth recognize that the ACS caseworkers and P2S life coaches have different jobs and they believe there is room for both in their lives.

Early in the project, outreach was limited to direct referrals received through ACS and The Door, with a little “mass marketing” through the use of brochures developed by ACS. Many of the youth being referred, particularly through ACS, were too young to fully benefit from the program, so a more strategic approach to ensuring appropriate referrals had to be implemented. Staff realized that they had to do active, targeted recruiting and, in particular, to look at the population of 19-year-olds in foster care. Early enrollments were very low, but they picked up quickly and have exceeded the target number of youth to be served. Many of the enrollments now come through “word of mouth.”

In addition to word of mouth, the staff believes that the most successful recruitment tool was a packet of materials that provided information about what youth get out of the program and particularly about the holistic approach to services offered. These packets were provided to the city foster care agencies in a number of ways, including direct mailings, meetings with individual foster care agencies and with groups of agencies, and informational booths at an expo/fair of the city’s independent living agencies. The P2S project director goes out into the community for these events as often as possible, and did so even more often in the earlier months of the project. Although the project has reached its target numbers, staff is still recruiting on a small scale and accepting referrals from staff at foster care agencies.

The Door does not turn anyone away. If a youth comes for services and does not fit the definition required for P2S, the staff finds another program within The Door, such as Career Pathways, in which youth can participate. The two programs are fairly similar in goals, but Career Pathways is described as using a cohort approach while P2S is described as using a more individualized approach.

Program staff acknowledges that the “rolling admission” approach has created some practical challenges. For example, they may not have a cadre of youth with similar needs for GED services or job-skills training at any given time. This makes implementing group activities difficult and requires services to be individualized to a greater degree than originally anticipated.

When young people are referred to P2S, their first step is to become a member of The Door. This membership gives them access to the building and all of the programs located there, including the health center, food service, legal services, and arts and recreational activities. During the membership interview, the youth is asked about his or her interests and whether he or she ever spent time in foster care. Once staff confirms the foster care status, the young person goes through orientation where they will meet a life coach, take the Ansell-Casey life skills assessment, and work with a life coach to create a membership development plan that includes the youth’s individual goals and needs. Next, the young person attends activities that correspond to his or her interests and needs, including GED classes, job-readiness workshops, etc.

Some of the programs and services the youth receive are standard activities required of all Door members, while other services are specific and unique to the P2S project. If properly documented, participation in P2S also “counts” toward the independent living activities required by ACS for all transition-age youth. All Door members, including the P2S youth, must participate in a “job package,” a set of activities and workshops on topics such as resume-writing and interview skills, as well as a “life skills package,” which includes topics such as hygiene, nutrition, and time management.

Alongside these required activities, which are provided in both individual and group settings, each youth creates a personal membership development plan (MDP) with his or her life coach. This plan details the youth’s current capabilities, goals, and the activities needed to accomplish the goals. The MDP outlines a sequence of steps and a daily schedule for the youth. This might include taking GED classes from 9 AM to 1 PM and participating in various job-related or personal-growth workshops between 3 and 5 PM. From 1 to 3 PM, the youth might work individually on writing a resume, completing GED homework, or using this opportunity to access other Door services including counseling, health care, legal services, etc. As youth progress in their job-readiness, their schedule may change to include some job shadowing, part-time work, or internships before entering a full-time job placement. The youth were quite enthusiastic about

the services they receive. One called P2S the “starter kit for my future,” while another said, “They teach me how to stay out of bad situations.”

Youth receive financial incentives for completing certain workshops and activities. The incentives are also used to support retention efforts, and youth know that if they stay with the program over time, they will be eligible for more financial rewards. “We all have incentives that we work toward in life,” one life coach noted, adding that the financial incentives have been an important part of the P2S retention success. In addition to the financial reward, staff recognizes achievements in other ways at least once a month.

According to P2S staff members, the biggest challenge they face is that they do not know what any new youth will need until he or she arrives at The Door and completes the assessment and MDP process. The youth present significant differences in both ability and interests. Staff found the range of differences eye-opening, and they have tried to create activities that weave together a young person’s interests in becoming a rap artist, for example, with his or her need for basic educational achievements such as a GED and concrete job skills.

Program Progress and Continuing Issues

Initially, the P2S staff did not realize how many of the youth enrolling in the program would need GEDs. They felt that they would be able to absorb the P2S youth into The Door’s existing GED classes. However, out-of-school youth from foster care in need of GEDs became the largest group of youth enrolling in P2S, and the staff soon found they had a waiting list for the GED classes. As a result, the P2S project had to hire its own GED instructor. The young people expressed a strong desire to accomplish academic goals before starting on their job search activities. The youth focus group confirmed this. The focus group members all stated they wanted to achieve academic goals—beginning with obtaining a GED. In fact, it is the promise of support toward reaching these goals that many of the youth highlighted as the principal reason they encourage their friends and siblings to join the P2S program as well. P2S staff has had to develop strategies to integrate the education program into the career services program.

The staff also quickly learned that youth with a foster care background presented different GED needs than other youth coming to The Door. Many of the youth from care were scoring somewhere between a 4th and 8th grade level in reading and math and were starting but not

finishing GED programs. The staff noted at least three reasons for not finishing. First, the youth had too much chaos in their lives to focus on the GED material. Second, they failed to see the relevance between the GED work and their long-range life and career goals. Third, they did not have the readiness skills needed to successfully complete a GED program.

P2S staff responded by integrating the GED program with the career services and requiring youth to participate in both concurrently. In addition, the life coaches make a point of talking to the teachers on a regular basis so they can provide current feedback to the youth and assist them in staying on track.

The life coaches acknowledge that these young people, perhaps even more so than their non-foster-care peers, are still figuring out who they are. Many have children to provide for, so they feel a sense of urgency around securing gainful employment and stable housing. Housing emerged as a significant issue, particularly for the youth who were transitioning from group homes with no family to fall back on. While the P2S staff focused on helping youth locate emergency housing, the ACS staff felt that there was not sufficient recognition of the youth's need for permanent family connections. "If we were starting over," an ACS official explained, "we would definitely create an expectation that assisting the youth in obtaining stability and permanency in their lives must be a priority." To an extent, the P2S life coaches believe they fill part of this gap, and they believe they have developed "deep and strong" relationships with the youth.

Regardless of differences in perspective, all agree that stability in relationships and housing has a direct and profound impact on employment outcomes. If a young person is living in a shaky situation, a simple argument can result in being kicked out and landing on the street. Without a place to live, the likelihood of employment success decreases. The life coaches therefore have to provide intense support through these periods of crisis and transition so that the youth know they have a base to come back to and from which to work forward. Nonetheless, finding suitable housing continues to be a significant challenge, and many of the youth end up living in shelters or moving from place to place.

Mental health challenges are a second area of concern. The staff asserts that the future-oriented focus of the P2S program is new to most of the youth. These youth are not accustomed to having people ask them about their future plans or life goals. They are more used to simply

worrying about how to survive the day or the week. As they begin to plan for their futures, it becomes apparent that many have undiagnosed mental illnesses, learning disabilities, and depression. A few have substance abuse challenges, although this has not been a significant issue. Without a staffed mental health component at the center, the life coaches often find themselves in this role. While they believe they know how to “ask the right questions” to help the youth, they acknowledge that this emotional work takes time away from other responsibilities related to employment and life goals.

When asked why they wanted to be part of P2S and what they valued most from the program, youth interviewed in focus groups included “getting a job” or “help finding a stable job” among their top two or three responses. The project has clearly made employment a central area of focus for the youth and the staff. Arbor has a history of delivering workforce programs. Arbor has worked with the Human Resources Administration (HRA), managed the Staten Island One-Stop Career Center, and welfare-to-work and workforce development programs in New York City. As a result of this history, Arbor has relationships with a large number of New York employers that they tap for P2S youth. Focused outreach to new employers is therefore not necessary, in their view.

Arbor’s director believes that, for many of these youth, part-time employment, while also focusing on educational activities and goals, is the developmentally appropriate goal. The conundrum is that the youth typically come in seeking immediate full-time employment, but they are not ready for full-time employment. They lack both the skills and maturity to be successful in the adult workforce. Yet because they have no family to fall back on and must provide for themselves, and in many cases for their own children or younger siblings, they need full-time employment for survival.

Project management at The Door and at ACS all acknowledged that capturing, reporting, and using data was a challenge. They felt there was initially a lack of clarity around what data needed to be collected and how it was to be reported. P2S staff strongly believes that the performance measures used by DOL are inappropriate for a demonstration project. For example, part-time employment is not adequately captured and thus not sufficiently valued. Moreover, the project has seen important outcomes in the lives of the youth that are not reflected in employment data.

Program Data

As seen in Table 1, over 70 percent of the 127 youth enrolled in New York City as of June 30, 2007 were age 17 and older. Seventy-one percent of these youth are black, and just over one-fourth are Hispanic. Sixty-two percent are female, and nearly half were in high school at time of program entry. Just over one-fourth were high school dropouts at entry, 16 percent were high school graduates, and 10 percent were in postsecondary education. The overwhelming majority of New York enrollees lived in stable housing, 84 percent compared to 10 percent in independent living arrangements and 6 percent who were homeless or in temporary housing. Just over one-fourth of youth had been adjudicated or incarcerated when they entered the program.

Only 12 percent of the youth enrolled in New York were identified as parents in the participant-level data. The percentages of parents who were custodial and non-custodial were nearly the same. New York did not begin enrolling participants until February 2006; accordingly, nearly 60 percent participated for 4–6 quarters, while 41 percent participated for 1–3 quarters.

In addition to the benefits youth in New York received by having access to a safe and welcoming environment at The Door, many youth received job preparation and life skills services, 47 percent and 43 percent, respectively. In addition, 14 percent received college preparation services, 11 percent received GED or Basic Education services, 6 percent received parenting services, and 5 percent received other services. The New York program did not provide participant-level data on the receipt of health, income support, or substance abuse services.

Less than one-fourth of youth in New York were reported to have achieved a positive outcome; 21 percent achieved an employment outcome and 9 percent received a GED or diploma. The lower rate of achievement is likely due to the duration the Passport to Success was in operation. Specifically, no youth in New York were served more than 6 quarters. In comparison, 46% of youth across all sites were served between 7 and 9 quarters. Given more time to serve youth, achievement of positive outcomes could only increase.

Table 1. Youth Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes

Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes	Category	New York City	Total for All Sites
Age	Under 17	27.9%	19.0%
	17 & older	72.1%	81.0%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	0.0%	9.5%
	Black	70.9%	71.3%
	Hispanic	28.3%	14.4%
	Other	0.8%	4.8%
Gender	Male	37.8%	41.6%
	Female	62.2%	58.4%
School status at entry	In high school	46.8%	42.3%
	In postsecondary	10.3%	8.6%
	Dropout	27.0%	22.9%
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	15.9%	26.2%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	84.0%	51.9%
	Independent living	10.4%	29.0%
	Temporary/homeless	5.6%	19.2%
Foster care at entry		52.0%	56.3%
Adjudicated/ Incarcerated		26.8%	21.9%
Parental status	Not a parent	88.2%	80.6%
	Non-custodial	6.3%	5.9%
	Custodial	5.5%	13.5%
Received public assistance and not in foster care		No data	7.1%
Quarters in program	1–3	40.9%	22.3%
	4–6	59.1%	31.9%
	7–9	0.0%	45.8%
Services and Participation: Received the Following			
Job prep		46.5%	76.3%
College prep		14.2%	31.3%
GED/Basic Education		11.0%	20.2%
Life skills		43.3%	41.1%
Parenting		5.5%	6.8%
Health		No data	34.8%
Income support		No data	33.0%
Substance abuse		No data	4.1%
Other		4.7%	45.9%
Attained the Following Outcome			
GED or diploma		8.7%	23.0%
Postsecondary		0.8%	16.8%
Employment		20.5%	35.0%
Any positive outcome		23.6%	44.8%
Number of youth		127	1058

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

Collaborations and Partnerships

NYC ACS, as the contracting agency, got the project off the ground in the beginning by organizing the planning meetings with all partners and a core group of other stakeholders. The rocky transition from ACS to Arbor and The Door caused strained relationships between the organizations, which have greatly improved over time. This past year, P2S youth participated in a pilot internship program sponsored by ACS that provided them with opportunities for career exploration and trial employment. Staff from P2S regularly participates in ACS-sponsored service provider meetings that are used to share information about community resources. ACS is clearly satisfied with the program at The Door and believes it should be replicated in other parts of the city. At the state level, the Office of Children and Family Services provides technical assistance, which has included a variety of training opportunities for the project's life coaches. In particular, staff has been trained in using two career development tools, Real Games Life and Career Zone.

In terms of other partnerships, the City University of New York (CUNY) was originally envisioned as a "primary partner" that would provide 40 slots for P2S youth in a special program designed to simultaneously assist youth in obtaining a GED or high school diploma and college credits. Enrollment of P2S youth in this program has not occurred. P2S staff seemed essentially unfamiliar with the project at CUNY and did not consider them to be a partner.

The New York City Human Resources Administration/Department of Social Services (HRA/DSS), which operates New York City's welfare reform initiatives (TANF) and its related employment programs, provides a variety of job and support opportunities for P2S youth through its role as a sister agency to ACS within New York City government. HRA/DSS has a special focus on youth with disabilities. P2S staff has worked with the agency to refer appropriate youth to this project, known as Binding Together. Binding Together plays a particular role with P2S in producing and printing the project's newsletter. The newsletter is hip, informative, and decidedly youth-focused. It is used in several ways. It is an outreach and retention tool, and it provides opportunities for youth to develop academic and job skills by working on the writing, editing, artwork, layout, and design of the product.

Other organizations who were at the table during the planning phase are not active partners in the project. These include several mentoring organizations, such as the Mentoring Partnership

of New York, Mentoring USA, and the Big Brother/Big Sister program. Part of the reason for this is that P2S is not keen on using outside mentors but prefers for the youth to develop the mentoring relationship internally with the life coaches.

A good relationship does exist with Job Corps, however. Job Corps offers comprehensive services and, perhaps most importantly, housing. The staff estimates that approximately 10 percent of the youth are referred to Job Corps.

When asked about “missing partners,” the project director’s immediate reaction was that more child care and mother infant programming is critically needed. A significant number of youth in the program have children, and he finds that child care challenges have resulted in numerous times when these youth missed workshops, job interviews, and other activities. While child care may help with some of that, he feels that these young women also need mother-infant programming that will help them learn to manage the work-life balance and handle both parenting and job responsibilities.

Program Legacy and Sustainability

There is a great deal of enthusiasm for this project at both the state OCFS level and the city agency, ACS. The state in particular is committed to sustaining the model and to replicating it in other areas of the city and state. Yet there is little evidence that this enthusiasm has translated into concrete plans for sustaining the program or for replicating it in other parts of the city. A new governor was elected last year, and there is a possibility of change in project-related staff at the state level, although this has not happened yet. Many hope that the state will see value in the project and help to keep it operational.

All the parties agree that this project was a catalyst for changing the way that the child welfare and workforce systems do business together on behalf of youth in New York City. Interestingly, at the state OCFS level, some stated that this project has changed the way the state agency interacts with ACS in ways that will continue beyond the life of this project. City ACS staff concur. They feel that this project has created a climate enabling them to work with the state in different ways. They also note that their (ACS) youth development office’s mission has shifted and they are no longer working with youth directly. This change has been internally challenging.

Staff misses the opportunity to have direct involvement with the youth and at times can become frustrated with their new role as service facilitators rather than direct providers.

While ACS feels they already had strong ties to the workforce system, they acknowledge that this project has helped broaden the scope of those connections. The internship program is cited as an example of a joint effort that was not in place before P2S.

While the plans for sustainability seem at an early stage, as yet unformed or grounded in a definite plan, it is clear that everyone who has been involved in this project, from the state officials to the youth served, believe there is a value in keeping it alive. As one youth noted, "There is nothing like this anywhere else in the city."

Lessons Learned

While many of the youth strenuously expressed a belief that youth from foster care are "no different" from other youth in the city, the staff at all levels of the P2S project feel that the most important lesson learned from this project is that youth from foster care do in fact have different needs than other at-risk or high-need populations of youth. Their educational backgrounds have been so inconsistent, their lives have been so unstable, their experiences so spotty that they do not fit easily or well into modularized or cohort approaches to services. The combined lesson then is that the youth are no different from other youth in their hopes, dreams, and desires for their lives and future opportunities, but they have very different needs in order to achieve these goals and realize those dreams. They need a much more intensive level of case management and individualized services to achieve successful outcomes. Each life coach needs to be able to assess and then meet each young person where he or she is across a range of life skills and domains, and then help the young person to develop plans that build on strengths and fill in gaps.

Youth who have been in foster care are not likely to present themselves at a certain "level" of accomplishment that is measurable in typical developmental categories. While any particular youth may be strong in certain life or survival skills (such as food preparation or obtaining medical care), the youth may be totally unskilled in other areas (such as how to apply for a job or even the most rudimentary money management skills). Yet a program cannot be designed that assumes this set of strengths and gaps because the next youth from foster care to walk into

The Door may have the exact opposite profile—perfectly competent at getting a job and handling money but less versed in terms of basic knowledge about nutrition, food preparation, hygiene, or health care. Yet another youth will present a profile that is somewhere between these two. While other populations of at-risk youth also present a wide array of needs, they are not as all-over-the-map as youth from foster care often are.

Moreover, while other populations of youth are likely to have at least a minimal degree of home or family support, including basic needs such as food and housing, the youth transitioning from foster care must be able to independently support themselves, while at the same time working to overcome the competing challenges that affect their ability to be successful in educational and employment settings.

While both Arbor and The Door had worked with youth from foster care in the past, this was the first time that these New York agencies truly focused on this population. As a result, they feel that they have developed a much greater capacity for meeting the needs of these youth, and, even if the program is not sustainable as a standalone or discreet program, they will be better equipped to serve youth from care that come to their respective agencies.

One of the concerns raised by the youth is that the life coaches and other staff are not available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. They raised this issue tentatively, and somewhat jokingly, acknowledging that these life coaches “have a life, have a family” and should not have to be available night and day. Yet they also recognized that their own needs, as youth just starting on the path of adult living, don’t adhere to a 9-5 schedule, and that issues may come up late at night, on weekends and holidays, or at other inopportune times. They expressed a wish for a 24-hour hotline or other mechanism that would fill this gap. ACS staff noted that this is a perfect argument for why paying attention to the youth’s needs for permanent family connections is paramount. “A family IS there 24/7,” one person noted, “unlike any agency under the sun.”

“Does The Door or any one place have the resources to serve the whole population of transitioning youth?” one young person in the focus group wondered. The answer, probably, is no. Those interviewed from ACS believe that there need to be satellite centers in other locations. In their view, while The Door is easily accessible by subway, it is not necessarily accessible for youth from all corners of the city to travel there for services. The Door has a

unique and well-known culture and reputation among youth in the city. For the most part, this is a plus—it is a youth-friendly center that nearly everyone feels comfortable joining. But “nearly” is not “all,” and, in a city the size of New York, it needs to be recognized that no single location or model will meet the needs of all youth. Staff at Arbor, The Door, ACS, and OCFS all agree that there needs to be a continual pushing of the envelope to explore new possibilities and new opportunities to reach those youth who are on the margins and less likely to be reached by established organizations.

Appendix – Additional Data on New York

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	Sub-stance Abuse	Other
Age	Under 17	29.4%	--	--	29.4%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	17 & older	54.5%	--	18.3%	51.1%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
Race/ Ethnicity	White	--	--	--	--	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Black	50.0%	--	17.9%	47.8%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Hispanic	38.9%	--	--	33.0%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Other	--	--	--	--	--	No data	No data	No data	--
Gender	Male	54.2%	--	--	47.9%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Female	41.8%	--	--	40.5%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
School status at entry	In high school	45.8%	--	18.6%	37.3%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	In postsecondary	--	--	--	--	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Dropout	44.1%	--	--	50.0%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	55.0%	--	--	50.0%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
Housing at entry	Stable housing	43.8%	--	--	40.0%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Independent living	--	--	--	69.2%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Temporary/ homeless	--	--	--	--	--	No data	No data	No data	--
Foster care	In care at entry	45.5%	--	--	40.9%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Out of care	47.5%	17.9%	--	45.9%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
Incarcerated/ Adjudicated	Yes	55.9%	--	--	44.1%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	No	43.0%	--	14.7%	43.0%	--	No data	No data	No data	--

Characteristics at Entry	Category	Job Prep	College Prep	GED/ Basic Ed	Life-Skills	Parenting	Health	Income	Sub-stance Abuse	Other
Parental status	Not a parent	45.5%	11.9%	16.9%	43.8%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Non-custodial	--	--	--	--	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	Custodial	--	--	--	--	--	No data	No data	No data	--
Quarters in program	1-3	--	--	--	--	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	4-6	72.0%	14.7%	--	73.3%	--	No data	No data	No data	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--	--	No data	No data	No data	--
Number of Youth		127	114	93	127	15	127	127	127	127

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	26.1%	--	--	29.5%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	--	--	--	--
	Black	20.0%	--	--	23.3%
	Hispanic	--	--	--	--
	Other	--	--	--	--
Gender	Male	22.9%	--	--	27.1%
	Female	19.0%	--	--	21.5%
School status at entry	In high school	20.3%	--	--	22.0%
	In postsecondary	--	--	--	--
	Dropout	--	--	--	--
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	--	--	--	--
Housing at entry	Stable housing	16.2%	--	--	20.0%
	Independent living	--	--	--	--
	Temporary/homeless	--	--	--	--
Foster care at entry	Yes	19.7%	--	--	24.2%
	No	21.3%	--	--	23.0%
Incarcerated/ Adjudicated	Yes	--	--	--	29.4%
	No	18.3%	--	--	21.5%
Parental status	Not a parent	19.6%	--	--	23.2%
	Non-custodial	--	--	--	--
	Custodial	--	--	--	--
Number of youth		127	93	114	127

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 Outcomes			
		Employment	GED or Diploma ^a	Postsecondary ^b	Any Positive Outcome
Quarters in program	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	32.0%	--	--	34.7%
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Job preparation	0	--	--	--	16.2%
	1-3	29.3%	--	--	31.0%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
College preparation	0	21.1%	--	--	23.9%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
GED/ Basic Education	0	19.5%	--	--	22.1%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Life skills	0	--	--	--	--
	1-3	36.4%	--	--	40.0%
	4-6	--	---	---	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Parenting	0	20.4%	--	--	22.5%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Health	0	20.5%	--	--	23.6%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Income support	0	20.5%	--	--	23.6%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Substance abuse	0	20.5%	--	--	23.6%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Other	0	19%	--	--	22.3%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Number of Youth		127	93	114	127

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.