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Setting the Scene

- Young adults from low-income backgrounds less likely to obtain post-secondary training needed for well-paying occupations
- Year Up, a one-year program for young adults (18-24) with high-school credentials, has proven to be an effective response
  - Year Up is one of 9 programs being evaluated for PACE, a project sponsored by the federal Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation
  - First PACE report (Fein and Hamadyk 2018) found large positive earnings impacts lasting at least 3 years
- Forthcoming (late ’20 publication) report extends impact analysis to 5 years and analyzes costs and benefits over the same period. Today’s presentation focuses on impact findings.
- Spoiler: Large impacts persisted undiminished to the end of the 5-year period!
Year Up

- Stand-alone version evaluated in PACE operates in 9 cities, serves about 2,000 young adults/year
- Provides 6 months of full-time training followed by 6 month internships with major employers
- Hallmarks
  - Focus on IT and financial service sectors
  - Stringent applicant screening
  - Basic, professional (soft), and occupational skills training
  - “High expectations, high support” model
  - Strong connections to employers
  - Relatively intensive and costly ($28,290/participant)
The Study

- Randomly assigned 2,544 to treatment (Year Up) and control (no-Year Up) groups
- For impact study, measured and compare average outcomes based on
  - 5 years of administrative (wage and college) records data
  - Data from a 3-year follow-up survey
- Note that follow-up period covered in upcoming report is entirely pre-pandemic
  - Future reports will cover period following pandemic onset
Main Finding: Large Earnings Impacts Persisted to the End of the 5-Year Period
Other Findings

- Earnings impacts large and statistically significant for all subgroups examined—though not quite as large for some groups (e.g., weaker educational backgrounds) as for others
- Little/no longer term impacts on additional education and training
- Effects in some but not all other domains examined
  - Financial circumstances (+)
  - Psycho-social outcomes (0)
  - Living independently (+)
Quiz: Which of the Following Best Explain Year Up’s Large Earnings Impacts?

- Careful applicant screening
- Multi-pronged approach to skills training, with strong supports and high expectations
- Close connections to employers with “skin in the game”
- All of the above (balance of sentiment in qualitative interviews w/YU stakeholders for implementation study)
- Don’t know
Upcoming PACE Reports

- Will extend analysis to 7- and 10*-year follow-up period and
  - Examine longer-term effects on earnings and other life outcomes that changed financial circumstances might influence
  - Extend CBA to encompass lifetime benefits and costs

- Also will begin to trace effects of pandemic economy. Substantial potential for effects due to T-C differences in occupation:
  - % employed in IT and finance higher for Ts than Cs
  - % employed in retail and services higher for Cs than Ts

* A 10-year follow-up is an option contingent on availability of funding.
Questions for Future Studies

- What changes in the Year Up program might produce earnings impacts that grow (not just persist) over time?
- What is the potential for extending Year Up’s impacts to broader populations?
- The pandemic accelerated Year Up’s shift to all/partly virtual training. It also is piloting shorter models. Can such adaptations achieve comparable effectiveness?
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The Economic Opportunities Program (EOP) advances strategies, policies, and ideas to help low- and moderate-income people thrive in a changing economy. We recognize that race, gender, and place intersect with and intensify the challenge of economic inequality and we address these dynamics by advancing an inclusive vision of economic justice. For over 25 years, EOP has focused on expanding individuals’ opportunities to connect to quality work, start businesses, and build economic stability that provides the freedom to pursue opportunity.
Generation Work & EOP’s Role

- Annie E. Casey Foundation’s **Generation Work** initiative
  - 5 communities – Cleveland, Hartford, Indianapolis, Philadelphia, and Seattle
  - New ways of connecting young people — particularly youth of color — with the knowledge, experience, and relationships necessary to succeed in today's job market

- Aspen EOP’s role with Generation Work
  - National research partner
  - Research focuses on practices related to engaging business representatives in deeper conversations to identify and cultivate “good fit” job opportunities for young people.
Learnings about Work-based Learning

- Aerospace Joint Apprenticeship Committee (AJAC), Seattle, WA

- District 1199C Training & Upgrading Fund (The Training Fund), Philadelphia, PA

- Goodwill Indianapolis,

- PowerCorpsPHL, Philadelphia, PA
Objectives Work-based Learning

- Relevant work experience that helps position young adults to secure subsequent employment opportunities;

- Development of occupation-specific and essential work skills such as respect for self and others, leadership skills, ability to manage emotions, communicate and problem-solve;

- Relevant experience that allows young adults to apply the technical, academic, and employability skills learned in a classroom to a work-setting;

- Early exposure to an occupation so that young adults can understand whether it is a good fit;

- A chance for young adults to demonstrate their abilities to an employer and challenge biases that have played a role in limiting employment opportunities for young adults of color;

- Development of professional relationships and expanded social networks;

- Opportunities for young adults to work in a safe environment where they can learn, make mistakes and grow;
Pre-Work of Preparing Young Adults for WBL

- Connecting students to employers early in WBL programming
  - Employer connections include – participating as guest speakers, providing instruction, arranging tours of facilities, conducting mock interviews, and participating in informational interviews.

- Preparing young adults for the short- and long-term
  - Equipping young adults with portable credentials that are transferable to other jobs and industries

- Nurturing positive relationships and providing a comprehensive set of supports

- Preparing young people for racism in the workplace
The Work of Managing WBL Opportunities with Employers

- Discerning occupations where WBL is a feasible option
  - In what ways is WBL a value add for employers?
  - Are there occupations where on-the-job experience is a pre-requisite

- Addressing employer-associated risks and burden with providing WBL
  - Strategies include being sponsor of record for apprenticeship programs, or directly employing young adult participants on behalf of the employer.

- Ensuring that a young person will be working in a safe and supportive environment
  - Understand the accessibility of the work site
  - Understand the demographic characteristics (age, sex, race) of the frontline workers and supervisors at the facility;
  - Understand type of equipment that workers use and whether it is aligned with the students’ training;
  - Learn about WBL supervisors’ mindset around supporting worker stability and growth;
The Work of Managing WBL Opportunities with Employers

- Helping employers guide young adults at work
  - Identify key job functions that young adults will perform at work
  - Manage expectations about performance and provide guidance on how to assess performance and provide feedback to young adults at work
  - Identify ways to support the development of healthy relationships at work

- Paying young adults
Final Thoughts

- There is untapped potential of the most diverse generation of workers and WBL can help address many of the workforce challenges that young adults of color encounter in the labor market.

- As the economy moves into recovery, centering young adults of color in workforce investments will help move us towards more just and equitable workforce and economic outcomes

- Successful WBL programs will need investments that both support the time and staff resources necessary to work with both participants and employers.
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The Y.O.U. SYEP Program

• Y.O.U. (Youth Opportunities Unlimited) serves youth living in economically distressed circumstances in the Cleveland area and provides the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP).

• This experience is intended to serve as a building block for future employment opportunities and financial literacy.

• Each summer, the program places as many as 3,000 youth in summer jobs
• Within the last five years, a few studies have looked specifically at the impact of SYEP on key criminal justice and educational outcomes.

  – Studies in other American cities examining the impact of SYEP on both criminal justice (Heller, 2014; Davis and Heller, 2017; Modestino, 2019; and Gelber et al, 2015) and educational outcomes (Leos-Urbel 2014; Davis and Heller 2017; Gelber et al, 2015; and Schwartz et al, 2015) report promising but somewhat mixed results.

• The present study builds upon this previous research using an integrated data system to examine whether similar patterns are evident in Cleveland for the Y.O.U. SYEP.
Research Questions

• What is the effect of the Y.O.U. SYEP on:
  – juvenile delinquency filings in the 1-2 years following job placement?
  – county jail incarceration in the 1-2 years post placement for those who turn 18 in the post-job placement period?
  – school attendance in the academic year following job placement?
  – high school graduation and college matriculation?
Data and Sample

• Sample is drawn from SYEP applicant records from 2014-2018 that were matched to the CHILD System (n=19,334)

Treatment Group (n=3,184)
SYEP applicants that were selected for a summer job and were present for at least 2/3 of program days

Comparison Group (n=16,150)
SYEP applicants that were not selected to participate.

• Selection process is not based on applicant credentials
Using integrated data to build the evidence-base
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile delinquency</td>
<td>Delinquency filings</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>County jail incarceration</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational outcomes</td>
<td>Attendance rate; graduation; college matriculation</td>
<td>E1, E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.O.U intervention</td>
<td>Completed SYEP program</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth characteristics</td>
<td>Gender; race/ethnicity; age; education; Cleveland resident</td>
<td>E1, S, Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth outcomes</td>
<td>Premature birth; low birth weight</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal characteristics</td>
<td>Teen motherhood; mothers’ education at child birth</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty status</td>
<td>SNAP &gt;50% of life time</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare</td>
<td>Neglect/abuse investigation; foster care placement</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Concentrated disadvantage factor score</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: J=Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court; I=Cuyahoga County Jail Inmate data; E1=CMSSD and Inner ring suburban school districts in the county; E2=Ohio Department of Education; Y=Y.O.U; C1=Cuyahoga County Job and Family Services; C2=Cuyahoga County Division of Children and Family Services; N=American Community Survey (ACS); S=Ohio Department of Health
Study Design

• Set out to treat this like an RCT…
• But, baseline comparability analysis revealed key differences between groups.

• As a result, we modeled selection using a propensity score technique to identify a sub-group of the non-selected applicants most similar to those in the treatment group.
• Outcomes for matched samples were compared in the one and two years following summer employment.
Results: Juvenile Delinquency Filings

*The difference between the groups is statistically significant
Results: Adult Incarceration

The difference between the groups is statistically significant.

* = The difference between the groups is statistically significant.
Results: School Attendance

- **Rate (%)**
  - Treatment: 87.08*
  - Control: 85.23

- **Log (rate)**
  - Treatment: 4.45*
  - Control: 4.42

*=The difference between the groups is statistically significant
Results: High School Graduation and College Matriculation

*The difference between the groups is statistically significant.
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