

Contract No.: K-5547-5-00-80-30
MPR Reference No.: 8279-080

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research, Inc.

**The Quantum
Opportunity Program
Demonstration:**

Implementation Findings

August 2003

*Myles Maxfield
Laura Castner
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*

*Vida Maralani
Department of Sociology
University of California at Los
Angeles (Previously of Berkeley
Policy Associates)*

*Mary Vencill
Berkeley Policy Associates*

Submitted to:

U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Room N-5637
Washington, DC 20210

Project Officer: Eileen Pederson

Submitted by:

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
600 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Suite 550
Washington, DC 20024
(202) 484-9220

Project Director: Allen Schirm

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared under Contract No. K-5547-5-00-80-30 from the U.S. Department of Labor. The views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the policies or opinions of the U.S. Department of Labor.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of David Lah, Eileen Pederson, Daniel Ryan, and James Woods of the U.S. Department of Labor and of Allen Schirm and Nuria Roderiguez-Planas of Mathematica Policy Research. Chapters III through X are based largely on data gathered by Berkeley Policy Associates of Oakland, California. Errors and omissions are the sole responsibility of the authors.

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

DEDICATION

The authors dedicate this report to the individuals who devoted themselves to the youth participating in QOP: the QOP coordinators and case managers:

Cleveland, Ohio

Coordinator

Mary Beth Bartholomew

Case Managers

Kacie Armstrong

Tameka Ronny-Gray

Bill Miller

Mike Favors

William Spells

Fort Worth, Texas

Coordinator

Karen Windham

Case Managers

Shelley Marshall

Linda Cantu

Angie Reeder

Rhonda Kerl

Dominicia Spikes

Jeannie Spitzer

Ellen Wedemeyer

Houston, Texas

Coordinators

Roberto Spears

Cornelius Crockett

Case Managers

Jennifer Franco

John Josiah

Tom Carrizal

Chenee Franklin

Memphis, Tennessee

Coordinator

Sandra DeGraffenreid

Case Managers

Angela Thomas

William Little

Kip Alexander

Nichelle Quinn

Bobbie Davis

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Coordinator

Deborah Scott

Case Managers

Ernest Merriweather

Darold Williams

Ashley Cooke

Alexis Greaves

Washington, D.C.

Coordinators

Marie Sharp

Cecily Williams

Rhonda Muse

Case Managers

Kelvin Delmar

Anita Lyles

Themba Masimini

Anthony (Tony) Lee

Sandra Richardson

Yakima, Washington

Coordinators

Tamara Bosler

Darrel Armstead

Case Managers

Sondra Pieti

Jackie Meyer

Jose Sosa

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

CONTENTS

| Chapter | | Page |
|---------|--|------|
| | DISCLAIMER..... | iii |
| | ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... | iii |
| | DEDICATION..... | v |
| | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | xi |
| I | INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| II | WHAT IS QOP? | 3 |
| | Target Population and Sample Selection..... | 3 |
| | Program Components and Services..... | 4 |
| | What Kind of a Youth Program Is QOP? | 7 |
| | History of QOP | 9 |
| | QOP Funding and Structure..... | 11 |
| III | QOP IMPLEMENTATION BY SITE | 13 |
| IV | INTENSITY | 53 |
| | Intensity in the QOP Model | 53 |
| | Intensity as Implemented | 54 |
| V | CASE MANAGEMENT AND MENTORING | 57 |
| | Case Management and Mentoring in the QOP Model | 57 |
| | Case Management and Mentoring as Implemented | 57 |
| VI | THE EDUCATION COMPONENT | 61 |
| | The Education Component in the QOP Model..... | 61 |
| | The Education Component as Implemented..... | 61 |
| VII | DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES | 69 |
| | Developmental Activities in the QOP Model..... | 69 |
| | Developmental Activities as Implemented..... | 70 |

CONTENTS *(cont.)*

| Chapter | | Page |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| VIII | COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES | 75 |
| | Community Service Activities in the QOP Model | 75 |
| | Community Service Activities as Implemented | 75 |
| IX | INCENTIVES..... | 77 |
| | Incentives in the QOP Model..... | 77 |
| | Incentives as Implemented..... | 77 |
| X | MANAGEMENT, ADMINISTRATION, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE | 81 |
| | Operating QOP under the JTPA Structure | 81 |
| | Program Planning and Start-Up | 82 |
| | National Program Management | 83 |
| | Technical Assistance | 84 |
| | Local Grantee Management..... | 85 |
| | CBO Management of QOP | 86 |
| | Schools | 87 |
| XI | THE COST OF QOP | 89 |
| | Revenue per Enrollee..... | 89 |
| | Expenditures per Enrollee | 92 |
| | Technical Assistance | 92 |
| | Cost Accounting | 94 |
| | Types of Expenditures..... | 94 |
| | QOP Costs Relative to Other Youth Programs | 94 |
| XII | CONCLUSIONS | 99 |
| XIII | SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE YOUTH PROGRAMS | 109 |
| | Contracting, Governance, and Management..... | 109 |
| | Evolving Program Goals and Service Mix..... | 110 |
| | Target Group..... | 111 |
| | Program Intensity, Case Management, and Mentoring..... | 112 |
| | Education..... | 113 |
| | Developmental Activities | 113 |
| | Supportive Services | 113 |
| | Financial Incentives for Enrollees..... | 114 |
| | REFERENCES | 115 |

TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--------------|---|
| III.1 | SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—CLEVELAND.....15 |
| III.2 | SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—FORT WORTH21 |
| III.3 | SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—HOUSTON27 |
| III.4 | SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—MEMPHIS33 |
| III.5 | SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—PHILADELPHIA.....39 |
| III.6 | SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION— WASHINGTON, D.C.....43 |
| III.7 | SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—YAKIMA.....47 |
| VII.1 | DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES OFFERED BY QOP DEMONSTRATION SITES71 |
| XI.1 | REVENUE PER ENROLLEE PER YEAR BY SITE, YEARS 1 THROUGH 4.....90 |
| XI.2 | REVENUE PER ENROLLEE BY SITE, YEAR 5.....91 |
| XI.3 | EXPENDITURES PER ENROLLEE BY SITE AND YEAR, YEARS 1 THROUGH 5.....93 |
| XI.4 | VALUATION OF DONATED ITEMS.....96 |
| XI.5 | SALARIES, STIPENDS, AND OTHER ITEMS AS A PERCENT OF EXPENDITURES, YEARS 1 THROUGH 5.....97 |
| XI.6 | EXPENDITURES ON SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND TUTORING COSTS BY SITE PER ENROLLEE PER YEAR, YEARS 1 THROUGH 4.....98 |

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From July 1995 through September 2001, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and the Ford Foundation operated a demonstration of the Quantum Opportunity Program (QOP). QOP is an intensive case management and mentoring program for high school-aged youth that emphasizes after-school supplemental education, developmental activities, and community service activities. The primary goals of the program were to increase the likelihood that enrollees would complete high school and enter a postsecondary education and training program. The program was also intended to improve the youth's grades and achievement test scores and to reduce risky behaviors such as substance abuse, crime, and teenage childbearing.

The evaluation was designed to estimate the impacts of QOP on its enrollees and to yield information for program designers and managers on the challenges for program design, implementation, and operation. This report documents how QOP was implemented at each of the seven sites participating in the demonstration.

The method used for this report was to compare the implementation of the program at each demonstration site to the program model. The implementation at each site was observed during a visit lasting several days at each site in each year of the demonstration. Information was also gathered at annual staff conferences and periodic conference calls with site staff. During those visits, we met with each member of the QOP staff; officers of the community-based organization operating the site; officers of the local grantee organization; teachers; counselors; administrators of the QOP schools; and participating youth.

The key implementation findings follow:

- **QOP can be implemented through local community-based organizations, although the complete QOP model is difficult to replicate.** While none of the seven sites failed to implement the QOP demonstration, two sites implemented a version of QOP that deviated substantially from the program model, and the other five sites implemented programs that deviated moderately from the model. Deviations from the program model might have been reduced by using contracts or cooperative agreements rather than grants; by providing more time for the sites to plan and set up their operation; and by providing additional documentation, training, and technical assistance early in the sites' involvement in the program.
- **QOP enrolled a representative sample of the target group of disadvantaged youths.** In particular, QOP avoided the tendency of many youth programs to enroll the most motivated and able youth. Youth enrolled in QOP generally faced many barriers to educational success and needed many of the services offered by QOP. Given that many of these barriers were in place when the QOP enrollees joined the program in the middle of the 9th grade, future funders may consider a QOP model for middle-school-age youth.

- **Fidelity to the program model varied widely, from a replication of most of QOP's components to a mere re-labeling of another youth program as QOP.** Fidelity of implementation appeared to be associated with whether the community-based organization (CBO) operating QOP at the site had a pre-existing program broadly similar to QOP in philosophy and structure.
- **Apart from the number of hours of participation, the prescribed intensity for QOP was implemented at most sites.** All sites implemented the prescribed ratio of roughly 15 to 25 enrollees per case manager. Most case managers stayed with the program for several years, and many stayed for the entire five-year duration of the demonstration. All of the sites, however, discovered that the intensity of QOP services had practical limits. QOP's policy of providing enrollees a great deal of access to case managers, some of whom were on-call seven days per week and 24 hours per day, and providing access to services regardless of the enrollee's behaviors (i.e., becoming incarcerated, moving to another community, dropping out of high school) was generally well implemented. The demonstration showed that such policies are limited by the case managers' personal lives and families, the physical difficulties of providing services to enrollees who moved to other states or metropolitan areas, and the legal limits on case manager overtime in the Fair Labor Standards Act.
- **All sites successfully implemented case management and mentoring.** Mentoring and case management formed the core of the QOP demonstration and were more intensive than in virtually any other youth program. Case managers reported forming relationships with about half of their caseloads, and those relationships resembled that of a caring aunt or uncle.
- **No site implemented all aspects of QOP's education component.** In particular, few sites regularly assessed academic performance using tests, no site developed individual education plans based on assessment results, no site implemented a sustained program of course-based tutoring, and only three sites effectively implemented computer-assisted instruction.
- **All sites successfully implemented developmental activities.** While developmental activities were intended to focus on life skills that would enable the youth to avoid risky behaviors, they included many recreational activities at most sites. Enrollees found recreational activities to be fun, and case managers found them useful for fostering active program participation.
- **Few sites implemented the community service component as intensively as prescribed in the program model, especially in the latter half of the demonstration.** Most sites decided to reallocate their resources away from community service to mentoring, case management, and educational activities. These decisions were based on case managers' assessment of enrollee needs.
- **Only two sites offered the prescribed number of hours of education, developmental, and community service activities.** Other sites offered fewer than

the prescribed number of hours for one or more program components, frequently the community service component.

- **All sites implemented the stipend and accrual account components**, although accrual accounts at DOL-funded sites did not bear interest. Enrollees at those sites did not receive regular statements of their accrual accounts. Most sites implemented bonuses for enrollees who achieved major program milestones.
- **Most sites supplied many of the most commonly needed supportive services, including afternoon snacks and transportation to program activities. On the other hand, most sites did not meet their enrollees' need for child care, health and mental health services, substance abuse treatment, and family counseling.** Future comprehensive programs like QOP may consider placing greater emphasis on referring enrollees who have these needs to community organizations that specialize in these services.
- **On average, enrollees spent 23 percent of the goal of 750 hours of program activities per year over the first four years of the demonstration.** The proportion of inactive enrollees grew from 1 percent in the first year to 36 percent in the fourth year. This suggests that the goal of 750 hours per year is unrealistic for this target group and that future programs may consider setting a lower goal.
- **The total QOP expenditure per enrollee averaged \$25,000 for the full five years of the demonstration.** The five-year expenditure per enrollee for the DOL-funded sites ranged from \$18,000 to \$22,000. For the two Ford-funded sites, the expenditure per enrollee was \$23,000 in Yakima and \$49,000 in Philadelphia. Thus, Philadelphia had a much higher expenditure per enrollee than any other site.

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

From July 1995 through September 2001, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and the Ford Foundation operated a demonstration of the Quantum Opportunity Program (QOP). QOP is an intensive case management and mentoring program for high school-aged youth that emphasizes after-school supplemental education, developmental activities, and community service activities. The QOP demonstration served a single cohort of 579 high school-aged youth from fall 1995, when all were beginning the ninth grade, through fall 2000.¹ The QOP demonstration was implemented and operated by local community-based organizations (CBOs) in seven sites: six inner-city communities and one rural community. At each site, 50, 80, or 100 youth participated in the program. By the end of the demonstration, the enrollees had reached various points in their education—some were attending college or other postsecondary training, some were still in high school, some had just finished high school or had just earned a general educational diploma (GED), and some had dropped out of high school and were working or unemployed.

The primary goals of the program were to increase the likelihood that students would complete high school and enroll in postsecondary education and training. The program was also intended to boost academic achievement in reading and mathematics and to reduce risky behaviors such as substance abuse, crime, and teenage childbearing. The evaluation was also intended to yield information for program designers and managers on challenges to designing, implementing, and operating intensive case management and mentoring programs for disadvantaged youth.

The purpose of this report is to document how the QOP program model was implemented and to identify lessons for future QOP-like programs. This report has two companion reports: Schirm et al. (2003) presents the short-term impacts of QOP on enrolled youth and Maxfield et al. (2003) summarizes all the evaluation findings.

The implementation at each site was observed during a visit lasting several days at each site in each year of the demonstration. During those visits, we met with each member of the QOP staff; officers of the community-based organization operating the site; officers of the local grantee organization, school teachers, counselors, and administrators; and participating youth. The data/information gathered through these visits was supplemented by attending the annual training conferences for QOP staff and officers of the community-based organizations and participating in periodic conference calls with site staff.

Chapter II describes the QOP model, the history of QOP, and the institutional structure of the demonstration. Chapter III views program implementation by site. A series of tables shows how the

¹ The program at one of the sites began one year after the others and ran from fall of 1996 through fall 2001.

program implemented at each site compares with the program model and with the programs implemented at other sites. Chapters IV through X view implementation by program component: intensity (Chapter IV), case management and intensive mentoring (Chapter V), education (Chapter VI), developmental activities (Chapter VII), community service (Chapter VIII), financial incentives (Chapter IX), and management and administration (Chapter X). Chapter XI presents the costs of the QOP demonstration and Chapter XII offers conclusions regarding how QOP was implemented. The final chapter suggests lessons for future youth programs like QOP.

CHAPTER II

WHAT IS QOP?

The description of the QOP model covers the program's target population, the components of the program model, and the institutional structure of the demonstration.

TARGET POPULATION AND SAMPLE SELECTION

The target group in the QOP demonstration was youth who met the following criteria:

- Began the ninth grade at a high school with a dropout rate of 40 percent or more.
- Had a grade point average (GPA) below the 67th percentile of entering ninth graders at the participating high school. (The GPA was measured on the basis of final eighth-grade grades.)
- Were not repeating the ninth grade.
- Were not so physically disabled or learning disabled that participation in the program would not be appropriate, as determined by the school.

A sample of youth meeting these criteria was drawn from lists of ninth graders entering the schools participating in the demonstration. Sampled youth were aggressively recruited to participate in the demonstration, and more than 97 percent of those who could be found agreed to join the research sample. The youth were then randomly assigned to a treatment group or a control group. This means that QOP enrollees were representative of youth meeting the eligibility criteria and were not limited to those who had sufficient motivation, self-esteem, and optimism about the improbability of the future to seek out and volunteer for the program. This was an important feature of the evaluation.

Most enrollees were 14 years old when they entered QOP and 19 years old when the demonstration ended. Virtually all enrollees lived in low-income neighborhoods and were African American or Hispanic. The group included undocumented residents, youth in special education programs, youth with disabilities, teen parents, youth involved in the juvenile justice system, out-of-school youth, and youth who were one or more grades behind in basic skill levels.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND SERVICES

Case Management and Mentoring

The central component of the QOP model was intensive case management and mentoring. Case management was defined as assessing the needs of each participating youth and structuring a service mix appropriate to those needs. Mentoring was defined as helping each youth establish a personal relationship with a caring adult. Case management and mentoring are regarded as two aspects of a single program component. In four respects, this component was more intensive in the QOP than in many other mentoring programs.

- Enrollees had greater access to case managers.
- Program eligibility was not contingent on enrollee behavior or life situation.
- Case managers addressed all barriers facing participating youth.
- The program provided substantial educational and other material resources to participating youth.

Each of these is discussed in turn.

First, QOP gave enrollees greater access to their case managers and engaged them in more program activities for a longer period of time. DOL-funded QOP CBOs employed a full-time case manager for between 15 and 25 enrollees.² In other words, most case managers worked from morning until early evening every weekday and usually part of one weekend day. Most were also available to youth by telephone or pager at night and on weekends to respond to urgent situations. QOP provided mentoring services year round, including during summers and other school vacations. Absent staff turnover and the rare case of voluntary reassignment of youth to a different case manager, each enrollee had the same case manager for the full five years of the demonstration, although the intense involvement described here was limited to the first four years for all participants and to the fifth year for participants who continued in high school in the fifth year.

The intensity of program activities is reflected in the program participation goal for each enrollee: 750 hours per year, or over 14 hours per week on average throughout the year. One-third of that time was to be spent on educational activities, one-third on community service, and one-third on developmental activities. A typical schedule included meetings with case managers, who were available at the school throughout the school day, program activities at a central facility from 3:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. each weekday, and program activities for half a day every Saturday. Youth were also encouraged to participate in activities every day during lunch and free periods and during

² The staffs of the two Ford-funded CBOs had both QOP and non-QOP job responsibilities, and were compensated by incentive payments based on program attendance.

summers and school vacations. Such intense involvement in the program continued for four to five years, longer than in many other youth programs.

The second way in which QOP mentoring was more intensive than most programs of its type was that eligibility was not contingent on the enrollee's behavior, change in residence, or health status. For instance, other similar programs limit eligibility to youth living in a specific neighborhood, to in-school or out-of-school youth, to youth in the criminal justice system or youth not in the criminal justice system, to able-bodied youth, or to youth who complete some minimum number of program activities. In contrast, QOP served youth who:

- **Dropped out of school.** Program staff attempted to get dropouts to re-enroll in school or, failing that, to earn a GED.
- **Moved to a different school or neighborhood.** Case managers were to provide services to those who moved to another neighborhood in the metropolitan area, to visit those who moved outside the metropolitan area but remained within driving distance, and to call those who moved beyond driving distance. Case managers were also expected to enlist someone at the student's new school to help the youth who moved beyond driving distance.
- **Became incarcerated.** Case managers were to visit and phone incarcerated enrollees, sending them educational materials to complete and return to the case manager.
- **Became ill or disabled.** Case managers were to visit and provide educational materials to enrollees who were hospitalized or confined to their homes because of illness or disability.
- **Became inactive.** Case managers were to maintain contact with inactive enrollees and attempt to engage them in the program. Once a youth was enrolled in QOP, a program slot was held for that person for the full five years of the demonstration regardless of how much time he or she spent in program activities. For example, some enrollees were active in the ninth grade and then became inactive in the tenth and eleventh grades. The program never filled those slots with new enrollees, and the case manager never gave up trying to re-engage the enrollees after they became inactive.

The policy of maintaining contact despite the response of enrollees was based on the view that a youth's need for mentoring does not diminish and, indeed, may increase when he or she drops out of school; moves; or becomes incarcerated, disabled, ill, or inactive in the program. This philosophy also reflects the fact that the lives of many disadvantaged youth are unstable. For example, an enrollee might be in school in the ninth grade, drop out and become inactive in the program, move several times, become incarcerated, and eventually return to school or a GED program and become active again in the QOP after release.

QOP mentoring was more intense than in other programs in terms of the depth and breadth of the youths' relationship with their case manager. The relationship was personal, long-term, and comprehensive. While many QOP activities were conducted with groups of participants, case managers spent one-on-one time with every enrollee. Case managers were expected to help

enrollees overcome a broad range of barriers to achieving program goals. Common barriers included low educational achievement, alienation from school, substance abuse, physical health problems, mental health problems, gang membership, criminal activities, teen parenthood, unstable or abusive family environment, and insufficient money to pay for necessities. Some enrollees faced additional difficulties because their parents or guardians also had these same problems.

Finally, QOP mentoring was more intensive than most youth programs in providing enrollees with material resources, including, at most sites, facilities for computer-assisted instruction, offices in the school, and a CBO facility near but separate from the school where enrollees could meet with case managers and other QOP enrollees. As discussed in more detail in the section on financial incentives, the program also provided enrollees with a cash stipend for time spent on program activities and set an equal sum aside in a savings account to defray some of the costs of postsecondary education or training. In addition to these material resources, most sites offered college tours and cultural and recreational activities as part of their mentoring activities.

Education Services, Community Service Activities, and Developmental Activities

While case management/mentoring was the central component of QOP, the program also included education services, community service activities, and developmental activities. Each of these components was geared toward achieving a specific program goal.

- **Education** services were intended to raise enrollees' academic achievement. Education services consisted of an academic assessment, which formed the basis of an individual education plan that included one-on-one tutoring and computer-assisted instruction in specific coursework and basic reading and mathematics. Education services also included visiting nearby college campuses and other activities designed to promote awareness of and planning for college.
- **Developmental activities** including lifeskills training, employment-readiness training, cultural awareness, and recreation. Lifeskills training was generally designed to reduce the youths' likelihood of engaging in risky behaviors, the consequences of which could become barriers to success. Risky behaviors include substance abuse, criminal behavior, and teenage parenting.
- **Community service** activities, such as visiting the residents of a local nursing home or volunteering at a neighborhood food bank, were designed to help youth develop a sense of responsibility for the quality of life of others in their neighborhood.

Supportive Services

QOP provided afternoon snacks and transportation assistance to facilitate attendance at program activities. QOP also provided information on, and referrals to, other resources in the community. For example, some QOP case managers referred enrollees to community health and mental health services, summer jobs programs, and local agencies providing housing, transportation, or income support.

Financial Incentives

Finally, QOP provided enrollees with three types of financial incentives to spend time on program activities. The first was a stipend of approximately \$1.25 for every hour devoted to program activities other than mentoring and recreation. The second incentive was a matching amount deposited in an accrual account and promised to the enrollee when he or she earned a high school diploma or GED and enrolled in any of the following postsecondary activities:

- Two- or four-year college
- Accredited technical or vocational training program
- Apprenticeship program certified by DOL
- Armed forces

The purpose of the accrual accounts was to provide financial support for college or other postsecondary training and to teach enrollees about planning, saving, and investing for the future. By the end of the demonstration period, accrual account balances ranged from a few hundred dollars to nearly \$10,000, with most under \$2,000. Final payments were made directly to the enrollee rather than to the postsecondary institution or to the enrollee's parents.

In addition to a stipend and accrual account contributions, participants at several sites could earn bonuses for achieving major milestones, such as completing the school year with a grade point average higher than a benchmark or completing a computer-assisted instruction module. Bonuses took many forms including cash, hours recorded for purposes of computing the stipend and accrual account contribution, and going with case managers to movies or other entertainment events.

Finally, the case managers of the two Ford-funded sites received incentive payments based on the attendance of their participants at program activities.

WHAT KIND OF A YOUTH PROGRAM IS QOP?

Part of understanding QOP means understanding how it compares with other types of youth programs. Youth programs are broadly defined here as public programs intended to solve a social problem experienced by substantial numbers of individuals from age 12 through 21. This definition excludes programs not open to the public, programs targeting other age groups, programs designed to address problems not considered to be social, and programs targeting small numbers of individuals. It also excludes defunct federal youth programs, such as the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s.

Of the many programs that would fall within this broad definition, we focus on programs sponsored by the federal government that are designed to help disadvantaged youth avoid poverty in adulthood. In 1998, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) counted 131 such programs, where

a program was defined as an independent federal funding stream. These programs were sponsored by 16 federal agencies, collectively costing approximately \$4 billion in 1997. Of these programs, 35 provided mentoring and 37 provided academic tutoring (GAO 1998). QOP differs from other youth programs in terms of the social “unit” it treats, cost, goals and service mix, target population, and the relationship between case managers and enrollees.

The social unit treated by QOP is the individual youth, as opposed to the school, the family, employers, or the community. The QOP designers decided to focus on youth because they interpreted the problem of poverty and career failure from the human capital perspective. The human capital perspective comes from the field of economics and assumes that if the skills of a youth are improved, he or she will be employable and able to avoid poverty. Defining the program’s social unit as a youth means that:

- **QOP is not a school reform program**, in which the unit of intervention would be the school, school district, or state education agency. Although QOP provides tutoring and computer-assisted instruction, it was not designed to influence the structure, policies, or operation of the high schools with which local QOP programs are associated.
- **QOP is not a family therapy program**. While case managers sought to involve the parents of enrollees and communicated regularly with many of them, QOP was not designed to address the problem of poverty and career failure by providing therapy to troubled families.
- **QOP does not focus on employers**. QOP addresses the supply side of the labor market, that is, the skills that enrollees bring to the labor market as young adults. It does not address the demand side of the labor market, as does the Work Opportunity Tax Credit program by, for example, offering tax incentives for employers to hire disadvantaged persons.
- **QOP is not a community development program**. Although all QOP sites lay within high-poverty communities, QOP was not intended to attract new businesses to the community or to address other social problems on a community-wide basis.

In addition to the social unit, QOP also differs from other programs of its kind in cost. QOP is intensive and thus expensive. At \$25,000 per enrollee, QOP costs more per enrollee than any other federal youth program, as discussed in detail in Chapter XI. The intensity of QOP’s services is comparable to that of Job Corps, which is primarily a residential program, but QOP is not residential.

QOP also differs from other programs of its kind in its goals and service mix. QOP focused more on educational outcomes and provided more education services than do most other DOL-sponsored programs, which focus more on employment outcomes. In the language of other DOL-sponsored programs, QOP focused on basic education skills, as opposed to vocational training, work-readiness training, job search assistance, job development, or direct placement. Under QOP, getting a job right after graduation from high school was not considered a measure of program success.

This focus on postsecondary education and training was motivated by two complementary trends in the U.S. labor market:

- Falling real wages and higher unemployment of high school dropouts, those with a GED, and those whose terminal degree is a high school diploma.
- Increasing real wages and high employment rates of those with postsecondary education or training.

QOP was also more comprehensive and holistic than most other federal youth programs. It provided services related directly and indirectly to the following: basic education; college planning and applications (including financial aid); physical and mental health; substance abuse; conflict resolution; family planning; cultural and ethnic awareness; career awareness and planning; issues related to gang membership and involvement in the criminal justice system; coping with dysfunctional, abusive, or unsupportive family environments; finding summer jobs, transportation, nutrition, and housing; and paying bills in family emergencies. Traditionally, such services have been supplied by a host of programs independent of and not necessarily coordinated with one another.

In addition to its scope of services, QOP differed from other youth programs in the scope of its target population, which is not limited to highly motivated eligible youth. While no youth program is mandatory, QOP enrolled all sampled eligible youth. Since eligible youth at the beginning of the demonstration were minors, program staff first approached a youth's parent (or parents), usually in person. Nearly all parents enthusiastically enrolled their son or daughter in QOP. Case managers attempted to engage reluctant eligible youth, so QOP enrolled many at-risk youth who would not have ended up in such a program had the recruitment procedures been more passive and selective, as in many youth programs.

Finally, QOP differed from other programs of its kind in terms of the relationship between case managers and participating youth. This highly personal, long-lasting connection mirrored the relationship between a teenager and a nurturing, supportive, and available older relative such as an aunt or uncle. Enrollees could confide in their case managers more freely than they might confide in a parent, and case managers could provide guidance on how to handle a situation without risking the traditional parent-teen conflict that often works against the acceptance of such guidance. Like an older relative who has made a commitment to a child, case managers made every attempt to sustain the relationship with youth despite youth's disengagement and alienation. Finally, case managers acted as advocates by negotiating on behalf of youth with the high school, the college admissions and financial aid offices, and criminal justice and other public agencies.

HISTORY OF QOP

The QOP program model was developed in 1988 by three individuals: Robert Taggart of the Remediation and Training Institute of Alexandria, Virginia; Gordon Berlin, then of the Ford Foundation; and Benjamin Lattimore of Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OICA) in Philadelphia. The basis of the education component of QOP was the Comprehensive

Competencies Program (CCP), a computer-assisted instruction program that focused on reading and mathematics skills, and that operated in several cities in the late 1980s. Taggart developed CCP under grants from the Ford Foundation.

To create QOP, Taggart, Berlin, and Lattimore added mentoring, community service, cultural/recreational/life-style activities, and financial incentives to CCP. From summer 1989 through summer 1993, OICA implemented a pilot QOP program that was operated in five cities by five OICA affiliates. The pilot was funded by the Ford Foundation and evaluated by the Center for Human Resources at Brandeis University. The evaluation included an implementation and an impact analysis.

The implementation analysis revealed wide variation in success across the five sites. One site failed to implement the program and dropped out of the pilot. Three sites were partly successful in implementing the program, but only one site did so completely. Hahn (1994) identified the following challenges to successful implementation of QOP:

- At some sites, instability in the residence of the youth prevented long-term participation in the program.
- Turnover in program staff and leaders in some sites interfered with the establishment of long-term mentoring relationships and disrupted the continuity in program policies and procedures.
- The low-quality and inconsistent services offered in some sites discouraged enrollees from staying active.

The impact analysis of the four remaining pilot sites concluded that it had a positive impact at the end of the four-year pilot period. The likelihood of becoming a teenage parent or dropping out of high school decreased, and the likelihood of graduating from high school in four years and enrolling in a postsecondary education or training program increased. These impacts did not manifest themselves until after four years of participation. Most of the pilot-wide impacts were attributable to a single site. Few significant impacts appeared in the other four sites.

In spring 1995, DOL and the Ford Foundation began planning the full QOP demonstration. The perceived need to continue to test the program was based on the combination of significant positive impacts found through the pilot evaluation and the uncertainties regarding these impacts raised by technical reviews of the methods used by the pilot evaluation. In addition, the demonstration was seen as a way to test such a program operated by CBOs not affiliated with the founding organization, OICA, and funded, regulated, and directed by a federal agency, as opposed to a private foundation.

In summer 1995, DOL awarded demonstration grants to five sites, as well as the contract for evaluating the demonstration to Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. The Ford Foundation awarded a single grant to Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OICA) in Philadelphia to operate two additional sites and provide technical assistance to *all* sites. By January 1996, six sites were up and running, and they completed operations in September 2000. The remaining seventh site started up in fall 1996 and continued operating through September 2001.

QOP FUNDING AND STRUCTURE

Under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), DOL funded program operations in five sites through grants to local organizations. For each of the first four years of the demonstration, each site received a grant of \$200,000 and was obliged to provide local matching funds of an equal amount, for a total budget of \$400,000 per year.³ In the fifth year, DOL-funded sites received a federal grant of \$200,000 but no local matching funds. DOL distributed grant funds on a cost basis. Grants were renewed annually.

DOL funded sites in Cleveland, Ohio; Fort Worth, Texas; Houston, Texas; Memphis, Tennessee; and Washington, D.C. Each grantee was the public agency that administered the JTPA program in its area, the service delivery area (SDA). The SDAs did not operate QOP directly but contracted with a local CBO to do so. Typically, 80 to 90 percent of the QOP grant was passed on from the SDA to the CBO in reimbursement for the CBO's expenses in administering and operating the QOP program. Each CBO hired a QOP coordinator and five case managers. Each case manager served from 15 to 25 youth, for a total of 100 enrollees per site.

Through a grant to Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OICA), a Philadelphia CBO, the Ford Foundation funded program operations at two sites, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and Yakima, Washington.⁴ Despite the absence of a formal contractual arrangement between DOL and the Foundation, the two organizations coordinated their activities throughout the demonstration.

The structure of the two Ford-funded sites differed in several ways from that of the five DOL-funded sites. OICA operated QOP in Philadelphia directly and had an informal agreement with its local OICA affiliate in Yakima to oversee operations there. The relationship between the Philadelphia OICA and the Yakima affiliate was that of a franchise linked to a national headquarters. Each Ford-funded site had 50 enrollees, half that of each DOL-funded site, and each had three case managers who also had responsibilities for programs other than QOP.

Each site developed an informal relationship with one, two, or three high schools that participated in QOP in several ways. First, they provided the population of eligible students from which the evaluation sample was selected. Second, they gave case managers access to enrollees' teachers so that case managers could monitor enrollees' academic performance. Third, with the informed consent of enrollees' parents, the schools gave case managers access to enrollees' school records. Fourth, most schools provided office space for QOP case managers. Participating schools did not enter into a contractual arrangement with either the SDA or the CBO and were not reimbursed from the QOP grant.

³ Houston operated on a reduced budget for years 3 and 4 of the demonstration, after the local school district discontinued its match funding of the program.

⁴ OICA was one of the designers of the QOP model and was involved in the pilot of QOP in the early 1990s. OICA operated the Philadelphia site directly, and funded the operation of the Yakima site. It also provided technical assistance to all the demonstration sites.

Case managers at some sites provided services during school hours in an office on school grounds. Case managers at other sites spent time in the school during school hours but did not have an office there. At still other sites, case managers had no significant in-school presence. For after-school activities, most case managers and enrollees assembled at the CBO's facility. At three sites, the QOP activities scheduled for after-school hours were conducted in the schools.

CHAPTER III

QOP IMPLEMENTATION BY SITE

The seven demonstration sites varied substantially in the implementation and operation of QOP. Tables III.1 through III.7 show how each site implemented each program component relative to the program model for that component. Shown, too, are additional services not officially part of the program model that some sites provided.

Several broad patterns emerge from the tables.

- Fidelity to the program model varied widely, from a replication of most of QOP's components to a mere relabeling of another youth program as QOP.
- All sites provided case management, intensive mentoring services, and developmental services.
- No site implemented all aspects of QOP's education component. In particular, few sites regularly assessed academic performance, no site developed individual education plans based on assessment results, no site implemented a sustained program of course-based tutoring, and only three sites effectively implemented computer-assisted instruction.
- Only two sites offered the prescribed number of hours of education, developmental, and community service activities. Other sites offered fewer than the prescribed number of hours for one or more program components, frequently the community service component.
- All sites faced practical limits to maintaining contact with enrollees who moved outside the metropolitan area.
- All sites implemented the stipend and accrual account components, although accrual accounts did not bear interest at DOL-funded sites, and enrollees at those sites did not receive regular statements of their accrual accounts.
- Most sites provided snacks and transportation, although these services were limited or delayed at several sites. No site fully met the need for child care.

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

TABLE III.1

SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—CLEVELAND

| QOP Model | Cleveland Site |
|---|--|
| Case Management/Networking | |
| <p>Assessment of enrollee’s needs, determination of the best service mix for the enrollee, referral to other community organizations for services not directly provided by QOP. Representing and advocating for the enrollee with the school, criminal justice system, and other organizations. May include referral to child care providers, substance abuse treatment, health screening and treatment, and mental health screening and treatment.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Project staff advocated on behalf of enrollees with the school and criminal justice system. Assessment and service planning consisted of occasional intensive efforts. The frequency of referrals to outside resources increased over the life of the program.</p> |
| Mentoring | |
| <p>A close personal relationship resembling that of a caring aunt or uncle. Providing a role model, advice, standards of behavior, discipline, and encouragement.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Staff and program managers placed a strong emphasis on mentoring. Case managers were conscientious in carrying out “role model” responsibilities. The chief barrier to consistency in mentoring was frequent enrollee transfers to other schools and changes of residence. Case managers spent a lot of time tracking and visiting such enrollees.</p> |
| Intensity | |
| <p>Program Hours per Year 750 hours of program activities are scheduled each year, 250 in education, 250 in developmental activities, and 250 in community service.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The program scheduled fewer than the prescribed number of community service hours.</p> |
| <p>Case Manager Hours per Week Case managers are on duty each business day until early evening, one day on the weekend, and on-call during nights and weekends.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Case managers had flexible schedules and set few limits on their availability to enrollees.</p> |

TABLE III.1 (continued)

| QOP Model | Cleveland Site |
|--|---|
| <p>Unconditional Enrollment and Access to Services Enrollment and access to services are not contingent on the enrollee’s school attendance, location of residence, involvement in the criminal justice system, illness or disability, or inactivity.</p> <p>Sufficient Financial Resources At DOL-funded sites, expenditure on direct services to enrollees of \$4,000 per year per enrollee. Ford-funded sites were budgeted at \$6,750 per year per enrollee.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. In Year 5, the program conducted an intensive outreach campaign for dropouts and succeeded in re-engaging inactive enrollees.</p> <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| Education | |
| <p>Assessment Assessment of academic achievement in mathematics and English once per year.</p> <p>Individual Education Plan An individual education plan based on the assessments, the enrollee’s grades, and consultations with the enrollee’s school counselor and teachers, setting academic goals for the coming year.</p> <p>Tutoring One-on-one tutoring in mathematics, English, and other courses the enrollee is taking in school.</p> <p>Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI) Access to a personal computer with CAI software, guidance on how to use the CAI effectively, and assessment of the enrollee’s progress.</p> | <p>Not implemented. The program emphasized passing classes, passing the state proficiency test, and progress toward graduating or GED. Assessments were irregular or special-purpose.</p> <p>Not implemented. The program did not prepare formal plans.</p> <p>Partially implemented. The program tried different approaches to tutoring, including volunteer tutors and informal provision of after-school homework help from staff, before settling on a strategy of paying for tutoring from an outside provider.</p> <p>Partially implemented. The site did not implement CAI for the first three years of the demonstration. A CAI laboratory was available to enrollees three days per week in the last two years of the demonstration.</p> |

TABLE III.1 (continued)

| QOP Model | Cleveland Site |
|--|---|
| <p>Postsecondary Planning Advice on selecting college preparatory courses in high school, tours of local college campuses, seminars on federal financial aid, assistance in completing college applications and Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). For those not college-bound, planning for postsecondary apprenticeships and vocational-technical training.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The program provided workshops on applying to college and for financial aid, information on scholarships, SAT preparation, and college tours.</p> |
| <p>Developmental Activities (see Table VII.1 for a detailed list of activities)</p> | |
| <p>Decision-Making Skills Seminars on avoiding risky behaviors, including childbearing, substance abuse, and criminal behavior. Seminars also covered budgeting, saving, investing, and managing money.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| <p>Cultural Awareness Exposure to fine arts, performing arts, and other cultural activities.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The program conducted activities and outings throughout its five years.</p> |
| <p>Recreation Games, swimming, etc.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. In later years of the demonstration, the program emphasized fitness and swimming.</p> |
| <p>Community Service</p> | |
| <p>Volunteer activities designed to improve the physical environment, such as cleaning up a vacant lot, or to assist others in the community, such as visiting nursing home residents.</p> | <p>Not implemented. The program conducted few community service activities. The majority of community service consisted of enrollees' individual volunteer efforts certified by an adult sponsor.</p> |

TABLE III.1 (continued)

| QOP Model | Cleveland Site |
|---|--|
| Financial Incentives | |
| <p>A stipend of \$1.25 per hour spent on program activities other than recreation, paid biweekly or monthly. A contribution of an equal amount to an accrual account held by the program until the enrollee completes high school and enrolls in college, the armed forces, an accredited apprenticeship program, or a postsecondary vocational-technical school. Participants received bonuses for achieving major programmatic milestones. Staffs of Ford-funded sites received incentive compensation based on program attendance.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The program also used bonuses awarded for achieving individually established goals. Bonuses were often in-kind.</p> |
| Supportive Services | |
| <p>Supportive services were not included in the original formal QOP model but were added to the model during the demonstration.</p> <p>Food Substantial snack each afternoon and during weekend activities.</p> <p>Transportation Provided transportation directly via car or van or through financial subsidy, such as free or discounted bus tokens, for transportation to and from program activities.</p> <p>Child Care Arrange for and fund child care during time spent on program activities.</p> | <p>Partially implemented.</p> <p>Fully implemented. The program distributed bus tokens daily and occasionally rented buses or vans.</p> <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| Summer QOP | |
| <p>If the enrollee failed one or more courses, arrange for and fund remedial summer school. For other enrollees, arrange for part-time summer jobs. Continue to provide education, developmental, and community service activities throughout the summer and during other school vacations.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. In first year, the program arranged a program-specific summer school program and many enrollees participated. In some years, the school district did not offer summer school classes at the QOP schools.</p> |

TABLE III.1 (continued)

| QOP Model | Cleveland Site |
|---|--|
| Postsecondary Services | |
| Monitor the enrollee’s progress in college or other postsecondary training. | Fully implemented. Case managers stayed in touch with college attendees. |

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

TABLE III.2

SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—FORT WORTH

| QOP Program Model | Fort Worth Site |
|---|--|
| Case Management/Networking | |
| <p>Assessment of enrollee’s needs, determination of the best service mix for the enrollee, referral to other community organizations for services not directly provided by QOP. Representing and advocating for the enrollee before the school, criminal justice system, and other organizations. May include referral to child care providers, substance abuse treatment, health screening and treatment, and mental health screening and treatment.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The program assessed enrollees by using Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) when they first entered QOP, but the assessments were never used for planning education services. Plans were often generic. Case managers referred enrollees to other organizations for services and collaborated with other organizations in delivering services. Program did not strongly emphasize advocacy, especially during the first three years of the demonstration, but case managers maintained regular contact with teachers to track academic performance.</p> |
| Mentoring | |
| <p>A close personal relationship resembling that of a caring aunt or uncle. Providing a role model, advice, standards of behavior, discipline, and encouragement.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The CBO structured the program to prevent attachment of an enrollee to an individual case manager. An enrollee developed a relationship with all case managers as a group.</p> |
| Intensity | |
| <p>Program Hours per Year 750 hours of program activities are scheduled each year, 250 in education, 250 in developmental activities, and 250 in community service.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Activities were scheduled, but not at expected rate for at least one component. Participation was low and case manager outreach efforts inconsistent.</p> |
| <p>Case Manager Hours per Week Case managers are on duty each business day until early evening, one day on the weekend, and on call during nights and weekends.</p> | <p>Not implemented. Case manager hours were regular and less flexible than at other sites. On-call availability varied among case managers. Case managers never worked more than 40 hours per week.</p> |

TABLE III.2 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Fort Worth Site |
|--|---|
| <p>Unconditional Enrollment and Access to Services Enrollment and access to services are not contingent on the enrollee’s school attendance, location of residence, involvement in the criminal justice system, illness or disability, or inactivity.</p> <p>Sufficient Financial Resources At DOL-funded sites, expenditure on direct services to enrollees of \$4,000 per year per enrollee. Ford-funded sites were budgeted at \$6,750 per year per enrollee.</p> | <p>Not implemented. QOP was implemented as an in-school program, which limited participation among those who had transferred or dropped out.</p> <p>Not implemented. Expenditures per enrollee never met the standard. Only a single case manager was retained in the fifth year of the demonstration.</p> |
| Education | |
| <p>Assessment Assessment of academic achievement in mathematics and English once per year.</p> <p>Individual Education Plan An individual education plan based on the assessments, the enrollee’s grades, and consultations with the enrollee’s school counselor and teachers, setting academic goals for the coming year.</p> <p>Tutoring One-on-one tutoring in mathematics, English, and other courses the enrollee is taking in school.</p> <p>Computer-Assisted Instruction Access to a personal computer with CAI software, guidance on how to use the CAI effectively, and assessment of the enrollee’s progress.</p> | <p>Not implemented. Assessment consisted of reports from teachers about progress in classes.</p> <p>Fully implemented. Case managers prepared education plans, and students progressing poorly were referred to tutoring, school-sponsored after-school remedial classes. Case managers encouraged dropouts to enroll in alternative schools and GED preparation classes.</p> <p>Fully implemented. After-school homework help sessions were scheduled regularly, and individual or small-group tutoring was arranged through school-sponsored programs and outside organizations.</p> <p>Not implemented. By the second year of the demonstration, the program developed a computer laboratory in the school, but it never succeeded in establishing regular patterns of use, and it was unable to engage enrollees in taking advantage of CAI software on an ongoing basis.</p> |

TABLE III.2 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Fort Worth Site |
|--|---|
| <p>Postsecondary Planning Advice on selecting college preparatory courses in high school, tours of local college campuses, seminars on federal financial aid, assistance in completing college applications and Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). For those not college-bound, planning for postsecondary apprenticeships and vocational-technical training.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The program provided modest postsecondary planning.</p> |
| <p>Developmental Activities (see Table VII.1 for a detailed list of activities)</p> | |
| <p>Decision-Making Skills Seminars on avoiding risky behaviors, including childbearing, substance abuse, and criminal behavior. Seminars also covered budgeting, saving, investing, and managing money.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. In the first year, the program arranged for all students to attend “QOP classes” as part of their regular school schedule. In subsequent years, it arranged for small groups to be excused from non-critical classes so that enrollees could attend life skills training classes delivered by staff from outside organizations.</p> |
| <p>Cultural Awareness Exposure to fine arts, performing arts, and other cultural activities.</p> <p>Recreation Games, swimming, etc.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Case managers arranged an average of one or two cultural outings per month and provided transportation in either their own cars or rented vans.</p> <p>Fully implemented. Case managers arranged one or two activities per month, such as professional baseball games, swimming, and trips to a shopping mall.</p> |
| <p>Community Service</p> | |
| <p>Volunteer activities designed to improve the physical environment, such as cleaning up a vacant lot, or to assist others in the community, such as visiting nursing home residents.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The program scheduled frequent community service activities including helping younger children, a food bank for AIDS victims, and staffing a telephone hotline for youth who were home alone after school. Scheduled community service hours did not meet the goal number of hours.</p> |

TABLE III.2 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Fort Worth Site |
|---|---|
| Financial Incentives | |
| <p>A stipend of \$1.25 per hour spent on program activities other than recreation, paid biweekly or monthly. A contribution of an equal amount to an “accrual account” held by the program until the enrollee completes high school and enrolls in college, the armed forces, an accredited apprenticeship program, or a postsecondary vocational-technical school. Participants received bonuses for achieving major programmatic milestones. Staffs of Ford-funded sites received incentive compensation based on program attendance.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Stipends were regular. The program raised the stipend amount substantially in the third year of the demonstration.</p> |
| Supportive Services | |
| <p>Supportive services were not included in the original formal QOP model but were added to the model during the demonstration.</p> <p>Food Substantial snack each afternoon and during weekend activities.</p> <p>Transportation Provided transportation directly by car or van or through financial subsidy, such as free or discounted bus tokens, for transportation to and from program activities.</p> <p>Child Care Arrange for and fund child care during time spent on program activities.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Early in the program, case managers solicited donations of snacks and kept snack food available in the QOP office. Snacks were not substantial, and nutrition was not emphasized.</p> <p>Fully implemented. Transportation consisted of case managers giving people rides and renting vans for group outings.</p> <p>Not implemented.</p> |

TABLE III.2 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Fort Worth Site |
|---|---|
| Summer QOP | |
| <p>If the enrollee failed one or more courses, arrange for and fund remedial summer school. For other enrollees, arrange for part-time summer jobs. Continue to provide education, developmental, and community service activities throughout the summer and during other school vacations.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Summer school was scheduled and emphasized, and developmental and community service activities continued throughout the summer. The program emphasized job readiness training more than arranging for jobs.</p> |
| Postsecondary Services | |
| <p>Monitor the enrollee's progress in college or other postsecondary training.</p> | <p>Not implemented.</p> |

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

TABLE III.3

SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—HOUSTON

| QOP Program Model | Houston Site |
|---|--|
| Case Management/Networking | |
| <p>Assessment of enrollee’s needs, determination of the best service mix for the enrollee, referral to other community organizations for services not directly provided by QOP. Representing and advocating for the enrollee before the school, criminal justice system, and other organizations. May include referral to child care providers, substance abuse treatment, health screening and treatment, and mental health screening and treatment.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Assessment of enrollee’s needs was informal. The coordinator periodically reviewed the situation of each enrollee with the youth’s case manager. Case managers kept logs of contacts, problems, and plans, which were reviewed by the coordinator. Advocacy and individual counseling were strongly emphasized.</p> |
| Mentoring | |
| <p>A close personal relationship resembling that of a caring aunt or uncle. Providing a role model, advice, standards of behavior, discipline, and encouragement.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Mentoring was the most prominent feature of the program. Case managers visited each enrollee’s home every two weeks and prepared case notes documenting challenges facing each enrollee as well as strategies for resolving them. Moderate staff turnover and changes in workload meant that enrollees were sometimes switched from one caseload to another.</p> |
| Intensity | |
| <p>Program Hours per Year 750 hours of program activities are scheduled each year, 250 in education, 250 in developmental activities, and 250 in community service.</p> <p>Case Manager Hours per Week Case managers are on duty each business day until early evening, one day on the weekend, and on call during nights and weekends.</p> | <p>Not implemented. The Houston program did not schedule many formal activities due to budget constraints.</p> <p>Fully implemented.</p> |

TABLE III.3 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Houston Site |
|--|---|
| <p>Unconditional Enrollment and Access to Services Enrollment and access to services are not contingent on the enrollee's school attendance, location of residence, involvement in the criminal justice system, illness or disability, or inactivity.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| <p>Sufficient Financial Resources At DOL-funded sites, expenditure on direct services to enrollees of \$4,000 per year per enrollee. Ford-funded sites were budgeted at \$6,750 per year per enrollee.</p> | <p>Not implemented. After the second year, matching funds were cut and the program operated on half budget, with only four case managers, one of whom also served as the coordinator.</p> |
| Education | |
| <p>Assessment Assessment of academic achievement in mathematics and English once per year.</p> <p>Individual Education Plan An individual education plan based on the assessments, the enrollee's grades, and consultations with the enrollee's school counselor and teachers, setting academic goals for the coming year.</p> <p>Tutoring One-on-one tutoring in mathematics, English, and other courses the enrollee is taking in school.</p> <p>Computer-Assisted Instruction Access to a personal computer with CAI software, guidance on how to use the CAI effectively, and assessment of the enrollee's progress.</p> | <p>Not implemented.</p> <p>Partially implemented. Informal strategies were based on enrollees' success in passing classes, attendance, and staying in school. QOP paid for night school, GED classes, and other academic remediation when needed.</p> <p>Not implemented. Case managers occasionally helped with homework and encouraged students to take advantage of free tutoring services provided by the school.</p> <p>Fully implemented. Use of CAI was relatively strong during the program's first three years. During the first year, the laboratory was located some distance from the schools. After that, computers were installed in the QOP offices in each of the two schools, and enrollees spent time using CAI software. The program offered special incentives for CAI activity and held contests to reward those who participated the most. By Year 4, students had lost interest but were still using computers to research colleges.</p> |

TABLE III.3 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Houston Site |
|--|--|
| <p>Postsecondary Planning Advice on selecting college preparatory courses in high school, tours of local college campuses, seminars on federal financial aid, assistance in completing college applications and Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA.) For those not college-bound, planning for postsecondary apprenticeships and vocational-technical training.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. College tours were local and brief. Postsecondary planning was not systematic. For many enrollees, more time was spent on solving more immediate personal and family problems than on longer-range planning.</p> |
| <p>Developmental Activities (see Table VII.1 for a detailed list of activities)</p> | |
| <p>Decision-Making Skills Seminars on avoiding risky behaviors, including childbearing, substance abuse, and criminal behavior. Seminars also covered budgeting, saving, investing, and managing money.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The program scheduled life skills courses weekly for the first three to four years of the demonstration, but much of the life skills training took the form of individual counseling and problem solving.</p> |
| <p>Cultural Awareness Exposure to fine arts, performing arts, and other cultural activities.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Outings were infrequent because of the low budget.</p> |
| <p>Recreation Games, swimming, etc.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The program hosted occasional small-group activities throughout the demonstration, often including a meal.</p> |
| <p>Community Service</p> | |
| <p>Volunteer activities designed to improve the physical environment, such as cleaning up a vacant lot, or to assist others in the community, such as visiting nursing home residents.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Case managers scheduled community service activities on weekends and thus engaged few enrollees. Efforts dwindled in the program's later years.</p> |

TABLE III.3 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Houston Site |
|---|--|
| Financial Incentives | |
| <p>A stipend of \$1.25 per hour spent on program activities other than recreation, paid biweekly or monthly. A contribution of an equal amount to an “accrual account” held by the program until the enrollee completes high school and enrolls in college, the armed forces, an accredited apprenticeship program, or a postsecondary vocational-technical school. Participants received bonuses for achieving major programmatic milestones. Staffs of Ford-funded sites received incentive compensation based on program attendance.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| Supportive Services | |
| <p>Supportive services were not included in the original formal QOP model but were added to the model during the demonstration.</p> <p>Food Substantial snack each afternoon and during weekend activities.</p> <p>Transportation Transportation provided directly by car or van or through financial subsidy, such as free or discounted bus tokens, for transportation to and from program activities.</p> <p>Child Care Arrange for and fund child care during time spent on program activities.</p> | <p>Not implemented.</p> <p>Partially implemented. The CBO made a van available to QOP staff for group outings, but case managers had to drive two hours each way to pick up and return the van. Case managers also provided some transportation in their own cars.</p> <p>Not implemented.</p> |
| Summer QOP | |
| <p>If the enrollee failed one or more courses, arrange for and fund remedial summer school. For other enrollees, arrange for part-time summer jobs. Continue to provide education, developmental, and community service activities throughout the summer and during other school vacations.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Case managers encouraged or arranged for summer school. Activities during summers differed little from those during the remainder of the year, with emphasis on mentoring and informal one-on-one or small group interactions.</p> |

TABLE III.3 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Houston Site |
|---|---|
| Postsecondary Services | |
| Monitor the enrollee’s progress in college or other postsecondary training. | Fully implemented. Case managers stayed in touch with enrollees and knew about their progress, challenges, and plans. |

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

TABLE III.4

SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—MEMPHIS

| QOP Program Model | Memphis Site |
|---|---|
| Case Management/Networking | |
| <p>Assessment of enrollee’s needs, determination of the best service mix for the enrollee, referral to other community organizations for services not directly provided by QOP. Representing and advocating for the enrollee before the school, criminal justice system, and other organizations. May include referral to child care providers, substance abuse treatment, health screening and treatment, and mental health screening and treatment.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| Mentoring | |
| <p>A close personal relationship resembling that of a caring aunt or uncle. Providing a role model, advice, standards of behavior, discipline, and encouragement.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The site was noteworthy for no staff turnover during the demonstration.</p> |
| Intensity | |
| <p>Program Hours per Year 750 hours of program activities are scheduled each year, 250 in education, 250 in developmental activities, and 250 in community service.</p> <p>Case Manager Hours per Week Case managers are on duty each business day until early evening, one day on the weekend, and on call during nights and weekends.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Implementation was fuller in the first three years.</p> <p>Fully implemented. All case managers carried pagers from start of service delivery and set few limits on their availability to enrollees. Case managers reduced their hours per week in the third year in response to DOL guidelines on over-time regulations.</p> |

TABLE III.4 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Memphis Site |
|--|--|
| <p>Unconditional Enrollment and Access to Services Enrollment and access to services are not contingent on the enrollee’s school attendance, location of residence, involvement in the criminal justice system, illness or disability, or inactivity.</p> <p>Sufficient Financial Resources At DOL-funded sites, expenditure on direct services to enrollees of \$4,000 per year per enrollee. Ford-funded sites were budgeted at \$6,750 per year per enrollee.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Case managers kept in contact with all enrollees, including those who moved out of state. They mailed developmental exercises to enrollees who moved away and traveled to neighboring states to visit some enrollees.</p> <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| Education | |
| <p>Assessment Assessment of academic achievement in mathematics and English once per year.</p> <p>Individual Education Plan An individual education plan based on the assessments, the enrollee’s grades, and consultations with the enrollee’s school counselor and teachers, setting academic goals for the coming year.</p> <p>Tutoring One-on-one tutoring in mathematics, English, and other courses the enrollee is taking in school.</p> <p>Computer-Assisted Instruction Access to a personal computer with CAI software, guidance on how to use the CAI effectively, and assessment of the enrollee’s progress.</p> | <p>Not implemented. The program assessed most students once, at the end of second year of the demonstration, using a local agency that specialized in academic assessment of at-risk youth.</p> <p>Not implemented.</p> <p>Partially implemented. Case management provided after-school assistance with homework and test preparation. QOP provided one-on-one professional tutoring to a few enrollees, but such assistance was not sustained.</p> <p>Partially implemented. Access was sporadic during first two years of the demonstration. Access improved during later years.</p> |

TABLE III.4 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Memphis Site |
|--|---|
| <p>Postsecondary Planning Advice on selecting college preparatory courses in high school, tours of local college campuses, seminars on federal financial aid, assistance in completing college applications and Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). For those not college-bound, planning for postsecondary apprenticeships and vocational-technical training.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The program provided trips to colleges and college fairs, but emphasis on college varied by case manager.</p> |
| <p>Developmental Activities (see Table VII.1 for a detailed list of activities)</p> | |
| <p>Decision-Making Skills Seminars on avoiding risky behaviors, including childbearing, substance abuse, and criminal behavior. Seminars also covered budgeting, saving, investing, and managing money.</p> | <p>Fully implemented, although case managers were initially reluctant to discuss contraception and sexuality explicitly.</p> |
| <p>Cultural Awareness Exposure to fine arts, performing arts, and other cultural activities.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| <p>Recreation Games, swimming, etc.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| <p>Community Service</p> | |
| <p>Volunteer activities designed to improve the physical environment, such as cleaning up a vacant lot, or to assist others in the community, such as visiting nursing home residents.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The community service component was well designed and well integrated into program services. Scheduled community service hours did not meet the goal number of hours.</p> |

TABLE III.4 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Memphis Site |
|---|--|
| Financial Incentives | |
| <p>A stipend of \$1.25 per hour spent on program activities other than recreation, paid biweekly or monthly. A contribution of an equal amount to an “accrual account” held by the program until the enrollee completes high school and enrolls in college, the armed forces, an accredited apprenticeship program, or a postsecondary vocational-technical school. Participants received bonuses for achieving major programmatic milestones. Staffs of Ford-funded sites received incentive compensation based on program attendance.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| Supportive Services | |
| <p>Supportive services were not included in the original formal QOP model but were added to the model during the demonstration.</p> <p>Food Substantial snack each afternoon and during weekend activities.</p> <p>Transportation Transportation provided directly by car or van or through financial subsidy, such as free or discounted bus tokens, for transportation to and from program activities.</p> <p>Child Care Arrange for and fund child care during time spent on program activities.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> <p>Fully implemented. The program used CBO vans and case managers’ cars to transport enrollees. It provided transportation to all activities.</p> <p>Partially implemented. Enrollees with children were invited to bring children along on activities. Case managers or other enrollees provided child care for special events such as taking the GED test or tutoring.</p> |
| Summer QOP | |
| <p>If the enrollee failed one or more courses, arrange for and fund remedial summer school. For other enrollees, arrange for part-time summer jobs. Continue to provide education, developmental, and community service activities throughout the summer and during other school vacations.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Summer programs were very good. The SDA provided high-quality summer jobs. QOP paid for summer school upon request.</p> |

TABLE III.4 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Memphis Site |
|--|--|
| Postsecondary Services | |
| <p>Monitor the enrollee’s progress in college or other postsecondary training.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The program did not monitor college attendees formally but stayed in touch with many such enrollees informally. The frequency of communication varied greatly based on the strength of the mentoring relationship and whether youth were attending school in the local area.</p> |

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

TABLE III.5

SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—PHILADELPHIA

| QOP Program Model | Philadelphia Site |
|---|---|
| Case Management/Networking | |
| <p>Assessment of enrollee’s needs, determination of the best service mix for the enrollee, referral to other community organizations for services not directly provided by QOP. Representing and advocating for the enrollee before the school, criminal justice system, and other organizations. May include referral to child care providers, substance abuse treatment, health screening and treatment, and mental health screening and treatment.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| Mentoring | |
| <p>A close personal relationship resembling that of a caring aunt or uncle. Providing a role model, advice, standards of behavior, discipline, and encouragement.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Relationships were close and long-term.</p> |
| Intensity | |
| <p>Program Hours per Year 750 hours of program activities are scheduled each year, 250 in education, 250 in developmental activities, and 250 in community service.</p> <p>Case Manager Hours per Week Case managers are on duty each business day until early evening, one day on the weekend, and on call during nights and weekends.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The prescribed number of hours was scheduled in development and education, especially in the first two years. Few hours were scheduled in community service. Education hours in the first three years consisted primarily of CAI. Education hours declined in the fourth and fifth years of the demonstration.</p> <p>Fully implemented. Case managers carried pagers from start of service delivery and set few, if any, limits on their availability to enrollees. Case managers reduced their hours per week in the third year in response to DOL guidelines on over-time regulations.</p> |

TABLE III.5 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Philadelphia Site |
|--|---|
| <p>Unconditional Enrollment and Access to Services Enrollment and access to services are not contingent on the enrollee’s school attendance, location of residence, involvement in the criminal justice system, illness or disability, or inactivity.</p> <p>Sufficient Financial Resources At DOL-funded sites, expenditure on direct services to enrollees of \$4,000 per year per enrollee. Ford-funded sites were budgeted at \$6,750 per year per enrollee.</p> | <p>Fully implemented, except for enrollees who moved out of state. Efforts to stay in contact with the several enrollees who wanted nothing to do with QOP from its inception became less frequent after the first year of the demonstration.</p> <p>Fully implemented. The budget and level of expenditure per enrollee at this Ford-funded site was higher than that of DOL-funded sites and higher than the other Ford-funded site.</p> |
| Education | |
| <p>Assessment Assessment of academic achievement in mathematics and English once per year.</p> <p>Individual Education Plan An individual education plan based on the assessments, the enrollee’s grades, and consultations with the enrollee’s school counselor and teachers, setting academic goals for the coming year.</p> <p>Tutoring One-on-one tutoring in mathematics, English, and other courses the enrollee is taking in school.</p> <p>Computer-Assisted Instruction Access to a personal computer with CAI software, guidance on how to use the CAI effectively, and assessment of the enrollee’s progress.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Enrollees were assessed three times during the demonstration by taking the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE).</p> <p>Partially implemented. The program developed individual education plans (IEPs), but they were limited to CAI plans and did not cover other aspects of education.</p> <p>Partially implemented. The program provided paid and volunteer tutoring in the first two years of the demonstration. Tutoring became less formal and systematic in later years.</p> <p>Fully implemented. The program offered a state-of-the-art computer laboratory at the CBO’s facility.</p> |

TABLE III.5 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Philadelphia Site |
|---|--|
| <p>Postsecondary Planning Advice on selecting college preparatory courses in high school, tours of local college campuses, seminars on federal financial aid, assistance in completing college applications and Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). For those not college-bound, planning for postsecondary apprenticeships and vocational-technical training.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The program provided college tours, preparation for standardized examinations, and counseling on applying to college and for financial aid.</p> |
| <p>Developmental Activities (see Table VII.1 for a detailed list of activities)</p> | |
| <p>Decision-Making Skills Seminars on avoiding risky behaviors, including childbearing, substance abuse, and criminal behavior. Seminars also covered budgeting, saving, investing, and managing money.</p> | <p>Fully implemented, in first two years. The frequency declined in the third year; none in the fourth year.</p> |
| <p>Cultural Awareness Exposure to fine arts, performing arts, and other cultural activities.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| <p>Recreation Games, swimming, etc.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| <p>Community Service</p> | |
| <p>Volunteer activities designed to improve the physical environment, such as cleaning up a vacant lot, or to assist others in the community, such as visiting nursing home residents.</p> | <p>Not implemented. Community service was never a systematic part of the service mix.</p> |
| <p>Financial Incentives</p> | |
| <p>A stipend of \$1.25 per hour spent on program activities other than recreation, paid biweekly or monthly. A contribution of an equal amount to an “accrual account” held by the program until the enrollee completes high school and enrolls in college, the armed forces, an accredited apprenticeship program, or a postsecondary vocational-technical school. Participants received bonuses for achieving major programmatic milestones. Staffs of Ford-funded sites received incentive compensation based on program attendance.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The stipend rate increased by a small amount each year. The program also paid bonuses for completing a certain threshold of participation. The CBO invested the accrual account funds, which earned interest. Enrollees received a quarterly statement of their account.</p> |

TABLE III.5 (continued)

| QOP Program Model | Philadelphia Site |
|--|---|
| Supportive Services | |
| <p>Supportive services were not included in the original formal QOP model but were added to the model during the demonstration.</p> <p>Food Substantial snack each afternoon and during weekend activities.</p> <p>Transportation Transportation provided directly by car or van or through financial subsidy, such as free or discounted bus tokens, for transportation to and from program activities.</p> <p>Child Care Arrange for and fund child care during time spent on program activities.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Snacks were not provided each weekday afternoon but were provided on weekends.</p> <p>Fully implemented. The program provided subway tokens but not vans or shuttles.</p> <p>Partially implemented. Enrollees with children were invited to bring children along on outings. Case managers or other enrollees provided child care for special events such as taking the GED test or tutoring.</p> |
| Summer QOP | |
| <p>If the enrollee failed one or more courses, arrange for and fund remedial summer school. For other enrollees, arrange for part-time summer jobs. Continue to provide education, developmental, and community service activities throughout the summer and during other school vacations.</p> | <p>Not implemented. While the program encouraged youth to go to summer school and paid for summer school in many cases, it offered few if any services during the summer months. It arranged for summer jobs during the first year but not in later years.</p> |
| Postsecondary Services | |
| <p>Monitor the enrollee's progress in college or other postsecondary training.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. The program did not engage in formal monitoring, but it stayed in touch with many college attendees. The frequency of communication varied greatly based on the strength of the mentoring relationship and whether youth were attending school in the local area.</p> |

TABLE III.6

SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—
WASHINGTON, D.C.

| QOP Model | Washington, D.C. Site |
|--|---|
| Case Management/Networking | |
| <p>Assessment of enrollee’s needs, determination of the best service mix for the enrollee, referral to other community organizations for services not directly provided by QOP. Representing and advocating for the enrollee before the school, criminal justice system, and other organizations. May include referral to child care providers, substance abuse treatment, health screening and treatment, and mental health screening and treatment.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Assessment of needs was not done formally and was not emphasized. Most case managers nonetheless knew about the needs of the enrollees in their caseloads. Case managers made some referrals to social services and to mental health screening.</p> |
| Mentoring | |
| <p>A close personal relationship resembling that of a caring aunt or uncle. Providing a role model, advice, standards of behavior, discipline, and encouragement.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Mentoring relationships were typically strong and positive but limited by turnover of both case managers and the coordinator.</p> |
| Intensity | |
| <p>Program Hours per Year 750 hours of program activities are scheduled each year, 250 in education, 250 in developmental activities, and 250 in community service.</p> <p>Case Manager Hours per Week Case managers are on duty each business day until early evening, one day on the weekend, and on call during nights and weekends.</p> <p>Unconditional Enrollment and Access to Services Enrollment and access to services are not contingent on the enrollee’s school attendance, location of residence, involvement in the criminal justice system, illness or disability, or inactivity.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Scheduled activities at or near the prescribed number of hours for some components, but not for others.</p> <p>Fully implemented. With a few exceptions, case managers were available to enrollees for the prescribed amount of time. Evening and weekend activities were frequent.</p> <p>Fully implemented. Participation suffered in the program’s later years because of the number of transfers to other high schools.</p> |

TABLE III.6 (continued)

| QOP Model | Washington, D.C. Site |
|---|---|
| <p>Sufficient Financial Resources At DOL-funded sites, expenditure on direct services to enrollees of \$4,000 per year per enrollee. Ford-funded sites were budgeted at \$6,750 per year per enrollee.</p> | <p>Fully implemented.</p> |
| Education | |
| <p>Assessment Assessment of academic achievement in mathematics and English once per year.</p> <p>Individual Education Plan An individual education plan based on the assessments, the enrollee's grades, and consultations with the enrollee's school counselor and teachers, setting academic goals for the coming year.</p> <p>Tutoring One-on-one tutoring in mathematics, English, and other courses the enrollee is taking in school.</p> <p>Computer-Assisted Instruction Access to a personal computer with CAI software, guidance on how to use the CAI effectively, and assessment of the enrollee's progress.</p> <p>Postsecondary Planning Advice on selecting college preparatory courses in high school, tours of local college campuses, seminars on federal financial aid, assistance in completing college applications and Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). For those not college-bound, planning for postsecondary apprenticeships and vocational-technical training.</p> | <p>Not implemented. About half of the enrollees completed the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) in the second academic year of the demonstration.</p> <p>Not implemented. Plans were neither formal nor consistent.</p> <p>Partially implemented. Case managers provided homework help when students requested it.</p> <p>Partially implemented. The computer laboratory's equipment and software were state-of-the-art. More problematic was the level of staff training. Students had access to the laboratory two days per week.</p> <p>Fully implemented. Case managers began discussing post-secondary options in the program's second year. The program scheduled local college tours, college fairs, and preparation for the PSAT and SAT. Planning and preparation for non-college-bound students was more individual and initiated by case manager.</p> |

TABLE III.6 (continued)

| QOP Model | Washington, D.C. Site |
|---|---|
| Developmental Activities (see Table VII.1 for a detailed list of activities) | |
| <p>Decision-Making Skills Seminars on avoiding risky behaviors, including childbearing, substance abuse, and criminal behavior. Seminars also covered budgeting, saving, investing, and managing money.</p> <p>Cultural Awareness Exposure to fine arts, performing arts, and other cultural activities.</p> <p>Recreation Games, swimming, etc.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Offered a varied and rich program of activities in the first two years of the demonstration. In later years, life skills training received less emphasis as the focus on education increased.</p> <p>Fully implemented.</p> <p>Fully implemented. Such activities were frequent on Fridays and non-school days.</p> |
| Community Service | |
| <p>Volunteer activities designed to improve the physical environment, such as cleaning up a vacant lot, or to assist others in the community, such as visiting nursing home residents.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Community service activities were planned in conjunction with the CBO's functions. Many students also arranged their own community service activities, consistent with the local school requirement of community service hours for graduation. Scheduled community service hours did not meet the goal number of hours.</p> |
| Financial Incentives | |
| <p>A stipend of \$1.25 per hour spent on program activities other than recreation, paid biweekly or monthly. A contribution of an equal amount to an "accrual account" held by the program until the enrollee completes high school and enrolls in college, the armed forces, an accredited apprenticeship program, or a postsecondary vocational-technical school. Participants received bonuses for achieving major programmatic milestones. Staffs of Ford-funded sites received incentive compensation based on program attendance.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The program also offered in-kind incentives, including certificates and tickets to recreational activities.</p> |

TABLE III.6 (continued)

| QOP Model | Washington, D.C. Site |
|--|---|
| Supportive Services | |
| <p>Supportive services were not included in the original formal QOP model but were added to the model during the demonstration.</p> <p>Food Substantial snack each afternoon and during weekend activities.</p> <p>Transportation Provided transportation directly by car or van or through financial subsidy, such as free or discounted bus tokens, for transportation to and from program activities.</p> <p>Child Care Arrange for and fund child care during time spent on program activities.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Initial offerings were not nutritious, but emphasis on nutritional value increased in later years.</p> <p>Fully implemented. Two dedicated QOP vans, with program logo on the side, provided transportation to and from program offices for use of after-school computer laboratories and enabled the program to provide transportation for recreational and development outings, college tours, etc.</p> <p>Fully implemented. The program created a child care area adjacent to the computer laboratory to encourage participation among student parents.</p> |
| Summer QOP | |
| <p>If the enrollee failed one or more courses, arrange for and fund remedial summer school. For other enrollees, arrange for part-time summer jobs. Continue to provide education, developmental, and community service activities throughout the summer and during other school vacations.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Program activities continued through the summer; the program arranged for summer school and summer jobs.</p> |
| Postsecondary Services | |
| <p>Monitor the enrollee's progress in college or other postsecondary training.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Case managers had other responsibilities during the fifth year of the demonstration that limited the amount of time they could devote to staying in touch.</p> |

TABLE III.7

SITE-BY-SITE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QOP DEMONSTRATION—YAKIMA

| QOP Model | Yakima Site |
|---|--|
| Case Management/Networking | |
| <p>Assessment of enrollee’s needs, determination of the best service mix for the enrollee, referral to other community organizations for services not directly provided by QOP. Representing and advocating for the enrollee before the school, criminal justice system, and other organizations. May include referral to child care providers, substance abuse treatment, health screening and treatment, and mental health screening and treatment.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. No formal assessment of enrollee’s needs. Case managers made some referrals to social service providers but also stated they were not always sure enough about some needs. Developed formal contracts with enrollees early in the program.</p> |
| Mentoring | |
| <p>A close personal relationship resembling that of a caring aunt or uncle. Providing a role model, advice, standards of behavior, discipline, and encouragement.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Mentoring was well implemented for those enrollees who remained engaged in the program. Since case managers did not have offices in the school, they had difficulty working with enrollees who did not come to the CBO facility. Several enrollees re-engaged in the program’s fourth year.</p> |
| Intensity | |
| <p>Program Hours per Year 750 hours of program activities are scheduled each year, 250 in education, 250 in developmental activities, and 250 in community service.</p> <p>Case Manager Hours per Week Case managers are on duty each business day until early evening, one day on the weekend, and on call during nights and weekends.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. For the first three years, the program scheduled few developmental and community service activities. Barriers included budget constraints and enrollees’ family and work responsibilities.</p> <p>Partially implemented. Case managers were on duty only part-time and thus had little time to make home visits. They did not carry pagers. Part-time availability to QOP participants was consistent with the version of the QOP model implemented at Ford-funded sites. This involved staff having substantial non-QOP job responsibilities.</p> |

TABLE III.7 (continued)

| QOP Model | Yakima Site |
|--|---|
| <p>Unconditional Enrollment and Access to Services Enrollment and access to services are not contingent on the enrollee's school attendance, location of residence, involvement in the criminal justice system, illness or disability, or inactivity.</p> <p>Sufficient Financial Resources At DOL-funded sites, expenditure on direct services to enrollees of \$4,000 per year per enrollee. Ford-funded sites were budgeted at \$6,750 per year per enrollee.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Case managers' time constraints kept managers from being as proactive when situations called for staying in touch with those who dropped out of QOP or moved away.</p> <p>Not implemented. The budget at this Ford-funded site was less than that at DOL-funded sites and significantly less than that at the other Ford-funded site. The level of funding improved in the final two years of the demonstration.</p> |
| Education | |
| <p>Assessment Assessment of academic achievement in mathematics and English once per year.</p> <p>Individual Education Plan An individual education plan based on the assessments, the enrollee's grades, and consultations with the enrollee's school counselor and teachers, setting academic goals for the coming year.</p> <p>Tutoring One-on-one tutoring in mathematics, English, and other courses the enrollee is taking in school.</p> <p>Computer-Assisted Instruction Access to a personal computer with CAI software, guidance on how to use the CAI effectively, and assessment of the enrollee's progress.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Used Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) and tracked progress through the CCP software.</p> <p>Partially implemented. Developed education plans, but they were not comprehensive. Case managers collected report cards and mid-term examination results. They intervened only when there was a problem and did not routinely interact with teachers. Lack of office space at the school, along with other jobs during school hours, was a barrier to this interaction.</p> <p>Partially implemented. Case managers provided tutoring. In early years, tutoring was geared to helping enrollees progress through the CAI program rather than focusing on course content. In later years, students increasingly requested and received help with homework.</p> <p>Fully implemented. The computer laboratory was new and state-of-the art and served as a center of program activities. Staff were well trained and tracked enrollees' progress through the CAI.</p> |

TABLE III.7 (continued)

| QOP Model | Yakima Site |
|--|---|
| <p>Postsecondary Planning Advice on selecting college preparatory courses in high school, tours of local college campuses, seminars on federal financial aid, assistance in completing college applications and Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). For those not college-bound, planning for postsecondary apprenticeships and vocational-technical training.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. The program arranged college tours, both in and out of state. Case managers helped enrollees plan and apply for financial aid. QOP paid for SAT testing and encouraged students to prepare for and take the test.</p> |
| <p>Developmental Activities (see Table VII.1 for a detailed list of activities)</p> | |
| <p>Decision-Making Skills Seminars on avoiding risky behaviors, including childbearing, substance abuse, and criminal behavior. Seminars also covered budgeting, saving, investing, and managing money.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. In the first three years, the program offered few development activities. A new case manager in Year 4 and increases in the budget brought more frequent life skills activities and developmental outings.</p> |
| <p>Cultural Awareness Exposure to fine arts, performing arts, and other cultural activities.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Outings were infrequent because of the low budget.</p> |
| <p>Recreation Games, swimming, etc.</p> | <p>Not implemented. Activities were rare, especially during Years 1 through 3, lacking money for transportation, food, and entry fees.</p> |
| <p>Community Service</p> | |
| <p>Volunteer activities designed to improve the physical environment, such as cleaning up a vacant lot, or to assist others in the community, such as visiting nursing home residents.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Scheduled some community service activities, but this component received less emphasis than others.</p> |

TABLE III.7 (continued)

| QOP Model | Yakima Site |
|---|---|
| Financial Incentives | |
| <p>A stipend of \$1.25 per hour spent on program activities other than recreation, paid biweekly or monthly. A contribution of an equal amount to an “accrual account” held by the program until the enrollee completes high school and enrolls in college, the armed forces, an accredited apprenticeship program, or a postsecondary vocational-technical school. Participants received bonuses for achieving major programmatic milestones. Staffs of Ford-funded sites received incentive compensation based on program attendance.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. \$1.33 per hour, 100-hour bonuses, and some achievement-based bonuses. Late in the demonstration, the CBO developed a point system in which enrollees could earn points for participation and positive behaviors and have points docked for negative behaviors, ultimately cashing in their points for prizes. In Year 4, the program provided debit cards for enrollees and implemented money management training. After the first two years of the demonstration, the CBO invested the accrual account funds, which earned interest. Enrollees received a quarterly statement of their account.</p> |
| Supportive Services | |
| <p>Supportive services were not included in the original formal QOP model but were added to the model during the demonstration.</p> <p>Food Substantial snack each afternoon and during weekend activities.</p> <p>Transportation Provided transportation directly by car or van or through financial subsidy, such as free or discounted bus tokens, for transportation to and from program activities.</p> <p>Child Care Arrange for and fund child care during time spent on program activities.</p> | <p>Partially implemented. Enrollees could purchase snacks at the CBO’s snack bar.</p> <p>Partially implemented. The center’s accessibility by school bus and public transportation was a help, but transportation at the end of the day was more of a problem. Parents often had to pick up their children. Case managers used their own cars for outings and weekend activities. Lack of money for transportation was cited as a factor limiting the number of activities and outings offered.</p> <p>Not implemented.</p> |

TABLE III.7 (continued)

| QOP Model | Yakima Site |
|---|---|
| Summer QOP | |
| <p>If the enrollee failed one or more courses, arrange for and fund remedial summer school. For other enrollees, arrange for part-time summer jobs. Continue to provide education, developmental, and community service activities throughout the summer and during other school vacations.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Case managers encouraged or arranged for summer school, and QOP paid for it. In some years, as many as half of enrollees attended. Also arranged for summer JTPA jobs. QOP programming continued throughout the summer.</p> |
| Postsecondary Services | |
| <p>Monitor the enrollee's progress in college or other postsecondary training.</p> | <p>Fully implemented. Case managers stayed in touch with enrollees and appeared to know a great deal about their progress and challenges.</p> |

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

CHAPTER IV

INTENSITY

Starting with program intensity, this chapter begins a component-by-component analysis of how QOP was implemented. It and the next six chapters begin by summarizing the program model and conclude by describing how the demonstration sites actually implemented the component.

INTENSITY IN THE QOP MODEL

QOP's overall intensity was the main characteristic that distinguished it from many other youth programs. The program was intensive in several ways.

- Services lasted for five years, starting in the ninth grade. Intense services lasted for the first four years, or until a youth completed high school.
- Sites were to schedule 750 hours of activities per year—250 in education, 250 in developmental activities, and 250 in community service activities.
- Staff time was intensive, with one full-time case manager for 15 to 25 enrollees or part-time case managers paid according to their enrollees' participation.
- Case managers were expected to be on call at all times, making themselves available to enrollees at night and during weekends.
- Program staff were required to continue trying to engage enrollees regardless of the enrollees' response or whereabouts. This meant striving to stay in contact with enrollees who may be incarcerated, living out of state, attending a different school after a transfer, or disengaged from the program.
- Because program staff members are expected to adopt a “whatever-it-takes” approach to enrollees' needs, services were tailored to the unique circumstances of each enrollee.

INTENSITY AS IMPLEMENTED

While the QOP demonstration revealed several practical limits to implementing services at the prescribed level of intensity, it is clear that the program was more intensive than most other youth programs. Many of the school administrators, faculty, and CBO managers interviewed for this report stated that QOP was the most intensive program they had ever encountered. Principals at several QOP core schools said that, in particular, its intensive case management set QOP apart from other youth programs. One principal reported that QOP was more successful than any other youth program in his experience, saying, “Their intensive involvement is what distinguishes them from the others. They pick up youth at home. They do whatever is needed, inside or outside of school. They provide a stable and caring environment; they provide consistency.”

However, every site found it difficult to implement the model with regard to three aspects of program intensity: offering 750 hours of activities, ensuring that case managers were on call at all times, and requiring that staff members never give up on an enrollee.

Hours of Activities Offered

Sites varied in the extent to which they met the guidelines for service intensity. Two sites scheduled 750 annual hours of program activities, allocating approximately 250 hours of participation each to education, community, and developmental activities. The five remaining sites scheduled fewer than 750 hours. Some of these sites scheduled enough hours in education or development activities, but none scheduled sufficient hours in community service. One site offered 750 hours of program services, but case managers did not follow up with enrollees or make themselves available during off hours. In contrast, another site fell short of the prescribed number of hours but balanced services among the three components, and the case managers consistently pursued enrollees. As a result, enrollees at this site received a more intensive “dose” of QOP than enrollees at the other site even though it fell short of the 750 hours.

The three sites that did not offer the required number of hours often emphasized one program component over the others. For instance, one of these sites fell far short of offering enough program hours in education, developmental, and community service activities but heavily emphasized mentoring activities. The site’s case managers visited the home of each enrollee who lived within the city limits twice a month regardless of whether the enrollee attended the core QOP school. Another site fell far short of the prescribed number of hours in several components, but offered many hours in CAI.

Personnel Intensity

The services offered at nearly all QOP sites were staff-intensive. Caseloads at each site were small relative to many other youth programs, ranging from 15 to 27 youths per case manager. Approximately 80 percent of case managers were responsible for 20 or fewer enrollees, and 90 percent of case managers worked on QOP full time. Of the two sites where case managers worked

on QOP part time, case managers at one site had full-time positions as JTPA counselors.⁵ At the other site, case managers worked primarily on QOP but were also responsible for a small proportion of non-QOP youth who attended the QOP host high school and were enrolled in another program administered by the QOP CBO.

At five of the seven sites, case managers made themselves available to enrollees at all times. These staff carried pagers and encouraged youth to contact them as needed. Indeed, case managers at these sites reported that many enrollees called them in the evenings and on weekends. At the remaining two sites, case managers limited their availability. One site initially had only one pager that rotated among its case managers. However, beginning in the third year of the demonstration, all case managers at the site began carrying pagers, and as a result, enrollees called them more regularly. At the remaining site, case managers did not carry pagers but gave enrollees their home telephone numbers, although the extent to which the case managers made themselves available during off hours varied.

The policy of providing access to case managers 24 hours a day, seven days a week is based on the recognition that disadvantaged youth most often need help during non-business hours. Sites that attempted to provide such access, however, found that round-the-clock access eventually led to staff burnout. Further, case managers are covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, which required compensation at a higher rate for time on duty beyond 40 hours per week. While nearly all case managers spent more than 40 hours per week at work, none of the demonstration sites had budgeted for over-time compensation at the beginning of the demonstration.

Most sites found that although it was not necessary for case managers to be available around the clock, case managers had to be reasonably accessible, and their hours, flexible. Sites also found that it was more effective for case managers to work in teams so that they could share the responsibilities of evening and weekend work. Case managers reported that although they frequently received calls during off hours, most of the situations leading to those calls could be handled over the telephone.

The philosophy of never giving up on an enrollee was expressed in the program motto “Once in QOP, always in QOP.” However, sites found that there were practical limits to the implementation of this policy. By the fourth year of the demonstration, the proportion of participating high school students who had either transferred to another school or moved out of state ranged from 14 to 57 percent. For example, at one site, 30 of the 53 enrollees still known to be attending high school had transferred out of the QOP school. That proportion, added to the proportion of enrollees who had dropped out of school, moved away, enrolled in or completed a GED program, or were incarcerated, meant that nearly three out of every four QOP enrollees (74 percent) at the site did not attend the QOP school during the latter part of the demonstration.

With enrollees widely dispersed during the second half of the demonstration, case managers had to divide their time between providing services to local enrollees and tracking down distant

⁵ This arrangement was based on the design of the QOP pilot, in which case managers also had other full-time job responsibilities. Case managers were compensated for their overtime using an incentive system based on the number of hours that enrollees in their caseload spent on QOP activities.

enrollees. At some sites, case managers would set aside one morning a week to visit the other schools that QOP enrollees attended to follow up on them in person. During these visits, case managers checked enrollees' attendance records and met with teachers or administrators if necessary. Case managers also set aside one or two more mornings or afternoons per week to connect with enrollees who had dropped out of school. To find these individuals, case managers made home visits, went to the enrollees' places of employment, or drove around the neighborhoods where the enrollees might be found. Some sites balanced these responsibilities by relying on one case manager to follow up on out-of-school youth and another to visit the non-QOP schools.

It was particularly difficult for QOP case managers to maintain contact with enrollees who moved out of state. At some sites, case managers maintained regular contact through letters and telephone calls, sending packets of QOP materials and outlining activities for the enrollee to complete in exchange for continuing to receive a stipend. Some case managers also contacted enrollees' new schools to arrange for the youth to accrue QOP hours for activities completed there. One case manager with six out-of-state enrollees in her caseload regularly sent them letters and QOP materials, encouraged them to identify local community service activities in which they could participate, and drove hundreds of miles to visit an enrollee who had moved to a neighboring state. Case managers found it more difficult to gain access to these youths' academic records because administrators from the new schools were not familiar with the QOP program. Case managers learned about the academic progress of these enrollees only through the enrollees themselves or through their parents.

Not all sites, however, were as diligent in following up on youth who had moved or transferred to a non-QOP school. At these sites, case managers felt that they simply did not have enough time to serve youth who had moved away. Even at sites where staff members tried earnestly to keep in touch with youth who had moved or transferred, there were invariably some enrollees with whom case managers lost contact. Instead of continually trying to contact these individuals, many case managers felt that their time was better spent providing more services to the youth who remained geographically close to the site.

Each site also had a few enrollees who were incarcerated. The ability to maintain ongoing contact with these individuals depended on the requirements of the facility in which the individual was detained or on the restrictions of the sentence. At several sites, case managers maintained limited contact with incarcerated youth by visiting them at their detention site, sending them letters, contacting them by telephone, or visiting them at home when they were released on a weekend pass.

Case managers reported wasting many hours contacting individuals who had never participated in any QOP activities. Case managers tried for the first two years of the demonstration to engage these youth in QOP but reported that, by the program's third year, their time was better spent on youth who had some interest in QOP.

CHAPTER V

CASE MANAGEMENT AND MENTORING

Case management and mentoring were at the heart of QOP and served as the glue that held together all other program components.

CASE MANAGEMENT AND MENTORING IN THE QOP MODEL

In the QOP model, the purpose of case management was to assess both the unmet needs of enrollees and the barriers they face and to fashion a service mix that best addressed those needs and barriers. Case managers addressed any problems in any aspect of the enrollee's life; monitored the enrollee's progress; and advocated for the enrollee in matters pertaining to school, family, the juvenile justice system, and college. The mentoring function involved a long-term personal relationship between a enrollee and his or her case manager that is similar to the relationship between a youth and a close and caring older relative. The case manager was expected to model appropriate behavior and attitudes, set disciplinary standards, and be continually available.

CASE MANAGEMENT AND MENTORING AS IMPLEMENTED

Generally, the case management and mentoring component of QOP was successfully implemented. Case managers reported forming personal, mutually caring relationships lasting as long as the five years of the demonstration with between 40 and 60 percent of their total caseload. At all sites, mentoring absorbed the greatest number of staff hours. Despite the overall success in case management and mentoring, implementing the case management and mentoring component of QOP presented a number of challenges, such as staff turnover, relationships with parents, and other issues discussed below.

Staff Turnover

To the extent that longevity in large part characterizes a successful mentoring relationship, staff turnover has the potential to interfere with successful mentoring. Fortunately, turnover in the demonstration was relatively low. Of the 30 caseload groups in the demonstration, 14 had the same case manager throughout the first four years of the demonstration. During this time, one site experienced no staff turnover. At each of two other sites, the case managers for three caseload

groups remained the same for the first four years. Four of the seven sites experienced turnover of both coordinator and case managers.

Turnover was most damaging in two circumstances. The first was when a position remained vacant for some time, leaving some enrollees with no primary mentor for as long as two or three months. Case managers who filled in as temporary mentors were overworked and often unable to meet enrollees' needs. The second was when all enrollees experienced more than two case managers during the demonstration. Many enrollees did not develop strong relationships with their third case manager.

Some CBOs attempted to protect enrollees from staff turnover by increasing case manager compensation. Case manager salaries were typically in the range of \$20,000 to \$30,000 per year.

Relationships with Families

At six of the seven sites, coordinators expected case managers to conduct regular home visits or maintain telephone contact with parents and family members of each enrollee in their caseloads. One site required case managers to visit homes twice a month. The majority of case managers adopted a dual approach to communicating with enrollees' families. While staying in touch with individual families, they also conducted group events for parents such as picnics, awards banquets, open houses at the schools, and holiday celebrations.

Case managers reported forming close and cooperative relationships with some parents but not with others. Many families were grateful to have support in looking out for their children. Case managers found that parents who were most difficult to reach might have felt threatened by case managers' mentoring relationships with their children. Moreover, some of the most-difficult-to-reach families were those whose children had the largest number of persistent barriers to success. Case managers reported that some parents appeared anxious to limit the exposure of family problems to the case manager and saw the QOP case manager as being intrusive. Finally, in a few cases, case managers felt that parents had given up trying to influence their children, especially as enrollees grew older and more independent. QOP staff was least successful in engaging these parents. In those cases when the case manager established a relationship with the enrollee's parent, the case manager found the relationship to be an asset in providing the enrollee with case management and mentoring. The parent helped the case manager locate the youth, reinforced the value of attending program activities, shared news about events in the enrollee's life, and offered insights into the enrollee's feelings and perceptions.

Conflicting Roles of Nurturer and Disciplinarian

Case managers adopted a variety of mentoring styles, ranging from parental and authoritarian to friendly but not authoritarian. Case managers at several sites adopted a relatively formal style, expecting enrollees to address them by their last names and enforcing strict behavior rules when enrollees were on site. Case managers, like parents, occasionally found that they had to discipline enrollees in addition to advocating for and nurturing them. For instance, most case managers did not advocate for students who engaged in ongoing negative behaviors, believing that unqualified support for poor behavior would send the wrong message to the youth and to his or her QOP

peers. Case managers balanced advocacy with discipline by discussing problem situations with their QOP colleagues and using their intuition to guide the youth in their caseload.

The most successful mentors used a balance between nurturing and discipline. Some enrollees would steadfastly resist a parental or authoritarian approach while others would take advantage of or dismiss a case manager who adopted a more friendly approach. Case managers also learned that consistency was crucial. During the later years of the demonstration, some case managers found that they needed to nurture enrollees less in order to encourage them to become more self-reliant.

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

CHAPTER VI

THE EDUCATION COMPONENT

THE EDUCATION COMPONENT IN THE QOP MODEL

The goal of QOP's education component was to improve enrollees' basic skills and academic performance in high school and to prepare them for success in postsecondary education or training. The component included five key elements.

- Academic assessment to identify the specific academic needs of each enrollee
- An individualized education plan, including a sequence of instructional activities designed to bring each enrollee up to grade level in reading and mathematics and generally to keep youth on track academically
- Course-based tutoring to help enrollees pass their high school courses
- Computer-assisted instruction to support other educational activities and to leverage the case managers' time so that a larger number of enrollees could be served
- Planning for postsecondary activities

THE EDUCATION COMPONENT AS IMPLEMENTED

In describing the education component as implemented relative to the model component, we account for the fact that the model component continued to evolve during the first two years of the demonstration. DOL's QOP grant announcement did not require CBOs to budget for computer-assisted instruction facilities or equipment, although the initial training of site staff stressed that computer-assisted instruction was necessary and that it required a facility and computer equipment. In the first year or two of the demonstration, the DOL-funded sites arranged for such facilities and equipment as best they could, considering that neither was included in their budgets. In the second year of the demonstration, staff training stressed the other aspects of the education model: assessment, education plans, and course-based tutoring. Thus, the full scope of the education component was not clear to the sites until the latter half of the second year of the demonstration.

In contrast, the Ford Foundation grant funded the installation of a comprehensive computer learning center in each of its two sites. These sites contracted with the Remediation and Training Institute for all the required hardware, software, and supporting materials as well as on-going training and technical assistance. These two sites were the only demonstration sites that had functioning computer laboratories at the beginning of the demonstration.

The implementation of the education component varied widely from site to site and was incomplete at every site. By the time the education component became specified, the DOL-funded sites had already hired staff on the basis of their ability to serve as case managers rather than as teachers or tutors. Many sites tried to expand their services to include more formal educational activities, but they did not have the expertise to implement the needed changes either quickly or effectively.

Because of the lack of expertise in education-related activities, QOP staff members required extensive training and technical assistance in how to select assessment tools, interpret assessment results, develop education plans, select a computer-assisted instruction system or vendor, and translate plans into a course of tutoring and computer-assisted instruction.

Despite the barriers to implementing the education component, several sites succeeded in implementing some of its key elements. Their experiences with each element are described below.

Assessments and Individual Education Plans

Five sites used a formal assessment tool to determine enrollees' basic skills, though few understood how to use the assessment results to develop formal individual education plans. The remaining two sites did not conduct assessments.

One of the five sites that conducted assessments contracted for assessment services with a local CBO that specialized in remedial education for teenagers. The assessment process began during the fall semester in year three of the demonstration and continued into the spring term. Assessments were completed for approximately two-thirds of the site's enrollees. By the time assessments were completed, most enrollees were finishing eleventh grade. The four other sites that conducted assessments did so early in the demonstration by using the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). Two of the sites did not use the results at all while the other two used them only for planning the sequence of CAI lessons. One of these two sites assessed enrollees three times: at program start-up, during fall of the second year, and in summer and fall of the fourth year. Case managers reviewed test results informally and noted progress and weaknesses in enrollees' scores. However, the site did not use the assessment results to develop a structured education plan that integrated enrollees' academic needs with their computer-assisted instruction activities.

Enrollees showed little patience for standardized tests, refusing to attend QOP activities when assessment tests were administered. Some youth who did take the tests marked their answer sheets randomly to finish as quickly as possible. Enrollees who had difficulty reading were especially put off by the tests. The sites that succeeded in motivating the majority of their enrollees to complete assessments did so only by using incentives and bonuses, but even these devices failed to motivate many particularly resistant youth. Case managers reported that the assessments seemed to alienate the very enrollees most in need of QOP's educational services.

Only two sites made individual education plans for youth. Virtually all plans lacked depth and detail, were not tailored to individual needs, and listed generic activities such as “after-school tutoring, teacher conferences, reviewing progress reports.” Furthermore, even though enrollees at the two sites had taken the TABE, case managers did not incorporate the results into enrollees’ educational plans.

While meaningful education plans were not developed at any site, case managers at most sites followed up on enrollees’ progress and needs—often daily or weekly for in-school youth. Case managers reviewed report cards and progress reports, held meetings with teachers, and sat in on enrollees’ classes. They also encouraged enrollees who failed a class to attend summer school, and at many sites, QOP paid summer school fees for enrollees who could not afford them. These types of monitoring activities are essential to any effective individual education plan. Unfortunately, in the absence of formal education plans, these activities were often informal and unsystematic.

Tutoring

All sites offered some type of course-based tutoring, although the quality and consistency of services varied greatly. At some sites, case managers served as the tutors. They helped enrollees upon request, using whatever knowledge they had of the particular subject. Some case managers reported that they were uncomfortable providing tutoring. One site referred enrollees to their high school teachers for extra help. At another site, the coordinator set up extensive in-service training to improve case managers’ tutoring skills. Some sites recruited volunteer tutors, although these sites had difficulty forging long-lasting relationships with the volunteers, most of whom were local college students who worked with QOP for only one or two semesters. Enrollees at one site where case managers acted as tutors reported that access to more expert tutoring would have greatly improved services at that site.

Four sites were located in states that required passing a proficiency examination for high school graduation. At those sites, the tutoring was designed to prepare enrollees for the examinations. Staff at the sites learned that the tests were a major barrier to successful completion of high school. At one school, for example, only one-third of QOP enrollees had passed both the mathematics and the English sections of the state’s eighth-grade proficiency examination by the first semester of their senior year.

Several sites also provided tutoring for SATs and ACTs. As test dates drew near, most sites focused educational activities on preparing for these tests. Case managers encouraged enrollees to attend Saturday workshops held at the school or at local community agencies. A few sites also purchased books and CD-ROMs that provided enrollees with test-taking tips and sample examinations.

One site convinced a few enrollees who were most in need of academic remediation to participate in professional tutoring sessions offered through a different local CBO specializing in academic remediation of at-risk youth. Case managers provided transportation to and from the tutoring sessions to ensure enrollees’ attendance. The responsibility for transportation soon proved too burdensome for case managers, and, as managers ceased to provide transportation, youth ceased to attend tutoring sessions with any regularity.

One site took a particularly promising approach to tutoring, offering services after school four days a week. Tutors included a teacher from the high school who was paid for her time by the QOP program, student volunteers from the local university, and the site's computer-assisted instruction teacher. Although student participation was voluntary, case managers encouraged participation by requiring youth to complete a specific number of tutoring hours to qualify for participation in upcoming recreational activities.

Participation levels in tutoring activities were low in all sites. Enrollees were more likely to participate in tutoring for standardized tests and college entrance examinations than in course-based tutoring.

Computer-Assisted Instruction

The implementation of computer-assisted instruction varied greatly by site. The two Ford-funded sites had state-of-the-art computer laboratories operating at the start of the demonstration, and one DOL-funded site set up a state-of-the-art computer facility by the start of the second year. Lack of expertise and resources significantly hindered the remaining four DOL-funded sites for some or all of the demonstration period. Although each of the four sites devoted considerable time to setting up a computer laboratory, none succeeded in providing enrollees with a computer facility that was state-of-the-art or available for enough time.

These four sites spent a great deal of staff time arranging for access to computer facilities owned and operated by other organizations. Unfortunately, after months of negotiations, the arrangements often fell through. Several sites eventually secured access to functioning, but outdated, computers without Internet access. One site was able to secure access to a computer laboratory for eighteen months. Another site set up a modern computer laboratory equipped with educational software in the fourth year of the demonstration.

The two Ford-funded sites, which implemented computer-assisted instruction most effectively, set up a computer learning center at the CBO's facility, which housed modern, well-equipped computers with Internet access and Comprehensive Competency Program (CCP) software.⁶ The sites supplemented their CAI with other computer-based educational resources, including a library of CD-ROMS, educational videos, and paper-and-pencil workbooks. CCP developers provided site staff with extensive training on the use of the software and the accompanying materials. The two sites also had a least one staff member who had extensive computer skills. Thus, QOP staff at these sites was able to assist youth in navigating and managing the CAI software, web-based research activities, and other computer-based educational activities.

⁶ In recent years, the field of computer-assisted instruction has developed significantly as researchers and experts have discarded "drill and practice" software in favor of more progressive educational technology that is integrated with school curricula, uses multimedia, is matched to learner skill levels, and through which instruction is conducted in small groups by teachers or trained paraprofessionals. Approaches of this caliber most often focus primarily on educational technology and do not try to offer the kind of comprehensive services offered by QOP. In our assessment of computer-assisted instruction in QOP, we did not hold demonstration sites to this standard. All QOP sites primarily used education software that was of the "drill and practice" variety. And given the current model design, it is unrealistic to expect that sites could implement anything more progressive. Therefore, our analysis relates only to the type of computer-assisted instruction that was feasible given the design and funding of the demonstration.

The two Ford-funded sites emphasized computer-assisted instruction above other educational activities and did not offer tutoring services on a consistent basis. Staff completed assessments and individual education plans only with regard to computer-assisted instruction and did not use assessments to develop individual education plans that addressed enrollees' academic progress holistically. It proved difficult, however, to address enrollees' academic needs with computer-assisted instruction alone. Case managers reported that many youth progressed through their CAI lessons but still failed their academic subjects.

In DOL-funded sites, enrollee participation in CAI was lower than in other educational activities. The majority of enrollees found computer-assisted instruction boring and "too much like school." Enrollees seemed most engaged by computers that offered Internet access and had CD-ROM drives. By the fourth year of the demonstration, at least four sites had stopped using CAI.

Postsecondary Planning

All sites encouraged enrollees to plan for and pursue postsecondary education and training, and all emphasized college attendance more than any other postsecondary activity. Case managers encouraged enrollees to think about college by taking them on local and out-of-state college tours and to college fairs; inviting members of local fraternities and sororities to speak to enrollees; providing workshops for parents and youth on financial aid, application forms, and researching different colleges; encouraging youth to take the PSAT, SAT, or ACT and paying the registration fees if necessary; and helping enrollees prepare for these tests by offering tutoring and purchasing training software. Case managers received guidance on postsecondary planning during the second, third, and fourth training conferences.

Many enrollees reported that college tours were among their favorite QOP activities. Enrollees enjoyed taking trips, especially to out-of-state campuses, and for many, the tours were their first opportunity to travel beyond their neighborhood. Many sites also used out-of-town college tours as an incentive, requiring that enrollees maintain a certain GPA or level of attendance at QOP activities (or both) to qualify for the trips. Some enrollees reported that they thought about college more than their non-QOP friends did. Others reported that without the constant reinforcement from case managers, they would not have made college a personal goal.

Although staff at nearly all sites took youth on college tours as early as the first and second years of the demonstration, not all case managers gave college planning the same emphasis. Case managers at three sites encouraged enrollees to think about college but focused mostly on ensuring that the enrollees graduated from high school. These case managers believed that it was more important to remove the immediate barriers to enrollees' success in high school. At these sites, motivated and higher-achieving enrollees sought information about college themselves. And although case managers were available and eager to help motivated students when called upon, they did not conduct many group activities that promoted college attendance.

During the first four years of the demonstration, sites rarely emphasized other types of postsecondary education and training, such as vocational schools or apprenticeship programs. QOP staff knew little about quality vocational training or apprenticeship options despite the fact that between one-third and two-thirds of enrollees had no stated intention of attending college. Some of these enrollees hoped to join the military while others were considering trade school in electronics, carpentry, and cosmetology. Some youth had not made or followed through with plans at all. Every

case manager had one or more individuals on his or her caseload (and some had as many as six or eight) who had dropped out of school and disengaged from the education system altogether. At some sites, case managers encouraged these individuals to pursue alternative activities such as Job Corps or night school as a way to continue their education.

This under-emphasis on other types of postsecondary education and training may be explained by QOP's philosophy that any youth can go to college if he or she is provided with the right supports. Program designers emphasized that college attendance was the goal for every enrollee. The technical assistance documentation and all national conferences supported this view. This emphasis set the tone for the activities pursued by the various sites. Nearly all case managers believed that in-school enrollees should aim to go to college. Moreover, during the first few years of the demonstration, staff encouraged all dropouts to return to high school. Only near the end of the program, when most youth were age 17 or older, did case managers begin to push enrollees who had either left school or were behind by more than two grade levels to pursue a GED and enroll in some form of vocational training.

This singular focus on college may have alienated some youth who did not see college as a desirable goal. Presenting youth with a variety of postsecondary options would have allowed enrollees to choose the option with which they identified most. De-emphasizing college may also have reduced the risk of alienating enrollees who did not want to go to college and helped to keep them engaged in the program.

Unmet and Changing Needs

Staff at all sites expressed surprise and disappointment at the number of enrollees who failed classes or dropped out of school. Despite the emphasis on academic remediation and the personal dedication of staff, many enrollees did not stay on track academically. By the beginning of the fourth academic year of the demonstration, between 10 and 24 percent of enrollees at each site had dropped out of school and were not pursuing a GED. Even at the two sites with the highest promotion rates, fewer than 60 percent of enrollees were scheduled to graduate on time.

During the first two years of the demonstration, staff tried to re-engage all enrollees in regular high school through whatever means possible. Case managers would call an enrollee's parents if she or he were absent from school, would make home visits to find an enrollee who had not attended school for several days, and would even transport chronically truant youth to and from school every day. However, these efforts were not sustainable in the long run. As time went on, many youth transferred away from the QOP high school, making it difficult for case managers to keep up with enrollees' attendance or school performance on a daily basis.⁷ Other youth repeatedly renege on promises they made to teachers and case managers, making it impossible for QOP to negotiate a plan to keep them on track academically.

By the fourth year of the demonstration, case managers at many sites began to recommend that certain enrollees, chiefly those who were more than one year behind grade level and unlikely to

⁷ Youth most at-risk of leaving school, however, needed daily monitoring. In most schools, after a given number of absences, teachers were required to give the offender a failing grade. Daily monitoring allowed case managers to intercede before enrollees reached the limit of allowable absences.

complete high school, take the GED examination rather than continue to pursue a regular high school diploma. By this time, each site also had a significant number of enrollees who had stopped going to school altogether. Case managers encouraged these youth to attend GED preparation classes, purchased GED workbooks for them to use at home, and purchased GED preparation software for the QOP computer laboratories.⁸ By the fifth and final year of the demonstration, QOP services at all sites focused almost entirely on helping youth who had not completed high school pass the GED examination and enroll in a vocational training program.

⁸ Most sites also had a few out-of-school enrollees who enrolled in programs such as Job Corps or YouthBuild. These enrollees received GED preparation services through these other programs.

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

CHAPTER VII

DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES IN THE QOP MODEL

The QOP model stipulated that enrollees should spend 250 hours per year in developmental activities designed to broaden enrollees' cultural horizons and strengthen their decision-making skills. QOP's developmental activities fall into four categories.

- **Life skills training**, which helps enrollees improve their decision-making skills and avoid behaviors that could interfere with their education
- **Employment-readiness skills**, which prepare enrollees for seeking and retaining jobs
- **Cultural activities**, which expose enrollees to their own and other cultures and methods of self-expression
- **Recreational activities**, which help enrollees build relationships with mentors and peers

The rationale for the developmental component was that many youth from disadvantaged backgrounds have not been afforded the social and cultural experiences that provide the background that a youth needs to succeed in postsecondary education and the world of work. Few have had an opportunity to travel out of their home town, attend the theater or concerts, go to summer camp, or take music lessons.

As a part of its technical assistance, OICA distributed to all sites a developmental curriculum including more than 300 examples of prestructured developmental activities that take the form of discussions, multimedia projects, field trips, and group projects that teach life skills.⁹ The activities were categorized into awareness skills, civics skills, community skills, computer skills, consumer skills, cultural skills, decision skills, employment skills, family skills, health skills, learning skills, relationship skills, safety skills, and social skills. The curriculum detailed the logistics, procedures, and discussion points needed to maximize the value of each activity. The documentation also provided guidance on how to sequence the activities to match the stages of youth development.

⁹ One module of these materials was developed by Public/Private Ventures of Philadelphia, PA.

DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES AS IMPLEMENTED

Sites were largely successful in implementing developmental activities. Table VII.1 presents a list of the developmental activities offered across QOP sites. During the demonstration's first three years, four sites offered approximately 250 hours of developmental activities each year while the remaining three sites offered 180 to 200 hours. By the fourth and fifth years of the demonstration, all sites had de-emphasized developmental activities primarily because enrollees' interest in them declined with age. While most sites continued to provide life skills sessions on dating, family planning, sexually transmitted diseases, money management, and employment-related issues such as writing a resume or interviewing for a job, the sessions became less frequent and more sparsely attended in the program's last two years.

Sites designed their own developmental activities in addition to using the formal QOP curriculum. Each site had particular strengths that shaped the type of developmental activities it offered. For example, at least four sites had strong ties with the local JTPA summer youth employment program such that case managers at these sites tended to emphasize the development of employment skills. Another site was run by a CBO with access to a ropes-training course that QOP enrollees used during the summer. Therefore, case managers at this site tended to emphasize life skills development geared toward trust building, individual goal setting, and group decision-making. The strengths and interests of site staff also affected the design of developmental activities. One site had a case manager with a strong interest in technology. With his help, enrollees at that site developed a local QOP Web page. The coordinator at another site was skilled in visual and performing arts. She taught case managers how to conduct art and performance activities that both encouraged self-expression and creativity, giving students an avenue through which to communicate their feelings and goals.

Sites structured developmental activities in several ways. Some were open to all enrollees and conducted in large groups. Other activities were offered to small groups through a sign-up sheet or on a first-come, first-served basis. Some activities, such as anger management workshops, were planned with certain enrollees in mind, and only those enrollees were "invited" to join that activity. Particularly costly or popular activities, such as out-of-town trips, were used as incentives for participation in less popular activities, such as educational testing.

Case managers reported that enrollees benefited from developmental activities. They believed these activities improved enrollee's self-esteem and motivation, and contributed to a positive social orientation and strong social bonding. Enrollees identified developmental activities as "fun" and among the best activities QOP offered. Many felt that QOP gave them access to activities—such as traveling out of state, attending the Million Man March, or speaking to civic leaders—that were otherwise out of reach.

Because developmental activities drew more enrollees than did other activities, case managers used these activities to re-engage youth who had stopped participating in QOP. Case managers would contact inactive enrollees to invite them to special recreational and cultural events in hopes of drawing them back to the program. Even intermittent participation in these types of activities proved useful to case managers attempting to continue their mentoring relationships with reluctant enrollees.

TABLE VII.1

DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES OFFERED BY QOP DEMONSTRATION SITES

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Life skills activities/discussion topics | Budgeting Money management Financial planning Menu planning/grocery shopping Business ownership Personal hygiene Nutrition Overcoming adversity Conflict resolution training Managing anger Avoiding drug abuse Contraception, family planning, and abstinence | Gang prevention CPR training Peer mediation training Behavioral skills Self-esteem Sexual harassment Sexual abuse Dating behavior and decision making Date rape Male parenting roles Importance of education Current magazine reading assignments Prison tours Decision-making/problem-solving activities |
| Pre-employment training | World-of-work basic skills Telephone etiquette Mock interviews Resume writing workshops On-site corporate tours Career exposure through guest speakers | Summer placements in: Hospitals, nursing homes Federal, state, and county offices (e.g., health department, park service) Day care centers Local schools Restaurants Grocery stores Social service agencies (Goodwill, United Way) |
| Cultural activities | Museums Theater Ballet Symphonies, concerts Civic events Zoo State capitol tours | Music and dance lessons Public lectures History videos Arts and crafts projects Fund raisers Workshops on topics such as African heritage, AIDS awareness, volunteerism, civic participation, entrepreneurship Classes in cooking, photography, arts and crafts |
| Recreational activities | Movies Ice skating Bowling Swimming Sailing Golfing Mountain biking Amusement/water parks | Haunted houses Board/computer games Local fairs Picnics Attending sporting events Pizza lunches Dinners in restaurants |

The following discussion explains how the sites implemented the four types of QOP developmental activities.

Life Skills Training

The life skills training offered by sites covered a wide range of subjects, including money management, nutrition, self-esteem, family planning, gang prevention, and current events (see Table VII.1). Activities varied greatly from site to site and even from case manager to case manager at a given site. Some activities were initiated by case managers as a result of mentoring interactions with enrollees. Other activities, such as gang prevention or anger management workshops, were designed for certain subgroups of enrollees.

All sites emphasized pregnancy prevention but were challenged in how to deliver appropriate services. Because reducing teenage pregnancy was one of the demonstration's objectives, OICA provided sites with material developed by Private/Public Ventures (P/PV) specifically for teenage pregnancy prevention. During the initial training conference, QOP site staff received instruction on how to use the P/PV material. Nevertheless, few sites provided enrollees with early or consistent education in the areas of sexuality and reproduction. Case managers at several sites said that they were uncomfortable addressing the topic, especially in mixed-sex groups and particularly during the first two years of the demonstration before they had established a solid, trusting, and mature relationship with enrollees.

The sites addressed this awkwardness in several ways. Staff at several sites conducted separate sessions for men and women. Some sites invited other community agencies to come to QOP to make presentations on subjects such as family planning. Other sites did not conduct presentations on these topics but rather engaged students in related activities, such as mock parenting exercises using infant-sized dolls. Some sites limited themselves to the other facets of life skills training, such as financial planning and conflict resolution.

Despite the emphasis on pregnancy prevention, however, case managers at four sites reported that at least one of every six enrollees was parenting or pregnant by the beginning of the fourth year of the demonstration, leaving staff both surprised and frustrated. Some case managers reported that no amount of training or education seemed to affect enrollees' choices about sexual activity and contraception.

Other areas of life skills training included substance abuse prevention, conflict resolution training, date rape, and sexual abuse. Some sites found that forming partnerships with agencies that specialized in these topics improved the overall quality of the services offered by QOP. For example, one site worked with the local Boys and Girls Club, which offered QOP enrollees anger management and self-esteem workshops, as well as with Planned Parenthood, which offered family planning and other life skills workshops. The same site also invited staff from another community agency to conduct a drug abuse prevention workshop. This cooperative approach meant that case managers did not have to become experts in all of the life skills areas but that they could build on the expertise of and lessons learned by other agencies. Case managers reported that such partnerships proved useful.

Employment-Readiness Skills

Case managers reported that approximately 70 percent of QOP enrollees held jobs at some point during the first four years of the demonstration. Some found jobs on their own while others benefited from the assistance of case managers and SDA staff. As enrollees got older, many worked during both the school year and the summer. Most worked in the retail, service, and fast-food industries, although enrollees at two sites were offered summer internships in local government and social service agencies.

Sites prepared youth for employment in various ways. Some conducted workshops on resume writing, job application preparation, interviewing, and the fundamentals of professional dress and behavior. The two sites with the most highly structured and best-developed employment-readiness activities worked closely with their local JTPA system. At one of these sites, the local SDA's youth employment program provided summer jobs for most enrollees. The work experience was tailored to the individual's age and interests whenever possible. Enrollees typically earned minimum wage and worked in organizations such as the health department, the local hospital, the department of parks and recreation, social service agencies, restaurants, and grocery stores.

At one site, the CBO was also a JTPA grantee providing employment services to disadvantaged youth. This CBO had staff whose responsibilities included finding summer employment opportunities for youth. At some sites, the SDA arranged for enrollees in ninth and tenth grades to attend classroom-based employment training. At some sites, enrollees who were not of working age attended classes on career exploration and basic world-of-work skills (such as how to dress professionally, arrive on time, and behave properly in the work place).

Unfortunately, summer employment opportunities sometimes conflicted with summer school. Case managers encouraged youth who had failed a class during the school year to attend summer school. Some sites paid the fees required for the enrollee to attend summer school. At the sites that provided summer internships through the local SDA, staff made every attempt to ensure that employment did not conflict with classes. If the conflict could not be resolved, case managers recommended summer school over employment. In some cases, case managers were not able to prevent an enrollee from choosing employment over summer school. This tension worsened as youth grew older.

Cultural and Recreational Activities

At the beginning of the demonstration, most sites emphasized recreational activities such as movies, sporting events, and ice-skating to attract youth to the program. As the demonstration continued, however, staff tried to limit the number of purely recreational activities and to focus more on activities with learning content. Many sites reported that the transition was not an easy one and that attempts to make developmental activities more substantive met resistance. Enrollees reported that they missed doing "fun things" and that museums and other cultural activities were boring. Many case managers reported that, in implementing a future program, they would schedule fewer purely recreational activities.

Sites that provided a more balanced mix of recreational and other developmental activities at the start of the demonstration experienced less difficulty in maintaining interest in a wide range of activities. Indeed, at some sites, recreational activities eventually became an informal part of the mentoring process instead of the mainstay of the developmental component. Case managers took

individuals or small groups to the movies, to their gym, or to the golf course as a way to spend unstructured time with enrollees. These informal, ad hoc activities often took place in the evenings or on weekends.

CHAPTER VIII

COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES

COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES IN THE QOP MODEL

The QOP model stipulated that enrollees must spend 250 hours per year performing services that both benefit the community and teach enrollees the value of helping others. Many community service activities were designed to expose enrollees to careers, connect them with community agencies that can provide them with additional support, and teach them social skills that will prove useful later in life.

In the QOP documentation, community service activities for young enrollees were described as large-scale fix-up and clean-up projects, internships in hospitals, nursing homes, and homeless shelters. The curriculum materials distributed to all sites covered 46 sample service activities, including both large-group and individual assignments. They also described the logistics of setting up each activity and included guidelines for follow-up discussion between case managers and enrollees in the activities.

COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES AS IMPLEMENTED

Of the four major QOP components, all seven sites accorded community service the least emphasis. Five of the seven sites offered fewer than the 250 annual hours stipulated in the model. The QOP site with the most active community service component offered an especially successful all-day workshop devoted to building enrollees' community service skills. Attendees learned to conduct activities for young children in day care centers, such as storytelling, songs, and games. They also learned crafts such as making paper flowers and holiday pillows.

At the same site, the coordinator developed a clown-mime troupe. The troupe performed in day care centers and nursing homes throughout the city and at QOP celebrations. In training sessions for interested enrollees, the coordinator taught entertainment and performance techniques. The enrollees also attended a workshop on making balloon sculptures, and they traveled to a nearby city to attend a training session on magic tricks. The troupe was popular among enrollees, increasing enrollees' confidence and encouraging their creativity and self-expression. By QOP's fourth year, the troupe had grown from five to 15 performers.

The following are other examples of community service activities offered by the demonstration sites:

- At two sites, staff connected QOP enrollees with ongoing service programs such as a weekly senior nutrition program and a food bank.
- At least four QOP sites scheduled public clean-up and graffiti removal as part of their community service. One site's school clean-up projects were arranged, in part, to improve the program's image with school administrators and staff. Most sites reported that clean-up activities were not popular, and few enrollees participated. The exception was a site that emphasized information about the history of the community.
- Most sites participated in some activities sponsored by outside organizations, such as a fundraiser race for Head Start, a Red Cross blood drive, Habitat for Humanity building projects, and helping with a Special Olympics event.
- Neighborhood-based projects included planning and running a Halloween party for neighborhood children, with proceeds donated to a local charity; working for a local theater; helping at a soup kitchen; helping with school registration and voter registration drives; and organizing a diabetes walkathon.
- Other projects included volunteer work at a nursing home, child care centers, a local youth center, a food bank for people with AIDS, a hotline for latchkey kids, and a local children's museum.

These successful community service activities were the exceptions at most sites. At the low end of the spectrum, one site's community service program was so inactive that, by the beginning of the third academic year of the demonstration, 47 percent of its enrollees had not been involved in any community service activities during the year, and the median level of participation was only two hours over the life of the program. At another site, staff members were able to schedule only about four hours of community service activities a month during the first two years of QOP. In contrast, they scheduled between 10 and 20 hours a month in the last two years of the demonstration, but participation rates remained as low as two or three people per event. The principal reasons for the lack of emphasis on community service were the lack of staff experience with conducting community service activities, the lack of enrollee enthusiasm, and the need for case managers to devote their time to mentoring and education.

Community service received little attention in the annual staff training sessions and in the technical assistance provided to sites. The technical assistance provider learned in the early months of the demonstration that many enrollees were deficient in academic skills and recommended that the education component should take precedence over community service.

CHAPTER IX

INCENTIVES

INCENTIVES IN THE QOP MODEL

The documentation provided at the initial training conference for site staff specified the following financial incentives for enrollees:

- A stipend of between \$1 and \$1.33 for each hour spent on QOP activities other than recreation and mentoring
- Bonuses awarded at the CBOs' discretion for completion of major blocks of activity, such as an academic year with good grades or a unit of the computer-assisted instruction curriculum
- An amount equal to the earned stipend to be deposited in an accrual account and held for disbursement to the enrollee once he or she received either a high school diploma or GED *and* enrolled in a qualifying postsecondary education or training program (two- or four-year college, the armed forces, a certified apprenticeship program, or vocational training)

Incentives were designed with several goals. Stipends were intended to induce enrolled youth to participate in QOP activities. Accrual accounts were intended both to help fund college and to teach the value of saving and investing.

In addition to enrollee incentives, QOP provided incentive payments to staff members at most sites. Staff compensation at Ford-funded sites was entirely incentive-based. Staff members at some DOL sites received bonuses for good performance.

INCENTIVES AS IMPLEMENTED

All sites implemented stipends as specified in the model. Case managers reported that stipends induced newly enrolled youth to attend program activities, thereby giving case managers an opportunity to establish a personal relationship with each enrollee. Once personal relationships were established, case managers found that stipends lost much of their power to induce participation. Enrollees attended program activities because of the social relationships with other

enrollees and the case managers rather than the stipend. In addition, stipends of slightly more than a dollar per hour began to pale next to the wages paid by the jobs that enrollees found after they turned 16.

Some CBOs increased the stipend rate slightly in the latter two years of the demonstration to encourage enrollees to engage in specific activities, most often computer-assisted instruction. One site doubled and occasionally tripled the stipend during certain weeks to stimulate participation in computer-assisted instruction. Another site paid a stipend of \$4 per hour for afternoon computer-assisted instruction hours and \$5.50 per hour for evening and weekend CAI hours. Both sites found that higher incentives were effective for only short periods of time and only for students already inclined to spend time on the computer. Many enrollees appeared to be bored by the software, and even the enhanced incentive failed to motivate them to use it over the long term. Some sites paid higher stipend rates for time spent preparing for the SAT or the state proficiency tests required for graduation.

The types of program activities that qualified for a stipend varied by site. Only one site was consistent throughout the demonstration in offering a stipend for education, developmental, and community service activities but not for time spent in one-on-one mentoring with the case manager or on purely recreational activities, as specified in the original QOP model. Most sites, in their initial attempts to attract enrollees to the program, defined qualifying activities in broad terms. At the beginning of the demonstration, some sites paid stipends if the enrollee merely dropped by the QOP office. In later years, most sites adopted stricter policies, paying only for the time enrollees spent engaged in education, developmental, and community service activities. At least one site continued to pay stipends for mentoring time.

Some sites paid stipends for time spent on school activities, such as summer school, even though QOP staff did not administer those activities. During the first summer of the demonstration, when most enrollees were too young for regular employment, one site arranged with the local SDA to define summer school as the enrollee's summer job under JTPA and for JTPA to pay enrollees for attending summer school at the then-prevailing JTPA rate of \$4.75 per hour. That site subsequently had difficulty re-engaging enrollees in QOP activities such as community service for which they received the regular \$1.25 stipend. Another site paid a stipend for time spent on summer jobs.

All sites paid stipends for organized group recreational activities. Sometimes these activities had bona fide developmental content, such as organized swimming lessons or aerobics classes, a movie or play selected for its content, or a QOP awards banquet. More problematic were decisions to pay stipends for purely recreational activities, such as picnics, football or basketball games, or trips to amusement parks. Several sites struggled with the decision about whether to continue to pay stipends for such activities after doing so initially. It was also difficult to decide how to pay stipends to enrollees who had moved out of state or transferred to a school so distant that they were no longer able to participate in QOP group activities. Case managers were often creative in helping these enrollees identify activities they could undertake independently to earn stipends. The case managers devised procedures for getting independent activities certified and approved for payment. Often they arranged for an adult at another school or an adult supervisor of a community service activity to sign a certification form to confirm the number of enrollee hours spent in the qualifying activity. In at least one site, youth participated in many community service activities other than

QOP activities, such as those sponsored, for example, by a church or other community group. Thus, case managers frequently relied on third-party certification of enrollees' activities to approve the payment of stipends.

Method of Paying Stipends

Procedures for delivering stipends to enrollees varied from site to site, and payment was generally more difficult to arrange than sites expected. In the most straightforward practice, and the one preferred by case managers and enrollees, case managers delivered checks in person to enrollees at the QOP office. Case managers reported that, because enrollees had to pick up their stipend checks, youth appeared at the QOP office more often than they otherwise might have.

At one site, the SDA required checks to be mailed directly from the SDA to the enrollee. Case managers were concerned that, in this case, parents might intercept some checks before they reached enrollees and use the funds for another purpose.

Two sites deposited stipends funds directly into enrollee's bank accounts and other sites adopted this practice during the second or third year of the demonstration. One advantage of direct deposit was that it permitted case managers to help enrollees set up savings accounts and to talk to them about sound money management. One site offered enrollees an additional \$20 if they established savings accounts, and staff attempted to draw parents into the effort to educate enrollees about saving for the future.

At a few sites, program managers had difficulty developing or negotiating procedures for prompt payment of stipends. Enrollees clearly saw timely payment as important and complained about delays. The most severe stipend-related problem was the JTPA prohibition on payment of stipends to undocumented enrollees. A few enrollees at two DOL sites were undocumented, and their ineligibility for a stipend deterred their participation in QOP activities. At both of these sites, however, case managers were eventually able to form mentoring relationships with undocumented QOP enrollees and even convince some of them to attend some QOP activities without stipends.

Sanctions and Bonuses

Several sites withheld all or some portion of the stipend as a sanction for misbehavior. One site listed specific behaviors and their associated stipend penalties in a public space. For instance, loud or disruptive behavior in the QOP office resulted in a one-hour deduction while violence or a threat of violence might result in the deduction of five hours or a full day.

Many sites also paid bonuses for good behavior. One site awarded enrollees an additional \$50 for each 100 hours they completed in each program component. In addition, that site often gave on-the-spot bonuses of between \$10 and \$25, for example, to reward an enrollee who correctly answered a question about current events. This was the only site where staff clearly believed that money was a major motivator for enrollees. Two sites gave a monetary reward for good grades. A third site debated about whether to use such a reward but decided it would be unfair because some enrollees already were earning good grades. Instead, they occasionally rewarded an enrollee for achieving an agreed-upon improvement in grades. Several sites paid bonuses of \$200 or \$300 for completion of the GED.

Overall, in-kind bonuses were the most widely used reward. For instance, several sites rewarded active participation in QOP with the opportunity to go on special outings such as overnight or week-long out-of-town trips, which were extremely popular. One site adopted a point system that allowed enrollees to earn credits toward the purchase of a desired item such as sports equipment or automobile insurance. Points were deducted for particularly poor grades, missed assignments, and misbehavior. One site invited the enrollee in each caseload who spent the most hours each month in computer-assisted instruction activities to attend a group dinner with case managers at his or her favorite restaurant. Several sites used gift certificates or movie passes to reward desired behavior.

Accrual Accounts

All sites used accrual accounts as intended in the program model. Ford-funded sites regularly provided account statements to enrollees. In addition to showing the enrollee's current accumulated balance, the statements included a projection of the amount the enrollee could accumulate by the end of the program if he or she participated in QOP for a specified number of hours per month. However, DOL-funded sites did not provide regular statements to enrollees, thereby reducing the incentive value of the accounts. DOL-funded sites relied on case managers to emphasize to enrollees the importance of accrual accounts. However, case managers typically did not have the information to calculate current balances or to project potential balances.

The demonstration revealed some special difficulties posed by the administration of accrual accounts at the DOL-funded sites. Federal regulations restrict accrual accounts in two ways: First, contributions made by a grantee or contractor to a depository or investment account were not considered reimbursable expenses, and second, contingent payments were not considered reimbursable expenses. Given that the distribution of accrual account balances was contingent on the enrollee's achieving certain programmatic goals, CBOs could not be reimbursed for accrual account contributions until after the funds were distributed—four or five years after the first contributions were to be made. DOL-funded CBOs solved this problem by keeping informal internal records of accrual account contributions and balances rather than setting up actual accounts in enrollees' names or transferring any funds. When an enrollee met the conditions for receiving his or her accrual balance, the CBO paid the balance to the enrollee and submitted the expense to the SDA for reimbursement. This procedure required the CBO to reserve enough funds from each year's grant to cover the contributions accrued in that year and to roll the reserved funds over from one year to the next to the end of the demonstration. A disadvantage of this approach was that accrual balances at DOL-funded sites did not earn interest, dividends, or capital gains over the several years of the demonstration period.

CHAPTER X

MANAGEMENT, ADMINISTRATION, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

In this chapter, we assess the management and administration of the QOP demonstration in terms of the following:

- Operating QOP under the JTPA structure
- Demonstration planning and start-up
- The roles of the Ford Foundation, DOL, and the technical assistance provider
- Local management in the five SDAs that served as grantees for the DOL-funded sites
- CBO's management of the program
- The role of the QOP schools

OPERATING QOP UNDER THE JTPA STRUCTURE

QOP was not a traditional JTPA program nor a typical WIA youth program. It was more intensive, more expensive, involved a longer treatment period, and required greater breadth and flexibility in expenses considered reimbursable. Because DOL anticipated the nontraditional nature of the program, it funded the demonstration under the pilots and demonstration title of JTPA, which allowed more flexibility than did the title for operational youth programs.

Operating QOP within the JTPA framework limited the fidelity of implementation in several ways. First, even though the demonstration was funded under the pilots and demonstration title of JTPA, DOL designed QOP's implementation to simulate as closely as possible an operational program. Specifically, DOL funded the demonstration through grants to SDAs, the local JTPA agencies responsible for funding and monitoring operational programs. Since the funding mechanism was a grant, as opposed to a contract or cooperative agreement, DOL was not able to enforce local fidelity to the QOP model. Under a grant arrangement, the only sanction DOL could impose for deviating from the model was to withhold the subsequent year's funding. The agency was not inclined to exercise this option for fear of losing several sites from the demonstration. As the SDA staffs became more aware of this issue over the first three years of the demonstration, they granted increased flexibility to the CBOs. This lengthy period in which the SDA staffs grew to accept the QOP model resulted in some of the implementation delays.

The second problem was that the QOP demonstration provided a more comprehensive array of services than most other JTPA programs. Some of these expenses fell outside the JTPA norm, and the SDA initially deemed them to be unreimbursable. These included after-school snacks, emergency cash to prevent a family from becoming homeless, tickets to the theater, magazine subscriptions, neighborhood clean-up outings, college tours, and camping trips. By the middle of the demonstration, the SDAs at all five DOL-funded sites provided increased spending flexibility to the QOP CBOs. The CBOs noted that the demonstration was funded under Title IV of JTPA, which was designed for demonstrations and was therefore more flexible than funding provided under other titles. Sites learned to provide the SDAs with a written justification for each type of nontraditional expense. DOL and the Ford Foundation addressed this issue by inviting SDA staff members to attend the annual QOP training conferences. DOL also provided written and oral guidance to SDA staff, explaining the flexibility and authority to expend federal funds in non-traditional ways.

A third incompatibility between QOP and JTPA was that JTPA funds could not be used for undocumented residents, and several enrollees at two DOL sites were undocumented.

At the beginning of the demonstration, DOL officials determined that undocumented residents who were otherwise eligible would not be excluded from QOP. The undocumented youth enrolled in QOP received services funded by the local matching grant at each DOL-funded site, but they did not receive stipends or accrual accounts. DOL was reluctant to identify the legal status of enrollees for fear of discouraging undocumented youth from participating in the program and possibly in school as well. School officials in one site subsequently indicated that it could have identified such youth had they been asked. This is an example of how future implementations could be improved by including the QOP schools in the program planning process.

In response to this inequitable arrangement, several undocumented youth did not actively participate in the program during the first year of the demonstration. These inequities placed an extra burden on the case managers to engage undocumented youth who were treated differently than other participants.

PROGRAM PLANNING AND START-UP

Some of the implementation challenges at DOL-funded sites would have been alleviated had it been possible to finalize the program model and prepare a detailed grant announcement and supporting materials for potential grantees before the grants were awarded. The grant announcement provided only a sketchy description of the program model, and several aspects of the program design were incomplete when service delivery began. For example, eligibility issues concerning students enrolled in special education programs and undocumented students remained unresolved when grants were awarded (but were reconciled before youth were randomly assigned). In addition, specifications of the education component were incomplete at start-up. Assessment, development of education plans, and course-based tutoring had yet to be specified as key elements of the program and the design of the computer-assisted instruction component had not been completely outlined. The grant announcement also did not require sites to budget for computer-assisted instruction facilities, instructional materials, and education expertise. As a result, DOL sites were not prepared to implement the CAI education component. Many sites

experienced difficulties and delays in opening and operating their computer centers and using them to full advantage. Another problem that might have been anticipated with more planning was the difficulty in administering the accrual accounts at DOL sites (explained in detail in Chapter IX).

DOL awarded QOP demonstration grants to SDAs in June 1995, and scheduled CBOs to begin delivering services at the beginning of the academic year in August or September. One to two months proved to be inadequate for the SDAs to execute contracts with CBOs and for the CBOs to hire and train case managers, acquire a CAI system, develop a management information system, set up stipend and accrual account systems, prepare materials and plans, and enroll youth. In most sites, these activities took at least six months.

The inadequate time to set-up QOP demonstration sites was only partially the result of DOL not anticipating the length of time needed for these activities. First, DOL rushed the demonstration into operation in the fall of 1995 to protect its continued funding. Second, DOL assumed OICA would provide the technical assistance required for a quick program start-up. Third, SDA and CBO personnel spent time securing the informed consent of enrollees' parents for participating in and releasing data for the demonstration, an activity that would have required less time for an operational program.

NATIONAL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The presence of two independent funding sources, DOL and the Ford Foundation, with two different agendas, resulted in five major differences in how the DOL- and the Ford-funded sites operated.

- Compared with the DOL-funded sites, the Ford-funded sites implemented computer-assisted instruction more completely and with more up-to-date equipment. Most DOL sites had great difficulty starting up their computer learning centers while the learning centers at Ford-funded sites were well equipped and operational from the beginning of the demonstration period, likely due in part to Ford's experience overseeing the pilot program.
- At DOL-funded sites, case managers' time was dedicated to QOP, whereas Ford-funded case managers had duties other than QOP case management.
- Through most of the demonstration period, the Ford Foundation forward-funded its grantee (OICA), that is, paid portions of the total grant amount to OICA in advance of grantee expenditures, while DOL grantees were reimbursed after incurring expenses.¹⁰ OICA was able to invest much of its grants, thereby supplementing the grant with investment earnings.
- Federal regulations imposed several restrictions on the administration of accrual accounts at DOL-funded sites. Enrollees at Ford-funded sites received investment earnings on their

¹⁰ OICA did not forward-fund the Yakima site. It reimbursed the Yakima site's expenses much as DOL-funded sites were reimbursed.

account balances and received account statements quarterly. Enrollees at DOL-funded sites received neither.

- Ford-funded sites used a different staffing and compensation model than did DOL-funded sites. DOL-funded case managers had full-time salaried positions on QOP. Ford-funded case managers had part-time positions with incentive compensation.
- The Ford Foundation and DOL were involved in the operations of the demonstration to different degrees. The Ford Foundation representative took a hands-off approach to overseeing the project while DOL's representative worked closely with local grantees and program operators. Both grant officers deferred to their technical representatives for program direction, who also provided technical assistance and guidance to all grantees.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Both OICA and DOL provided technical assistance to QOP CBOs. As part of its grant from the Ford Foundation, OICA provided several types of technical assistance (TA) to all seven QOP sites. The annual training conference was the principal TA activity. All case managers and QOP coordinators, CBO managers, and SDA staff were included in the conference. Its most important functions were to train case managers on the QOP model and to build team spirit and solidarity among staff members. Staff at sites that had experienced internal communications problems (between, for example, the SDA and the CBO, or between the coordinator and case managers) found that those difficulties decreased after they had attended a conference and gained greater insight into each other's perspectives. The conference also appeared to contribute to staff retention convincing some staff to persevere despite feelings of burnout from the stress of being a case manager. Conference attendees learned from each other's successes and from the experts brought in to speak. Staff at all levels across sites exchanged ideas and worked together to iron out implementation difficulties. They gained an appreciation of the reasons for some of the difficulties faced by DOL in resolving mismatches between the demands of QOP and the constraints associated with federal funding.

Other TA activities included helping sites set up and maintain the QOP management information system (MISs), making site visits, helping resolve management issues, and providing sites with written developmental curriculum material and CAI CD-ROMs. Several sites reported having unmet needs for TA, particularly through the first three years of the demonstration. The TA was insufficient for successfully establishing a smoothly functioning MIS at all sites. One site used an MIS from a different program to track QOP enrollee activities. Other sites experienced repeated difficulties with software or computer systems. OICA did not sufficiently train local staff to maintain and troubleshoot the QOP MIS. As a result, enrollee activity reports were often delayed by several months. At some sites, enrollee data had to be re-entered after being lost by the MIS.

DOL also provided TA to the demonstration CBOs. To DOL-funded sites, DOL provided material to assist CBOs in selecting CAI software, guidelines on setting up and operating accrual accounts, and quarterly calls with each site throughout the fourth year of the demonstration to discuss service strategies for each enrollee at the site. To all seven sites, DOL provided guidance about Internal Revenue Service

requirements for withholding from stipend payments, guidance on the overtime policy and compensation requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act, information on how to order videos on test-taking techniques, references to research on the efficacy of youth interventions, materials pertaining to applying to college and financial aid, and monthly conference calls with all sites to facilitate the cross-site sharing of best practices and innovative approaches.

Although OICA and DOL performed these numerous TA activities, sites had substantial unmet need for TA. On-site TA was sporadic and poorly organized. Although OICA made initial visits to all sites, it never conducted a systematic assessment of site capacity or TA needs. It did not prepare site-specific TA plans or reports. Local programs would have benefited from ongoing efforts to provide training tailored to their needs. The implementation of QOP may have been stronger and more consistent across sites if OICA had assisted each site in planning its core services and making the best use of available community resources.

OICA provided sites with substantial program materials, but site staff did not use them fully. At the initial training conference in 1995, OICA distributed a QOP replication manual that was based on the experience of the QOP pilot. The training that accompanied the manual did not, however, take into account the differences between the design of the pilot and the QOP model as adapted for the DOL-funded sites. Major portions of the replication manual and the training offered at the initial conference depended on the use of a specific proprietary CAI software package, a package that the DOL-funded sites did not use. Program materials might have been used more effectively if they had been accompanied by a face-to-face discussion of how to use them.

Finally, the TA provider and the national partners did not provide enough support for several specific program components. Assessment, development of individual education plans, tutoring and community service were not emphasized and, as a result, were underused throughout the demonstration.

LOCAL GRANTEE MANAGEMENT

While most SDA grantees at DOL-funded sites developed positive and supportive relationships with the operating CBOs, the role of the SDA grantees varied substantially from site to site and was problematic at a few sites. One site's SDA-QOP relationship, while initially promising, became extremely troubled. SDA management expressed strong initial support for program goals and promised to contribute nonfederal funds to enhance local program operations, but the SDA director did not become personally involved in QOP operation and did not ensure that mid-level staff delivered on their promised support. Mid-level managers did not become committed to the QOP model and seldom intervened to resolve contracting difficulties between the local agency and the CBO. In the absence of signed contract renewals, the CBO continued to operate the program even though the SDA's payments were more than a year late. The relationship remained difficult well into the program's fifth year.

At another site, communications between QOP and SDA staff were initially strained because the SDA staff assigned to QOP did not acknowledge the differences between QOP and traditional JTPA programs. Over time, the SDA began to cooperate with the CBO efforts to implement QOP by providing assistance with computers and summer jobs. SDA staff attendance at the QOP training conference

appeared to increase the SDA's appreciation for the program's importance and the demands it placed on program operators.

At the three remaining DOL-funded sites, the SDA was a supportive and stabilizing management presence. At these sites, the support for QOP's goals was consistently strong and the partnership worked well from the beginning of the demonstration. The SDA provided transportation, jobs, and advocacy in working with other local partners. SDA staff from these sites attended all QOP training conferences.

CBO MANAGEMENT OF QOP

One of the questions posed at the beginning of the QOP demonstration was whether the program could be operated successfully by CBOs other than those that had developed the QOP model in the late 1980s. The demonstration showed that the answer to that question is affirmative, provided that the program receives support from CBO management. In fact, CBO-level support was one of the most important determinants of successful program implementation. Conversely, the absence of CBO management support led to several of the most severe problems encountered during the demonstration. Two of the original CBOs were no longer operating the project by the second year, and a third never fully implemented the QOP model. In each of those instances, a major reason for project failure was lack of support from the CBO's management.

At one CBO, the executive director resisted implementing the QOP model because it differed from its traditional programs. The CBO's approach to youth programming was inconsistent with QOP's education-oriented approach and with several of its other components. Had the SDA not intervened to operate the program directly and then subcontract with a different CBO, that site's program would have concluded after the second year.

At another site, the SDA was never able to develop a contract with the originally designated CBO in part because that CBO was financially unstable. The SDA eventually contracted with another CBO, but service delivery was delayed by one year.

At a third site, the CBO did not implement the QOP model but rather operated a program that was a hybrid of its own service model and the QOP model. All QOP case managers went through the CBO's own training and considered QOP enrollees to be enrolled in its own program. The CBO's name received more prominence than QOP on QOP materials, and staff was instructed to answer the telephone by using the CBO's name rather than QOP.

The remaining CBOs supported QOP from the beginning, giving their QOP coordinators substantial help. One CBO showed exceptional resilience and commitment to the program when it was forced to advance more than a year's funding to QOP because the SDA did not renew contracts on a timely basis.

Many demonstration achievements are attributable to the effective leadership, commitment, and innovation of QOP coordinators. The most effective coordinators were those who worked on QOP full time, communicated closely with case managers, and demonstrated a willingness to experiment with new

service approaches. The coordinator who had training as an educator turned out to be among the most innovative.

Of the seven QOP sites, four experienced turnover in the coordinator position during the demonstration. Significantly, three of these four sites had CBO management that did not fully support QOP. A coordinator at one of these three sites who also served as a case manager found that the commitment required to manage the demands of two roles was extraordinary and not sustainable. The coordinators at the two other sites followed a “hands-off” management style such that their programs received little of their time and attention. Coordinators at four well-managed sites had at least some direct relationship with enrollees, met frequently with staff, and played an active role in designing and planning project activities.

Among the most important contribution coordinators made to the smooth functioning of QOP operations was the selection and training of case managers. Most coordinators were able to attract staff members who were ethnically and linguistically similar to the enrollees in their caseloads. In addition, most coordinators used male-female teams so that enrollees could develop relationships with a same-sex role model. One coordinator used a variety of ongoing professional development activities to strengthen her staff’s capabilities.

Overall, QOP coordinators recruited and retaining staff dedicated to the well-being of enrollees. Almost all coordinators experimented with a variety of strategies to prevent or alleviate staff burnout. The most common strategy was flexible scheduling. Another successful strategy was to shape activities to take advantage of staff interests and skills.

SCHOOLS

The host high schools provided office space for QOP staff at most sites. The amount of communication between QOP staff and teachers and administrators ranged from regular consultation on individual enrollees’ academic progress to irregular and casual contact. The school district at one site was initially a sponsor and funder of the local QOP program, but terminated its sponsorship after learning that QOP continued to provide services to enrollees who dropped out of school or moved to another school district.

Page Is Intentionally Left Blank to Allow for Double-Sided Copying

CHAPTER XI

THE COST OF QOP

This chapter presents the revenues and expenditures of the QOP demonstration, focusing primarily on program costs. Most cost figures are presented per enrollee and are expressed by site, by year, and by type of cost.

REVENUE PER ENROLLEE

We begin with the income side of the grantee's ledger. In each of the five years of the demonstration, DOL provided \$200,000 to each of the five DOL-funded sites, an amount that was, with one exception, matched by an equal amount of local funds in the first four years of the demonstration. The exception was one site that lost its local matching funds in the third and fourth years of the demonstration. DOL provided that site with an additional \$50,000 grant in each of those two years, and classified the value of the SDA's staff time spent administering the grant as local matching funds. The additional funds came from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, which was interested in QOP as a gang violence and delinquency prevention program.

The Ford Foundation provided the OICA with three grants totaling \$4.1 million. The grants covered expenses for the demonstration in the two Ford-funded sites, administered by OICA, and for technical assistance to all of the demonstration sites. The second Ford-funded site provided its own funds to cover the expenses of tutoring and summer school tuition.

Tables XI.1 and XI.2 present the sources of each site's revenue on a per enrollee basis for the first four years and separately for the fifth year. Throughout much of this chapter, we present figures for the fifth year of the demonstration separately because both the services delivered in the fifth year and the fifth-year funding differed from the previous four years. Only those still in high school in the fifth year of the demonstration received intensive services. Moreover, DOL did not require local matching funds in the fifth year; therefore, budgets and the case manager staff at DOL-funded sites underwent a substantial reduction in the demonstration's final year.

Each DOL-funded site received \$4,245 per year per enrollee on average during the first four years of the demonstration. The Ford-funded sites received \$7,720 per year per enrollee on average for the first four years. All sites also received a variety of in-kind donations such as space in the schools, volunteer time, and tickets to events. Over the entire first four years of the demonstration, in-kind donations to QOP sites ranged from \$129 to \$2,680 per year per enrollee.

TABLE XI.1

REVENUE PER ENROLLEE PER YEAR BY SITE, YEARS 1 THROUGH 4

| | DOL-Funded | | | | | Ford-Funded | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| | Cleveland | Fort Worth | Houston | Memphis | Washington, DC ^a | Philadelphia ^b | Yakima |
| Number of Enrollees | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 80 | 50 | 50 |
| Total Revenue | \$4,518 | \$4,772 | \$4,444 | \$4,129 | \$5,219 | \$14,139 | \$5,317 |
| Federal QOP Grant | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,250 | \$2,000 | \$2,500 | NA | NA |
| Ford Foundation/OICA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | \$11,459 | \$3,981 |
| Cash Match Amount | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$1,419 | \$2,000 | \$2,500 | NA | NA |
| In-Kind Match Amount | \$0 | \$0 | \$554 | \$0 | \$0 | NA | NA |
| In-Kind Donations/Other Contributions | \$518 | \$772 | \$220 | \$129 | \$219 | \$2,680 | \$1,336 |

SOURCE: Site financial statements.

^aThe SDA in Washington, DC, did not charge for its administration of the QOP grant. The value of this time was not included in the in-kind donations.

^b Revenue for Philadelphia did not include money spent for technical assistance for other sites.

TABLE XI.2

REVENUE PER ENROLLEE BY SITE, YEAR 5

| | DOL-Funded | | | | | Ford-Funded | |
|---|------------|------------|---------|---------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| | Cleveland | Fort Worth | Houston | Memphis | Washington, DC | Philadelphia ^a | Yakima |
| Number of Enrollees | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 80 | 50 | 50 |
| Total Revenue | \$2,494 | \$3,165 | \$4,233 | \$2,583 | \$2,695 | \$64 | \$1,708 |
| Federal QOP Grant | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 | \$2,500 | NA | NA |
| Ford Foundation/OICA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | \$0 | \$922 |
| Cash Match Amount ^b | \$327 | \$938 | \$1,814 | \$519 | \$0 | NA | NA |
| In-Kind Match Amount | \$0 | \$0 | \$385 | \$0 | \$0 | NA | NA |
| In-Kind Donations/Other Contributions | \$167 | \$228 | \$34 | \$64 | \$195 | \$64 | \$786 |
| Carryover from Years 1 through 4 | \$1,771 | \$2,540 | \$260 | \$1,442 | \$2,654 | \$17,162 | \$0 |

SOURCE: Site financial statements.

^aRevenue for Philadelphia did not include money spent for technical assistance for other sites.

^bThese cash matches were carried over from year 4 of the demonstration and do not represent new cash matches.

Total resources per enrollee over all five years of the demonstration, including cash and donated items, ranged from \$19,099 to \$23,571 per enrollee at DOL-funded sites, and ranged from \$22,975 to \$56,620 per enrollee at Ford-funded sites. These figures translate into a range of \$4,129 to \$5,219 per enrollee per year for the first four years and \$2,494 to \$4,233 for the fifth year at DOL-funded sites. Revenues for Ford-funded sites ranged from \$4,595 to \$11,324 per enrollee per year.

EXPENDITURES PER ENROLLEE

The total QOP expenditure per enrollee averaged \$24,827 for the full five years of the demonstration (see Table XI.3). The average expenditure per enrollee for the DOL-funded sites was \$16,732 for the first four years and \$3,596 for the fifth year. For the two Ford-funded sites, expenditures per enrollee in the first four years were \$21,267 in Yakima and \$39,394 at Philadelphia. In the fifth year, they were \$1,708 in Yakima and \$9,780 in Philadelphia. Thus, the expenditures per enrollee over all five years varied substantially from site to site, ranging from \$18,143 to \$49,173. These figures may be decomposed into a range of \$3,768 to \$9,848 per year per enrollee for the first four years and a range of \$1,708 to \$9,780 per enrollee for the fifth year. One of the Ford-funded site's per-enrollee expenditures stands out as much higher than those of the other sites.

Annual expenditures at most sites varied over the five years of the demonstration. Spending typically increased each year during the first four years and decreased during the fifth year. For example, one site steadily increased its spending by \$600 to \$900 per enrollee each year until the last year, when expenditures fell back. QOP coordinators reported that they developed a better understanding of what they could do with the money and where they needed to spend it in the last few years compared with the first few years of the demonstration. Such year-to-year differences were possible because DOL permitted grantees to roll over any unspent balances from one year into the following year's budget.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The figures presented in other sections of this chapter cover program operations and management, excluding the cost of technical assistance provided to all sites by OICA. Technical assistance included helping sites set up their management information software, funding an annual week-long training conference for all QOP staff, and answering questions as needed. The cost of providing technical assistance for the five years of the demonstration was \$1,125,493, or \$37,516 per year per site.

TABLE XI.3

EXPENDITURES PER ENROLLEE BY SITE AND YEAR, YEARS 1 THROUGH 5

| | DOL-Funded | | | | | | FORD-Funded | | | Overall Average |
|---|------------|------------|----------|----------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|
| | Cleveland | Fort Worth | Houston | Memphis | Washington, DC ^a | DOL-Funded Average | Philadelphia ^b | Yakima | FORD-Funded Average | |
| Number of Enrollees | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 80 | | 50 | 50 | | |
| Year 1 | \$2,950 | \$2,495 | \$3,026 | \$2,682 | \$4,025 | \$3,036 | \$9,200 | \$5,450 | \$7,325 | \$4,261 |
| Year 2 | \$3,773 | \$4,272 | \$4,665 | \$3,665 | \$4,364 | \$4,148 | \$9,879 | \$3,695 | \$6,787 | \$4,902 |
| Year 3 | \$4,516 | \$4,394 | \$4,860 | \$4,039 | \$4,629 | \$4,487 | \$9,457 | \$5,397 | \$7,427 | \$5,327 |
| Year 4 | \$5,062 | \$5,388 | \$4,965 | \$4,688 | \$5,202 | \$5,061 | \$10,858 | \$6,724 | \$8,791 | \$6,127 |
| Total Expenditures, Years 1 through 4 | \$16,301 | \$16,549 | \$17,515 | \$15,074 | \$18,220 | \$16,732 | \$39,394 | \$21,267 | \$30,330 | \$20,617 |
| Average Expenditures, Years 1 through 4 | \$4,075 | \$4,137 | \$4,379 | \$3,768 | \$4,555 | \$4,183 | \$9,848 | \$5,317 | \$7,583 | \$5,155 |
| Year 5 | \$4,207 | \$2,918 | \$4,478 | \$3,069 | \$3,310 | \$3,596 | \$9,780 | \$1,708 | \$5,744 | \$4,210 |
| Total Expenditures, Years 1 through 5 | \$20,508 | \$19,468 | \$21,993 | \$18,143 | \$21,531 | \$20,329 | \$49,173 | \$22,974 | \$36,074 | \$24,827 |

SOURCE: Site financial statements.

NOTE: The in-kind donations for years 1 through 4 are spread evenly across those years for this table. The year 5 in-kind donations were estimated separately, and are included in the year 5 costs.

^aThe SDA in Washington, DC charged no expense for their efforts in the QOP demonstration. Estimates of the amount of this donated time were not available and have not been included in the in-kind donations.

^bCosts for Philadelphia do not include money spent for technical assistance for other sites.

COST ACCOUNTING

Revenue and expenditure figures include cash and the value of donated items and volunteered time expended during the accounting period. Expenditures include those of the CBO and, for DOL-funded sites, the SDA. We assigned values to each type of donated item and volunteered time. Table XI.4 shows some of the more common donated items and their valuation.

TYPES OF EXPENDITURES

At most sites, the largest component of expenditures was labor costs, including both wages and benefits, representing 24 to 67 percent of the total (see Table XI.5). Four of the five DOL-funded sites spent more than 50 percent of their budget on wages and benefits. The stipends and accrual accounts for the associates represented another 5 to 27 percent of the total costs. The two Ford-funded sites spent about 50 percent of their budgets on salaries and stipends, though they had budgeted from 50 to 90 percent for salaries and stipends.

Other expenses included food, transportation, child care, and tutoring. Many of the food items were donated, and volunteers provided much of the tutoring. Sites did not maintain records for the costs of each of these items. Table XI.6 shows the total costs of these activities in the first four years of the demonstration and includes both in-kind and actual expenses.

Two aspects of the costs at the Philadelphia site stand out beyond the fact that expenditures per enrollee were more than double those of DOL-funded sites. First, labor costs per enrollee were 171 percent of the average for DOL-funded sites. Since the caseloads of Philadelphia case managers were approximately the same as those at other sites, this implies that each Philadelphia case manager received a substantially greater compensation than did case managers at DOL-funded sites. Second, other costs were 373 percent of the average for DOL-funded sites. Such costs of the Philadelphia site included the purchase of personal computer hardware and software, travel, leasehold improvements, maintenance and repair, and program supplies.

QOP COSTS RELATIVE TO OTHER YOUTH PROGRAMS

QOP at almost \$25,000 per enrollee is the most expensive federal youth program. By comparison, the operating costs of the also-expensive Job Corps program (as distinct from the fixed cost of the Job Corps residential facility) were approximately \$17,000 per enrollee in 1998. In addition, the cost of operating a traditional Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) youth program was slightly over \$2,000 per enrollee in 1996, less than one-tenth that of QOP. Finally, Upward Bound,

a pre-college program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education to provide academic enrichment to disadvantaged youth in grades 8 through 12 costs slightly over \$6,000 per enrollee.¹¹

¹¹ As noted at the beginning of this chapter, QOP costs are averaged over *all enrollees*, including those who seldom or never engage in program activities. The costs of Job Corps, JTPA programs, and Upward Bound are averaged over enrollees who engage in some program activities. If QOP costs were averaged over enrollees who engaged in some program activities, the per-enrollee costs would be even higher.

TABLE XI.4
VALUATION OF DONATED ITEMS

| Type of Item | Valuation |
|-------------------------------|---|
| New Computer ^a | \$2,000 |
| Computer Upgrade ^a | \$1,000 |
| Printer ^a | \$500 |
| Internet Access | \$100 per month |
| Tutoring ^b | \$40 per hour |
| Lecture | \$100 per hour |
| Donated Tickets ^c | \$27 per ticket |
| Office Space (full-time use) | Cost per square foot estimated by CBO |
| Office space (occasional use) | Classroom size: \$100 per use Larger room: \$500 per use |

^aEstimated costs for purchase of new/upgraded mid-level system.

^bHourly charge for professional tutoring service.

^cEstimated average of ticket prices for sporting events, theaters, movies, and performing arts events.

TABLE XI.5

SALARIES, STIPENDS, AND OTHER ITEMS AS A PERCENT OF EXPENDITURES,
YEARS 1 THROUGH 5

| | DOL-Funded | | | | | Ford-Funded | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| | Cleveland | Fort Worth | Houston | Memphis | Washington, DC | Philadelphia ^a | Yakima |
| Total Expenditures per Enrollee | \$20,508 | \$19,468 | \$21,993 | \$18,143 | \$21,531 | \$49,173 | \$22,974 |
| Staff Wages and Benefits (amount followed by percent of total) | \$12,100 59% | \$8,566 44% | \$13,044 67% | \$9,434 52% | \$11,541 54% | \$18,686 38% | \$11,802 24% |
| Student Stipends and Accrual Accounts (amount followed by percent of total) | \$2,666 13% | \$1,168 6% | \$973 5% | \$2,540 14% | \$3,099 14% | \$5,409 11% | \$13,277 27% |
| Other Costs (amount followed by percent of total) | \$5,742 28% | \$9,734 50% | \$5,451 28% | \$5,806 32% | \$6,891 32% | \$25,078 51% | \$24,095 49% |

SOURCE: Site financial statements

^aCosts for Philadelphia do not include money spent for technical assistance for other sites.

TABLE XI.6

EXPENDITURES ON SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND TUTORING COSTS BY SITE
PER ENROLLEE PER YEAR, YEARS 1 THROUGH 4

| | DOL-Funded ^a | | | | Ford-Funded | |
|----------------|-------------------------|------------|---------|---------|---------------------------|--------|
| | Cleveland | Fort Worth | Houston | Memphis | Philadelphia ^b | Yakima |
| Food | \$32 | \$110 | \$17 | \$55 | \$231 | \$128 |
| Transportation | \$63 | \$35 | \$193 | \$196 | \$670 | \$408 |
| Child Care | \$21 | \$3 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Tutoring | \$126 | \$35 | \$61 | \$17 | \$476 | \$310 |

SOURCE: Site financial statements.

NOTE: This includes donated items (such as bags of food and restaurant certificates) and donated time (such as volunteer tutors, college students).

^aData for the Washington, D.C. site were not available.

^bCost for Philadelphia do not include money spent for technical assistance for other sites.

CHAPTER XII

CONCLUSIONS

We assessed the implementation of the QOP demonstration by comparing the program operations to the QOP model developed by DOL, the Ford Foundation, and OICA. We begin with the broadest findings from that assessment, and conclude with findings that apply to each of the program components.

All sites implemented a version of QOP for the full five years of the demonstration. All sites hired a full complement of staff, enrolled a representative sample of target youth, and provided case management and mentoring to their enrollees for five years. Program start up, from receiving the grant to the onset of service delivery, took about six months. The caseloads of case managers ranged from 15 to 27 enrollees per case manager.

There was wide site-to-site variation in how faithfully the QOP model was implemented. One CBO limited its implementation of QOP to minor adjustments to its pre-QOP flagship youth program. In large measure, the CBO's flagship program was relabeled as a QOP program without changing much of its program content. Aside from such an extreme, sites varied widely in terms of the emphasis placed on academic activities and community service and the provision of supportive services. Variation in mentoring was somewhat more modest. Case managers at two sites were routinely unavailable in the evening or on weekends. Sites varied in their efforts to stay in contact with enrollees who moved, dropped out, or became ill or incarcerated.

Several factors appear to be associated with the variation in model implementation. The most important reason is that the QOP model is difficult for many CBOs to implement. QOP is more comprehensive and complex than most youth programs. It covers a wider array of services, involves engaging youth over a five year period covering multiple developmental stages, targets youth who may not be enthusiastic participants, requires delivering services in a wide range of settings, and involves maintaining links with other CBOs and public agencies. The staffs of several demonstration CBOs reported taking two years and two week long training conferences to understand the complexities of the model. The imperfect understanding of the model in several sites limited the fidelity of implementation, especially in the first half of the demonstration.

In communications with sites, DOL did not require the sites to adopt all elements of the QOP model. The DOL grant announcement required DOL sites to admit only eligible youth; to set a goal of 750 hours of participation; to provide educational, developmental, and community service activities; to staff the program for a 20:1 ratio of enrollees to case managers; and to pay enrollees a stipend and accrual account. DOL asked each site to implement educational assessment, individual education plans, computer-assisted instruction, and tutoring only at the end of the second year of the demonstration.¹² Further, DOL did not specify that its sites should provide supportive services.

¹²Some of this lack of initial guidance to sites resulted from DOL's need to implement the QOP demonstration quickly.

The technical assistance provider suggested such supportive services to sites during annual training sessions starting in the second year of the demonstration.

There were other sources of site-to-site variation. Chapter XI documents the wide variation in program expenditures per enrollee. The highest-cost site spent 2.7 times the amount of money per enrollee as did the least-cost site. Sites with greater expenditures per enrollee were able to implement fuller versions of QOP.

A final source of variation in the fidelity of program implementation was that the leaders of some QOP SDAs and CBOs were more sympathetic to the QOP philosophy than were leaders at other sites. The leadership at one site in particular felt that QOP's intensity was harmful to enrollees in the long term. At the other extreme, the Philadelphia CBO was one of the designers of the QOP model and had both a deep understanding of and commitment to QOP.

Enrolled youth faced many barriers to academic success and needed a wide array of services. Indeed, the intensity and number of barriers facing many enrollees exceeded the expectations of the demonstration designers and some site staff. Some of the barriers were apparent in the eligibility criteria for enrolling in QOP. All enrollees began QOP in schools whose dropout rates were 40 percent or more, and QOP enrollees were in the bottom two thirds of the grade distribution for entering ninth graders. By the fourth year of QOP, case managers reported the following about their caseloads:

- Four in 10 enrollees had repeated at least one grade, and the large majority was at least one grade level behind in terms of achievement test scores.
- More than one in five had been suspended or expelled from school.
- Seven percent were special education students.
- More than one in four abused substances.
- One in five was involved in criminal activities, one in six had been incarcerated, and one in 10 was on probation.
- One in six was a teen parent.
- More than one in four experienced a severe personal or family crisis, such as homelessness or the violent death of a family member or close friend.

Most sites did not offer, and most enrollees did not engage in, the suggested 750 hours of program participation per year. Sites varied substantially in the number of hours offered to enrollees. Only two of the seven sites scheduled 750 hours of activities per year, with approximately one-third in education, one-third in community service, and one-third in developmental activities. None of the remaining five sites scheduled 250 hours of community service activities; however, some sites succeeded in scheduling 250 hours in education or developmental activities.

Enrollees engaged in program activities for substantially fewer hours than the stated goals. On average, QOP enrollees spent 174 hours on QOP activities per year— 23 percent of the goal of 750 hours through the first four years of the demonstration. Enrollees spent an average of 72 hours per year on education (29 percent of the goal), 76 hours on developmental activities (30 percent of the goal), and 26 hours on community service (11 percent of the goal). The average time spent on QOP activities fell steadily from 247 hours in the first year of the demonstration to 89 hours in the fourth year. The percentage of enrollees spending no time at all on QOP activities increased steadily from 1 percent in the first year to 36 percent in the fourth year. Enrollee hours varied widely, both within each site and from site to site. Total program hours per year per enrollee ranged from 345 to 68; hours in education activities from 161 to 24; hours in community service from 76 to 4; and hours in developmental activities from 108 to 40. Enrollees who spent few hours in QOP reported feeling that QOP was too much like school or that they faced a barrier to participation, such as transportation, child care responsibilities, or a job.

Case managers developed close mentoring relationships with between 40 and 60 percent of the enrolled youth assigned to them. Case managers at most sites implemented a broad scope of mentoring and interacted with an enrollee’s parent or guardian and school teachers, counselors, and other school administrative staff. As appropriate, some case managers made referrals to, and assisted the enrollee in making arrangements with agencies providing family planning, income support, housing, transportation, summer jobs, summer school, and GED programs. Many case managers assisted enrollees who became involved in the criminal justice system, especially those who became involved as juveniles. The case manager appeared with the enrollee at hearings and volunteered to monitor the enrollee’s behavior during probationary periods. Most case managers took enrollees on college tours and assisted their college-bound enrollees in selecting a college, applying for college, and applying for financial aid.

The formation of mentoring relationships with enrollees in the other 40 to 60 percent of the caseload was limited by several factors. The most important factor was a youth’s lack of interest in joining program activities. Given QOP’s ideology and recruitment procedures (described in Chapter II), the enrolled population included youth who were not motivated to participate in program activities. At each site, around 1 percent of enrollees never had any contact with the program. Most of the remainder of the enrollees who did not form a close mentoring relationship with a case manager attended a small number of QOP activities at the beginning of the demonstration but did not sustain their participation. Some enrollees were unable to sustain their participation because of other after-school responsibilities, including involvement in a team sport, employment, and caring for younger siblings.

Another limitation to forming close mentoring relationships was the mobility of many enrollees. By the fourth year of the demonstration, approximately one third of enrollees had left the original QOP high schools—transferring to other schools or moving sufficiently far away that the case manager was unable to spend much time with them. Case managers found that maintaining mentoring relationships with the many youth who moved out of the area consumed a disproportionate share of their time. Case managers therefore reduced the intensity of their relationship with out-of-town youth in order to free up their time for the enrollees who remained nearby.

Sites implemented the QOP education component only partially. DOL-funded sites did not budget, plan, or staff QOP with a focus on education. At the beginning of the demonstration, most DOL-funded sites made little provision for computer-assisted instructional equipment or for tutoring services. In contrast, Ford-funded sites emphasized their CAI facilities and CAI activities. All sites staffed QOP with individuals experienced in delivering social services to disadvantaged youth, but not experienced in teaching. Case managers saw themselves more as mentors than as teachers.

Even when DOL strengthened its emphasis on educational services in the second and third years of the demonstration, most sites continued to implement the education component only imperfectly. By this time, however, sites were largely locked into their previous staffing and budgeting decisions. Many sites tried to expand their services to include more formal educational activities, but, for most, educational services did not fundamentally improve.

No site implemented periodic formal academic assessment or individual education planning. Five of the seven sites assessed enrollees' academic achievement at least once during the demonstration while the remaining two did not. None of the five sites that assessed academic achievement tailored its education services to the results of the assessment.

In spite of the absence of formal academic assessment and planning, case managers monitored the academic progress of each in-school enrollee by reviewing report cards, conferring with teachers, and occasionally sitting in on classes. Case managers tailored some services to the academic needs of each enrollee. Specifically, case managers tried to keep discouraged enrollees from dropping out of school, arranged for summer school for students who needed to repeat a failed course, assisted enrollees in preparing for high-stakes state achievement tests, and arranged for GED classes for dropouts.

Sites did not provide one-on-one tutoring during the first year of the demonstration. All sites eventually offered it, but at most sites, it was sporadic and not sustained. Case managers themselves provided much of the tutoring, although many felt uncomfortable in the role of tutor. Tutoring typically consisted of answering enrollees' questions about homework. Some sites occasionally arranged for tutorials by outside volunteers or by other agencies specializing in academic tutoring, but these efforts were also sporadic and not long lasting.

The two Ford-funded sites and one of the DOL-funded sites implemented computer-assisted instruction (CAI) while the remaining four DOL sites did not meaningfully implement CAI. The four sites did not budget or plan at the beginning of the demonstration for the purchase and maintenance of facilities and equipment necessary for computer-assisted instruction, and little guidance was received from DOL or the TA provider. For several years, these sites attempted to negotiate with other organizations for free or inexpensive access to a computer facility, but such arrangements proved unsatisfactory, lasting for only a few months. Access was limited to a narrow range of hours and the equipment was out of date. In contrast, the two Ford-funded sites and the remaining DOL-funded site invested in a state-of-the-art facility, equipment, and library of educational software.

All sites assisted enrollees in planning for postsecondary activities, particularly for college. Activities included preparation for SAT/ACT tests, participation in college fairs and college tours,

and assistance in selecting a college, filling out college applications, writing the application essay, and applying for financial aid. QOP provided less preparation for other postsecondary activities than the program nonetheless viewed as successful outcomes, including postsecondary vocational schools, the armed forces, and certified apprenticeship programs.

Developmental activities, including recreation, cultural awareness, and avoidance of risky behaviors, proved to be the most popular type of activity for both enrollees and case managers. As a result, the implementation of this component of QOP was more successful than the education or community service component. Four sites scheduled approximately 250 hours of developmental activities per year, with the remaining three sites scheduling between 150 and 200 hours per year. Recreational activities were the most popular type of developmental activity. The popularity of developmental activities declined in the second half of the demonstration as enrollees became more involved in other activities, such as jobs and sports.

Community service was not effectively implemented at most sites. While all sites implemented a program of community service, most case managers chose to allocate little time to this component. Their decision was largely motivated by the belief that enrollees would benefit more from time spent in mentoring, education, and developmental activities than time spent in community service. As a result, community service became an inactive component at most sites during the final three years of the demonstration.

QOP enrollees had a greater need for supportive services than QOP designers and managers expected in terms of both the frequency and range of services. The need for supportive services fell into two categories: supportive services needed by a large proportion of enrollees and specialized supportive services needed by an individual enrollee or a small number of enrollees. The first of these categories included four supportive services—food, transportation, child care, and substance abuse treatment.

- **Food.** In mid-afternoon after the school day, many enrollees were hungry and needed a substantial snack. Case managers found it necessary to provide snacks to induce enrollees to show up for afternoon program activities. Program-provided snacks also improved on the nutritional content of the snacks enrollees would have eaten in the absence of the program and helped maintain the youths' attention on the program activity. Some participants also needed breakfast. DOL-funded sites generally did not budget or plan for significant expenses for food or other supportive services. By the midpoint in the demonstration, most sites had arrangements to provide food (and transportation) services. Six of the seven sites provided afternoon snacks either daily or weekly. Snacks became budgeted line items at the two Ford-funded sites and at two of the five DOL-funded sites. Two of the remaining DOL-funded sites provided snacks through donations by outside organizations and by case managers themselves. One of the DOL-funded sites did not provide snacks.
- **Transportation.** Many enrollees needed transportation or a subsidy for the use of public transportation, both to the CBO's facility after school and to special group events on weekends. At the beginning of the demonstration, case managers attempted to provide transportation with their own cars. By the midpoint of the demonstration, three sites provided transportation with vans owned by the CBO. Other sites distributed bus or subway tokens to enrollees, and others provided subsidized taxi rides.

- ***Child care.*** From the beginning of the demonstration many enrollees did not have children of their own but cared for a younger sibling while the parent or parents worked. In the second half of the demonstration, case managers reported that 16 percent of enrollees had children and that, for half of these enrollees, child care responsibilities were a barrier to participating in program activities. Child care was not provided in a sustained and systematic way. Reasons included the site's lack of experience in providing child care, the cost of child care, and the difficulties associated with state and local licensing requirements for operating a public child care center.
- ***Substance abuse treatment.*** Case managers reported that, by the third year of the demonstration, slightly over one in four enrollees used illegal substances at least occasionally and that approximately one-quarter of those used such substances heavily. The need for substance abuse treatment went largely unmet throughout the demonstration.

The need for the second category of supportive services—specialized services needed by one or a small number of enrollees—proved surprising in two ways. First, even though only a small number of individuals needed each individual service, a large number of enrollees collectively needed a range of specialized services. Second, the range of such services was wide. Some enrollees had attempted suicide, experienced the death of a family member, were abused at home, were shot, became seriously and even terminally ill, were raped, entered the foster care system, became homeless, experienced substance abuse and domestic violence of their parents, and were in families who had no money for food or rent. Case managers took homeless youth into their own homes, arranged for funeral services, mediated family conflicts, arranged for stays at shelters for runaways, made loans to enrollees, and occasionally bought groceries or paid the family utility bill. Providing for such a wide variety of supportive services required sites to rely on the judgment of case managers with personal knowledge of the enrollee's situation. CBOs and SDAs had to trust in the case manager's judgment and to remain flexible with respect to the types of expenses they allowed. For example, one site equipped its van for a wheel chair when one of its enrollees became disabled. Nevertheless, the sites' abilities to provide many of the specialized supportive services were limited by restrictions on allowable expenses.

Financial incentives for enrollees were successfully implemented. All sites paid stipends and established accrual accounts. Enrollees who met the requirements received their accrual account balances and used the funds to support their postsecondary training or education. The establishment of accrual accounts at DOL-funded sites was delayed by DOL's publishing guidelines and procedures for setting up the accounts only at the end of the third year of the demonstration, although sites were keeping sufficient funds in reserve for payment. The delay was caused by the fact that DOL paid grantees on a cost basis and accrual account contributions did not meet the definition of a cost on two grounds. First, accrual account contributions were held by the grantee or CBO and were not disbursed to enrollees at the time the contribution was made. Since no payment was made, the contribution was not considered a reimbursable expense. Second, given that ultimate disbursement of the accrual account was conditional on the enrollee's behavior (i.e., the enrollee had to complete high school and enroll in an approved postsecondary education or training program), disbursement was uncertain. At the time the contributions accrued, enrollees could not be certain that they would ever collect the balances due to them. Accrual account balances for those enrollees who failed to meet the specified conditions could not ever be claimed as an expense.

This situation was resolved by requiring each DOL-funded site to maintain a record of the funds that would have been contributed to the accrual account of each enrollee, wait until the enrollee met the conditions for disbursement, pay the appropriate amount to the enrollee, and report the payment as a reimbursable expense at the time of disbursement. This approach required the grantee or the CBO to reserve enough of the total grant budget to cover large lump-sum payments at the end of the demonstration. One casualty of this informal bookkeeping system was that enrollees generally did not receive regular statements of their accrued amounts, accrued amounts were not invested, and case managers were unable to use accrual accounts as a device for teaching enrollees about managing money, investing, and planning.

In contrast, Ford-funded sites made monthly accrual account contributions to separate accounts at a brokerage firm. Funds were invested conservatively, and the firm provided a quarterly statement to each enrollee. The sites used the accounts and statements to teach enrollees money management and investing.

With respect to stipends, case managers reported that stipends appeared to induce greater participation in program activities among 14- and 15-year-old enrollees but had less influence on older enrollees, many of whom had jobs paying a much higher hourly wage. Several sites intensified the incentives by offering bonus stipends to enrollees who completed a major activity or achieved a major program success, an aspect of the program model that was not previously implemented at DOL-funded sites.

A difficulty with stipends was the ambiguity about which activities were “stipendable,” particularly activities that were not academic, community service, or life-skills activities. The ambiguity led to some site-to-site inconsistencies in stipend policy. For example, one site paid a stipend for every hour the enrollee worked at a summer job, and another site paid stipends for every hour the enrollee attended summer school class while other sites did neither.

The demonstration revealed two legal issues. Midway through the demonstration, DOL notified its sites that, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, sites could not require case managers to work more than 40 hours per week without compensation at an over-time rate. Serving from mid-morning to early evening every weekday and on one of two weekend days, as well as being on-call throughout each night, meant that case managers at several sites routinely worked more than 40 hours per week. After DOL made the requirements of the act clear to sites, one site reduced case manager hours to 40 per week, thereby potentially limiting enrollee access to managers. Other sites did not originally make staff available for more than that amount.

A legal inconsistency between the treatment of undocumented aliens under JTPA and their treatment by public schools resulted in undocumented enrollees not being offered stipends and accrual accounts. In 1982, the Supreme Court in *Plyer v. Doe*¹³ ruled that public school districts are not permitted to deny services to undocumented residents. Since the QOP demonstration drew its sample from lists of students enrolled in participating high schools, we included undocumented residents in the research sample. The result was that approximately 5 percent of enrollees, concentrated in the two Texas sites and the Yakima site, were undocumented aliens. However, the

¹³ U.S. Supreme Court, *Plyer v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202 (1982), 457 U.S. 202, *Plyler, Superintendent, Tyler Independent School District et al. v. Doe, Guardian et al.* appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, No. 80-1538, argued December 1, 1981, decided June 15, 1982.

DOL-funded sites were funded by JTPA, which forbade the delivery of services to undocumented aliens. DOL-funded sites underwrote most services for undocumented residents by relying on local matching funds, but were unable to provide stipends or accrual accounts for undocumented enrollees.

The total QOP expenditure per enrollee averaged \$25,000 for the full five years of the demonstration. The five-year expenditure per enrollee for the DOL-funded sites ranged from \$18,000 to \$22,000. For the two Ford-funded sites, the expenditure per enrollee was \$23,000 in Yakima and \$49,000 in Philadelphia. Thus, Philadelphia had a much higher expenditure per enrollee than any other site.

Annual expenditures at most sites varied over the five years of the demonstration. Spending typically increased each year during the first four years and decreased during the fifth year to about one quarter of the average for the first four years. For example, one site steadily increased its spending by \$600 to \$900 per enrollee each year until the last year, when expenditures decreased sharply. QOP coordinators reported that they developed a better understanding of what they could do with the money and where they needed to spend it after the first year or two of the demonstration.

These cost figures cover program operations and management, but exclude the cost of technical assistance provided by OICA. Because of the anticipated need for technical assistance and OICA's experience in helping to design the QOP model, Ford awarded a grant to OICA to provide technical assistance for the QOP demonstration. Technical assistance included helping sites set up management information software, funding annual week-long training conferences for all QOP staff, and answering questions as needed. OICA provided technical assistance for the first four years of the demonstration at a cost of \$1,125,000, or \$47,000 per year per site (not counting the Philadelphia site itself). In addition to providing technical assistance, OICA operated the Philadelphia site throughout the demonstration.

QOP was incompatible with the operational youth program title of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) in several ways. QOP was a nontraditional program that was many times more intensive, expensive, and holistic than the typical JTPA program, which lasted about six weeks, cost \$1,000 to \$2,000 per enrollee, and was administered exclusively in a group setting. Because of QOP's nontraditional nature, one or two of the SDAs were less than fully committed to the QOP model. The SDAs' low level of commitment manifested itself as a reluctance to reimburse nontraditional expenses of the QOP CBO. For example, one site fitted its van with equipment for a wheelchair for an enrollee who became disabled after being shot. Another site paid for music lessons for an enrollee whose case manager became convinced that such lessons would be an effective treatment for the youth's depression. SDAs ultimately reimbursed most nontraditional expenses, but only after considerable delay and additional documentation and justification from the CBO, and written guidance from DOL.

A second dimension of incompatibility was that QOP's focus on case management and mentoring meant that the case manager was responsible for tailoring the service mix and supportive services to the individual enrollee's needs. Case managers needed a level of spending authority consistent with their level of responsibility. Several SDAs and CBOs found that delegating spending authority to case managers was inconsistent with their traditional method of operation.

A third incompatibility between the QOP model and JTPA related to the handling of undocumented enrollees. As discussed above, the QOP demonstration served undocumented youth because of the program's involvement with the public school districts at each site. Since JTPA prohibited JTPA funding from benefiting undocumented residents, undocumented enrollees did not receive stipends or accrual accounts. Case managers reported that the absence of financial incentives alienated some undocumented enrollees in the first year of the demonstration.

A fourth incompatibility related to outcome measures. The primary outcome measures of the QOP demonstration were earning a high school diploma or GED and enrolling in a postsecondary education or training program. The secondary outcomes were performing well on academic achievement tests and avoiding risky behaviors such as parenthood, substance abuse, and criminal activity. For operational JTPA programs, as opposed to demonstration programs, the primary outcome measure was whether or not the enrollee got a job.

A fifth type of incompatibility was caused by the nature of JTPA grants for operating QOP. Funding the QOP demonstration via grants limited DOL's ability to require each site to implement the QOP model. As a result, no DOL-funded site fully implemented QOP. A second problem caused by the nature of the grants was that, even though DOL renewed each site's grant in every year of the demonstration, each grant was limited to a one-year period. Since local matching grants conformed to the federal grant, the local matching grant never exceeded one year in duration. In at least one site, the one-year duration of matching grants allowed the local funding agency to avoid feeling it was committed to the demonstration for the full demonstration period. The source of matching funds at this site was the local school district, which became disenchanted with the program during the second year of the demonstration largely because many QOP enrollees moved to other school districts or dropped out of school. This meant that some of the school district's funds were used for the benefit of youth not attending any school in that district. The school district elected not to renew its financial commitment for the third and fourth years.

A sixth incompatibility was that, unlike most JTPA and WIA programs, initiation of the delivery of QOP services to participating youth took six months from the date of letting the QOP demonstration grants. QOP required more time for start-up than traditional JTPA and WIA programs for recruiting and training staff, arranging for facilities and equipment, and identifying and enrolling enrollees. Further, the extensive training of case managers required to start up a QOP program implies that case managers should be hired at least four months before the initiation of service delivery.

The host schools and school districts must be intimately involved in local QOP programs, but the school system may not be able to provide financial support to QOP.

Education is one of QOP's major components. Case managers found they needed to assist enrollees with coursework and advocate on behalf of their enrollees with school teachers and administrators. Case managers reported that knowledge of each enrollee's teachers and coursework was important for assisting the enrollee effectively.

Although QOP continued to serve enrollees who transferred to a different school or school district, dropped out of school altogether, or enrolled in a private GED class, public schools in many school districts are prohibited from providing services or financial support to youth who do not attend that school or at least attend some public school within that district. One QOP site used public school funds as local matching funds. Once the school district administrators realized that QOP was providing services to youth who attended other schools both in the district and outside

the district, as well as youth who dropped out, the school district terminated its funding. In contrast, other DOL-funded sites used local government revenues for the local match. Local public agencies were not limited to serving youth attending a particular school or school district.

CHAPTER XIII

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE YOUTH PROGRAMS

This chapter presents suggestions for the design, administration, and operation of current and future intensive case management and mentoring programs for youth. The suggestions are based on our assessment of implementation successes and the difficulties sites faced in implementing specific components of the QOP model, and are not based on statistical estimates of the impacts of the QOP demonstration. Where several sites struggled with a component, we suggest ways that future program designers and administrators might avoid difficulties. The suggestions do not imply a recommendation to continue a current program or initiate any future program. We begin with lessons that apply to the entire program and progress to lessons that apply to specific components.

CONTRACTING, GOVERNANCE, AND MANAGEMENT

A program like QOP can be operated through local CBOs. Most such organizations enjoy some advantages over state or national organizations in that they have already forged informal networking relationships with other local agencies that provide related services, know neighborhoods well enough to keep track of participating youth, and enjoy access to local sources of case managers.

If the funding organization wants sites to replicate a program model faithfully, however, we suggest it adopt a “hands on” approach to model implementation, including the use of performance-based contracts rather than grants as the contracting mechanism. Contracts enable the funding agency to require implementation of a specific program model. Performance measures specified in the contract can help ensure the fidelity of site operations to the program model. We suggest the use of two types of performance measures: those indicating the fidelity of model implementation and those indicating program outcomes. The former should be based on a comparison of existing program policies and operations with the program model. The latter should include, for younger enrollees, improvement in achievement test scores, staying in school, promotion to the next grade, and avoiding risky behaviors such as pregnancy, substance abuse, and criminal activities. For older enrollees, performance indicators should include high school graduation, earning a GED, enrolling in college or another postsecondary training activity, and avoiding risky behaviors. Contracts should be in place six months before the beginning of the first academic year of service delivery to allow for program development, staff recruitment and training, acquisition of materials and equipment, and recruitment of eligible youth.

Providing sites with comprehensive documentation, training, and guidance on the model early in the program can facilitate fidelity to the model. Some documentation should be provided before contracts are awarded, and the request for proposals should include a full description of the program model. The program description should make clear that the CBOs’ budget should provide for computer-assisted instructional equipment and paid tutoring. After contracts are awarded and staff hired, each site should receive a more detailed documentation and specification of the program

model. We suggest that the funder conduct several activities immediately before and after award. First, the funding agency should review each potential CBO before award to assess the financial stability of the organization and its willingness to adopt an intensive, nontraditional program model. Second, the funding agency should conduct a kick-off meeting at each site during program launch to engage and brief officials from the involved schools and other community organizations. Third, site staff, funder staff, and the staff of intermediary institutions such as workforce investment boards (WIBs) should be trained in the program model. The initial training should last several days and should cover educational assessment, individual education plans, tutoring, computer-assisted education, health and mental health screening, and family therapy. After the initial training, there should be periodic in-service training and ongoing technical assistance.

To enable CBOs to implement a holistic approach to treating barriers facing disadvantaged youth, contracts should allow for the reimbursement of costs for a wide variety of program activities and supportive services. Further, WIBs and CBO management should delegate a modest level of spending authority to case managers. The program documentation should include guidelines for acceptable expenditures.

QOP-like youth programs should not be funded through the public school system. At one demonstration site in which a public school district provided local matching funds to QOP, the district withdrew its funding when it became aware that, after the first two years of the demonstration, some QOP enrollees had dropped out of school and others had transferred to other school districts.

EVOLVING PROGRAM GOALS AND SERVICE MIX

The QOP demonstration treated youth from roughly ages 14 through 19. The needs of younger adolescents entering the program differ dramatically from the needs of young adults completing the program. Any program in which youth might participate for such a long period needs to adjust the service mix to address the changing needs of enrollees as they progress through the stages of adolescent development.

Enrollees who have not yet engaged in risky behaviors need preventive services, that is, services designed to prevent youth from engaging in risky behavior in the future, as opposed to services that remediate the outcomes of past risky behaviors. Preventive services include academic assessment and development of an individualized education plan; homework assistance, tutoring, and computer-assisted instruction designed to assist the youth in passing all courses and getting up to grade level in reading and mathematics; advice on which courses to take in preparation for college; seminars, workshops, and other activities designed to prevent teen childbearing, substance abuse, and criminal activity; team building among enrollees, including asking enrollees who succeed at a difficult activity to assume responsibility for helping less successful enrollees; and community service.

Enrollees who have engaged in risky behaviors are more likely to need remediation services, as opposed to preventive services. **For such enrollees, we suggest that youth programs tailor the program goal, service mix, and performance indicators to each of the following subgroups.¹⁴**

- **Enrollees who were held back in high school for one or more years but did not drop out.** High school graduation should be the short-term goal. Intensive remedial academic services are appropriate for this group. The longer-term goal should be enrollment in community college or other vocational postsecondary training.
- **Enrollees who dropped out** and could not be persuaded to re-enter high school. Receipt of a GED certificate should be the short-term goal. GED preparation programs and assistance in enrolling in community college or other vocational postsecondary training are appropriate for this group.
- **Enrollees who have a child, abuse substances, or engage in crime.** The program should focus on the goal of preventing those consequences from becoming barriers to continued education and training. Child care designed to enable enrollees to both engage in program activities and stay in school are appropriate for enrollees with children. Counseling and treatment programs are appropriate for those who abuse substances. For those who have become involved in the criminal justice system, case managers should appear at legal proceedings when appropriate and help to ensure that enrollees receive legal representation.

Another QOP program goal that should keep up with the evolving circumstances of enrollees is that of sending every enrollee to college. While this goal is appropriate for enrollees in the 9th grade, by the time some enrollees reach the 11th and 12th grades, attending college may be unrealistic. For such enrollees, shifting the program goal and program resources to vocational/technical training, apprenticeship, or the armed forces may be more effective than clinging to college as the goal.

TARGET GROUP

QOP case managers felt that intensive mentoring programs, especially those oriented to preventing risky behaviors, should consider enrolling at-risk youth as early as the beginning of middle school. Although QOP for middle school youth is outside the experience of this demonstration, many case managers reported that a large proportion of QOP enrollees already faced substantial barriers by the beginning of 9th grade. The majority had achievement test scores below grade level, often several grades below grade level, and many were already engaging in risky behaviors.

¹⁴ An individual enrollee can belong to more than one of these subgroups.

PROGRAM INTENSITY, CASE MANAGEMENT, AND MENTORING

For programs as intensive as QOP, case managers felt that caseloads should not go much above 25 youth per case manager. According to case managers, youth with learning disabilities and youth who are out of school, involved in criminal activity, or both require about twice the average amount of the case manager's time. Caseloads with several such youth may need to be smaller than the standard caseload.

While we support QOP's policy of not making continued enrollment contingent on enrollee behavior, we suggest that the slots of enrollees who remain inactive for a year, are sentenced to three or more years of incarceration, or move outside a reasonably large catchment area should be made available to other eligible youth. Many QOP slots remained essentially unfilled for the duration of the demonstration, an inefficiency that an ongoing program should avoid. For enrollees who are inactive but continue to reside in the area, the program should make continued, vigorous efforts to engage the youth for a full year. For youth who move far away, the program should arrange for the youth to enroll in a mentoring program in his or her new location.

Based on experience in the QOP demonstration, the goal of 750 hours per year for each enrollee appears to be unrealistically high. We suggest that 450 hours per year of time spent in organized program activities, exclusive of one-on-one mentoring, might be more appropriate. Further, we suggest that the program should allocate the desired hours among types of activities in proportion to the priority of the type of activity. Education activities are the highest priority and should have a goal of 250 hours per year. Developmental activities are second priority, with a goal of perhaps 125 hours per year. Community service is third priority with a goal of 75 hours per year.

To ensure that an individual enrollee can participate the desired amount of time in program activities, the CBO should schedule at least 30 percent more hours of program activities than the goal number of hours. Enrollees, particularly by ages 16 and 17, are involved in team sports, jobs, child care, and other responsibilities during the afternoon hours. The program should try to accommodate the schedules of such youth by offering program activities at a wide variety of times.

Ease of access to case managers, tutors, and computer-assisted instruction is essential for active participation. The demonstration sites that maintained offices on school grounds found that many enrollees dropped in on their case managers before, during, and immediately after the school day for brief visits, suggesting that programs should arrange to have office space in host schools. In addition to providing enrollees with easy access to case managers, in-school offices offer case managers easy access to their enrollees' teachers. The central program facility for after-school activities should ideally be within easy walking distance to the school. Case managers found it useful to transport enrollees between the school or home and the CBO's facility in order to ensure the active engagement of less enthusiastic enrollees.

Several case managers reported that the requirement to be available nearly around the clock led to burnout and to conflicts with their family responsibilities. One approach to providing enrollees with more than 40 hours of access to case managers each week while avoiding stress and over-time pay for case managers is to stagger the schedules of case managers. This arrangement would require more than one case manager to establish a relationship with each enrollee.

Fourteen case managers, out of a case manager staff of 31, left the program during the five years of the demonstration. Enrollees seemed not to be disturbed by the departure of a case manager and the arrival of a new case manager if that event occurred once during the enrollee's tenure in QOP. On the other hand, enrollees who had three or more case managers during the five years tended not to develop personal relationships with the third or fourth case manager. Requiring case managers to work in pairs, such that each enrollee develops a personal relationship with more than one case manager, limits the enrollee's perception of instability when a case manager leaves, thereby reducing the risk of alienation from the program.

EDUCATION

We suggest that each program site hire at least one staff member with a teaching or educational counseling background. Such a staff member can provide training and guidance to the staff with social service backgrounds in educational assessment, individual education plans, computer-assisted instruction, and tutoring.

To be effective, tutoring and CAI resources should be budgeted, sustained, and available daily, with continuity of tutors and CAI staff. Relying on informal volunteer tutors or donated access to another organization's CAI facility led to unsustainable service delivery and became a barrier to implementing a systematic education program for QOP enrollees.

Sites should monitor each enrollee's academic progress by administering an achievement test each year. To tailor education services to each enrollee's needs, sites should use the results of the assessment as the basis of an individual education plan for each enrollee. Tutoring and computer-assisted instruction should be customized per the enrollee's plan.

DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES

Case managers reported that recreational activities were useful for recruiting and engaging the youth in a relationship with the mentor early in the enrollee's tenure. After the first few months of engagement, developmental activities should incorporate more cultural and risky behavior-avoidance content and less recreational content.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Case managers reported unmet need among QOP enrollees for child care, mental health, substance abuse, and family therapy services. Since many CBOs are not staffed to provide such services directly, we suggest that CBOs train case managers to screen for service needs and then refer enrollees to other community organizations specializing in various social services. To facilitate

such referrals, each CBO should compile a comprehensive catalogue of organizations providing such services. It would also be helpful for the CBO to develop relationships with other organizations at the beginning of the program. The relationships may involve formal briefings or memoranda of understanding between the CBO and the organizations.

The experience of the QOP demonstration suggests that sites should budget and plan for daily afternoon snacks and for transporting many enrollees to and from program activities. Sites should reimburse enrollees for child care expenses during hours spent in program activities to encourage continued participation by enrollees who have become parents.

FINANCIAL INCENTIVES FOR ENROLLEES

Case managers reported that stipends and accrual accounts were useful for encouraging the participation of younger enrollees, even beyond the incentive effects of recreational activities. Incentives were also useful for teaching money management, and accumulating savings for postsecondary training. Clear guidelines on what activities are stipendable should be disseminated to both staff and enrollees.

We suggest that future programs offering accrual accounts explore the possibility of setting up a trust account for each enrollee so that the CBO can expense its accrual account contributions each month and thus be reimbursed for its contributions. To increase the funds available to college-bound enrollees, the site should arrange for an investment manager to invest the accrual account balances conservatively. As a device for teaching money management, the investment manager should provide statements to enrollees at least quarterly.

REFERENCES

- Blanchette, Cornelia M. "At-Risk and Delinquent Youth: Multiple Programs Lack Coordinated Federal Effort." Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, T-HEHS-98-38, November 5, 1997.
- Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Wellbeing*, 2000. Washington, D.C.: 2001.
- Hahn, Andrew, Tom Leavitt, and Paul Aaron. "Evaluation of The Quantum Opportunities Program (QOP) Did The Program Work? A Report on the Post Secondary Outcomes and Cost-Effectiveness of the QOP Program (1989–1993)." Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, June 1994.
- Maxfield, Myles, Allen Schirm, and Nuria Roderiguez-Planas. "The Quantum Opportunity Program Demonstration: Implementation and Short-Term Impacts." Washington, D.C.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 2003.*
- National Center for Education Statistics. "Trends in Academic Performance: Three Decades of Progress." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2000.
- Schirm, Allen, Nuria Roderiguez-Planas, Myles Maxfield, and Christina Tuttle. "The Quantum Opportunity Program Demonstration: Short-Term Impacts." Washington, D.C.: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., 2003.
- Teachman, Jay D., Kathleen M. Paasch, Randal D. Day and Karen P. Carver. "Poverty during Adolescence and Subsequent Educational Attainment." In Greg J. Duncan and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn., eds. *Consequences of Growing Up Poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1997.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. "Resident Population Estimates of the United States by Age and Sex." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, September 1998b.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. "Poverty in the United States: 1997." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, September 1998a.