



**U.S. Department of Labor (DOL)**  
**Employment and Training Administration (ETA)**  
**Occasional Paper Series (ETA-2012)**

## **An Evaluation of the District of Columbia Summer Youth Employment Program**

Prepared by:

**Nisha Sachdev, DrPh**  
Public Health

The George Washington University  
The DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation

**This project has been funded, either wholly or in part, with Federal funds from DOL/ETA, under Contract Number DOLJ111A21738. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement of same by the U.S. Government.**

*\*A paper prepared for the 2011 ETA Research Papers Program, which competitively awarded doctoral students and post-doctoral researchers funding to conduct original research and prepare scholarly papers on topics of interest to the public workforce investment system. There were fifteen awardees for this competition, which was conducted by Synergy Enterprises, Inc. (SEI) on ETA's behalf.*

## **Executive Summary**

The District of Columbia (DC) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) is a six week program through the Department of Employment Services (DOES) designed to provide eligible youth with enriching summer work experiences through placements in community-based, private, or government sectors. The program is open to youth who ages 14 to 21 years, who are DC residents and permitted to work in the United States. SYEP meets the needs of these youth range using a youth development framework promoting positive work experiences.

This evaluation utilized quantitative and qualitative methods including surveys, focus groups, interview, and SYEP records to evaluate if the youth were provided learning opportunities, if youth and supervisors were satisfied with the program, and the effect of SYEP on short term outcomes of increasing employability skills and future goals towards employment as well as increasing positive attitudes towards avoidance of negative behaviors. In 2011, SYEP served 12,651 youth. There were about an equal number of males and females, with a majority in high school or below between the ages of 14 and 17 years. In addition, a majority of the participants (53 percent) came from Wards 7 and 8. It should also be noted that SYEP has a high retention rate, with 88 percent of the youth returning from the previous summer. In addition, a majority of the organization sites that youth were employed at were local non-profits and DC Government agencies.

Overall the findings show that 95 percent of the youth felt that they were provided learning opportunities and 69 percent were satisfied with the program. Furthermore, 95 percent of supervisors were also satisfied with SYEP and have recognized the improvements that SYEP has made over the past years. With respect to youth outcomes, the program has shown limited short term outcomes. The qualitative findings revealed continued improvements can still be

implemented specifically around the application process and quality of programming.

Recommendations are provided based on these findings including research, policy, and practice implications.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	i
I. Introduction.....	1
Overview .....	1
Purpose of Study .....	2
Positive Youth Development Framework.....	3
Research Questions .....	4
II. Literature Review.....	5
Significance of Youth Employment Programs .....	7
Career Exposure and Awareness .....	7
Financial and Social Benefits.....	8
Work Preparedness .....	9
Role of Employers .....	10
III. Methodology .....	11
Overview .....	11
Study Population.....	12
Protection of Human Subjects .....	15
Data Sources and Collection Methods .....	16
Description of Variables .....	20
Data Analysis Procedures .....	25
IV. Findings.....	29
Descriptive Analysis (Youth and Supervisor Enrollment and Program Offerings) .....	29
Post Program Youth Participant Survey .....	36
Pre-Post Program Youth Participant Survey.....	37
Findings from the Focus Groups and Interviews .....	39

V. Discussion .....	51
Summary of Findings.....	51
Recommendations .....	53
Study Implications .....	60
Conclusion .....	61
References .....	63
Appendices.....	71
Appendix A: Informed Consent Forms.....	72
Appendix B: Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey .....	75
Appendix C: DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey .....	90
Appendix D: DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey.....	106
Appendix E: Focus Group Protocols .....	115
Appendix F: Supervisor Interview Protocols.....	120

## **I. Introduction**

### ***Overview***

In urban areas, effective out of school time (OST) programs provide youth a positive environment and opportunities which help decrease negative youth development outcomes. For example, it was found that youth who participate in at least one hour of OST activities per week are 49 percent less likely to use drugs and 37 percent less likely to become teen parents (National Recreation and Park Association, 2010). Furthermore, OST programs can provide youth with the necessary skills to increase their perceptions that they can succeed in the future and have control over their actions, and can increase their motivation and ability to learn in school and other settings. Specifically, youth employment programs play an encouraging role in youth's lives by teaching youth leadership, interpersonal, and occupational skills; providing opportunities to explore careers; and serving as a catalyst for a positive youth development (Ross, 2009). Current studies show that participation in these programs can have lasting academic, vocational and life benefits including increased high school graduation rates, greater employability skills, decreased drug use, and reduced teenage pregnancy rates (Flannery, Hussey and Thomas, 2009).

One such program is the District of Columbia (DC) Department of Employment Services (DOES) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP)<sup>1</sup>. The DC SYEP is a 6-week program that provides DC youth, ages 14 to 21 years, with meaningful professional experiences to increase employment related experiences and alleviate the potential for negative developmental outcomes. Through the DC SYEP, youth participants have structured and supervised opportunities to explore vocational interests, develop useful work habits and

---

<sup>1</sup> Information on the DC SYEP can be found at: <http://does.dc.gov/does/cwp/view,a,1232,q,537757.asp>.

marketable skills, learn the value of earning money through gainful employment, and obtain educational enrichment.

### ***Purpose of Study***

Many older DC urban youth have limited exposure to career opportunities and other structured activities during the summer. In addition, although there are some existing programs that were developed to provide youth with these opportunities, there is a dearth of rigorous evaluations being performed to document both their short- and long-term effectiveness. Without sound evaluation, programs are unable to examine if and how their efforts are impacting their participants. Although the DC SYEP has been in existence since 1979, it has never been formally evaluated with regard to youth outcomes. Therefore, a rigorous evaluation is needed to assess the overall behavioral effectiveness of this program as well as build on the previous qualitative studies of the benefits of youth development programs. This study fills this gap by designing and implementing a formative (process) and summative (outcome) pilot evaluation to provide recommendations for the program and for longer term evaluation efforts.

Process evaluation is intended to look at the delivery of a program by assessing the quality of an intervention, explain why certain results are achieved, and identify factors that facilitate program success (Linnan and Steckler, 2002). Outcome evaluation complements process evaluation by observing the participant outcomes of the program (Wholey, Hatry, and Newcomer, 2004). Specifically, with regards to this study, the process evaluation examines the extent to which the DC SYEP is reaching the intended population and providing quality programming with which the participants are satisfied. The outcome evaluation examines the short-term behavior changes in the youth participants.

### ***Positive Youth Development Framework***

This evaluation follows a positive youth development (PYD) approach, focusing on the strengths of youth rather than their weaknesses. PYD recognizes that all youth can be successful if provided support, guidance, and opportunities that meet their needs (Clymer, Edwards, Ponce and Wyckoff, 2002). This approach also suggests that providing young people with opportunities and resources to help them achieve their full potential is the best way to prevent them from engaging in risky behaviors and increasing their engagement in positive behaviors. . The fundamental principle underlying PYD is that youth can successfully progress through adolescence by developing skills and abilities including social and interpersonal skills, basic academic skills, capacity to understand and plan for the future, ability to take responsibility, and obtaining knowledge of vocational skills and career interests (Clymer et al, 2002).

There are many variations of the PYD approach but important constructs included in all are promoting a sense of physical and psychological safety in youth; providing appropriate structures, such as programs, resources, and opportunities; creating supportive relationships with caring adults; providing opportunities to have a sense of belonging; providing positive social norms; giving youth responsibilities and meaningful challenges; and providing opportunities for skill-building. Programs implementing the PYD approach use these elements to develop and implement programming. For example, programs may provide mentors or utilize staff to provide youth the opportunity to model positive behaviors. Or programs may establish a sense of belonging by establishing a cohort of their youth who participate with their peers on specific activities.



The DC government has developed a citywide strategy centered on the Academy of Educational Development's (AED) Advancing Youth Development (AYD) model<sup>2</sup>. As the local provider of this curriculum, the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (CYITC) provides training for DC agencies and providers, front line staff, supervisors and policy makers on implementing the AED AYD approach in youth programming they provide. Furthermore, DC agencies frequently use constructs of this model to guide programming. AED's AYD model identifies opportunities and supports for youth that are necessary to achieve 12 outcomes that indicate healthy development in youth. The model further categorizes these outcomes in areas of identity (youth demonstrate a positive identity when they have a sense of personal well-being and a sense of connection and commitment to others) and ability (youth demonstrate ability when they gain knowledge, skills and attitudes that prepare them for adulthood). Specifically, SYEP works two of the 12 outcomes, mastery and future orientation<sup>3</sup> and employability skills<sup>4</sup>. Accordingly, the development of the evaluation in this study is grounded in these core constructs.

### ***Research Questions***

This study addresses three main research questions that correspond to the DC SYEP conceptual framework and the purposes of the evaluation:

Research Question 1: To what extent did supervisors<sup>5</sup> at host work sites provide learning opportunities geared towards (1) employability skills and (2) mastery and future orientation?

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.cyitc.org/elements/file/Indicators%20OST%20providers.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Mastery and future refers to a perception that one is "making it" and will succeed in the future.

<sup>4</sup> Employability skills refers to the ability and motivation to gain the functional and organizational skills necessary for employment, including an understanding of careers and options, and the steps necessary to reach goals.

<sup>5</sup> Supervisors refer to the supervisors of the host sites at which the youth are employed.

*Hypothesis 1.1:* At the end of the six-week program, at least 65 percent<sup>6</sup> of the youth participants will report via survey that they learned skills geared towards (1) employability and (2) mastery and future orientation.

Research Question 2: To what extent are youth and supervisors very satisfied with their overall participation in the DC SYEP?

*Hypothesis 2.1:* At the end of the six-week program, at least 65 percent of youth participants will be very satisfied with their overall participation in the program.

*Hypothesis 2.2:* At the end of the six-week program, at least 65 percent of supervisors will be very satisfied with their overall participation in the program.

Research Question 3: To what extent has participation in the DC SYEP had an impact on (1) employability skills and (2) mastery and future orientation as it relates to employability?

*Hypothesis 3.1:* By the end of the six-week program, youth participants will display an increase in employability skills as measured by self-report in pre and post participation surveys.

*Hypothesis 3.2:* By the end of the six-week program, youth participants will display an increase in mastery and future orientation as it relates to employability skills as measured by self-report in pre and post participation surveys.

## **II. Literature Review**

The successful transition from youth to adulthood is not only critical to individual development but also the well-being of society. The societal consequences of a well-educated citizenry include increased productivity, lower crime rates, and increased community service. Unfortunately, many issues plaguing youth in the United States—including poverty, sexual

---

<sup>6</sup> Sixty-five percent was used as a cut off as previous research of summer youth employment programs have used this cut off.

health, substance abuse, low academic achievement, and crime—hinder this successful transition

In addition, in today's economy, making a successful transition into adulthood often requires not only finishing high school but also earning a post-secondary education or training credential and obtaining and maintaining a job (Harvard Graduate School of Education (HGSE), 2011).

This is of specific importance to youth from urban areas where statistics show that nationally, African American and urban youth are predisposed to more negative health and social outcomes than their Asian-American and White counterparts due to poverty, educational inequalities, environmental threats, and access to health care (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010). In 2009, about one in four African American youth was considered disconnected from education and work (Ross, 2011). Also, low-income African American youth are faced with limited resources and generally have the poorest record of student academic success (Thomas, 2000). These negative outcomes make it especially imperative to focus resources and opportunities in this population.

Specifically in DC, in 2007, only 43 percent of DC youth graduated from high school within five years and only 29 percent of those students enrolled in post-secondary education within 18 months of graduation (Double the Numbers (DTN), 2006). Moreover, DC Public Schools' (DCPS) students have the fourth highest dropout rate in the nation (DTN, 2006). Furthermore, 67 percent of DC's youth cannot find viable employment (Urban Alliance (UA), 2010; Annie Casey Foundation, 2011) while continuing in school working toward graduation. In fact, in 2003, 29 percent of DC's youth (ages 18 to 24 years) were not in school, not working, and had not attained a high school diploma (UA, 2010).

### ***Significance of Youth Employment Programs***

Young people who work are more likely to graduate, less likely to be involved with crime, less likely to become teenage parents, and more likely to achieve greater lifetime earnings (Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children, 2011). Furthermore, work experience benefits youth by providing them with opportunities that assist in the development of employability skills including social responsibility, communication, professionalism, and teamwork. In addition, work experiences provide career exploration, financial benefits, education, work preparedness, and future employment. Lastly, exposure to work during adolescence assists in the growth of adult identities through opportunities for increased responsibility, financial independence, and exposure to adult roles and expectations (HGSE, 2011). By providing career exposure and opportunities to youth, employers are able to provide these benefits to youth. In addition, employers also gain from the work experiences of youth and receive benefits such as increased productivity and opportunities to train future workers (Martinson, 2010).

### ***Career Exposure and Awareness***

Youth in low-income urban areas lack the information or the connections to help them determine and obtain jobs that match their interests (McClanahan, Sipe and Smith, 2004). At home, low-income parents often lack the knowledge and resources to provide this exposure to their children, as they may not have knowledge of higher education or diverse careers (America's Promise, 2011). In addition, youth may not have opportunities to gain this exposure in schools. Although career guidance and counseling is a component of the traditional school system, it is often inadequate due to high ratios of students to counselors as well as the fact that many counselors are trained in the area of mental health and do not have the expertise or training to provide high quality career guidance (HGSE, 2011).

It is important for youth to not only gain awareness of careers and fields of study, but also to learn how to translate their personal interests and strengths to specific careers and educational options that match these interests and strengths. Without this, youth may have limited aspirations for careers and fields of study. The lack of adequate guidance often leads students to pursue courses in which they are not engaged, which may serve as a precursor for dropping out of high school. Providing a visible connection between a program of study and tangible opportunities in the work world reduces the likelihood of this (HGSE, 2011). This helps students prepare for future academic training as it relates to their future career goals. Employment programs can help inform youth about career and educational options and motivate them to see the connection between high school studies and work (Whalen, DeCoursey and Skyles, 2003).

### ***Financial and Social Benefits***

Youth with limited work experience also face limited earnings later in life, perpetuating the cycle of poverty (Ross, 2011). Employment and academic training during adolescence provides opportunities to assist individuals become self-sufficient adults. Youth employment programs have been found to provide long-term benefits such as higher annual earnings, greater likelihood of receiving fringe benefits, and higher status occupations (Jekielek, Cochran and Hair, 2002). This is important to note as urban youth are more susceptible to the consequences of economic fluctuations due to lack of employment themselves and of their parents. When the economy is doing well, usually their well-being improves also. However, when the economy falls, they experience more hardships than their White counterparts (Land, 2010).

Employment programs can also have a benefit on health outcomes of youth. For example, low-income, teenaged males who cannot find work are more likely to become

connected with the law and females are more likely to become single mothers (HGSE, 2011).

This might be due to the fact that employment programs have natural opportunities for mentorship as well as provide a structured opportunity afterschool. In addition, it has been found that youth who earn their own money access social services such as medical care (Bauermeister, Zimmerman, Gee, Caldwell and Zue, 2009). These benefits show the importance of employment programs.

### ***Work Preparedness***

It is vital to prepare youth for the workplace. Reducing the share of youth with low or no qualifications for the workplace is vital in addressing the challenges facing youth in America (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009). Traditionally, adolescence is a period where youth are structured to engage in long-term academic preparation instead of activities that expose them to the adult world (Whalen et al, 2003). This causes youth to not be exposed to workplace norms, foundational skills, and to have unrealistic expectations about the work world.

Employers believe that youth are not equipped with the adequate skills needed to succeed in today's workforce (HGSE, 2011). For example, according to a survey of several hundred employers, 80 percent rated professionalism and work ethic as the most important skills needed by entrants to succeed in today's workforce and that over 40 percent of new entrants with a high school diploma are poorly prepared in these skills (Casner-Lotto and Barrington, 2006). Furthermore, human resource executives interviewed emphasized the need for proper dress, strong interviewing and communication skills and an understanding of the job application process (Casner-Lotto et al, 2006).

Work experience helps youth develop these necessary employability skills. For example, working adolescents were found to describe themselves as possessing qualities such as being dependable, punctual, and responsible more often than nonworking adolescents (Greenberger and Steinberg, 1986). This is important not only for individual growth but also for productivity.

By providing employment experiences early, youth are exposed to employment skills that will follow them through future careers.

### ***Role of Employers***

Employment not only benefits young people but employers as well. Employers can increase their financial and productivity goals by investing in a skilled workforce, particularly in the current economic environment (Martinson, 2010). For example, employers spend over \$400 billion a year in providing both formal and informal training to employees who have already completed their schooling and are currently working full-time (Casner-Lotto et al, 2006). By providing jobs through youth employment programs, not only are employers preparing youth at an early age for employment, but can also rely on the program to support early training efforts at a low cost. This allows for employers to spend less time and costs on training while preparing their future workforce.

Employers also play an important role in preparing youth for successful transition into adulthood. Not only do they provide opportunities for work-linked learning but often also play a role as advisor and trainer in relevant skills (Casner-Lotto et al., 2006). Furthermore, employers provide natural exposure to careers and youth development practice. Employers can provide developmental assets to youth that no other setting can fully duplicate. For example, they can provide exposure to the mainstream economy, practices of the working world, authentic

information about career options and paths, and opportunities to apply formal learning to solve real-world problems in a team setting (Whalen et al, 2003).

### **III. Methodology**

#### ***Overview***

This study consists of two components: a process evaluation and an outcome evaluation. The process evaluation examines the operation of the DC SYEP, including services provided, participant characteristics, and enrollment of participants. This allows for feedback on the processes for implementing the program with the intention of improving the program (McDavid and Hawthorn, 2006). Specifically in this evaluation this component includes measures of services provided (characteristics of the participants, enrollment of participants, program offerings leading to learning opportunities), use (youth attendance) and satisfaction (youth and supervisor satisfaction). A pre participation (pre) survey and a post participation (post) survey are used to collection information from youth on their experience and satisfaction with the program. A separate post survey is used to collect information from supervisors on their satisfaction with the program. In addition, focus groups and interviews provide further insight to satisfaction with the program. Lastly, SYEP records provide demographic characteristics of the youth enrolled in the program.

The outcome evaluation provides information on the effects of the program on youth behaviors. It follows a single group pre-post design to measure the short-term effects of SYEP on employability skills and mastery and future orientation as it relates to career goals. This allows for feedback on whether the program is successful in reaching its objectives and provides recommendations for further implementation and replication. The pre and post surveys were



used to collect information on the youth's perceptions of the outcomes at the beginning and end of the program.

To assess achievement of the program objectives and research questions, both qualitative and quantitative methods were used. Youth and supervisor surveys were developed specifically for this study to capture how the youth and supervisors' satisfaction with the program how the youth perceived the program had an effect on their employability skills, mastery and future orientation, and provided learning opportunities geared towards these outcomes with the program. Focus groups with youth and employers that participated in the 2011 DC SYEP were used to obtain anecdotal information of the youth and supervisors about their experiences with the DC SYEP.

### ***Study Population***

Youth and supervisors were selected to participate in this study based on their participation in the DC SYEP. All participants were identified by the DC SYEP and all initial contact with the participants including providing information about the evaluation as well as disseminating the surveys was made through the DC SYEP staff. The eligible study population included the youth (n=12,651) and adults (n=2,243) who applied and served as participants and supervisors, respectively, to the 2011 DC SYEP. The inclusion criteria required a youth participant or supervisor to be accepted and enrolled in the DC SYEP in order to be eligible to participate in the study. This was necessary because the study is focusing on the experiences and impact of participation in the program. A data sharing agreement as well as specific evaluation tasks to be completed was obtained in May 2011 through a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between DOES, which administers the DC youth program and CYITC

which provides the curriculum and training to DOES, and where the author of this paper was employed while conducting the study.

The youth survey was administered at the start of the program and again at the end of the program via Zoomerang<sup>7</sup>, an online survey software. The youth survey remained open through the first two weeks of the program and again the last week and three weeks following the conclusion of the program to help increase response rates. Youth received a link to complete the questionnaire through an email sent by the DC SYEP staff to all participants. This email also explained the purpose of the evaluation and consent requirements and details. A reminder email was sent both for the pre and post surveys. No compensation was given outside of the regular pay that is provided during work hours.

The supervisor survey was administered the last week of the program via Zoomerang and remained open until the end of September 2011 (a total of five weeks). Initial requests to complete the survey were sent from the DC SYEP staff by email to all participating supervisors at the conclusion of the program. In order to increase the response rate, two additional reminder emails were sent in early September as well as one week before the survey was scheduled to close. Copies of correspondence with youth participants and supervisors, and the youth participant and supervisor surveys are attached (see Appendix A).

Individuals engaging in the focus groups were recruited by the DC SYEP staff. An email was sent inviting all the DC SYEP supervisors and youth-participants to participate in a discussion of their experiences with participating in the DC SYEP. Those interested in participating replied to the DC SYEP staff and the staff followed up with provision of the logistical information. Four supervisor focus groups and two youth-participant focus groups

---

<sup>7</sup> See <http://www.zoomerang.com>

took place at the DOES located in Ward 7. A third youth focus group took place at a local community-based organization (CBO) which is located in Ward 6. Transportation funding and refreshments were provided.

Interviews with 17 supervisors were held by telephone to gain further insight into strengths, challenges, as well as feedback for the program. Interviews were conducted in addition to focus groups to provide supervisors who were unable to attend the focus groups or those supervisors who wanted a more intimate climate, an opportunity to participate in the evaluation. The author sent an email providing this opportunity to a random sample of 100 supervisors whose contact information was provided by DC SYEP. The author conducted phone calls with the supervisors from September to November and each interview lasted about 45 minutes.

#### *Survey Respondents*

An attempt was made to have all youth participants (n=12,651) complete the survey; however, only a 7.3 percent response rate for the pre survey (n= 931) and 7.0 percent response rate for the post survey (n=888) were achieved. According to Fitz-Gibbon and Morris (1987), for a population size of over 10,000, an adequate sample size is 350 (Fitz-Gibbon et al, 1987). This allows for ample consideration for dropouts, non-responses, and those youth under 18 years that were not able to obtain parental consent. Analysis of this subgroup of respondents showed similar representation of the total youth population with respect to age, ward of residence, and grade level of the youth. Therefore, the findings from the survey can also be representative of the entire DC SYEP youth participant population. All participating supervisors (n=2,243) were also invited to participate in the survey process. A total of 213 supervisors completed the supervisor survey, generating a 9 percent response rate (n=2,243).

### *Focus Group and Interview Respondents*

The subjects in the three youth focus groups included 60 youth (n=24, n=13, n=23) ranging from the ages of 14 to 21 years. There were approximately an equal number of males and females and ages represented in each of the focus groups. The first two focus groups only included participants in the DC SYEP, however the third focus group included 10 youth who applied for the program but did not participate due to the limited spaces available for the program or not turning in their eligibility documents. These youth were recruited via DOES through an email sent to participants who applied for the program but were not accepted. These youth were asked via DOES to participate to provide feedback on the application process and what the youth did during the summer instead of participating in the program.

The subjects in the four supervisor focus groups included 92 supervisors (n=15, n=22, n=33, n=22). These subjects represented CBO, private corporations, and government agencies including schools, however a majority (over 80%) was from CBO and government agencies with the remaining from private corporations.

Telephone interviews were conducted with an additional 17 supervisors, which included representatives from all types of host agencies, and new supervisors (six) as well as supervisors returning to the DC SYEP. All of the participants who participated in the interviews also completed the survey.

### *Protection of Human Subjects*

Ethical approval to conduct this study was granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of The George Washington University (GWU) School of Public Health and Health Services in Washington, DC (IRB# 61125). Eligible participants were identified by the DC SYEP staff and all email communication including sending the link for the surveys and

coordination of the focus groups took place by the DC SYEP staff. However, supervisors recruited for the interviews were chosen at random by the DC SYEP staff and the researcher was provided this randomly generated list of 100 potential participants and their contact information. The researcher then scheduled and conducted interviews with those that responded to an email asking for their interest in participating.

Informed consent (a copy is provided in Appendix A) was obtained from all individuals enrolled in the study as well as their parents if they were under the age of 18 years. If minor youth expressed interest in participating, a consent form was sent home with the child to their parents by their supervisor and returned to the researcher via scanned emails or fax. Youth 18 years and over and supervisors signed the consent electronically on the first page of the survey and via a link sent to participate in the interviews or focus groups.

Participation in the study was completely voluntary and participants could discontinue participating at any given time with no consequences. Furthermore, the questions asked were not intended to be of a sensitive nature. Confidentiality was ensured to participants by removal of any personally identifiable information, such as names, when collecting and sharing data; and completion of the surveys, focus groups or interviews did not create any risk of harm to participants. Aside from the time spent completing the surveys and/or participating in the focus groups or interviews, there were no costs to youth or supervisors associated with participating in the study.

### ***Data Sources and Collection Methods***

This study follows a single group pre-post design utilizing both qualitative and quantitative techniques including interviews and focus groups, surveys, and SYEP records to

obtain characteristics of youth and supervisors; and their experiences, successes, and challenges in the program; and overall development. The study time period is the six-week program period.

**Figure 1. Design Notation for Outcome Evaluation – Youth-Participants**

6 Weeks			
	Pre Survey	DC SYEP	Post Survey
E	O	X	O
<b>E</b> SYEP Youth Participants <b>X</b> DC SYEP <b>O</b> Observation			

#### *Youth Survey*

A survey was created to assess the short-term, six week outcomes as well as participants' overall experiences with SYEP (see Figure 1). The specific purpose of the survey was to measure the scope, quality, and satisfaction of youth participation in the DC SYEP as well as the effect of the DC SYEP on their employability skills and mastery and future orientation as it relates to employability (research questions 1, 2, and 3).

The survey instrument was developed using items from existing surveys such as Detroit's Summer Youth Employment Program Evaluation 2010, MyCom Summer Work Readiness Assessment, and The Colorado Trust Youth Participant Survey (Shanks and McGee, 2010; Flannery et al, 2009, The Colorado Trust, 2004; Nielsen and McGhee, 2005). These surveys addressed youth employment experiences as well as risk behaviors. The final pre participation survey included 73 closed-ended questions and the final post participation survey included 74 closed-ended questions (see Appendix B and C). The total time associated with taking the survey was 10 to 15 minutes.

Face validity, which is the degree to which an instrument appears to measure what it is designed to measure, was assessed for the new instrument by having non-experts in the youth development field review the survey as well as by pilot testing the survey using a convenience sample of ten youth who previously participated in the program but did not this year due to age restriction or missing application deadlines. These two groups assessed the length and readability of the questions. Specifically the non-experts were chosen on the basis that they could provide input on if the questions asked seemed to pertain to the programs and outcomes, and youth were chosen because they are familiar with the program and could provide feedback on how understandable and relevant they felt the questions were.

Content validity, the extent to which a tool reflects the intended domain of content, was assessed by a panel of experts including two faculty members at GWU and three researchers in the youth development field. This panel was chosen as they have experience with youth development programs and evaluation methods. They were specifically asked to judge the relevance of the items on the survey. After the pilot testing, no major areas of inquiry were changed within the survey instrument.

#### *Supervisor Survey*

A supervisor post-program survey was developed to gather information on satisfaction with the DC SYEP (see Appendix D). This survey was intended to be descriptive and gather information on program implementation. The survey included items adapted from Detroit's Summer Youth Program 2010 Evaluation (Shanks et al, 2010). The survey consisted of 34 closed-ended questions that collected information on respondent demographics and experiences with the 2011 program. The total time associated with taking the survey was 10 minutes.

Content and face validity were also assessed with the supervisor survey as it is an adapted version of an existing survey. Face validity was assessed by pilot-testing of the survey with a convenience sample of five supervisors who had previously participated in SYEP was conducted as they had experience with the program and could provide feedback on questions that should be removed or asked. In addition, content validity was examined by experts in the field, such as SYEP staff and GWU faculty, reviewed the survey and specifically assessed the length, readability, and overall content of the survey questions. After the pilot testing, no major areas of inquiry were changed within the survey instrument.

#### *SYEP Records*

SYEP records provide information regarding characteristics of the work sites that host the youths' employment experiences and the characteristics and total enrollment of youth participants. The DC SYEP provided these records at the end of the 2011 summer program. Specific de-identified information included the ward in which the youth resides, age of youth, and education level of youth.

#### *Focus Group*

A focus group protocol was developed for youth-participants and supervisors with input from SYEP staff regarding specific programmatic feedback they wanted including the overall application process and selection of youth (see Appendix E). The purpose of the focus groups was to provide a snap shot of perspectives and perceptions or anecdotal information to supplement the survey and administrative data or SYEP records (Creswell, 2003). The youth focus group included 37 guiding questions in 7 categories. The supervisor focus group included 52 guiding questions in 5 categories. It should be noted that qualitative assessments are not subject to internal and external validity criteria.



Each focus group session began with a brief introductory presentation about the DC SYEP 2011, which was developed by the DC SYEP staff as well as discussed the purpose of the focus group. After the introductory presentation, general questions such as overall experience of participation were asked. The participants were then placed in random groups of six where they were asked further questions about their SYEP experience using the appropriate protocol. The DC SYEP staff conducted the focus groups, with the help of the researcher, to take advantage of the fact that the DC SYEP staff had developed a good relationship with the supervisors and the youth-participants. The total time of each focus group was between one and two hours.

### *Interviews*

A structured interview protocol was developed consisting of 27 open-ended questions. Questions addressed supervisors' satisfaction and experience with SYEP, their perceptions regarding the SYEP's progress towards meeting the program's objectives of providing youth meaningful work experiences and strengths and challenges of program implementation (see Appendix F). In addition, supervisors were asked to provide recommendations for future SYEP programming offerings. Each interview took between 45 minutes and one hour.

The focus groups and interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

### *Description of Variables*

Variables for demographics, learning opportunities, satisfaction, employability, and mastery and future orientation were created using items from the youth surveys (with the exception of supervisor satisfaction which utilized one item from the supervisor survey). Table 1 lists these variables, their level of measurement, and possible score ranges. For the youth outcomes, responses to Yes/No and Likert-scaled questions were used to create continuous

variables representing each of these outcomes. Reverse coding for questions in which higher scores were more negative, occurred for questions, as necessary.

*Demographics:*

Descriptive variables were created using responses to demographic questions regarding gender/sex (coded 0 if female and 1 if male), ethnicity/race (coded 0 if other and 1 if black), and age (coded 1 if 14 or 15 years, 2 if 16 or 17 years, 3 if 18 to 21 years). Ages were grouped based on several dimensions that differentiated them: SYEP provides youth 14 and 15 years with opportunities to work a maximum of 20 hours per week in placements that are geared towards work readiness skills; 16 and 17 year olds are most likely those that attended the program in the past and now work a maximum of 25 hours per week in positions that allow them to practice work skills they may have gained in previous experiences; and 18 to 21 year olds are similar to the 16-17 year old group, but are most likely out of high school. Ward was categorized as 1 if youth resides in Wards 1 or 4; 2 if resides in Wards 2, 3, or 6; 3 if resides in Ward 7, or 4 if resides Ward 8. These categories were chosen as each of the Wards that were paired has similar social demographics. Education level was coded as 1 if the youth was in high school or below, 2 if graduated high school and not attended college, 3 if currently in college, 4 if had some college but did not complete, and 5 if graduated from college. Lastly, prior participation in the DC SYEP was coded as 0 if the youth was a new participant, 1 if it was their second summer participating in the program, 2 if third summer, and 3 if they had participated four or more summers.

### *Learning Opportunities:*

The variable “learning opportunities” was created using an item from the youth post survey “What job skills do you think you learned through participating in SYEP?” (0 if selected “I learned nothing from participating in SYEP.” and 1 if selected a skill learned).

### *Satisfaction:*

The variable “satisfaction” was created using an item from the post survey “Overall, how satisfied are you with your participation in SYEP?” and coded 1 if very satisfied, 2 if somewhat satisfied, and 3 if not satisfied at all.

### *Employability:*

A variable “employability” was created from youth responses to eight Yes/No questions. A summated rating scale was derived from responses to specific questions (where 0 was given if response was “No” and 1 if response was “Yes”): “Do you think that there are rules you are expected to follow at work?”; “Do you think you should ask questions if you do not understand what you are supposed to do at work?”; “Do you feel like you have to call your supervisor if you are going to be just a few minutes late?”; “Do you feel it would be okay to take off a few days from work without telling your supervisor?”; “Do you think it is important to have a clean and neat appearance at work?”; “Do you have a cover letter?”; and “Do you have a resume?” Higher scores suggest a positive outcome or increase in the likelihood of employability.

### *Mastery and Future Orientation:*

A variable “mastery and future orientation” was created from youth responses to one question with a Yes/No response and two questions with a Likert-scaled response, which included three optional responses, but was converted to a dichotomous variable (Yes/No) as described next. The variable was created by using a summated rating scale derived from

responses to the following questions (where 0 was given if the response was “No” and 1 if the response was “Yes”): “Can you name three careers you are interested in?”; “How much do you think the things you may learn in SYEP will help you later in life?” (“Yes” if responded, “Help me very much.” or “Help me a little bit.”, and “No” if responded, “Not help me at all.”); and “How optimistic are you about your future?” (“Yes” if responded “The future looks great.” or “The future looks ok.” and “No” if responded, “The future looks very bad.”) Higher total scores indicate higher perception of mastery and future.

**Table 1. Youth Participant Survey Variables**

Variable	# of Items	Level of Measurement	Possible Range
<b>Demographics</b>			
Gender/Sex	1	Nominal	0 = female 1 = male
Age	1	Ordinal	1 = 14 – 15 years 2 = 16 – 17 years 3 = 18 – 21 years
Ward	1	Ordinal	1 = wards 1 and 4 2 = wards 2, 3, and 6 3 = ward 7 4 = ward 8
Ethnicity/Race	1	Nominal	0 = other 1 = black
Education Level	1	Nominal	1 = high school or below 2 = high school, no college 3 = currently in college 4 = some college 5 = graduate from college
Prior Participant	1	Nominal	0 = new participant 1 = second summer 2 = third summer 3 = four summers or more
<b>Learning Opportunities</b>			
Gained Job Skills	1	Nominal	0 = no 1 = yes
<b>Satisfaction</b>			
Youth Satisfaction	1	Ordinal	1 = very satisfied 2 = somewhat satisfied 3 = not satisfied at all
Supervisor Satisfaction	1	Ordinal	1 = very satisfied 2 = somewhat satisfied 3 = not satisfied at all
<b>Youth Outcomes</b>			
Employability	7	Continuous	0 – 8
Mastery and Future	3	Continuous	0 – 4

### ***Data Analysis Procedures***

All quantitative data was analyzed using Statistical Analysis System (SAS) version 9.3. All qualitative data was analyzed using NVIVO 8.0. Review of data, including double entry and data checks, was implemented to ensure data accuracy and assumptions are met for the statistical tests being conducted.

### ***Descriptive Analysis***

Univariate analysis was conducted to provide descriptive statistics on all participants as well as those who completed the survey (sample characteristics). Specifically, frequency distribution was conducted on age, gender/sex, highest grade completed, parents' education level, ethnicity/race, language spoken at home, years participating in the DC SYEP, and parents or guardians employment status. These findings relate to the process evaluation to see if the program reached the intended population.

### ***Test of Hypotheses***

The hypotheses for the three research questions were tested as outlined below. An alpha of 0.05 was used to assess the significance of findings.

Hypothesis 1.1: At the end of the six-week program, at least 65 percent of the youth participants will report via survey that they were learned skills geared towards (1) employability and (2) mastery and future orientation.

To test hypothesis 1.1, a one-tailed, directional z-test for single binomial proportion was employed. The research question examined one population (youth participants) with one categorical binomial variable (engaging opportunities – yes or no) and a predefined proportion (65 percent).

Hypothesis 2.1: At the end of the six-week program, at least 65 percent of youth participants will be satisfied with their overall participation in the program.

To test hypothesis 2.1, a one-tailed, directional z-test for single binomial proportion was employed. The research question examined one population (youth participant) with one categorical variable (satisfaction – very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not satisfied at all) and a predefined proportion (65 percent). Specifically, the level tested was “very satisfied.”

Hypothesis 2.2: At the end of the six-week program, at least 65 percent of supervisors will be very satisfied with their overall participation in the program.

To test hypothesis 2.2, a one-tailed, directional z-test for single binomial proportion was employed. The research question examined one population (supervisor) with one categorical variable (satisfaction – very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not satisfied at all) and a predefined proportion (65 percent). Specifically, the level tested was “very satisfied.”

Hypothesis 3.1: By the end of the six-week program, youth participants will display an increase in employability skills as measured by self-report in pre and post participation surveys.

Hypothesis 3.2: By the end of the six-week program, youth participants will display an increase in mastery and future orientation as it relates to employability skills as measured by self-report in pre and post participation surveys.

To test hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2, a one-tailed paired samples t-test was employed for each respective outcome (employability and mastery and future orientation). The research question examined one population and two mean scores (pre and post survey) that are likely correlated with each other. Due to this correlation, the mean of the differences must be tested rather than the difference of the means.

Next, a multiple linear regression was conducted on each respective outcome (employability and mastery and future orientation) to assess if demographics (including gender/sex, age, ethnicity/race, education level, Ward, and prior participation) were predictive of a difference if it was seen. Lastly, multivariate linear regression was conducted to assess if demographics (categorical variables including gender/sex, age, ethnicity/race, education level, Ward, and prior participation) affected the relationship between pre and post survey scores (continuous variables).

Due to the fact that the same youth did not take the pre and post surveys, data had to be matched on demographic characteristics to account for this missing data. The demographics were equivalent for those youth who took the pre survey and those who took the post survey respondents making this possible. To estimate the missing pre survey and post survey scores for each of the three outcomes (employability and mastery and future) each outcome variable was regressed on each of the demographic variables to create a regression model. These models were then used to complete this missing data. This “new” dataset was used with the data analysis procedures explained above for hypotheses 3.1 and 3.2. The results of this study should be considered cautiously due to the repeat here.

### *Qualitative Analysis*

All interviews and focus groups were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim for analysis. Once the initial data was transcribed, coding was completed to retrieve pre-determined concepts (see section for discussion of coding). The coded data was then reviewed to determine emerging concepts of participant-youth and supervisor experiences and future recommendations for SYEP.



### *Study Limitations*

It must be emphasized that this research comprises a pilot study, since the DC SYEP has not undergone an outcome evaluation in the past. However, the organization engaged in a qualitative assessment of program offerings and satisfaction of the supervisor participants in 2010. Findings from this study are intended to not only provide results on short-term youth participant outcomes but also provide recommendations for future the DC SYEP programming and provide preliminary information to set the stage for future evaluations. The evaluation was developed in a limited time frame to ensure that it could be implemented during the summer of 2011 and provide DOES with much-needed preliminary results in a timely manner. Therefore, the evaluation was designed as the necessary starting point for a longer term process. This study is intended to serve as a baseline; future iterations of the evaluation, including improvements to survey and interview questions, are intended to provide DOES with increasingly useful information.

Furthermore, measurement tools, i.e., the surveys and focus groups and interview protocols, were developed specifically for this pilot study and procedures were designed to reach the largest number of youth participants served by the DC SYEP. Further validity testing of the surveys should occur to ensure that the tools are measuring what they are intended to measure. The data relies heavily on self-reported information which can be unintentionally biased due to recall bias.

Another limitation of this study was the necessity of relying on the DC SYEP staff to distribute the surveys. As the researcher could not ensure that the survey was being distributed in a timely manner, this posed a control issue. Also, while instructions were clear and precise, this does not eliminate the possibility that the DC SYEP staff and/or supervisors may have

influenced the participants' responses for example, by being present while the youth completed the survey.

Lastly, as this evaluation was performed for the DC SYEP, the relationship between academia/research and social service practice needs to be taken into account. The goals for this study and those for the DC SYEP need to be balanced with the needs of the author conducting this study as part of academic requirements. This was a limitation, as many best practices for research—such as having unbiased parties distribute the surveys—could not be incorporated due to policies of the DC SYEP.

#### **IV. Findings**

The process evaluation results are assessed through the descriptive analysis of the characteristics of all youth participants and characteristics of the youth from the study sample (pre and post surveys completed), as well as the testing of hypotheses 1 (learning opportunities) and 2 (satisfaction). This is complemented with the outcome findings through the testing of hypothesis 3 (employability skills and mastery and future orientation).

##### ***Descriptive Analysis (Youth and Supervisor Enrollment and Program Offerings)***

###### ***SYEP Youth Participants***

Table 2a and 2b show the demographic and academic characteristics of all participants (N=12,651) and sample (N=931 in pre survey and N=888 in post survey), respectively. SYEP served about an equal number of males (N=5,664 or 45 percent) and females (N=6,987 or 55 percent). In addition, a majority of the youth were in high school or below (76 percent) and between the ages of 14 and 17 years (62 percent) (M = 16.87 years, SD = 2.00). Although youth participated from all wards, most of the participants came from Wards 7 and 8 combined (53 percent). Most of the youth identified themselves as Black (Non-Hispanic) (93 percent). Lastly,

the DC SYEP has a high retention rate with about 88 percent of the participants returning to participate from a previous year.

#### *SYEP Youth Participant Study Sample*

The pre and post survey respondents included two-thirds female (67 percent and 67 percent, respectively) and one-third males (33 percent and 33 percent, respectively). Over half the participants were ages 14 to 17 years (about 55 percent in the pre survey and 57 percent in the post survey) and from wards 7 and 8 (52 percent in the pre survey and 48 percent in the post survey). There was a high non-response rate on the surveys for youth identifying their Ward (20 percent pre participation and 23 percent post survey) which could be due to youth not knowing in which Ward they live. Similar to the all DC SYEP youth participants (93 percent), a majority of the youth (over 90 percent) in the sample identified themselves as Black (Non-Hispanic). In addition, over half of the study participants live with their mother (57 percent pre and 60 percent post survey). In addition, most of the participants lived in a household with three or more people and in which English was the primary language (92 percent). The highest education level obtained by a parent most often reported was high school or a GED (41 percent in the pre and 31 percent in the post survey), however there also was a high percentage of a parent having some college (30 percent in the pre and 30 percent in the post survey) or college and above (27 in the pre and 31 percent in the post survey). In addition, it was found that about 80 percent of youth in the pre survey, as compared with 70 percent in the post survey, has at least one parent currently employed in the post survey.

**Table 2a. Demographic Characteristics of SYEP Youth Participants**

Characteristic	SYEP Youth		DC Youth <sup>†</sup>	
	N Total = 12,651	%	N Total=69,352	%
Gender/Sex				
Female	6,987	55%	36,615	53%*
Male	5,664	45%	32,737	47%*
Age				
14	1,736	14%	5,140	7%
15	2,049	16%	5,347	8%
16	2,060	16%	5,659	8%
17	2,051	16%	6,008	9%
18	1,869	15%	9,656	14%
19	1,339	11%	13,249	19%
20	982	8%	12,516	18%
21	565	4%	11,777	17%
Ward				
1	829	7%	7,603	11%*
2	258	2%	14,196	20%*
3	60	<1%	7,678	11%*
4	1,563	12%	6,269	9%*
5	2,096	17%	9,478	14%*
6	1,018	8%	4,836	7%*
7	3,444	28%	9,060	13%*
8	3,245	26%	10,232	15%*
No Response	138	-	-	-
Ethnicity/Race				
American Indian	61	<1%	-	-
Asian (Non-Hispanic)	72	<1%	-	-
Black (Non-Hispanic)	10,576	93%	-	-
Hispanic/Latino	385	3%	-	-
Pacific Islander	8	<1%	-	-
White (Non-Hispanic)	36	<1%	-	-
Other	230	2%	-	-
No Response	1,283	-	-	-
Education Level				
High School or Below	9,631	76%	-	-
High School Graduate	1,066	9%	-	-
GED Recipient	232	2%	-	-
Left High School No Graduate	186	1%	-	-
College Student	1,530	12%	-	-
No Response	6	-	-	-
Prior SYEP Participant				
Yes	11,131	88%	-	-
No	1,520	12%	-	-

\*Comparison of SYEP youth demographics to overall DC youth population found that all \* are comparable (p<0.05) except age.

<sup>†</sup> These figures include enrollment of non-DC students in universities (Source: Census, 2011).

**Table 2b. Demographic Characteristics of SYEP Youth Survey Respondents**

Youth Sample Characteristic	Pre Survey <sup>F</sup>		Post Survey <sup>F</sup>	
	N Total = 931	%	N Total = 888	%
Gender/Sex	920	99%	879	99%
Male	305	33%	293	33%
Female	615	67%	586	67%
No Response	11	-	9	-
Age	912	98%	869	98
14	109	12%	94	11%
15	173	19%	160	18%
16	140	15%	126	15%
17	122	13%	117	13%
18	143	16%	138	16%
19	97	10%	107	12%
20	75	8%	76	9%
21	53	6%	51	6%
No Response	19	-	19	-
Ward	747	80%	733	83%
1	36	5%	40	5%
2	16	2%	16	3%
3	22	3%	7	1%
4	121	16%	116	13%
5	103	14%	96	11%
6	64	8%	74	8%
7	172	23%	183	21%
8	213	29%	201	23%
No Response	184	-	155	-
Ethnicity/Race	892	96%	824	93%
American Indian or Alaska Native	8	<1%	5	1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8	<1%	7	1%
Black or African American	827	93%	783	95%
Hispanic or Latino	42	5%	22	2%
White	7	<1%	7	1%
No Response	39	-	64	-
Prior SYEP Participant	910	98%	831	94%
New Participant	225	24%	217	26%
Second Summer	207	23%	180	22%
Third Summer	214	24%	196	23%
Four of More Summers	264	29%	238	29%
No Response	20	-	57	-

Continued on the next page.

**Table 2b. Demographic Characteristics of SYEP Youth Survey Respondents—Continued**

Youth Sample Characteristic	Pre Survey <sup>†</sup>		Post Survey <sup>†</sup>	
	N Total = 931	%	N Total = 888	%
Highest Level of Education	915	98%	868	98%
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade or Lower	73	8%	64	7%
9 <sup>th</sup> Grade	181	20%	153	18%
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade	151	17%	162	19%
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade	163	18%	141	16%
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade	139	15%	154	18%
High School/GED and No College	56	6%	36	4%
Freshman in College	60	7%	81	9%
Sophomore in College	51	6%	45	5%
Junior in College	25	3%	20	2%
Senior in College	7	<1%	7	1%
Left College Before Completing	4	<1%	4	<1%
Graduated from College	5	<1%	1	<1%
No Response	16	-	20	-
Family Structure	918	99%	861	97%
Lives with Both Mother and Father	219	24%	201	24%
Lives with Father	50	5%	36	4%
Lives with Mother	554	57%	520	60%
Other	95	10%	104	12%
No Response	13	-	27	-
Household Size	874	94%	866	98%
1	13	1%	13	1%
2	122	14%	120	14%
3	220	25%	205	24%
4	220	25%	209	24%
5	155	18%	146	17%
6 or More	144	17%	173	20%
No Response	57	-	22	-
Parent Education Level	834	90%	771	87 %
Middle School/Junior High School	22	2%	27	4%
High School or GED	340	41%	273	35%
Some College	247	30%	235	30%
College or Above	225	27%	236	31%
No Response	97	-	117	-
At Least 1 Parent Employed	849	90%	773	87%
Yes	678	80%	624	70%
No	171	20%	149	17%
No Response	82	-	115	13%
Primary Language	917	96%	844	95%
English	879	96%	816	92%
Spanish	23	3%	15	2%
Other	15	1%	13	2%
No Response	14	-	44	5%

<sup>†</sup> These numbers represent the number and percent who responded to each question.

### *Job Placements*

The largest number of host work sites (38 percent) and positions (34 percent) available to the youth were through the local, non-profit, CBOs. Fifty-two percent of youth were employed in DC Public Charter School (DCPCS), DC Public Schools (DCPS), and DC Agencies. In addition, the DC agencies provided the largest number of supervisors (40 percent). Table 3 provides this information and other statistics on employer organizations.

**Table 3. Supervisor Organizations**

Type of Organization	Total Host Work Sites N Total=465	Total Supervisors N Total=2,243	Total Positions at Each Site N Total=16,629
DCPCS	22 (5%)	52 (1%)	1,303 (8%)
DCPS	13 (3%)	74 (2%)	655 (4%)
DC Agency	76 (16%)	1,090 (48%)	6,692 (40%)
Federal Agency	46 (10%)	235 (10%)	791 (5%)
Non-Profit CBO	179 (38%)	612 (27%)	5,802 (34%)
Private Sector	129 (28%)	280 (12%)	1,476 (9%)

### *SYEP Supervisor Study Sample*

Analysis of the characteristics of the sample of supervisor survey respondents to all of the DC SYEP supervisors, found that the sub-sample of respondents is comparable representation of the total supervisor population with respect to type of organization (see Table 4 below) therefore results of the survey can be generalizable to the total DC SYEP supervisors. Most supervisors are executive directors or program managers (63 percent). In addition, many of the supervisors are returning to participate for another summer in the DC SYEP, with over half participating for three or more summers. This high retention rate (74 percent) shows commitment to the program. In addition, more than half have been employed with their organization or agency for over five years. Most of the work sites hosted one to ten youth (47 percent). Lastly, a majority of the supervisors reported that the main purpose of their

organization or agency was to serve youth (25 percent) or provide educational activities (21 percent).

**Table 4. Characteristics of SYEP Supervisor Survey Participants**

Characteristic	Supervisor Respondents	
	N	%
	Total = 213	
Type of Organization		
Government Agency	70	34%
For-Profit Organization	22	10%
Non-Profit/Community Based Organization	98	46%
School/University	21	10%
Other	2	<1%
Purpose of Organization		
Youth	84	25%
Faith	5	1%
Law Enforcement	9	2%
Education	67	21%
Community Improvement or Development	46	14%
Arts or culture	22	7%
Sales or retail	9	2%
Health	16	5%
Other	78	23%
Years Worked at Organization		
Less than 1 year	27	12%
1 to 2 years	40	19%
3 to 5 years	43	20%
5 or more years	103	49%
Role in Organization		
Administration	43	20%
Executive Director/Manager	59	28%
Program Manager	75	35%
Other	36	17%
Prior SYEP Participant		
New Participant	55	26%
Second Summer	50	23%
Three or More Summers	108	51%
Age of Youth Employed		
14 to 16 years	79	37%
17 to 21 years	134	63%
Number of Youth Employed		
1 to 10 youth	100	47%
11 to 20 youth	30	14%
More than 20 youth	83	39%



## ***Post Program Youth Participant Survey***

### ***Learning Opportunities (Research Question 1) and Satisfaction (Research Question 2)***

Table 5 shows the results from the z-test for single binomial proportion for the testing of research questions 1 (learning opportunities) and 2 (satisfaction). Table 6 shows the specific skills the youth reported that they learned. The proportion of youth participants stating they had opportunities for learning was 0.9505 (z-value=1.9875, p-value=0.0234). Further, the analysis shows that when asked about the top three skills learned, 51 percent of the youth responded, “being responsible”, 47 percent stated, “reporting to work on time”, and 42 percent youth said, “dressing appropriately for work” (see Table 6). The proportion of youth who stated they were satisfied with the program was 68 percent (z-value=18.771, p-value <0.0001). It should be noted this is a conservative calculation, as only responses of “very satisfied” were considered as the indicator of satisfaction. The percentage would be even higher if responses of “somewhat satisfied” were included. The results for supervisor satisfaction produced a proportion of 67 percent or 0.6786 (z-value, 0.8386, p-value 0.2008) for “very satisfied”. When considering “somewhat satisfied” as an indicator of satisfaction, the proportion was 96 percent or 0.9643 with a z-value of 9.225 (p-value <0.0001).

**Table 5. Results of z-test for Single Binomial Proportion (Hypothesis 1.1)**

		Total N	Sample $\Pi$	z-value	p-value
Learning Opportunities		888	0.9505	18.771	<0.0001**
Youth Satisfaction		649	0.6872	1.9875	0.0234*
Supervisor Satisfaction	Very Satisfied	196	0.6786	0.8386	0.2008
	Very Satisfied/Somewhat Satisfied	196	0.9643	9.2225	<0.0001**

\*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$

**Table 6. Specific Learning Opportunities Reported by Youth<sup>8</sup>**

List of Learning Opportunities From Which Youth Could Choose/Select	Youth Respondents listing this experience	
	N Total = 844	%
Computer skills	195	23%
Problem-solving	259	31%
Public speaking	289	34%
Accepting supervision	256	30%
Financial management skills	152	18%
Importance of a career	307	36%
Communication skills	289	34%
How to be organized	278	33%
Reporting to work on time	396	47%
Dressing appropriately for work	351	42%
Completing assignments on time	277	33%
Asking for help	264	31%
Being responsible	429	51%

***Pre-Post Program Youth Participant Survey******Short-Term Impact (Research Question 3)*****Hypothesis 3.1: Employability**

Comparing the means from pre to post surveys shows a decrease from pre survey score mean ( $M = 6.435$ ) to the post survey score mean ( $M = 6.256$ ) (See Table 7). Further analysis of the results from the paired samples t-test showed that this difference was significant ( $t\text{-value} = -7.72$ ,  $p\text{-value} < 0.0001$ ). However, it should be noted that the direction was different than hypothesized, with the average rating of employability skills decreasing in the post survey. Next, the results from the ANOVA show that pre survey scores have a positive relationship with post survey scores ( $R^2 = 0.007$ ,  $b = 0.075$ ,  $t\text{-value} = 2.85$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.004$ ) (Table 8). Table 9 provides the results of the linear regression. When demographics including gender/sex, ward, age, grade, and if the youth was a prior participant are included in a regression analysis, it was

---

<sup>8</sup> Responses to post survey question: “What job skills did you think you learned through participating in SYEP? Select all that apply.”

found that being from Ward 8 was associated with decreased self-reported employability while being either in a higher grade level or a prior participant in the program was associated with increased self-reported employability ( $R^2 = 0.133$ ) (See Table 9).

### Hypothesis 3.2: Mastery and Future Orientation

Comparing the means from pre surveys to post surveys shows an increase from pre survey score mean ( $M = 2.750$ ) to post survey score mean ( $M = 2.809$ ) (See Table 7). Further analysis of the results from the paired samples t-test showed that this difference was significant ( $t\text{-value} = 4.49$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.0001$ ). Next, the results from ANOVA show that the youth scores on the survey after the program were not found to be significantly related to their scores before the program ( $R^2 = 0.001$ ,  $t\text{-value} = 0.008$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.789$ ) (see Table 8 below). Also, when demographics were included in the model, it was found that, as age group increased, self-reported perception of mastery and future orientation also increased ( $R^2 = 0.028$ ) (see Table 9 below).

**Table 7. Means Results for Short-Term Impacts (Hypothesis 3)**

	n	M (CI)	t-value	p-value
Employability				
Difference = -0.179				
Pre survey	1252	6.435 (6.401 – 6.470)	-7.72	<0.0001**
Post survey		6.256 (6.224 – 6.288)		
Master and Future				
Difference = 0.059				
Pre survey	1291	2.750 (2.732 – 2.768)	4.49	<0.0001**
Post survey		2.809 (2.791 – 2.827)		

\*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$

**Table 8. ANOVA Results for Short-Term Impacts (Hypotheses 3)**

	b	SE	t-value	p-value
Employability				
Intercept	5.774	0.1698	34.00	<0.0001**
Pre survey	0.075	0.0262	2.85	0.004**
Mastery and Future				
Intercept	2.788	0.0782	35.67	<0.0001**
Pre survey	0.008	0.0282	0.27	0.789

\*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$

**Table 9. Linear Regression Results for Short Term-Impacts (Hypotheses 3)<sup>9</sup>**

	b	SE	t-value	p-value
Employability				
Intercept	5.728	0.166	34.49	<0.0001**
Gender/Sex	0.003	0.025	0.12	0.903
Ward	-0.085	0.033	-2.54	0.011*
Age	-0.00003	0.010	-0.00	0.998
Grade	0.168	0.023	7.31	<0.0001**
Prior Participant	0.085	0.023	3.69	0.0002**
Mastery and Future Orientation				
Intercept	2.758	0.081	34.11	<0.0001**
Gender/Sex	0.0002	0.028	0.01	0.994
Ward	-0.023	0.020	-1.20	0.229
Age	0.021	0.006	3.45	0.001**
Grade	0.019	0.014	1.41	0.160
Prior Participant	0.021	0.014	1.55	0.123

\*\* $p < 0.01$ , \* $p < 0.05$

### ***Findings from the Focus Groups and Interviews***

The qualitative results provide more in-depth findings/anecdotal information to enhance the meaning of the data as it relates to objectives for the process study (youth reach, program implementation, and satisfaction) and the youth outcomes (employability and mastery and

<sup>9</sup> Ethnicity/Race not included as 93 percent of youth respondents were African American.

future orientation). Overall major and emerging themes that were found from the focus groups and interviews were Youth Recruitment (application process), Program Implementation (preparedness for employment, quality of supervisors, and support for supervisors), Satisfaction (Overall satisfaction and job placement satisfaction), and Youth Outcomes (job readiness and work skills and future goals).

### *Youth Recruitment*

#### Application Process and Communication of Deadlines<sup>10</sup>

The youth application process consists of an online application through the SYEP Youth Portal and a document certification. After the youth successfully complete the online application, they are required to bring their eligibility documents to DOES.

Areas around the youth and supervisor application process and communication of deadlines were themes that emerged from the qualitative analysis.

Overall, the actual task of going to the Web site to fill out the program application was found to be straightforward and youth. As one youth who was new to the program stated:

“It was my first year doing this and it was user friendly.”

Likewise, supervisors from the focus groups and interviews found the application process easy and liked the transparency of information on the Web site in regards to the supervisor application. For example, a supervisor, who participated in the program last summer, stated:

“The portal overall worked well, everything online. They also did a much better job of informing us with program information. This was done by email and [the] DOES website. Email was good and having everything posted clearly on [the] DOES website was good.”

---

<sup>10</sup>See <http://does.dc.gov/does/cwp/view,a,1232,q,644003.asp> for more information on this process and the forms used by the program.

Although the online application step was favored by the youth, the second step of turning in the eligibility documents (proof of residency in DC, be between the ages of 14 and 21 years prior to the start of the program, social security card and birth certificate to verify eligibility to work in the United States, and parental or guardian permission to participate if under 18 years of age) was found to be complicated and discouraging for the youth due to long waiting lines and not having access to all of the necessary documents. For example, a supervisor from a CBO stated:

“The multiple steps for application made it hard for them [the youth] to apply – lines for certification was discouraging – it is hard for kids. I know it is something they have to do but it is hard for them.”

In addition, a teacher, who was also an supervisor to a youth participant, that worked in one of the schools that referred youth to the program and helped youth apply for the DC SYEP stated:

“The only thing that was hard was tracking down kids to make sure they had everything in. It is hard because a lot of the kids could not find their stuff like birth certificates, etc.”

Another supervisor who is a teacher at a school stated:

“What was hard was supporting the kids to have all of their stuff for their application – it was hard to have the time to help the kids. I took a few kids to enrollment events<sup>11</sup> but even that took a lot of time – kids did not have a lot of stuff – kids do not know how to do this stuff and it comes down on the teachers to help.”

---

<sup>11</sup>[http://www.does.dc.gov/does/frames.asp?doc=/does/lib/does/frames/SYEP\\_Certification\\_Schedule\\_2012\\_UPDA\\_TE\\_3.9.12.pdf](http://www.does.dc.gov/does/frames.asp?doc=/does/lib/does/frames/SYEP_Certification_Schedule_2012_UPDA_TE_3.9.12.pdf)

Unlike the supervisors who felt that the deadlines and information were transparent, youth had issues around communication of deadlines. A youth who did not participate in the program stated:

“I wanted to be in the program, I heard about the application process late and the deadline was too short.”

Furthermore, there was an issue around the communication of dates and the adequate and comparable recruitment methods via schools. A youth who did not participate stated:

“When I went down to the counselor’s office to talk to her about [the DC] SYEP, she gives me my application, mind you, its April, she knows that the deadline is up. I did my application, and when I finally give it back to her, she’s all like “oh wait, the deadline is over, you can’t get this job, because no one really informed us.”

Another youth participant, who was new to applying for the program, had a different experience. This youth’s experience demonstrates that the issues may have been school specific. This youth stated:

“I applied at my school, and my school gets out right at 3:30, but they told us we could do it at the school library at 3:15 when the application came on the Internet and everybody went to the library and started applying. Why, because I knew there was a job cut [limited spaces], and you had to do it fast [apply early] in order to get a job.”

This youth knew about the limited spaces available in the program in addition to the importance of registering early per the school’s instructions to have the youth complete the application once

it was launched. Not all students had this similar experience which shows a difference in the communication received via the schools around the application process of the DC SYEP.

Another youth, who did not participate in the program, stated:

“Even though they gave the notifications to the schools, it was left up to the schools to whether or not they would get the message out and whether the schools didn’t have time to, or forgot about it or something, the kids just wouldn’t know.”

Lastly, one supervisor from the CBO who was returning to the DC SYEP stated:

“The biggest obstacle of the program was getting the word out to the parents and getting the youth registered – there was a lot of confusion between the original start date and when registration [was] to end or ended. They were also confused on how to get the student assigned to our specific site. We only take our specific kids in our program.”

### *Program Implementation*

#### Preparedness for Employment

Youth enrolled in the DC SYEP were required to participate in an in-person orientation hosted at DOES that went over program details including logistics, rules, and expectations. In addition, there was a supplemental online orientation through the SYEP Youth Portal available prior to the start of the program. The orientation consists of a series of short videos addressing specific SYEP content questions. Also, during the first week, youth were supposed to have received an orientation at their worksite by their supervisors.

Over 85 percent of the youth stated they received an orientation to the work site and supervisors stated they had given a job orientation. Among students who received a workplace



orientation, most of them recalled that the orientation consisted of a tour, introduction to other staff members, an overview of job responsibilities, an overview of the schedule, and an explanation of the dress code. However, dress code was a major challenge for the youth, as expressed by supervisors. One supervisor from a district agency stated:

“Work place attire was a challenge. Some of the youth had to be pulled aside.”

Another supervisor from a school stated there was a need for a formal dress code, due to the issues around attire:

“I continued to tell them [about dress issues] and even provided them with a dress code and emphasized [its] importance. Males continued to dress inappropriately. Dress code should be standard. Everyone should have some sort of uniform; it prepares them for the real world.”

In addition, both supervisors and youth felt that parents needed to be involved in helping the youth prepare for the job. One youth returning to DC SYEP from the prior summer stated:

“I think it would be good to have communication to give my parents, having information sessions would be good for them”

A supervisor from a DC agency stated:

“Get parents involved, they should be there at orientation so they know what is expected so they can properly equip their child.”

### Quality of Supervisors

Overall, it was found that quality programming, which includes positive interaction and engaging youth, relied on the supervisors and their understanding of the overall program goals set for the youth by DOES. Those goals, provided to the supervisors at the supervisor orientation, included providing a meaningful work experience and guiding the youth

participants to develop employability skills as well as expectations of being a worker. One supervisor summed this up by stating:

“If someone is an SYEP supervisor but not having an interest in the kids, it is not worth it. The youth are youth and some of the youth are raising themselves – we understand that – we have been fortunate that we have a great [work site] staff and people here [at the organization/agency] who are willing and patient to work with them.”

In addition, one supervisor new to the DC SYEP stated:

“You not only have to have management experience but also know how to give back to students to help them grow. You have to definitely be patient. I think one thing that is very helpful is to understand the demographics of the young people, knowing where they are coming from – you might have certain expectations – but you can’t expect a student to just come in a mold to your work.”

Another youth stated:

“It’s not just DOES, it’s us as well. Our managers didn’t provide enough structured work for the students. They didn’t always see them as real employees.”

Furthermore, supervisors expressed the desire to be trained in working with youth. One supervisor, from the private sector, returning another summer to participate in the program stated:

“CYITC was an excellent partnership of SYEP because they showed us the whole purpose of SYEP. We saw [through the training] how it was to give work

experience and that's a process of youth development and how to get these kids interested in learning about working.”

Another supervisor who participated in a previous summer stated:

“I think [the Advancing Youth Development] AYD training needs to happen all across the board. There are a lot of people that need those skills. The last thing I would say is that you have to be able to work with kids and not everyone can do that – if you are not prepared to deal with kids it can be difficult.”

#### Support for Supervisors

With regards to support, supervisors stated that their questions were answered in a timely manner by SYEP staff and all of the seventeen supervisors interviewed expressed how helpful and supportive the SYEP staff was. One supervisor new to the summer employment program stated:

“Interaction between my liaison and I was great – they were very proactive, sent emails, constant contact, that was the biggest strengths of the program.”

In addition, another supervisor stated:

“Communication with the program staff was excellent. They were right on everything.”

Lastly, a supervisor from a DC agency, stated:

“I think that SYEP did a great job this summer and I hope that we can keep the same employees next year – I think having the relationship with my SYEP liaison was good – and I hope we can have the same one next year.”

## *Satisfaction*

### Overall Satisfaction

Overall, supervisors were satisfied with the program. In both the focus groups and interviews, supervisors discussed the value of the program for the youth. For example, a supervisor from one of the local CBOs stated:

“I think you all are doing a great job, I am impressed. You are certainly doing a great service to the city, and you are making a huge impact in the lives in youth. I think the payoff will be great.”

In addition, youth in all of the focus groups expressed satisfaction with the program and many of them stated they would want to return next year.

Also, a majority of the returning supervisors believed that the program has made improvements from the prior year, as stated by this supervisor:

“I think that they were definitely trying to improve things – there were definitely things that really make a good effective program.”

Specific improvements discussed specifically in the interviews included better process of selecting youth for placements at their worksites and better communication around program dates and announcements. For example, one supervisor from a CBO stated:

“The program communication was great this year – interaction with my SYEP liaison [at DOES] was very helpful, very proactive, sent emails, constant contact that was the biggest improvement of the program this year.

### Job Selection Satisfaction

Supervisors in the interviews expressed an improvement this year in the process of identifying and requesting youth they wanted to work at their site. For example, a supervisor

from a CBO and a supervisor from a DC agency stated:

“It was a great improvement from last year and it really helps us to be able to identify certain kids that are interested in working for our organization and to be actually be [sic] able to interview the kids and receive the kids we choose.”

It should be noted that an area of challenge expressed around the hiring process was the concern that the youth needed to also be engaged during this placement process such as responding to interview requests and emails sent from prospective worksites. For example, one supervisor stated:

“The quality of the youth – the screening process was a lot better – but we need to help youth to realize that they have to be serious and if they don’t follow suit they could lose their employment. They need to engage in the process with us.”

In addition, seven youth expressed that they do in fact like to be able to choose their job placements based on their interests. For example, one youth stated:

“They should ask us, which they do, our interests and maybe what we want to focus on. Like say somebody wants to be a lawyer, they can work at a law firm part time, or, me I want to do news broadcasting so I would want to be in that office, you know, something like that. It’s a big difference.”

Another youth expressed how choosing job placements are related to actual job skills that they want to learn and how the placement would help them learn these skills. This youth stated:

“Some people in SYEP, they work at a recreation center, or a school, some were at an actual office. And you learn different things depending where you are.

Depending on what type of person you are, what type of skills, or what you want to get from this, where your job is at is important.”

### *Youth Outcomes*

#### Job Readiness and Work Skills

With regards to future employment skills, youth reported having gained more of an understanding of career interests and qualifications for future careers. For example, one youth stated:

“I liked it [the job] and what it teaches you, you know, work ethics and communication skills, meeting people, what you need to do to prepare for this type of career.”

Supervisors reported that the youth learned a good work ethic and were introduced to a professional atmosphere. In addition, the youth learned leadership skills and working in teams. For example, one supervisor from a DC agency stated:

“The youth gained the soft skills – calling into work, contacting your supervisor, showing up on time, communicating with their supervisor.”

When the supervisors were asked about an overall assessment of the youth with which they worked, the supervisors reported that most youth accomplished some specific employability skills. The supervisors were asked specifically about the performance indicators such as arriving to work on time, following instructions, accepting constructive criticism, working well with others, and behaving in a professional manner. In an interview, one supervisor specifically noted:

“I think they achieved the main goals of having a job – getting the soft skills, calling into work, contacting their supervisor, showing up on time, communicating with their supervisor.”

### Future Goals

Many supervisors expressed in the interviews or focus groups the desire to evaluate the youth on an ongoing basis. For example, an ongoing database might be developed to keep track of youths’ progress from year to year. As one supervisor stated:

“It would be great to be able to keep track of each individual in the program and how long they have been in the program. In addition, it would be great to have annual evaluations of the youth and even be able to put recommendations in their files.”

In addition, supervisors in interviews/focus groups felt that the youth gained confidence and self-worth that will help them with future employment. One supervisor felt that the

“SYEP empowered them [the youth] to know that they can be responsible and succeed in the future.”

However, there were concerns about what the youth would do after the DC SYEP ended, with seven supervisors from the interviews making comments such as:

“What happens when the kids go back on home after the summer?”

Another supervisor stated:

“Some were raising themselves, they did not have parental support and they had no structure to help them or guide them. Very often the parents had to work hours when they [the youth] were home. There were a couple of pregnancies. A few had

to go back to school early. What happens after the summer when they do not have our support?”

## **V. Discussion**

### ***Summary of Findings***

#### ***Learning Opportunities (Research Question 1)***

Overall the findings show that 95 percent of youth surveyed stated that they were in fact provided learning opportunities geared towards employability skills and mastery and future orientation as measured through the youth post survey. Specifically youth were asked to respond to the question “What job skills did you think you learned through participating in SYEP? Select all that apply.” Further analysis showed that the top three skills learned were being responsible, reporting to work on time, and dressing appropriately for work. The two least learned skills were financial management skills and computer skills (See Table 6).

#### ***Satisfaction with SYEP (Research Question 2)***

Overall, 69 percent of youth stated that they were satisfied with the program. Furthermore, 96 percent of supervisors stated they were somewhat or very satisfied with the programming and have recognized the improvements that SYEP has made over the past years.

The focus groups and interviews revealed improvements from last year and recommendations for the following years. The findings from the focus groups/interviews/both indicated that despite the positive survey findings, continued improvements can still be made. Specifically, supervisors indicated that changes could be made at the youth application process, such as having more intentional outreach conducted to reach youth, including out-of-school youth, that do not have access to venues for communication about the program. Additional outreach to these youth about the program could come through youth serving centers such as



recreation centers, public libraries, and in neighborhood community centers. In addition, more assistance is needed to help youth navigate the eligibility stage of the application process such as what the documents look like that they should bring in and what to do if they did not have access to the documents.

Furthermore, it was found that supervisors were satisfied with the option to select the youth with which they wanted to work, and the youth satisfied with being able to select areas of interest and specific placements with which they wanted to work. However, youth did state they wanted more descriptions of the different job types and opportunities to make sure they chose job placements that were of their interests.

#### *Short-Term Impact (Research Question 3)*

With respect to employability, there was a decrease in the crude mean score between the pre and post participation surveys. This could be due to the fact that the youth felt they had the skills prior to the program, however when practicing the skills, they in fact realized they had not mastered it. Further analysis revealed that higher grade level and prior participation were associated with positive changes in employability skills. This could be due to the fact that youth in higher grades as well as those who have participated in past summers learned the skills over time and now feel that they have mastered them. However these findings need to be taken with consideration due to the fact that the data used to calculate the pre survey and post survey changes were based on different respondent groups (as discussed in the limitations section). The qualitative findings revealed that youth felt they did learn job readiness and work skills from the program, which contradicts the decrease in scores on the post survey.

Additionally, supervisors on average felt that youth did learn skills, felt the program does have a positive effect on youth outcomes, and that the program empowers youth. However,

there was a perception that the effect on youth behavior could vary with the quality of the placement sites and the supervisors' knowledge of working with youth. Supervisors and youth stated in focus groups and interviews that they felt that some sites were of better quality which could have led to better outcomes for the youth at those sites. Qualitative findings also revealed that some skills were not as well learned as others; appropriate work attire was still an issue with many of the youth as stated by the supervisors.

With respect to mastery and future orientation, there was an increase in crude mean scores between the pre and post surveys. In addition, older age predicted greater mastery and future orientation. This could be due to the fact that older the youth have more experience and knowledge of different careers which could help guide their future goals. In the survey results, the youth and supervisor findings revealed that the youth did gain a sense of self-worth in addition to learning about future careers.

### ***Recommendations***

Key recommendations are offered to strengthen the DC SYEP. In addition, other youth development programs focused on career development may find use of these recommendation so help guide their programming. Overall, recommendations include: collaboration among DC agencies and partners, quality around host work sites and supplemental activities, continual data collection improvements, and diversity in participants. These recommendations were guided by the findings and additional discussions in the focus groups and interviews with youth and supervisor.

### ***SYEP Recommendations***

#### **Quality Programming and Supervisors**

The DC SYEP has begun to incorporate activities that are age and developmentally

appropriate in an environment that engages the youth. For example, in order to continue to build on this, it is important that the youth are in quality sites and being engaged positively. For example, host work sites should undergo site visits with regards to programming to ensure they are providing positive programming. In addition, host work sites should demonstrate how learning opportunities exist there during their application process. Lastly, during the application process, supervisors should discuss how they plan to assist the youth in reaching the short-term outcomes.

It is necessary that supervisors have the proper training in working with youth. Although supervisors have the potential of being a key mentor in the lives of the youth they are supervising, few supervisors receive youth development training, leaving them unprepared to help teens make the most of their early work experiences (Public/Private Ventures (PPV), 2005). As stated by PPV (2005), “a job becomes a good developmental opportunity only when teens receive support and guidance from adults at work.” Because this is essentially a youth development program in conjunction with a workforce development program, supervisors need to be trained in both aspects which is possible with the partnership DOES has with CYITC. It is recommended that all supervisors undergo the Advancing Youth Development (AYD) training<sup>12</sup> that is customized for the workforce development programs for the youth. This can be provided by the CYITC. It should be noted that although this was the intention of SYEP for 2011, through the qualitative findings it was found that not all supervisors in fact participated in the trainings.

In addition to the training, helping supervisors develop the mentoring and implementation skills is important to build quality and sustainable learning for the youth. Also,

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://nti.aed.org/Curriculum.html>

further guidance should be provided to the supervisors on skills and objectives that the youth should meet throughout the summer including budgeting skills, work skills, and social skills. This will help provide youth with more meaningful experience outside of just learning work skills. These trainings can be accessed via a partnership with CYITC.

### Job Placements

Work placements should continue to be based on each youth's interests, education, and career goals. More job descriptions should be provided to the youth including example future careers in the respective field, sample types of job placements, and prior skills needed. However, more intentional job placements should also occur around general interests of the youth. In addition, returning youth should have the opportunity to continue working in a similar placement as the previous summer to gain further experience in their interests. However, returning youth should also be given information on the types of placements available to continue to learn about different careers and in the case that they want to change their placement. It is important that youth learn about different careers as it has been found that jobs that youth find boring and unchallenging in nature create negative attitudes toward work and acceptance of unethical practices (Mael, Morath and McLellan, 1997).

For new and returning youth, mandatory workshops before being placed at a host work site could be conducted, where participants can learn about the goals of SYEP, the different jobs opportunities available to them and what is expected of them, and work site rules and responsibilities. These workshops could continue monthly with the help of the host work site and include topics like college planning, life skills, and leadership skills.

### Improve Data Collection and Evaluation Efforts

The DC SYEP has made begun this process by engaging in a pilot evaluation of their

programs. However, for continued program improvement, it is necessary to continue working towards rigorous and comprehensive evaluation. One major recommendation to strengthen future findings is linking the pre and post participation surveys to the youth applications in order to ensure the same youth complete both. Therefore, the youth would need to complete the pre survey at the appropriate time (prior to program participation) and at completion of the program. This would increase response rate as the link is given at the application time while they are at a computer completing the application. In addition, by having them log back into their account at the end, this would also allow for the youth to have some type of closure to their participation in the program as they would be logging into their account and via the survey for self-reflection of their participation in the program.

In addition, it is important that all stakeholders are engaged in the evaluation process, from the youth, providers, funders and policymakers. It is recommended that DOES work with these youth, funders, proviers, and policymakers to come up with common goals of the evaluation and engage them in the process. This would increase buy-in from all parties for the evaluation, which will strengthen the methods and therefore findings. For example, it would help the youth understand the importance of completing the surveys which in turn could increase the response rates while engaging them in the planning and implementation process. In addition, it would help policymakers understand why specific outcomes are being measured and allow for their input of other outcomes they would like measured.

Another recommendation around data collection is to implement a quasi-experimental study design. The DC SYEP has a high number of youth applying to the program but only has openings for about half of these applicants. This provides an ample amount of youth to use the waitlist group as a comparative group. In addition, it is feasible as the youth can complete the

pre survey at the time of application and be sent a reminder email through the youth portal to complete the post participation survey. By conducting a quasi-experimental design, the findings on youth outcomes can be strengthened as it will eliminate external threats to validity.

### *General Recommendations*

#### Supplemental Activities

It has been found that a range of services are necessary for positive results with youth, such as the combination of early work experience with job training, the inclusion of remedial education in the array of educational and vocational services, and the combination of self-directed job search strategies and a job placement program (HGSE, 2011). As the DC SYEP is working with youth who are developing and learning skills to help navigate their transition into adulthood, program elements should be supplemented by other program activities, including career portfolio development, money management, career and educational exposure events, and youth leadership development.

The DC SYEP is an excellent avenue to provide youth with the necessary supplemental activities. The program attracts a high number of the youth population that traditionally lacks resources (as noted, the application process over 41% of youth are being reached). It is recommended that as early as during or after the web-based application youth are referred to external sites or services of their interests or needs around health, education, or extracurricular activities. This can help the youth become engaged with additional social and educational services that could increase their experience with not only the DC SYEP and later in life.

In addition, the DC SYEP should continue to partner with schools to assist with the application process, however make a concerted/conscious effort to provide support to

underresourced schools to make sure the youth that attend those schools are receiving information.

### Year Round Opportunities

Youth engaging in the DC SYEP have adult support for the time that they are in the program during the summer; however, this support is not sustained throughout the school year. This program is an excellent avenue to help youth engage in mentoring opportunities, especially with individuals who share similar interests around careers, such as their supervisors or older/mature adults who have retired from these careers. These mentors would serve as a professional role model and assist with not only setting career goals but help with school course selection and the college application process. Overall this could help reinforce the overall long-term outcomes of the DC SYEP as well as keep the youth engaged throughout the year.

### Collaboration with Other Agencies

Greater support is needed to develop citywide goals and strategies in working with youth. The DC SYEP provides one piece of working towards youth development, but a collaboration and increased support with other agencies is needed to help continually serve the youth. This study highlights the effect of the DC SYEP on youth while providing areas where other agencies can collaborate to help youth transition successfully to adulthood.

There are multiple agencies in DC that provide, fund, and oversee youth education, training, and employment services (Ross, 2011). However, the different funding streams and performance measures often cause a lack of collaboration and ability for data sharing (Ross, 2011). By collaborating with all of these agencies a strategic plan with regards to youth workforce development can be achieved and involve not only summer programming but ongoing year round opportunities.

SYEP has already begun to make efforts to collaborate with some of these agencies, and by continuing these efforts; the program can leverage the resources and opportunities available. For example, working with other agencies such as the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) can streamline recruitment and documentation that they require for programs such as the DC Tuition Assistance Grants, which provides financial assistance to DC youth applying and enrolling in college. The DC SYEP should also reach out to local universities to provide assistance with not only the implementation of the program but also to provide resources and opportunities such as college tours and career fairs. Lastly, research has found that for the way an individual manages their money can affect their future including making money decisions and creating motivation for continuing to save money (Danes and Rettig, 1993). Therefore, youth should be given the assistance on learning the importance of managing money. By reaching out to local banks such as PNC and Bank of America, youth can have the opportunity to not only learn money management skills but also open bank accounts.

#### Expanding Outreach to Reach “Opportunity” Youth

Although the DC SYEP has made progress in diversifying their participants and targeting youth from areas that lack resources and have higher negative indicators for youth, efforts are needed to continue to recruit youth who are at higher levels of negative risk factors, such as dropping out of school and poverty. In addition, the DC SYEP should continue to make a concerted effort to reach those youth who are disengaged from school, work, or reentering from incarceration, such as youth who have dropped out of high school (referred to as Opportunity Youth). Research has shown that training and education opportunities could help reengage and even reduce the number of opportunity youth. For example, programs could potentially incentivize businesses to work in collaboration with educational providers to



establish needs, and develop education with training (Americas Promise, 2012). The DC SYEP could utilize their program to provide opportunities to reengage these youth.s. For example, selected job openings could be reserved for these youth, coupled with a GED or credit recovery program to help them achieve self-sufficiency.

### ***Study Implications***

#### ***Research Implications***

A 2009 report by the Wallace Foundation stated that there was a lack of evidence found for youth development outcomes because those outcomes were rarely, if ever, evaluated (Terezen, Anderson and Hamilton, 2009). Further, few studies regarding youth employment have utilized a similar sample without constraining their analysis across races or ethnicities (Johnson, 2004). Moreover, a majority of the studies that have evaluated specifically summer youth employment programs focus on process evaluation and not behavior change in participants. Program administrators are not trained to conduct comprehensive evaluation and use simple research methods to develop quick information about the program and its function. This pilot study of the DC SYEP focused on a large sample of urban youth residing in DC and combines academic research with a practical model for documenting the processes and outcomes of this summer youth employment programs. This allows for both the researcher and the program staff to learn the needs, language, and culture while sharing evidence-based practices of academia and youth development programming.

#### ***Practice Implications***

This study provides a framework for understanding the current structure of the DC SYEP and possible implications for future programming. Prior to this study, there were no clear short, medium, or long term objectives of the DC SYEP. In addition, there was no clear visual

layout of how the activities of DC SYEP (youth application, youth placement, and youth employment) lead to attainment of these objectives. This study develops and describes the activities and outputs of the DC SYEP to outcomes of the program. In addition, the study provides recommendations to strengthen program offerings.

### *Policy Implications*

This study demonstrates a blending of academia with practice which is needed to help guide future policies. Policymakers are often interested on the return of investment of programs that are being funded. This study attempts to provide information on the youth outcomes and areas that can be strengthened in the program. In addition, as this was the first formal evaluation of the DC SYEP program, findings can help guide future evaluations. For example, a future evaluation might examine the years of participation in the summer program that youth have participated and how this may affect their development in terms of completing high school, continuing in post-secondary education, etc. In addition, further research could be conducted on looking at “opportunity youth” that have disengaged from school and/or work, and how investment in programs such as the DC SYEP has an effect on the outcomes of these youth.

### *Conclusion*

The DC SYEP is working towards strengthening programming to maximize youth outcomes. The overall findings show that youth are being provided learning opportunities related to employability and mastery and future orientation. and are satisfied with the program; however, more effort around building a quality program geared towards the goals and specific learning objective of providing meaningful work experiences to youth in the DC are needed. Although there are limitations of the current study, restate, this evaluation is an initial effort for the DC SYEP to describe its implementation of the program and the components that are

working and where strengthening the program for the next summer may be achieved. Lastly, this study provides guidance to the implementation and evaluation of national summer youth employment programs. It should be noted that evaluations of the program should be modified for city-specific goals and ensure the tools used are measuring the intended outcomes.

## References

- Allen, M. (2006). A formative program evaluation of Bridgepoint's great expectations. Louisville, KY: Spalding University.
- America's Promise Alliance. (2011). America's Promise: Parent engagement. Washington, DC: America's Promise Alliance. Accessed 15 March 2011.  
<http://www.americaspromise.org/Resources/ParentEngagement.aspx>.
- America's Promise Alliance. (2012). The economic value of opportunity youth. Washington, DC: America's Promise Alliance. Accessed 13 March 2012.  
[http://americaspromise.org/News-and-Events/News-and-Features/APB-2012/Vol-2/~media/Files/News/Econ\\_Value\\_Youth\\_Jan\\_11\\_2012.ashx](http://americaspromise.org/News-and-Events/News-and-Features/APB-2012/Vol-2/~media/Files/News/Econ_Value_Youth_Jan_11_2012.ashx).
- Annie Casey Foundation.(2011). Kids count online database. Accessed 12 April 2011.  
<http://www.aecf.org/MajorInitiatives/KIDSCOUNT.aspx>.
- Bauermeister, J., Zimmerman, M., Gee, G., Caldwell, C. and Zue, Y. (2009). Work and sexual trajectories among African American youth. *Journal of Sex Research*, 46(4), 290-300.
- Bernat, D. and Resnick, M. (2006). Healthy youth development: Science and strategies. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, 12(6), 10-16.
- Blagg, R. (2011). A bridge between basic social science and evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 131, 27-30.
- Cain, M. (1999). Youth and the environment: An evaluation of the Nova Scotia youth conservation corps program. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Dalhouse University.
- Cardoza, K. (2011). Summer program cuts will affect thousands of students. Washington, DC: American University. Accessed 10 September 2011.  
[http://wamu.org/news/11/05/26/summer\\_program\\_cuts\\_will\\_affect\\_thousands\\_of\\_dcps\\_](http://wamu.org/news/11/05/26/summer_program_cuts_will_affect_thousands_of_dcps_)

students.php.

Casner-Lotto, J. and Barrington, L. (2006). Are they really ready to work? Employers' perspectives on the basic knowledge and applied skills of new entrants to the 21<sup>st</sup> century US workforce. New York, NY: The Conference Board, Inc.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2010). Factors that contribute to health disparities. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Accessed 15 March 2011. <http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/disparities/black/factors.htm>.

Chaplin, D. (1999). Summary of capacity and needs assessments: Youth activities in the District of Columbia. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Clymer, C., Edwards, K., Ponce, J. and Wyckoff, L. (2002). Supporting youth employment: A guide for community groups. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

Creswell, J. (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Curnan, S., Kingley, C., LaCava, L. and Frees, J. (2010). Unfinished work: Building excellence in Washington, DC's summer youth employment program. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University.

Danes, S. & Rettig, K. (1993). The role of perception in the intention to change the family financial situation. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 14(4), 365-389.

DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation. (2010). Youth development best Practices. Washington, DC: DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation. Accessed 12 April 2011. [www.cyitc.org/elements/file/Youth%20Development.pdf](http://www.cyitc.org/elements/file/Youth%20Development.pdf).

DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation. DC youth needs assessment: Executive summary. Washington, DC: DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation.

Accessed 19 February 2012.

[www.cyitc.org/elements/file/Needs%20Assessment%20Executive%20Summary.pdf](http://www.cyitc.org/elements/file/Needs%20Assessment%20Executive%20Summary.pdf).

Double the Numbers. (2006). Double the numbers for college success: A call to action for the District of Columbia. Washington, DC: The Bridgespan Group. Accessed 15 March 2011. <http://www.doublethenumbersdc.org/images/pdfs/doublingnumber.pdf>.

Finkelhor, D. and Ormrod, R. (2010). The homicides of children and youth. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

First Focus. (2010). Children's budget 2010. Washington, DC: First Focus.

Fitz-Gibbon, C. and Morris, L. (1987). How to design a program evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Flannery, D., Hussey, D. and Thomas, R. (2009). 2009 Summer youth employment report.

Cleveland, OH: Youth Opportunities Unlimited. Accessed 17 April 2012.

<http://www.youthopportunities.org/images/MyCom%20Summer%202009%20Report.pdf>.

Greenberger, E. and Steinberg, L. (1986). When teenagers work: The psychological and social costs of adolescent employment. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Harvard Graduate School of Education. (2011). Pathways to prosperity: Meeting the challenge of preparing young Americans for the 21st century. Boston, MA: Pearson's Foundation.

Hastings, S., Tsoi, R. and Harris, L. (2010). Building a comprehensive youth employment delivery system: Examples of effective practice. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

- Healthy People 2020. (2011). 2020 Topics and Objectives: Adolescent Health. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Healthy People. Accessed 17 April 2011. <http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topicsobjectives2020/default.aspx>.
- Jekielek, S., Cochran, S. and Hair E. (2002). Employment programs and youth development: A synthesis. Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- Johnson, M. (2004). Further evidence on adolescent employment and substance use: Differences by race and ethnicity. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 45, 187-197.
- Kuehn D. and McDaniel, M. (2009). Vulnerable youth and the transition to adulthood fact sheet: low-income African American youth. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Land, K. (2010). The 2009 foundation for child development child and youth well-being index report. Durham, NC: Duke University.
- Lawrence, R, Gootman, J. and Sim, L. (2009). Adolescent health services: Missing opportunities. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Linnan, L. and Steckler, A. (2002). Process evaluation for public health interventions and research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lippman, L. and Keith, J. (2009). A developmental perspective on workplace readiness: Preparing high school students for success. Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- Mael, F., Morath, R. and McLellan, J. (1997). Dimensions of adolescent employment. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 45, 351-367.
- Martinson, K. (2010). Partnering with employers to promote job advancement for low-skill individuals. Washington, DC: The National Institute for Literacy.

- Matsuba, K., Elder, G., Petrucci, F. and Marleau, T. (2008). Employment training for at-risk youth: A program evaluation focusing on changes in psychological well-Being. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 37(15), 15-26.
- McClanahan, W., Sipe, C. and Smith, T. (2004). An evaluation of the summer career exploration program. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- McDavid, J. and Hawthorn, L. (2006). Program evaluation and performance measurement: An introduction to practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McLaughlin, J. and Sum, A. (2011). The steep decline in teen summer employment in the U.S., 2000-2010 and the bleak outlook for the 2011 summer teen job market. Boston, MA: Center for Labor Market Studies.
- McNeely, C. and Blanchard J. (2009). The teen years explained: A Guide to healthy adolescent development. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Bloomberg School of Public Health Center for Adolescent Health.
- Mishel, L., Bernstein, J. and Allegretto, S. (2005). The state of working America: 2004/2005. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mortimer, J., Zimmer-Gembeck, M., Holmes, M. and Shanahan, M. (2002). The process of occupational decision-making: Patterns during the transition to adulthood. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 439-465.
- Mortimer, J. (2003). Working and growing up in America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.



- National Recreation and Park Association. (2010). The key benefits: Synopsis of 2010 research paper. Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Nielsen, N. and McGhee, R. (2005). Ascend summer youth employment program 2005. Washington, DC: SRI International.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2009). Jobs for youth. Poland: Jobs for Youth. Accessed 20 August 2011.  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/22/3/44031073.pdf>.
- Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children. (2011). The state of youth employment. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Partnerships for Children. Accessed 15 March 2011.  
[http://www.psaydn.org/Documents/Employment\\_fact\\_sheet.pdf](http://www.psaydn.org/Documents/Employment_fact_sheet.pdf).
- Public/Private Ventures. (2005). Youth Development: Issues, Challenges, and Directions. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures
- Ross, M. (2009). Blog: The district's dime: Youth employment programs should focus on quality, not just numbers served. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Ross, M. (2011). Strengthening educational and career pathways for DC youth. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Shanks, T. and McGee, K. (2010). Detroit summer youth employment program: Results of employer and youth employee exit surveys. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Simpkins, S. (2003). Does youth participation in out-of-school time activities make a difference? *The Evaluation Exchange*, 9(1).
- Staff, J. and Mortimer, J. (2007). Educational and work strategies from adolescence to early adulthood: Consequences for educational attainment. *Social Forces*, 86(3), 1169-1194.

- Sum, A., Khatiwada, I., McLaughlin, J. and Palma, S. (2008). The collapse of the national teen job market and the case for an immediate youth jobs creation program. Boston, MA: Center for Labor Market Studies at Northeastern University.
- Terezen, M., Anderson, M. and Hamilton, K. (2009). Effective and promising summer learning programs and approaches for economically-disadvantaged children and youth. Washington, DC: Wallace Foundation.
- The Colorado Trust. (2004). After-school initiative's toolkit for evaluating positive youth development. Denver, CO: The Colorado Trust.
- Thomas, S. (2000). The distribution of dropout and turnover rates among urban and suburban high schools. *Sociology of Education*, 73, 39-67.
- Urban Alliance Foundation. (2010). Statistics for Washington, DC: Youth Employment and Academic Achievement, Washington, DC: Urban Alliance Foundation. Accessed 15 March 2011. <http://www.theurbanalliance.org/about/statistics>.
- US Census Bureau. (2008). Population estimates: National characteristics, national sex, age, race and Hispanic origin. Suitland, MD: US Department of Commerce, US Census Bureau. Accessed 20 March 2011. <http://www.census.gov/popest/national/asrh/NC-EST2009-sa.html>. .
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). FactFinder: District of Columbia. Suitland, MD: US Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau. Accessed 20 March 2011. <http://factfinder2.census.gov/>.
- US Department of Health and Human Services. (2010). Positive youth development fact sheet. Washington, DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration of

Children and Families. Accessed 10 March 2011.

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb/content/positiveyouth/factsheet.htm>.

Weeter, C. and Martin, N. (2011). Building roads to success: Key considerations for communities and states reconnecting youth to education. Washington, DC: National Youth Employment Coalition.

Whalen, S., DeCoursey, J. and Skyles, A. (2003). Preparing youth for the workforce: Exploring employer engagement in the Chicago region. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall Center for Children.

Wholey, J., Hetry, H. and Newcomer, K. (2004). Handbook of practical evaluation. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, John and Sons.

Zuckerman, A. (n.d.). The more things change, the more they stay the same: The evolution of youth employment programs. Washington, DC: National Youth Employment Coalition.

## **Appendices**

**Appendix A:**  
**Informed Consent Forms**



### Consent to Participate in the Evaluation Study of the DC SYEP



Dear Parent/Guardian,

Your child is registered to participate in the DC Department of Employment Services (DOES) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP). In order to monitor the effectiveness of SYEP, DOES, the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (The Trust), and the George Washington University (GWU) is conducting an ongoing evaluation study. The evaluation is being conducted to learn how the services and activities benefit students, how the program can be improved, and whether participation in SYEP increases youth development outcomes. Specifically we ask permission from you, as the parent/guardian, for a period of up to seven years, until your child's projected date of high school graduation to:

- Contact your child's school and obtain records showing their progress, including information about enrollment, grades, citywide test scores, suspensions, and attendance.
- Talk to employers and SYEP staff about your child's progress and participation in SYEP and review program records on participation in the program.
- Survey and/or interview you and your child about SYEP and its effects.

**This is an evaluation of SYEP and is NOT an evaluation of your child. Any information we collect will be used ONLY to assess SYEP and to track general group trends. Individual responses will not be made public. Participating in the evaluation will not affect your child in school, in SYEP, or in any other way. We will not use your name or your child's name in any report.** At the end of the evaluation, we will destroy all records that include personal information. There are no foreseen risks or discomforts that your child could experience during this study. Participating in this study poses no risks that are not ordinarily encountered in daily life. We expect that no harm will come to you or your child from participation in this study and it may benefit your child by providing opportunities, supports, and services that may enhance development. Participation in the evaluation study is completely voluntary and participants may withdraw at any time with no consequences.

It should be noted that the data collected between June 2011 and December 2011 will be also used as part of a dissertation research study for Nisha Sachdev, a Doctorate of Public Health student at GWU. As noted before, any information we collect will be used ONLY to assess SYEP and to track general group trends. Individual responses will not be made public and participation in the evaluation will not affect your child in school, in SYEP, or in any other way. We will not use your name or your child's name in any report. At the end of the evaluation, we will destroy all records that include personal information. The Office of Human Research of GWU, at telephone number 202-994-2715, can provide further information about your rights as a research participant. Further information regarding this study may be obtained by contacting Nisha Sachdev at 734-358-0151.

Please select ONE of the options below and return this form to the program director. Thank you.

Child Name

Last 4 Digits of Social Security Number

Child Date of Birth

☐ **YES, I GIVE PERMISSION FOR MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN BOTH THE EVALUATION AND THE RESEARCH STUDY.** I have read the above information and I give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP and the data may also be used in the GWU research study. I also consent for SYEP to obtain my child's records, to interview with researchers for program evaluation purposes, and for my child to take related surveys.

Signature

Date

☐ **I GIVE PERMISSION FOR MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN THE EVALUATION.** I have read the above information and I give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP and the data may NOT be used in the GWU research study. I do consent for SYEP to obtain my child's records, to interview with researchers for program evaluation purposes, and for my child to take related surveys.

Signature

Date

☐ **NO, I DO NOT WANT MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE.** I have read the above information and I **DO NOT** give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP or the GWU Research Study.

Signature

Date



## Consent to Participate in the Focus Group of the Evaluation of the DC SYEP



Dear Parent/Guardian,

Your child is registered to participate in the DC Department of Employment Services (DOES) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP). In order to monitor the effectiveness of SYEP, DOES, the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (The Trust), and the George Washington University (GWU) is conducting an ongoing evaluation. The evaluation is being conducted to learn how the services and activities benefit students, how the program can be improved, and whether participation in SYEP increases youth development outcomes.

Specifically we ask permission from you, as the parent/guardian to have your child participate in a focus group to gain in depth information about their participation SYEP. The focus groups will be electronically recorded for purpose of transcription. All focus groups and related materials will be kept confidential and upon transcription will be destroyed. If direct quotes are used in publication, your name and/or organization will not be included and any identifying information will be removed from the quote.

**This is an evaluation of SYEP and is NOT an evaluation of your child. Any information we collect will be used ONLY to assess SYEP and to track general group trends. Individual responses will not be made public. Participating in the evaluation will not affect your child in school, in SYEP, or in any other way. We will not use your name or your child's name in any report.** At the end of the evaluation, we will destroy all records that include personal information. There are no foreseen risks or discomforts that your child could experience during this program evaluation. Participating in this program evaluation poses no risks that are not ordinarily encountered in daily life. We expect that no harm will come to you or your child from participation in this program evaluation and it may benefit your child by providing opportunities, supports, and services that may enhance development. Participation in the evaluation is completely voluntary and participants may withdraw at any time with no consequences.

It should be noted that the data collected between June 2011 and December 2011 will be also used as part of a dissertation research study for Nisha Sachdev, a Doctorate of Public Health student at GWU. The purpose of this dissertation is to evaluate the effectiveness of SYEP. As noted before, any information we collect will be used ONLY to assess SYEP and to track general group trends. Individual responses will not be made public and participation in the evaluation will not affect your child in school, in SYEP, or in any other way. We will not use your name or your child's name in any report. At the end of the evaluation, we will destroy all records that include personal information. The Office of Human Research of GWU, at telephone number 202-994-2715, can provide further information about your rights as a research participant. Further information regarding this study may be obtained by contacting Nisha Sachdev at 734-358-0151.

Please select **ONE** of the options below and return this form to the program director. Thank you.

Child Name

Last 4 Digits of Social Security Number

Child Date of Birth

☐ **YES, I GIVE PERMISSION FOR MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN BOTH THE EVALUATION AND THE RESEARCH STUDY.** I have read the above information and I give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP and the data may also be used in the GWU research study. I also consent for SYEP to obtain my child's records, to focus group with researchers for program evaluation purposes, and for my child to take related surveys.

Signature

Date

☐ **I GIVE PERMISSION FOR MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN THE EVALUATION.** I have read the above information and I give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP and the data may NOT be used in the GWU research study. I do consent for SYEP to obtain my child's records, to focus group with researchers for program evaluation purposes, and for my child to take related surveys.

Signature

Date

☐ **NO, I DO NOT WANT MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE.** I have read the above information and I **DO NOT** give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP or the GWU Research Study.

Signature

Date

**Appendix B:**  
**Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey**



### **Survey Invitation Email**

Hello!

The Department of Employment Services has partnered with the George Washington University and the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation to evaluate the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP).

CLICK ON LINK TO TAKE SURVEY (or copy and paste it in your web browser):  
<https://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22CPSA5E672>

This survey will tell us about the effect SYEP can have on youth. The information you give will be used to develop better programming. All the answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write except the people involved in the study.

Make sure to read every question. Answer the questions based on what you really feel. Whether or not you answer the questions will not affect your participation in the program. If you are not comfortable answering a question, just leave it blank. The questions that ask about your background will be used only to describe the students completing this survey. The information will not be used to find out your name, in fact, no names will ever be reported. Please note: completing the survey is voluntary.

Thank you very much for your help!

For more information or questions contact:  
Nisha Sachdev at [nasachde@gwu.edu](mailto:nasachde@gwu.edu)

### **Survey Reminder Email**

Hello SYEP Participant,

Two weeks ago you were sent an email about an evaluation study. If you have not done so, please click on the link below to complete the survey about your experience with SYEP and also other outcomes.

This survey is to tell us about the effect that SYEP program can have on youth as well as your experience and reflections on participating in the program. The information you give will be used to develop better programming to help meet your needs as well as the needs of the youth. The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write except the people involved in the study. Completing the survey is voluntary and results are anonymous, therefore please be sure NOT to write your name or organization on any page. The survey can be accessed at this link:  
<https://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22CPSA5E672>

Thank you!

## ***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

### Evaluation of the DC Summer Youth Employment Program Informed Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a program evaluation of the Department of Employment Services (DOES) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP). Taking part in this evaluation is entirely voluntary. The status of your employment will not, in any way, be affected should you choose not to participate or if you decide to withdraw from the study at any time. The purpose of this study is to monitor the effectiveness of SYEP and ensure the future success of the program. If you choose to take part in this study, you will be asked questions about your experiences with SYEP, your views on certain issues, and personal reflections. The questions asked will be about demographics, attitudes towards risk behaviors, academic characteristics, and employability skills. The total amount of time you will spend in connection with this study is between 30 and 45 minutes.

You may refuse to answer any of the questions and you may stop your participation in this study at any time. In addition, if you are a DC Public School (DCPS) student choosing to participate in this study, your academic records will be requested from DCPS to show your progress, including information about enrollment, grades, citywide test scores, suspensions, and attendance. This information will not affect your status in school or your grades. There are no unusual risks or discomforts you could experience during this study. Participating in this study poses no risks that are not ordinarily encountered in daily life. You may feel some emotional stress/discomfort answering the survey questions. You are free to skip any questions or stop taking the survey at any point.

You will not benefit directly from your participation in the study. The benefits to science and humankind that might result from this study are: to provide DOES with information about participant's experiences and the overall effectiveness of SYEP. In addition, it will provide other programs with information on the effects of overall summer youth employment programs. The Office of Human Research of George Washington University, at telephone number (202) 994-2715, can provide further information about your rights as a research participant (IRB #061125). Further information regarding this study may be obtained by contacting Nisha Sachdev at 734-358-0151. The principal investigator (Karen McDonnell, Ph.D.) can be reached at 202-994-6823. To ensure anonymity, your signature is not required in this document. Your willingness to participate in this research study is implied if you proceed with completing the survey. You will be emailed a copy of this in a document in case you want to read it again.

There are about 68 questions and the survey will take about 15 minutes. Please click on the "SUBMIT" button at the bottom of each page.

### **Eligibility Questions**

Pick one:

- A. I consent to being a part of BOTH the dissertation study and the program evaluation.
- B. I consent to being a part of only the program evaluation.

Are you at least 18 years old?

- A. Yes
- B. No [*Skip to Screen Out*]

Are you at least 18 years old?

- A. Yes
- B. No [*Received Parental Consent Questions*]

Do you live in DC?

- A. Yes
- B. No [*Skip to Screen Out*]


## DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey


Did you have your parent/guardian check YES and sign a consent form like the one below AND you gave it to your supervisor or SYEP staff?

- A. Yes
- B. No [Skip to Screen Out]

Are you a participant in the DC Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) for the summer of 2011?

- A. Yes
- B. No [Skip to Screen Out]





Consent to Participate in the Evaluation Study of the DC SYEP

Dear Parent/Guardian,

Your child, \_\_\_\_\_, is registered to participate in the DC Department of Employment Services (DOES) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP). In order to monitor the effectiveness of SYEP, DOES, the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (The Trust), and the George Washington University (GWU) is conducting an ongoing evaluation study. It is the intention of the evaluation to learn how these services and activities benefit students, how the program can be continuously improved, and whether participation in SYEP increases youth development outcomes. Specifically we ask permission from you, as parent/guardian, for a period of up to seven years, until your child's projected date of high school graduation to:

- Contact your child's school and obtain records showing their progress, including information about enrollment, grades, citywide test scores, suspensions, and attendance.
- Talk to employers and SYEP staff about your child's progress and participation in SYEP and review program records on participation in the program.
- Survey and/or interview you and your child about SYEP and its effects.

This is an evaluation of SYEP and is NOT an evaluation of your child. Any information we collect will be used ONLY to assess SYEP and to track general group trends. Individual responses will not be made public. Participating in the evaluation will not affect your child in school, in SYEP, or in any other way. You will not use your name or your child's name in any report. At the end of the evaluation, we will destroy all records that include personal information.

There are no foreseen risks or discomforts that your child could experience during this study. Participating in this study poses no risks that are not ordinarily encountered in daily life. We expect that no harm will come to you or your child from participation in this study and it may benefit your child by providing opportunities, supports, and services that may enhance development. Participation in the evaluation study is completely voluntary and participants may withdraw at any time with no consequences.

It should be noted that the data collected between June 2011 and December 2011 will be also used as part of a dissertation research study for Nisha Sachdev, a Doctorate of Public Health student at GWU. As noted before, any information we collect will be used ONLY to assess SYEP and to track general group trends. Individual responses will not be made public. Participating in the evaluation will not affect your child in school, in SYEP, or in any other way. We will not use your name or your child's name in any report. At the end of the evaluation, we will destroy all records that include personal information. The Office of Human Research at GWU, at telephone number 202-994-2715, can provide further information about your rights as a research participant. Further information regarding this study may be obtained by contacting Nisha Sachdev at 754-350-0181.

Please select ONE of the options below and return this form to the program director. Thank you.

☒ **YES, I GIVE PERMISSION FOR MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN BOTH THE EVALUATION AND THE RESEARCH STUDY.** I have read the above information and I give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP and the data may also be used in the GWU research study. I also consent for SYEP to obtain my child's records, to interview with researchers for program evaluation purposes, and for my child to take related surveys.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

☐ **I GIVE PERMISSION FOR MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN THE EVALUATION.** I have read the above information and I give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP and the data may NOT be used in the GWU research study. I do consent for SYEP to obtain my child's records, to interview with researchers for program evaluation purposes, and for my child to take related surveys.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

☐ **NO, I DO NOT WANT MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE.** I have read the above information and I DO NOT give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP or the GWU Research Study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

### ***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

This survey will help tell us about the effect that SYEP program can have on youth. The information you give will be used to develop better programming to help meet your needs. The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write except the people involved in the study. Answer the questions based on what you really feel.

Completing the survey is voluntary. Whether or not you answer the questions will not affect your participation in the program. If you are not comfortable answering a question, just leave it blank. The questions that ask about your background will be used only to describe the types of youth completing this survey.

The information will not be used to find out your name. No names will ever be reported - please be sure NOT to write your name on any page. Make sure to read every question.

Thank you very much for your help!!!

There are about 68 questions and the survey will take about 15 minutes. Please click on the “SUBMIT” button at the bottom of each page.

#### **Demographics: This section will ask you about characteristics about you and your family.**

What is the first letter of your LAST NAME?

- A. A
- B. B
- C. C
- D. D
- E. E
- F. F
- G. G
- H. H
- I. I
- J. J
- K. K
- L. L
- M. M
- N. N
- O. O
- P. P
- Q. Q
- R. R
- S. S
- T. T
- U. U
- V. V
- W. W
- X. X
- Y. Y
- Z. Z

What are the last four digits of your social security number? If you do not know this, please write I don't know.

---

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

What month were you born?

- A. January
- B. February
- C. March
- D. April
- E. May
- F. June
- G. July
- H. August
- I. September
- J. October
- K. November
- L. December

What day were you born?

- A. 1
- B. 2
- C. 3
- D. 4
- E. 5
- F. 6
- G. 7
- H. 8
- I. 9
- J. 10
- K. 11
- L. 12
- M. 13
- N. 14
- O. 15
- P. 16
- Q. 17
- R. 18
- S. 19
- T. 20
- U. 21
- V. 22
- W. 23
- X. 24
- Y. 25
- Z. 26
- AA. 27
- BB. 28
- CC. 29
- DD. 30
- EE. 31

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

What year were you born?

- A. 1986
- B. 1987
- C. 1988
- D. 1989
- E. 1990
- F. 1991
- G. 1992
- H. 1993
- I. 1994
- J. 1995
- K. 1996
- L. 1997
- M. 1998
- N. 1999
- O. 2000
- P. 2001

What is the highest grade you have completed?

- A. 6th grade
- B. 7th grade
- C. 8th grade
- D. 9th grade
- E. 10th grade
- F. 11th grade
- G. 12th grade
- H. Freshman in college
- I. Sophomore in college
- J. Junior in college
- K. Senior in college
- L. Graduated from high school or got GED but not in college
- M. Graduated from college
- N. Left college before completing
- O. I would not like to answer this question

What is your sex?

- A. Female
- B. Male
- C. I would not like to answer this question

How old are you (in years)?

- A. 14 years
- B. 15 years
- C. 16 years
- D. 17 years
- E. 18 years
- F. 19 years
- G. 20 years
- H. 21 years
- I. 22 years
- J. Over 22 years [*Screen Out*]

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

Who do you live with most of the time?

- A. Mother
- B. Father
- C. Both Mother and Father
- D. Neither Mother or Father

How many people (including you) live in your household?

- A. 1
- B. 2
- C. 3
- D. 4
- E. 5
- F. 6
- G. 7
- H. 8 or more

What ward do you live in?

- A. 1
- B. 2
- C. 3
- D. 4
- E. 5
- F. 6
- G. 7
- H. 8
- I. Don't Know

What is the highest level of education completed by your mother?

- A. Middle School or Junior High School
- B. High School
- C. Some College
- D. College or Above
- E. Don't Know

What is the highest level of education completed by your father?

- A. Middle School or Junior High School
- B. High School
- C. Some College
- D. College or Above
- E. Don't Know

What is the language you use most often at home?

- A. English
- B. Spanish
- C. Other

Are one or more of your parents or guardians you are living with working?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. Don't Know
- D. Not Applicable

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

What is your race/ethnicity? (Select one or more responses)

- A. American Indian or Alaska Native
- B. Asian or Pacific Islander
- C. Black or African American
- D. Hispanic or Latino
- E. White
- F. Not sure

**Employment: These questions will ask you about previous participation in SYEP or other jobs.**

How many summers have you participated in SYEP?

- A. This is my first summer.
- B. This is my second summer.
- C. This is my third summer.
- D. I have participated in SYEP four or more summers.

Was it easy to apply for SYEP this year (2011)?

- A. Yes
- B. No

What is the name of your worksite (the name of the organization, company, or agency)? \_\_\_\_\_

Are you happy with your job placement?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think that you will learn about careers by participating in SYEP?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think that you will learn about work skills by participating in SYEP?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Have you worked for pay in the past?

- A. No
- B. Yes, part-time (at least 20 hours/week)
- C. Yes, full-time (more than 20 hours/week)

If yes, what type of paid work did you do in the past? Check all answers that apply.

- A. Working with a family member
- B. Food service or retail
- C. Babysitting and daycare
- D. Arts
- E. Office work/administrative assistant
- F. Community program
- G. Church program
- H. Health sector
- I. Landscaping and outdoor work
- J. Camp counselor
- K. Hair and beauty salon
- L. Tutoring
- M. Other



***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

How much do you think the things you may learn in SYEP will help you later in life?

- A. Help me very much
- B. Help me a little bit
- C. Not help me at all

Do you feel well-prepared for this job?

- A. Yes
- B. No

What other activities (if any) are you participating in this summer?

- A. I am only participating in SYEP
- B. Working at another job/internship outside of SYEP
- C. Going to summer school
- D. Taking college-level courses
- E. Going to camp or other activities
- F. Completing volunteer/community service hours
- G. I do not have plans
- H. Other

What are your goals of this summer experience? Check all answers that apply.

- A. Gain experience to advance my career
- B. Gain experience to better understand career options
- C. Gain experience to advance my studies
- D. Earn money
- E. Learn how to be professional in the world of work
- F. Other

Do you feel safe at your job site?

- A. Always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never

What challenges do you feel you might have while participating in SYEP? Check all that apply.

- A. Paying for transportation
- B. Paying for lunch
- C. Interacting with other youth
- D. Finding child care
- E. Staying interested in what I'm doing
- F. Conflict with my schedule
- G. I don't think I will have any challenges

Did your supervisor provide an orientation for your job duties?

- A. Yes
- B. No

If yes, what did your orientation include? Check all answers that apply.

- A. Gave me a tour of the workplace
- B. Introduced me to other staff members
- C. Connected me with other workers that could answer any questions I had
- D. Talked about job responsibilities
- E. Discussed my work schedule
- F. Discussed the dress code
- G. Trained me on skills I needed to do my job

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

**Academic Characteristics: These questions will ask you about your experience with school.**

I am in high school or college currently.

- A. Yes *[Skip to Future Orientation Questions]*
- B. No

What kind of grades do you get in school?

- A. Mostly A's
- B. Mostly B's
- C. Mostly C's
- D. Mostly D's
- E. Mostly F's

Do you like going to school?

- A. Almost always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never

Do you feel that the school and homework you are given is important?

- A. Almost always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never

Does it matter to you if you do well in school?

- A. Almost always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never

Is what you learn in school important to you?

- A. Almost always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never

How interesting are most of your school courses to you?

- A. Interesting
- B. Sometimes interesting and sometimes boring
- C. Always boring

Are you doing as well as you would like to in school?

- A. Yes
- B. No

**Future Orientation: These questions will ask you about your future careers.**

Can you name three careers you are interested in?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Have you talked to other people about what your career interests are?

- A. Yes
- B. No

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

Do you think about jobs or careers that you might be good at?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Have you ever written a cover letter?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Have you ever written a resume?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you know what your strengths are in the workplace?

- A. Yes
- B. No

How likely is it that you will attend and graduate from college?

- A. Very likely
- B. Somewhat likely
- C. Not at all likely
- D. I am in college right now

Do you know what it takes to succeed in a job?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you know what your weaknesses are in the workplace?

- A. Yes
- B. No

How energetic and healthy do you feel right now?

- A. Very healthy
- B. Somewhat healthy
- C. Not healthy at all

What are your future school plans? (Check up to two that apply)

- A. I have no plans to finish high school or get a GED
- B. I plan to finish high school or get a GED
- C. I plan to work after high school and not go to college
- D. I plan to complete a job training program (for example: electrician, plumber, hairstylist)
- E. I plan to graduate from college
- F. I already graduated from a college
- G. I plan to join the army
- H. None of the above

How satisfied are you with your life right now?

- A. Not satisfied at all
- B. Somewhat satisfied
- C. Very satisfied

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

How much stress or pressure is in your life right now?

- A. A lot of stress
- B. Some stress
- C. No stress at all

How optimistic are you about your future?

- A. The future looks very bad
- B. The future looks ok
- C. The future looks great

**Work Attitudes: The following questions ask about your things that might happen at work.**

Do you feel it would be okay to take off a few days from work without telling your Worksite Supervisor?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Did you arrive to work on time today?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. I did not go to work today.

Do you feel like you have to call your supervisor if you are going to be just a few minutes late?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think it is important to have a clean and neat appearance at work?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think it is okay to wear a cap or scarf to work if your hair doesn't look good?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think that there are rules you are expected to follow at your worksite?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think you should ask questions or for help at work if you do not understand what you are supposed to do?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think you should complete tasks neatly and to the best of your ability, even if you do not feel like it?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think if you do a good job then your boss won't have to supervise you all of the time?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think it is important to have a positive attitude at work?

- A. Yes
- B. No

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

Do you think if you did something the wrong way at work, it is okay to blame other workers?

- A. Yes
- B. No

**Self-Expression: These statements and questions ask about your feelings about yourself. This section also asks some other personal questions. Remember, your answers are confidential. This means your answers will stay secret.**

Please answer the following statements and respond:

- 1. Always
  - 2. Sometimes
  - 3. Never
- I am good at telling others my ideas and feelings.  
I am good at listening to other people.  
I work well with others on a team.  
I make good decisions.  
I am good at setting goals.  
I am important in my community.  
I am a good leader.  
I am good at solving problems.  
I care about other people.  
I am good at taking care of problems without violence or fighting.  
I feel like I have at least one adult that supports me.  
I stand up for what I believe in.  
I am interested in the community and world problems.  
I feel I have do not have control over things that happen to me.

**Risk Behavior Attitudes and Awareness: These questions ask about your experiences in other parts of your life. It asks some other personal questions. Remember, your answers are confidential. This means your answers will stay secret.**

For the next group of questions respond:

- 1. 1 friend
- 2. 2 friends
- 3. 3 friends
- 4. 4 or more friends
- 5. Don't know
- 6. None of my friends

In the past year (12 months), how many of your closest friends have:

Used marijuana when their parents didn't know about it?

Tried beer, wine or other liquor when their parents didn't know about it?

Used LSD, cocaine, amphetamines, or other illegal drugs?

Been suspended from school?

Dropped out of school?

Been arrested?

Carried a handgun?

Sold illegal drugs?

### ***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Pre Survey***

For the following questions, respond whether you feel like the statements are:

1. True
2. False

Drinking is bad for me.

Using LSD, cocaine, amphetamines, or other illegal drugs is bad for me.

It is ok to get suspended from school for fighting.

It is ok to carry a handgun to protect myself.

It is bad to sell illegal drugs.

It is ok to get arrested for doing something illegal.

It is ok to drop out of school.

It is ok to beat up people if they start the fight.

It is bad to take something without asking if you can get away with it.

It is important to be honest with someone, even if they become upset or you get punished.

How honest were you in filling out this survey?

- A. I was honest all of the time.
- B. I was honest some of the time.
- C. I was not honest at all.

Thank you so much for completing the pre-survey. You will be contacted again at the end of the summer to complete a post-survey!!!! Have a great summer!!!!



**Appendix C:**

**DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey**

## ***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

### **Survey Invitation Email**

Hello!

The Department of Employment Services has partnered with the George Washington University and the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation to evaluate Mayor Vincent C. Gray's One City Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP).

CLICK ON LINK TO TAKE SURVEY (or copy and paste it in your web browser):

<https://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22CVAVGRYPH>

This survey will tell us about the effect SYEP can have on youth. The information you give will be used to develop better programming. All the answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write except the people involved in the study.

Make sure to read every question. Answer the questions based on what you really feel. Whether or not you answer the questions will not affect your participation in the program. If you are not comfortable answering a question, just leave it blank. The questions that ask about your background will be used only to describe the students completing this survey. The information will not be used to find out your name, in fact, no names will ever be reported. Please note: completing the survey is voluntary.

Thank you very much for your help!

### **Survey Reminder Email**

Hello SYEP 2011 Participant:

Several weeks ago, you were sent an email about an evaluation study related to Mayor Vincent C. Gray's One City Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP).

If you have not done so already, please click on the following link to complete a survey about your experience with SYEP and also other outcomes:

<https://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22CVAVGRYPH>

This survey is designed to help us learn more about the effects that the SYEP may have on its youth participants as a whole and also provides us with insight into your specific experience as a participating youth in the program. The information you provide will be used to help improve the program to better meet your needs as well as the needs of the employers who participate in the SYEP.

The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write except the people involved in the study. Completing the survey is voluntary and results are anonymous, therefore please be sure NOT to write your name on any page. Once again, the survey can be accessed at the following link:

<https://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22CVAVGRYPH>

Thank you!



## ***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

### Evaluation of the DC Summer Youth Employment Program Informed Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a program evaluation of the Department of Employment Services (DOES) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP). Taking part in this evaluation is entirely voluntary. The status of your employment will not, in any way, be affected should you choose not to participate or if you decide to withdraw from the study at any time. The purpose of this study is to monitor the effectiveness of SYEP and ensure the future success of the program. If you choose to take part in this study, you will be asked questions about your experiences with SYEP, your views on certain issues, and personal reflections. The questions asked will be about demographics, attitudes towards risk behaviors, academic characteristics, and employability skills. The total amount of time you will spend in connection with this study is between 30 and 45 minutes.

You may refuse to answer any of the questions and you may stop your participation in this study at any time. In addition, if you are a DC Public School (DCPS) student choosing to participate in this study, your academic records will be requested from DCPS to show your progress, including information about enrollment, grades, citywide test scores, suspensions, and attendance. This information will not affect your status in school or your grades. There are no unusual risks or discomforts you could experience during this study. Participating in this study poses no risks that are not ordinarily encountered in daily life. You may feel some emotional stress/discomfort answering the survey questions. You are free to skip any questions or stop taking the survey at any point.

You will not benefit directly from your participation in the study. The benefits to science and humankind that might result from this study are: to provide DOES with information about participant's experiences and the overall effectiveness of SYEP. In addition, it will provide other programs with information on the effects of overall summer youth employment programs. The Office of Human Research of George Washington University, at telephone number (202) 994-2715, can provide further information about your rights as a research participant (IRB #061125). Further information regarding this study may be obtained by contacting Nisha Sachdev at 734-358-0151. The principal investigator (Karen McDonnell, Ph.D.) can be reached at 202-994-6823. To ensure anonymity, your signature is not required in this document. Your willingness to participate in this research study is implied if you proceed with completing the survey. You will be emailed a copy of this in a document in case you want to read it again.

There are about 68 questions and the survey will take about 15 minutes. Please click on the "SUBMIT" button at the bottom of each page.

### **Eligibility Questions**

Pick one:

- A. I consent to being a part of BOTH the dissertation study and the program evaluation.
- B. I consent to being a part of only the program evaluation.

Are you at least 18 years old?

- A. Yes
- B. No [*Skip to Screen Out*]

Are you at least 18 years old?

- A. Yes
- B. No [*Received Parental Consent Questions*]

Do you live in DC?

- A. Yes
- B. No [*Screen Out*]

## ***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

Did you have your parent/guardian check YES and sign a consent form like the one below AND you gave it to your supervisor or SYEP staff?


A. Yes


B. No [Screen Out]

Are you a participant in the DC Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) for the summer of 2011?

A. Yes

B. No [Skip to Screen Out]





Consent to Participate in the Evaluation Study of the DC SYEP

Dear Parent/Guardian,

Your child, \_\_\_\_\_, is registered to participate in the DC Department of Employment Services (DOES) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP). In order to monitor the effectiveness of SYEP, DOES, the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (The Trust), and the George Washington University (GWU) is conducting an ongoing evaluation study. It is the intention of the evaluation to learn how these services and activities benefit students, how the program can be continuously improved, and whether participation in SYEP increases youth development outcomes. Specifically we ask permission from you, as parent/guardian, for a period of up to seven years, until your child's projected date of high school graduation to:

- Contact your child's school and obtain records showing their progress, including information about enrollment, grades, citywide test scores, suspensions, and attendance.
- Talk to employers and SYEP staff about your child's progress and participation in SYEP and review program records on participation in the program.
- Survey and/or interview you and your child about SYEP and its effects.

This is an evaluation of SYEP and is NOT an evaluation of your child. Any information we collect will be used ONLY to assess SYEP and to track general group trends. Individual responses will not be made public. Participating in the evaluation will not affect your child in school, in SYEP, or in any other way. You will not use your name or your child's name in any reports. At the end of the evaluation, we will destroy all records that include personal information.

There are no foreseen risks or discomforts that your child could experience during this study. Participating in this study poses no risks that are not ordinarily encountered in daily life. We expect that no harm will come to you or your child from participation in this study and it may benefit your child by providing opportunities, supports, and services that may enhance development. Participation in the evaluation study is completely voluntary and participants may withdraw at any time with no consequences.

It should be noted that the data collected between June 2011 and December 2011 will be also used as part of a dissertation research study for Nisha Sachdev, a Doctorate of Public Health student at GWU. As noted before, any information we collect will be used ONLY to assess SYEP and to track general group trends. Individual responses will not be made public. Participating in the evaluation will not affect your child in school, in SYEP, or in any other way. We will not use your name or your child's name in any reports. At the end of the evaluation, we will destroy all records that include personal information. The Office of Human Research at GWU, at telephone number 202-994-2715, can provide further information about your rights as a research participant. Further information regarding this study may be obtained by contacting Nisha Sachdev at 754-355-0151.

Please select ONE of the options below and return this form to the program director. Thank you.

☒ YES, I GIVE PERMISSION FOR MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN BOTH THE EVALUATION AND THE RESEARCH STUDY. I have read the above information and I give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP and the data may also be used in the GWU research study. I also consent for SYEP to obtain my child's records, to interview with researchers for program evaluation purposes, and for my child to take related surveys.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

☐ I GIVE PERMISSION FOR MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN THE EVALUATION. I have read the above information and I give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP and the data may NOT be used in the GWU research study. I do consent for SYEP to obtain my child's records, to interview with researchers for program evaluation purposes, and for my child to take related surveys.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

☐ NO, I DO NOT WANT MY CHILD TO PARTICIPATE. I have read the above information and I DO NOT give permission for my child to participate in the evaluation of SYEP or the GWU Research Study.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### ***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

This survey will help tell us about the effect that SYEP program can have on youth. The information you give will be used to develop better programming to help meet your needs. The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write except the people involved in the study. Answer the questions based on what you really feel.

Completing the survey is voluntary. Whether or not you answer the questions will not affect your participation in the program. If you are not comfortable answering a question, just leave it blank. The questions that ask about your background will be used only to describe the types of youth completing this survey.

The information will not be used to find out your name. No names will ever be reported - please be sure NOT to write your name on any page. Make sure to read every question.

Thank you very much for your help!!!

There are about 68 questions and the survey will take about 15 minutes. Please click on the "SUBMIT" button at the bottom of each page.

#### **Demographics: This section will ask you about characteristics about you and your family.**

What is the first letter of your LAST NAME?

- A. A
- B. B
- C. C
- D. D
- E. E
- F. F
- G. G
- H. H
- B. I
- C. J
- D. K
- E. L
- F. M
- G. N
- H. O
- I. P
- J. Q
- K. R
- L. S
- M. T
- N. U
- O. V
- P. W
- Q. X
- R. Y
- S. Z

What are the last four digits of your social security number? If you do not know this, please write I don't know.

---

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

What month were you born?

- A. January
- B. February
- C. March
- D. April
- E. May
- F. June
- G. July
- H. August
- I. September
- J. October
- K. November
- L. December

What day were you born?

- A. 1
- B. 2
- C. 3
- D. 4
- E. 5
- F. 6
- G. 7
- H. 8
- I. 9
- J. 10
- K. 11
- L. 12
- M. 13
- N. 14
- O. 15
- P. 16
- Q. 17
- R. 18
- S. 19
- T. 20
- U. 21
- V. 22
- W. 23
- X. 24
- Y. 25
- Z. 26
- AA. 27
- BB. 28
- CC. 29
- DD. 30
- EE. 31

What is your sex?

- A. Female
- B. Male
- C. I would not like to answer this question

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

What year were you born?

- A. 1986
- B. 1987
- C. 1988
- D. 1989
- E. 1990
- F. 1991
- G. 1992
- H. 1993
- I. 1994
- J. 1995
- K. 1996
- L. 1997
- M. 1998
- N. 1999
- O. 2000
- P. 2001

What is the highest grade you have completed?

- A. 6th grade
- B. 7th grade
- C. 8th grade
- D. 9th grade
- E. 10th grade
- F. 11th grade
- G. 12th grade
- H. Freshman in college
- I. Sophomore in college
- J. Junior in college
- K. Senior in college
- L. Graduated from high school or got GED but not in college
- M. Graduated from college
- N. Left college before completing

How old are you (in years)?

- A. 14 years
- B. 15 years
- C. 16 years
- D. 17 years
- E. 18 years
- F. 19 years
- G. 20 years
- H. 21 years
- I. 22 years
- J. Over 22 years *[Skip to Screen Out]*

Who do you live with most of the time?

- A. Mother
- B. Father
- C. Both Mother and Father
- D. Neither Mother or Father

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

How many people (including you) live in your household?

- A. 1
- B. 2
- C. 3
- D. 4
- E. 5
- F. 6
- G. 7
- H. 8 or more

What ward do you live in?

- A. 1
- B. 2
- C. 3
- D. 4
- E. 5
- F. 6
- G. 7
- H. 8
- I. Don't Know

How old is your mother?

- A. 18 to 21 years
- B. 22 to 25 years
- C. 26 to 30 years
- D. 30 to 35 years
- E. 36 to 40 years
- F. 40 to 45 years
- G. 45 to 50 years
- H. Over 50 years
- I. I don't know

How old is your father?

- A. 18 to 21 years
- B. 22 to 25 years
- C. 26 to 30 years
- D. 30 to 35 years
- E. 36 to 40 years
- F. 40 to 45 years
- G. 45 to 50 years
- H. Over 50 years
- I. I don't know

What is the highest level of education completed by your mother?

- A. Middle School or Junior High School
- B. High School
- C. Some College
- D. College or Above
- E. Don't Know

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

What is the highest level of education completed by your father?

- A. Middle School or Junior High School
- B. High School
- C. Some College
- D. College or Above
- E. Don't Know

Are one or more of your parents or guardians you are living with working?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. Don't Know
- D. Not Applicable

What is your race/ethnicity? (Select one or more responses)

- A. American Indian or Alaska Native
- B. Asian or Pacific Islander
- C. Black or African American
- D. Hispanic or Latino
- E. White
- F. Not sure

What is the language you use most often at home?

- A. English
- B. Spanish

Do you have a son or daughter?

- A. Yes
- B. No

If yes, how old is your oldest child?

- A. 0 to 2 years
- B. 3 to 6 years
- C. 7 to 10 years
- D. Over 10 years
- E. Don't know

**Employment: These questions will ask you about participation in SYEP and other activities.**

How many summers have you participated in SYEP?

- A. This is my first summer.
- B. This is my second summer.
- C. This is my third summer.
- D. This is my fourth summer.
- E. I have participated in SYEP five or more summers.

Was it easy to apply for SYEP this year (2011)?

- A. Yes
- B. No

What is the name of your worksite (the name of the organization, company, or agency)? \_\_\_\_\_

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

Were you happy with your job placement?

- A. Yes
- B. No

What was your summer job with the SYEP? Select up to two answers that apply.

- A. Worked with a business
- B. Worked with the government
- C. Office work
- D. Mentoring or tutoring
- E. Community clean-ups and improvement
- F. Research or data collection
- G. Camp counselor
- H. Gardening or outdoor maintenance
- I. Building maintenance
- J. Daycare
- K. Academic or educational classes
- L. Other

Do you think you were well-prepared for your summer job?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Did you feel safe at your job site?

- A. Always
- B. Usually
- C. Never

Overall, how satisfied were you with your supervisor?

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Somewhat satisfied
- C. Not satisfied at all

Do you think you were well-prepared for your summer job?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Did you feel safe at your job site?

- A. Always
- B. Usually
- C. Never

What challenges do you feel you had while participating in SYEP? Select all that apply.

- A. Paying for transportation
- B. Paying for lunch
- C. Interacting with other youth
- D. Finding child care
- E. Staying interested in what I'm doing
- F. Conflict with my schedule
- G. I had no challenges



***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

How much do you think the things you may learn in SYEP will help you later in life?

- A. Help me very much
- B. Help me a little bit
- C. Not help me at all

Overall, how satisfied were you with your supervisor?

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Somewhat satisfied
- C. Not satisfied at all

Did your supervisor provide an orientation for your job duties?

- A. Yes
- B. No

If yes, what did your orientation include? Select all that apply.

- A. Gave me a tour of the workplace
- B. Introduced me to other staff members
- C. Connected me with other workers that could answer any questions I had
- D. Talked about job responsibilities
- E. Discussed my work schedule
- F. Discussed the dress code
- G. Trained me on skills I needed to do my job
- H. Other

To what extent have the activities you participated in changed your ideas about your future?

- A. A lot
- B. Somewhat
- C. Not at all

If a lot or somewhat, how have your ideas about your future changed this summer? Select all that apply.

- A. I was thinking about quitting school but now think I can stay in school.
- B. I can reach a higher level of education.
- C. I now think I can get a better job.
- D. I now have more confidence about whatever I do.
- E. I now plan to do more community service and volunteer work.
- F. I now think I can provide leadership in my community.
- G. Other

This summer, how often did you feel that you did a good job managing the money you earned?

- A. Always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never

What did you do with most of the money you earned this summer? Select up to two answers that apply.

- A. Saved it for college
- B. Saved it for something I really needed
- C. Spent it on something I really needed
- D. Gave it to my family
- E. Used it to pay off money I owed
- F. Spent it on something I want, but really didn't need
- G. Spent it on food
- H. Other

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

How did your job placement help you prepare for future employment? Select all that apply.

- A. Helped me decide what kind of job I like
- B. Showed me how to search for jobs
- C. Showed me how to fill out a job application
- D. Helped me create a resume
- E. Prepared me for a job interview
- F. Referred me to potential jobs
- G. Helped me to understand what qualifications I need for my dream job
- H. Helped me arrange child care
- I. Other
- J. Did not help me prepare for employment

What job skills did you think you learned through participating in SYEP? Select all that apply.

- A. Computer skills
- B. Problem-solving
- C. Public speaking
- D. Accepting supervision
- E. Financial management skills
- F. Importance of a career
- G. Communication skills
- H. How to be organized
- I. Reporting to work on time
- J. Dressing appropriately for work
- K. Completing assignments on time
- L. Asking for help when I don't understand an assignment
- M. Being responsible
- N. Using numbers
- O. Other
- P. I learned nothing from participating in SYEP

Have you worked for pay before this summer?

- A. Yes, part-time (at least 20 hours/week)
- B. Yes, full-time (more than 20 hours/week)
- C. No

If yes, what type of paid work did you do in the past? Select all that apply.

- A. Working with a family member
- B. Trades
- C. Food service or retail
- D. Hospitality service
- E. Babysitting and daycare
- F. Arts
- G. Office work/administrative assistant
- H. Community program
- I. Church program
- J. Health sector
- K. Landscaping and outdoor work
- L. Camp counselor
- M. Hair and beauty salon
- N. Tutoring
- O. Other

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

Outside of SYEP, what other activities (if any) did you participate in this summer? Select all that apply.

- A. I only participated in SYEP
- B. Worked at another job/internship outside of SYEP
- C. Went to summer school for middle school or high school
- D. Took college-level courses
- E. Went to camp or other activities
- F. Volunteer/community service hours
- G. Played sports
- H. Hung out with friends
- I. Traveled
- J. Babysat
- K. Other

How did the job placement help you academically? Select all that apply.

- A. Helped me decide to stay in school
- B. Helped me strengthen my reading skills
- C. Helped me strengthen my math skills
- D. Helped me have higher academic expectations for myself
- E. Other
- F. Did not help me prepare academically

**Academic Characteristics: These questions will ask you about your experience with school.**

I am in high school or college currently.

- A. Yes [*Skip to Future Orientation Questions*]
- B. No

What kind of grades do you get in school?

- A. Mostly A's
- B. Mostly B's
- C. Mostly C's
- D. Mostly D's
- E. Mostly F's

Do you like going to school?

- A. Almost always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never

Does it matter to you if you do well in school?

- A. Almost always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never

How interesting are most of your school courses to you?

- A. Interesting
- B. Sometimes interesting and sometimes boring
- C. Always boring

Are you doing as well as you would like to in school?

- A. Yes
- B. No

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

**Future Orientation: These questions will ask you about your future careers.**

Can you name three careers you are interested in?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Did you talk to supervisors at your worksite about jobs you are interested in?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you have a cover letter?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you have a resume?

- A. Yes
- B. No

How energetic and healthy do you feel right now?

- A. Very healthy
- B. Somewhat healthy
- C. Not healthy at all

How satisfied are you with your life right now?

- A. Not satisfied at all
- B. Somewhat satisfied
- C. Very satisfied

How much stress or pressure is in your life right now?

- A. A lot of stress
- B. Some stress
- C. No stress at all

How optimistic are you about your future?

- A. The future looks very bad
- B. The future looks ok
- C. The future looks great

What are your future school plans? (Check up to two that apply)

- A. I have no plans to finish high school or get a GED
- B. I plan to finish high school or get a GED
- C. I plan to work after high school and not go to college
- D. I plan to complete a job training program (for example: electrician, plumber, hairstylist)
- E. I plan to graduate from college
- F. I already graduated from a college
- G. I plan to join the army
- H. None of the above

*DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey*

**Work Attitudes: The following questions ask about your things that might have happened at work.**

Did you arrive to work on time today?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you feel it would be okay to take off a few days from work without telling your Worksite Supervisor?

- C. Yes
- D. No

Do you feel like you have to call your supervisor if you are going to be just a few minutes late?

- C. Yes
- D. No

Do you think it is important to have a clean and neat appearance at work?

- C. Yes
- D. No

Do you think that there would be rules you are expected to follow at work?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you think you should ask questions if you do not understand what you are supposed to do at work?

- A. Yes
- B. No

**Risk Behavior Attitudes and Awareness: These questions ask about your experiences in other parts of your life. It asks some other personal questions. Remember, your answers are confidential. This means your answers will stay secret.**

Please respond whether you feel like the statements are:

- 1. True
- 2. False

Drinking is bad for me.

Using LSD, cocaine, amphetamines, or other illegal drugs is bad for me.

It is ok to get suspended from school for fighting.

It is ok to carry a handgun to protect myself.

It is bad to sell illegal drugs.

It is ok to get arrested for doing something illegal.

It is ok to drop out of school.

***DC Youth Summer Youth Employment Program Post Survey***

What do you think you would have done if you had not participated in SYEP? Select all that apply.

- A. Stayed at home
- B. Looked for another job
- C. Worked somewhere else
- D. Played sports
- E. Attended other summer programs
- F. Volunteered
- G. Hung out with friends
- H. Summer school for middle or high school
- I. Travelled
- J. Took summer courses in college
- K. Babysat
- L. Other
- M. I don't know

If I did not have a job this summer, I would have been more likely to get into trouble or be a trouble maker in my community.

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. I don't know

**Satisfaction: These questions ask about your experience with participating in 2011 SYEP.**

Overall, how satisfied are you with your participation in SYEP?

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Somewhat satisfied
- C. Not satisfied at all

Do you want to participate in SYEP next summer?

- A. Yes, at the same job
- B. Yes, but at a different job
- C. No

If no, why don't you want to participate in SYEP next summer? Select all that apply.

- A. I expect to have a better job.
- B. I expect to be in school.
- C. I do not expect to be living in the District of Columbia.
- D. I did not have a good experience.

How honest were you in filling out this survey?

- A. I was honest all of the time.
- B. I was honest some of the time.
- C. I was not honest at all.

**Appendix D:**  
**DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey**

## ***DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey***

### **Survey Invitation Email**

Hello SYEP Supervisor,

The Department of Employment Services has partnered with the George Washington University and the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation to evaluate Mayor Vincent C. Gray's One City Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP).

The survey can be accessed at this link: <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22CVA38RGNM>  
This survey is to tell us about the effect that SYEP program can have on youth as well as your experience and reflections on participating in the program. The information you give will be used to develop better programming to help meet your needs as well as the needs of the youth. The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write except the people involved in the study. Completing the survey is voluntary and results are anonymous, therefore please be sure NOT to write your name or organization on any page.

In addition, over the next month you may be contacted to participate in an in-person or phone interview. Once again, participation in this is completely voluntary.

Thank you!

### **Survey Reminder Email**

Hello SYEP 2011 Supervisor:

Several weeks ago, you were sent an email about an evaluation study related to Mayor Vincent C. Gray's One City Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP).

If you have not done so already, please click on the following link to complete a survey about your experience with SYEP: <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22CVA38RGNM>.

This survey is designed to help us learn more about the effects that the SYEP may have on its youth participants and also provides us with insight into your experience as a participating employer in the program. The information you provide will be used to help improve the program to better meet your needs as well as the needs of the youth.

The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write except the people involved in the study. Completing the survey is voluntary and results are anonymous, therefore please be sure NOT to write your name or organization on any page.

Once again, the survey can be accessed at the following link:  
<http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22CVA38RGNM>

Thank you!



## ***DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey***

### Evaluation of the DC Summer Youth Employment Program Informed Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a program evaluation of the Department of Employment Services (DOES) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP). Taking part in this evaluation is entirely voluntary. The status of your employment will not, in any way, be affected should you choose not to participate or if you decide to withdraw from the study at any time. The purpose of this study is to monitor the effectiveness of SYEP and ensure the future success of the program. If you choose to take part in this study, you will be asked questions about your experiences with SYEP, your views on certain issues, and personal reflections. The questions asked will be about demographics, attitudes towards risk behaviors, academic characteristics, and employability skills. The total amount of time you will spend in connection with this study is between 30 and 45 minutes. You may refuse to answer any of the questions and you may stop your participation in this study at any time. There are no unusual risks or discomforts you could experience during this study. Participating in this study poses no risks that are not ordinarily encountered in daily life. You may feel some emotional stress/discomfort answering the survey questions. You are free to skip any questions or stop taking the survey at any point.

You will not benefit directly from your participation in the study. The benefits to science and humankind that might result from this study are: to provide DOES with information about participant's experiences and the overall effectiveness of SYEP. In addition, it will provide other programs with information on the effects of overall summer youth employment programs.

It should be noted that the data collected between June 2011 and December 2011 will be also used as part of a dissertation research study for Nisha Sachdev, a Doctorate of Public Health student at GWU. This dissertation is under the direction of Dr. Karen McDonnell of the Department of Prevention and Community Health at George Washington University (GWU). As noted before, any information we collect will be used **ONLY** to assess SYEP and to track general group trends. Individual responses will not be made public. We will not use your name in any report. At the end of the evaluation, we will destroy all records that include personal information. The Office of Human Research of GWU, at telephone number 202-994-2715, can provide further information about your rights as a research participant. Further information regarding this study may be obtained by contacting Nisha Sachdev at 734-358-0151.

### **Eligibility Questions**

Pick one:

- A. I consent to being a part of BOTH the dissertation study and the program evaluation.
- B. I consent to being a part of only the program evaluation.
- C. I consent to being a part of only the dissertation study.

Did you participate in the DC Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) for the summer of 2011?

- A. Yes
- B. No [*Screen Out*]

### ***DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey***

Please complete this survey as honestly as you can and any information provided will be confidential. In addition, please make sure you answer every question and select only one response unless noted that you may select more than one. In addition, you may be contacted in the next few weeks to participate in a voluntary in-person or phone interview. The purposes of these interviews are to obtain more in-depth information about your experience with SYEP. If there are any questions or you are unable to access the survey online, please contact Nisha Sachdev at [nasachde@gwu.edu](mailto:nasachde@gwu.edu). Please complete the survey online by September 10, 2011. The survey contains about 35 questions and takes about 15 minutes to complete.

#### **Demographic Information**

What type of organization do you represent?

- A. Non-Profit/Community Based Organization
- B. For-Profit Organization
- C. Government Agency
- D. School/University
- E. Other

What is the main purpose of your organization? Select up to two answers that apply.

- A. Youth
- B. Faith
- C. Law enforcement
- D. Education
- E. Community improvement or development
- F. Research or data collection
- G. Outdoor beautification
- H. Arts or culture
- I. Sales or retail
- J. Health
- K. Sports or recreation
- L. Childcare
- M. Other

How many years have you worked at your organization/agency?

- A. Less than 1 year
- B. 1 to 2 years
- C. 3 to 5 years
- D. 5 to 8 years
- E. More than 8 years

What is your primary role within your organization/agency?

- A. Administration
- B. Youth worker
- C. Executive Director/Manager
- D. Assistant
- E. Program Manager
- F. Other

How many years have you participated in SYEP?

- A. This is my first summer.
- B. This is my second summer.
- C. This is my third summer.
- D. I have participated in SYEP four or more summers.

***DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey***

Was the online host work site portal easy to use?

- A. Always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never
- D. I did not use the portal

Did you have issues with the payroll system?

- A. Always
- B. Sometimes
- C. Never
- D. I did not use the payroll system.

Did you participate in the Advancing Youth Development training?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. I don't know

If yes, do you believe this training was helpful in working with the youth this summer?

- A. Yes
- B. No

How many youth did you employ this summer as part of SYEP?

- A. 1 to 5 youth
- B. 6 to 10 youth
- C. 11 to 15 youth
- D. 16 to 20 youth
- E. More than 20 youth

What age group did a majority of your youth fall in?

- A. 14 to 16 years
- B. 17 to 21 years

Did you identify the specific youth you wanted to engage at your specific worksite?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. I don't know

If yes, did you receive the youth you identified?

- A. Yes, all of them
- B. Yes, some of them
- C. No

Do you believe you had a clear understanding of your responsibilities before the start of SYEP?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you feel that you were given the information necessary to properly plan a high quality program?

- A. Yes
- B. No

***DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey***

Did you provide an orientation to the specific position(s) youth were employed in?

- A. Yes
- B. No

If yes, what did your orientation include? Please check all that apply.

- A. Gave a tour of the workplace
- B. Introduced youth to other staff members
- C. Set up the opportunity for youth to learn from another employee
- D. Connected youth with other workers that could answer any questions they had
- E. Talked about job responsibilities
- F. Discussed work schedule
- G. Discussed the dress code
- H. Gave an overview of the equipment they would be using
- I. Trained youth on skills they needed to do their job
- J. Other

Overall, do you feel like you were prepared to work with the youth this summer?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Do you feel that any questions or concerns you had were addressed by your SYEP liaison appropriately and in a timely manner?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. I did not have any questions or concerns

How did your worksite help prepare youth for future employment? Select up to two answers that apply.

- A. Passing on good work ethic
- B. Introducing youth to a professional atmosphere
- C. Teaching the importance of team work
- D. Building leadership skills
- E. Offering exposure to possible career choices
- F. Other
- G. My worksite did not help prepare youth for future employment.

Did your worksite help prepare youth academically?

- A. Yes
- B. No

If yes, how did your worksite help prepare youth academically? Select up to three answers that apply.

- A. Building reading and writing skills
- B. Building math and science skills
- C. Building problem-solving and critical thinking skills
- D. Strengthening skills associated with organization, following directions, and time management
- E. Reinforcing study habits
- F. Reinforcing the importance of getting an education
- G. Connecting youth to higher education or educational resources
- H. Building computer and technology skills

Do you believe the youth fully understood the requirements of participating SYEP?

- A. A majority of the youth
- B. Some youth
- C. None of the youth

***DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey***

What do you think were the most important job skills that were passed on to youth this summer? Select up to three answers that apply.

- A. Computer skills
- B. Problem-solving
- C. Public speaking
- D. Accepting supervision
- E. Financial management skills
- F. Importance of a career
- G. Communication skills
- H. How to be organized
- I. Reporting to work on time
- J. Dressing appropriately for work
- K. Completing assignments on time
- L. Asking for help when they don't understand an assignment
- M. Being responsible
- N. Using numbers
- O. Other

Do you think that SYEP helped the youth with any of the following? Choose all answers that apply.

- A. Telling others about ideas and feelings
- B. Listening to other people
- C. Working with others on a team
- D. Making good decisions
- E. Setting goals
- F. Being a good leader
- G. Taking care of problems without violence or fighting
- H. Finding at least one adult that supports them
- I. I do not think that SYEP helped the youth with any of the above.

How do you feel the youth engaged with your program or organization?

- A. Youth were involved and engaged.
- B. Youth were not interested initially, but became interested.
- C. Youth were not involved or engaged.

What do you feel was the greatest challenge of employing youth? Select up to two answers that apply.

- A. Encouraging youth to be on time
- B. Keeping youth on task
- C. Lack of experience of the youth
- D. Finding common understanding of expectation
- E. Providing adult supervision
- F. Assisting youth in developing a positive work ethic
- G. Encouraging youth to use appropriate language and behavior
- H. Keeping youth busy with things to do
- I. Handling youth transportation issues
- J. Providing additional job training during the summer
- K. Finding dependable, committed youth
- L. No challenges
- M. Other

### ***DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey***

The following questions are assessing the performance of the youth at the end of the program. Please rate if you feel a majority of the youth (at least 75% of the youth supervised) accomplished the following skills. Choose:

1. At least 75% of the youth supervised accomplished the skill.
2. At least 75% of the youth supervised DID NOT accomplish the skill.
3. You are unsure if the youth accomplished the skill.

Reported to work at the appropriate time and place

Called when late or absent

Had regular attendance

Dressed appropriately

Had a positive attitude

Accepted constructive criticism from supervisors and co-workers

Completed tasks appropriately

Followed instructions

Worked well with others

Asked appropriate questions

Behaved in a professional manner at the worksite

Showed initiative

Do you have plans to permanently hire the youth who worked for you this summer?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. I don't know

Would you have hired the youth even if their salaries were not fully subsidized?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. I don't know

Would you participate in SYEP again?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Would you encourage other organizations similar to yours to participate in SYEP?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Overall, how satisfied are you with your participation in SYEP?

- A. Very satisfied
- B. Somewhat satisfied
- C. Not satisfied at all

Was your organization a grantee of the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (The Trust)?

- A. Yes
- B. No *[Screen Out]*

***DC Supervisor Summer Youth Employment Program Survey***

Which resource(s) offered by the Trust did you find beneficial?

Respond:

1. Very Beneficial
2. Somewhat Beneficial
3. Not Beneficial

Program Officer

Programming Support

Administrative Support

Access to Agency Partnerships

Funding

Which process of communication with the Trust worked best for your organization?

- A. Communicating with only one agency
- B. Communicating with both agencies simultaneously
- C. Communicating separate concerns to separate agencies

How supportive was the Trust with the following:

1. Very Supportive
2. Somewhat Supportive
3. Not Supportive

Program support

Youth engagement

Grant expectations

Communication with DOES

Length of grant

Access to funding

Would you consider applying for the SYEP grant through the Trust next summer?

- A. Yes
- B. No
- C. I don't know

Thank you for participating in the evaluation of SYEP!!!

**Appendix E:**  
**Focus Group Protocols**



### *Youth Focus Group Protocol*

Hello SYEP 2011 Participants:

First, thank you again for your participation in Mayor Vincent C. Gray's One City Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP). I hope that you enjoyed your time in the program and that you will apply again next year.

Our team is currently finalizing plans for SYEP 2012, but we need your help! We will be working with the George Washington University (GWU) and the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (CYITC) to host our SYEP 2011 Youth Focus Group Sessions.

These sessions will be held on Thursday, November 10 and Monday, November 14 from 4:30-6:30PM at the DOES Headquarters Building which is located at 4058 Minnesota Avenue NE (right next to the Minnesota Avenue Metro Station).

These sessions are a chance for you to tell us what you really think of SYEP...

- What did you like or dislike about your experience?
- What, if anything, did you learn?
- How can we improve the program?
- What aspects of the program worked well and what didn't work so well?
- How can we help ensure you are better prepared for work?
- How can we communicate with you better?

If you have something to say, we want to hear it! We want to capture your feedback so that we can make this program the best in the nation!

If you would like to attend one of our SYEP 2011 Youth Focus Group Sessions, please RSVP by clicking the correct link below:

SYEP Youth Focus Group – Session 1 (Thursday, November 10 from 4:30-6:30PM):

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SYEPYouthFocusGroupSession1>

SYEP Youth Focus Group – Session 2 (Monday, November 14 from 4:30-6:30PM):

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/SYEPYouthFocusGroupSession2>

Transportation assistance is available and refreshments will be served! Hope to see you there!

All the best,  
Gerren Price  
Associate Director  
DOES Office of Youth Programs

## **YOUTH FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL**

### **Recruitment/Outreach**

1. How did you hear about the SYEP application?
2. How did you hear about the program (flyers, radio, ads)?

### **Application Process**

1. Was the on-line application user friendly?
2. Did you need assistance at any point with the application?
3. Who assisted you with the application process (teacher, parent, etc.)?
4. Were you aware of all application requirements?
5. Did you understand the career categories and interest questions?
6. How can we improve the certification process?
7. Did you bring your documents in person? Did you know what to bring?
8. What prevented you from completing the application process?

### **Job Placement**

1. Did your job placement match your listed career interest?
2. Did you gain reliable/transferable skills from your job? Would you go back?
3. Did you know how to select your job in the SYEP system? Why or Why not?
4. Did you attend the SYEP Job Expo? Was it helpful to you?
5. Were you interviewed? Were you ready for your interview?
6. Is it important that you work close to home or within your career interest?

### **Youth Preparedness/Orientation**

1. Were you prepared for the first day of work?
2. Did you have the right clothes?
3. Were you able to get to your job the first day?
4. Was orientation helpful?
5. Was the information presented clearly in orientation? How can we improve it?
6. Was there anything difficult about your job? Did your supervisor help you?

### **Payroll**

1. Were you paid on time and correctly?
2. If you had any payroll issues, were they resolved in a timely manner?
3. How did you use your funds? Did you need assistance with anything?
4. Were you aware of proper card use? Fees? Balance-checking etc.?
5. Did you have issues accessing your funds?
6. Did you withdraw all funds at once?

### **On the Job Experience**

1. Did you feel safe on the job?
2. Did you have clear responsibilities? Was your supervisor helpful?
3. Do you know anyone who was terminated? Do you know why? Do you understand the process?
4. Were there any barriers that hindered your participation?

### **Post SYEP/Next Steps**

1. What did you do after the SYEP shift was over?
2. What did you do after SYEP concluded for the summer?
3. How did SYEP support your future goals?
4. What is one thing you would change (besides wages/hours)?
5. Are you using skills used in SYEP in school or school in SYEP?

## *Supervisor Focus Group Protocol*

### **SUPERVISOR FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL**

#### **Host Worksite/Youth Application Process**

1. What are the strengths/weaknesses of the host work site application?
2. What are the strengths/weaknesses of the job matching process?
3. What are the strengths/weaknesses of the youth selection process?
4. How can we do better at making sure that we get the word out to all constituents?
5. Is there anything in the application that people found difficult?
6. Were you satisfied with the confirmation process?
7. How can we improve the confirmation process?
8. Was the application easy to access?
9. Was the application easy to use?
10. What are additional questions we can add to the application to better assist you with identifying youth that match your program criteria/needs?
11. Did the application capture all information necessary?
12. Overall how would you rate the SYEP 2011 Host Work Site/Youth Application Process?

#### **Host Worksite/Youth Preparedness/Experience**

1. Were you and your youth prepared for the first day of work?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Employer Orientation?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the job fair?
4. What are the strengths/ weaknesses of the youth portal?
5. What capacity building things can we do to better equip the young people with to make them better prepared for their work experience?
6. What should the young people have gained from the experience?
7. Were you able to make contact with your youth prior to the start of the program?
8. What would have made your youth better prepared for the first day of work?
9. What are some of the common barriers for youth at your site? How could DOES assist in these areas?
10. Overall how would you rate the SYEP 2011 Host Work Site/Youth Preparedness/Experience process?

#### **Payroll**

1. How did the once a week pay schedule work for you and your payroll coordinator?
2. What are the strengths/ weaknesses of the time entry system?
3. What are the strengths/weaknesses of the pay resolution system?
4. How user friendly was the time application?
5. Were you able to successfully enter time for your youth each pay period?
6. Overall how would you rate the SYEP 2011 Payroll process?

#### **Policies and Procedures**

1. Was there a clear transfer/termination process outlined?
2. What are the strengths/weaknesses of the termination process and policies?
3. What are the strengths/weaknesses of the transfer process and policies?
4. Did you have more control over transfers to your site?
5. Did you receive adequate warning when youth were added to your site?
6. How do you rate/feel about the policy as it pertains to disciplining youth?
7. Did the policies and procedures address the needs of your program?
8. Were there some policies that you felt were not helpful, if so which ones?
9. How easy or difficult did you find it to adhere to the rules and regulations regarding SYEP 2011?
10. Overall how would you rate the SYEP 2011 Policies and Procedures process?

### ***Supervisor Focus Group Protocol***

#### **Communication/Customer Service**

1. Did you find the Monitors helpful for your site? Any suggestions on the Monitoring component?
2. Was DOES responsive to all inquiries regarding deadlines?
3. What are the strengths/weaknesses of the liaison communication system?
4. What are the strengths/weaknesses of our email communication system?
5. Was your liaison helpful in assisting you with all your issues and concerns?
6. Were the program monitors helpful with assisting you with your issues and concerns?
7. Were you aware of all program deadlines?
8. What could we do better to inform you?
9. Overall how would you rate the SYEP 2011 Communication/Customer Service?

**Appendix F:**  
**Supervisor Interview Protocols**

*Supervisor Interview Protocol*

Hello SYEP Supervisor,

The Department of Employment Services and George Washington University are conducting an evaluation of the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) to monitor effectiveness and ensure future success of the program.

You are invited to participate in an in-person or phone interview to share your experiences. Participation is VOLUNTARY and all responses are CONFIDENTIAL and ANONYMOUS.

If you wish to participate, please click on the link below to schedule the day and time you are available to speak for about 45 minutes.

<http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22D4NTCA2DL>

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Nisha Sachdev at [nasachde@gwu.edu](mailto:nasachde@gwu.edu) or 734-358-0151.

Thank you!  
Nisha

## *Supervisor Interview Protocol*

### **SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL**

1. How did you find out about the SYEP?
2. Have you participated in SYEP previously?
3. How many youth did you employ?
4. What information did you receive about your duties and responsibilities?
5. Describe your assigned duties.
6. What do you do if you finish your work early?
7. What do you feel like a successful summer looks like in the eyes of the youth and the employers?
8. What do you feel were the overall strengths of this year's SYEP program?
9. What support and resources do you feel you had that helped with your experiences?
10. What was your biggest obstacle this summer? What do you think would have helped you overcome this obstacle?
11. What barriers have stood in the way of intended implementation of SYEP?
12. What were your big goals for the summer? Do you feel like you met these goals?
13. What do you feel worked better this summer than last summer?
14. What do you hope the youth gained through their summer experience?
15. How do you think the employers benefited from SYEP?
16. What staff skills and knowledge is necessary to run the summer program effectively?
17. Please comment on the level of support SYEP provided you during the summer.
18. What communication techniques from DOES were helpful to you during your experience?
19. What benefits do you realize from participating in this program?
20. What other resources or supports (if any) would have been helpful?
21. What are your opinions about the AYD Training?
22. Please describe any highlights or memorable moments you experienced during the program.
23. What kinds of Work site problems occurred if any? How did you solve them?
24. What issues do you feel effected youth success at the work site?
25. Do you have any suggestions for improving the program, other comments, or questions?
26. If you could change one thing about SYEP what would it be? Explain.
27. Would you participate in SYEP in 2011? Explain.