DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 753 CE 037 790

AUTHOR Lund, Leonard; Weber, Nathan
TITLE Summer Youth Employment: The Corporate Experience. Research Bulletin Number 141.
INSTITUTION Conference Board, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 16p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Conference Board, Inc., 845 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022 ($25.00; $5.00 to educators and members).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Business Responsibility; Community Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Employment Programs; Job Development; Job Placement; Part Time Employment; Private Agencies; *Program Effectiveness; *Summer Programs; Young Adults; *Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS *Private Sector

ABSTRACT

During the summer of 1982, summer jobs programs organized and operated by the private sector were underway in numerous cities, often in addition to or in cooperation with the government-funded Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) projects. Of the 176 companies that responded to a Conference Board survey of 480 of the largest corporations in cities with populations of more than 250,000, 70 percent indicated that they participated in summer jobs programs in 1982. Most of the firms took part in programs for disadvantaged youth as part of community summer jobs programs, where the major portion of growth in business involvement in offering summer jobs has come. Most of the summer jobs were routine, low-skill clerical or maintenance positions, providing little if any training. The motives cited by the survey respondents as most important lean heavily toward social obligation, such as "an interest in advancing opportunities for youth," "an act of social responsibility," or "a means of practicing community involvement." Other reasons cited included "good public relations for the company," and "need for additional employees in the summer." Although one of the least pervasive motivations was "peer pressure from other business leaders," this reason seems to be one of the key elements in putting together a successful community-based summer jobs program. The summer jobs experience was deemed to be relatively successful by most companies, and 66 percent say that they will participate again. The overall number of jobs created and youth placed, however, was small compared to the need. Greater efforts, including year-round jobs programs sponsored by the private sector, are needed. (This report includes specifics of the summer jobs programs of 14 cities.) (KC)

Research Bulletin

Number 141

Summer Youth Employment:

The Corporate Experience

by Leonard Lund
and
Nathan Weber

The Conference Board

THE CONFERENCE BOARD, INC.
845 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
THE CONFERENCE BOARD OF CANADA
25 McArthur Road, Ottawa, Ontario, K1L-6R3, Canada
THE CONFERENCE BOARD, INC.
Avenue Louise, 207 Bte 5, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium

Introduction

The proverbial summer job, once the casual concern of students and local employers, has become a matter of public policy during the past few years. Formerly, a summer job was a means to extra spending money, or a way to meet the upcoming year's college expenses. It was also an inexpensive way for employers to bridge vacation absences. Now, a summer job also can mean a socially responsible act for an employer, an opportunity for a meaningful employment experience for a young person—student or nonstudent—and a way to keep a community "cool" during the summer.

Summer-job programs today are organized community efforts, developed and marketed with some of the same techniques used for products or candidates. These "campaigns" to provide jobs for disadvantaged youth involve scores of volunteer corporate executives, numbers of community and governmental agencies, business and political leaders, and an extensive and sophisticated use of advertising media.[1] (Note the details of the "Summer Jobs for Youth/82" campaign in New York City, pages 12-13.)

Other job programs may also include the participation of the National Alliance of Business, which has published a handbook on how to organize and conduct such programs, and local Private Industry Councils.[2]

The Background

Throughout the early 1970's, the role of the private sector in summer-job programs had been limited primarily to providing some of the jobs, or making cash and in-kind contributions, often at the request of a local government or community agency. But by the end of the decade, corporate leaders in many industrial cities were undertaking more active efforts to coordinate the private sector's involvement.[3]

During the Summer of 1982, programs organized and operated by the private sector were under way in numerous cities, often in addition to—or in cooperation with—the government-funded CETA projects.[4] This move from a largely passive to an active role coincides with the Reagan Administration's emphasis on voluntarism and private-sector initiatives as an alternative to government programs in the resolution of pressing social and economic problems. It may also reflect a growing awareness on the part of corporate management that summer youth unemployment remains an issue serious enough to warrant concerted or organized approaches. While many firms continue to administer their own summer-employment policies, apart from any coordinated undertaking, there is a discernible move within the private sector away from individual, and toward cooperative solutions.

This development has affected government and social organizations as well as other corporations. In some cities, in fact, private firms have taken the initiative to request cooperation by local government agencies—generally a reverse of the historic situation in which some local or federal authority would make an appeal to private companies to "give a damn," as a popular promotional campaign once put it. In Atlanta, Georgia, for example, the Housing Authority was contacted by two major corporations to provide youths for the companies' individual summer openings. Following these requests, the Authority attempted to interest other firms in the city, and will continue that effort for the Summer of 1983. In turn, the Authority is working with its tenant associations on an information and publicity campaign, thereby extending the participation to additional sectors.

Summer Jobs as a Public Policy Issue

The availability and distribution of summer jobs became public policy issues following the summer riots of 1964, when federal manpower and training legislation added summer programs as an antidote to that season's idleness and as a way to pump funds into the hands of disadvantaged young people in many urban centers. Expanded recreation programs, as sponsored by private

About This Research

A major policy initiative of the present Administration is reliance on the private sector as an alternative to government in the resolution of social and economic problems. To explore the effects of this policy as it applies to summer youth employment, The Conference Board undertook a review of corporate experiences during the Summer of 1982.

A questionnaire on individual and community youth employment practices was sent to the largest corporations in cities of over 250,000 people. Of this sample of 480 companies, responses by 176 firms, or just over one-third of the population, provide the data for part of this report. In addition, interviews were conducted with private-sector program coordinators in fourteen cities, selected on the basis of size and location.

[1] The term "disadvantaged youth" includes young people (16 to 21) who qualify under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) definition of being economically disadvantaged, that is, a member of a family receiving public assistance, or part of a family whose income in the previous six months does not exceed the poverty level or does not exceed 70 percent of the lower living standard income level.

[2] National Alliance of Business, *Summer Youth Employment, A Technical Assistance Guide*, Washington, D.C., January, 1982.

[3] Henrietta Schilit and Richard Lacey, *The Private Sector Youth Connection, Volume I: School to Work*. New York: Vocational Foundation, Inc., 1982, esp. Chapter 8: "Summer Youth Employment."

[4] CETA is being phased out, and will be replaced by The Job Training Partnership Act.

and public agencies, had not proved to be adequate deterrents to youth unrest.

By 1980, the CETA summer-job program was providing public-sector placements for more than 700,000 young people. This was in addition to job programs provided by individual companies and those public-service jobs financed by charitable organizations and local governments.

Many of these locally funded programs were traditional seasonal jobs in parks and playgrounds. Youths were employed as recreation workers, lifeguards or maintenance people, and performed simple clerical functions. The federally funded CETA summer jobs were essentially similar in nature, and in some instances merely replaced existing positions with CETA-eligible candidates, rather than increasing the number of jobs available.

The CETA summer-job program stirred controversy in much the same fashion as the other countercyclical public-sector employment programs created by the Act. Some critics of CETA charged that the summer employment programs were merely "leaf-raking" jobs, providing scant usefulness as a work experience that could be translated into permanent employment—one of the stated objectives of the program. A more devastating critique of the program was made by former Senator Lawton Chiles of Florida, who "has charged the summer program with having a plainly adverse effect on youths whom it is supposed to prepare for the job market. The senator says that, from watching their indolent and indifferent supervisors, the young trainees 'get such a strong message of cynicism and corruption that it cannot fail to carry over into their attitudes about work, crime, and society.'"[5] At the same time alleged "horror stories" circulated about physical intimidation of municipal supervisors by crews of CETA summer workers so that they would be required to do little or no work.

On the other hand, there are examples of job programs that are providing young people with some valid job experience while benefiting the community. A study of the CETA program, conducted by the National Council on Employment Policy in 1981, found that these jobs for in-school youths benefited participants by providing income and involvement in rudimentary work activities. However, they offered no training. Nevertheless, the Summer Youth Employment Program did help reduce unrest, lower youth arrest rates from 3.2 percent to 1.5 percent, and lessen failure to return to school from 9.4 percent to 6.1 percent.[6] Despite whatever weaknesses may have been identified, the value of continuing the summer-job programs has been confirmed and publicly underwritten. The Job Training Partnership Act, a replacement for CETA, calls for grant allocations of $725 million to support 718,000 summer public-sector jobs in fiscal year 1983 and the same number in FY 1984.[7] Moreover, the President has placed a high priority on urging business people to hire young people for summer jobs. The Administration has, in addition, proposed legislation allowing for a "subminimum wage" for summer youth jobs; the proposal assumes that a lower wage will encourage more such hirings.[8]

[5] Juan Cameron, "How CETA Came To Be A Four-Letter Word," *Fortune*, April 9, 1979.

[6] National Council on Employment Policy, *CETA's Results and Their Implications*. Washington, D.C., September, 1981, p. 4.

Experience From the Summer of 1982

The overall environment for summer jobs in 1982 was one of fewer job opportunities in the face of a higher general level of unemployment. Confirming this, nine out of ten companies responding to The Conference Board's survey reported that the youth unemployment problem in their headquarters' community had "become more severe"—due mainly to the deteriorating condition of both the national and local economies.

The self-evident greater need for employment opportunities for youth, and the concerted efforts in larger cities to generate jobs in the private sector resulted in the involvement of a larger number of businesses in 1982's summer-jobs programs. But there were fewer jobs available for young people overall.

Of the 176 companies responding to The Conference Board's survey, 70 percent indicated that they did take part in summer-job programs in 1982. This means also that one out of four companies in the selected sample of 480 firms, the major employers in cities with a population of over 250,000, provided some jobs for young people. It should be noted that some of this involvement, particularly in the companies that operate their own programs, has been part of the firms' urban programming for many years, paralleling the public summer-job programs developed in response to the riots of 1964. A majority of the involvement, however, is of recent origin and can be seen as part of the private sector's voluntary assumption of programs that had heretofore been financed almost wholly by the Federal Government.

Of the 124 companies involved in summer-job programs, 89 firms (or 72 percent) took part in programs for disadvantaged youth, and almost eight out of ten of these jobs were part of communitywide summer-job programs, where the major portion of growth in business involvement has come. Only 19 of the responding companies are now involved in single-company programs. And several of these firms participate in both community and single-firm programs.

[7] National Council for Urban Economic Development, *Legislative Report*, Washington, D.C., February 15, 1983.

[8] *National Journal*, March 5, 1983, p. 487.

Table 1: Summary of Survey on Summer-Job Programs

Kind of Program	Number of Companies	Percent of Response	Percent of Job Programs
No Summer Jobs.....	52	30%	—
All Summer Job Programs.....	124	71[a]	100%
Jobs for Disadvantaged	89	51	7
Run by company....	19	11	15
Run by community or business organization.....	70	40	56
Other Jobs Program[1]..	35	20	28
Seasonal hirings....	22	13	18
For college students.	13	7%	11%

[1]While this category places no emphasis upon the hiring of minority and disadvantaged youth, neither does it exclude them. Some of the college internships are reserved for disadvantaged youth. In these programs, ability is the prime requirement since these jobs usually lead to regular employment.

[a]Details do not add to 100 because of rounding.

Not all of the involvement is in programs targeted for disadvantaged youth. About 50 of the firms continue to conduct summer-job operations as a means to meet seasonal staffing needs. Many of these companies often give preference to the children of regular employees.

A considerable number of companies explained that they were providing fewer jobs in 1982 than in the previous year. Only six respondents stated that they had no summer positions at all in 1982.

A little more than a quarter of the responding companies report that they have some involvement with training and hiring programs on a year-round basis, usually with the local Private Industry Council. While some of these companies do not do any specialized summer hiring, others are active in both types of activities.

What Kinds of Jobs?

As noted earlier, most of the summer jobs, as provided under public-sector programs, were routine, low-skill clerical or maintenance positions, despite the hope of the administrators of the federal programs that summer work should offer "expanded career awareness that would develop job readiness skills."[1] The majority of the jobs provided in the private-sector programs were of the same quality. Most were clerical and service (mailroom, messenger, maintenance, and the like). These jobs, like the public-sector jobs provided little, if any, training. Less than 10 percent of the companies involved in summer efforts report that they did any training. Among those that did, some provided career counseling and job-seeking information, and several others said that they gave training in communication skills. Among the nineteen companies that operated their own programs, only two provided any kind of specific skills training.

In some of the community or business organization programs, such as the New York Partnership's Summer Jobs for Youth/82 program, a serious effort was made to match openings with applicants and the program supervisors were pleased that they had substantial improvements over the past year's experiences.

A major selling point of the community-based efforts, such as the Partnership's program, is the opportunity for businesspeople to hire needy teenagers as extra help at a reasonable price. Most of the jobs are for an eight-week period, and some are less than a full forty-hour week. Thus, at a minimum wage of $3.35 per hour, costs to the employer are a little more than a total of a thousand dollars per job. This amount could be reduced a bit by the company claiming a tax credit under the federal Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program. However, fewer than 10 percent of the employers surveyed made such claims.

Motivations

The motives and incentives that are cited by the survey respondents as most important lean heavily toward social obligation. Of the fourteen reasons suggested on a checklist for participation in summer-job programs, the following three were most often cited:

- an interest in advancing opportunities for youth;
- an act of social responsibility;
- a means of practicing community involvement.

Three out of five of the next most popular motivations were directed to the firms' own needs. They included:

- good public relations for the company;
- the operational need for additional employees in the Summer;
- willingness to cooperate with local government or public institutions;
- means to help stabilize the community;
- chance to screen potential new employees.

It is interesting to note that one of the least persuasive motivations was "peer pressure from other business leaders." Yet this seems to be one of the key elements in putting together a successful community-based summer-job program.

Given all of these motivations, the summer-job experience, despite lowered goals in most communities, can be adjudged to have been relatively successful on several counts. More than 70 percent of the responding companies reported that the programs in which they participated were well run, and 66 percent say that they will

[1]Thomas A. Johnson, "Summer Jobs for Youths Gaining Full-Time Status," *The New York Times*, September 22, 1980.

participate again. Only 3 percent noted that they may wish to reconsider their participation.

Expectations

With a continuing concern about the high level of youth unemployment, in particular for minority and disadvantaged youths, a number of communities are considering the feasibility of building upon the success of summer-job programs to create year-round operations. This has been a long-range goal of the New York Partnership's Summer Jobs for Youth/82, as well as of similar programs in other cities.

Those who are assigned responsibility for structuring a year-round program are familiar with the very real differences between these two kinds of efforts. While the summer-job program is a relatively limited, inexpensive program—staffed largely by volunteers and providing marginal jobs with little or no training content—the full-year program would require a permanent cadre of trained specialists to find meaningful positions. The jobs should have career potential, and such training as may be necessary to prepare an unskilled young person for regular employment. Certain aspects of the summer programs, particularly the voluntary organization structure, the cooperation with public-sector agencies and community organizations, and the marketing and media activities, are components transferable to a year-round operation. However, an altogether different set of aims would have to be applied—emphasizing fewer but better-quality placements.

Another major consideration is the dichotomy between the accepted view that businesses are cost conscious and rationally aim for maximum productivity, and the goal of a year-round job program that asks businesses to hire youth because they need the jobs. While a summer-job program can bridge this philosophical gulf because it is short-term and inexpensive, a similar approach, as a standard for a yearly business operation, would not be acceptable for many companies.

The survey indicated that the leading motives for hiring summer workers were an interest in advancing opportunities for youth and an act of social responsibility. In the long run, for a full-time program, the choice may be between the real needs of businesses and the things they can afford to do for needy youth.

Experiences of Selected Cities

This section presents an overview of Summer, 1982, programs coordinated by the private sector in 14 cities. Highlighted are each city's goals, experiences and effectiveness in coping with the overall problem.

Except where otherwise noted, the unemployment data were provided by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). In general, the jobless figures should be seen as *understatements* of the problem within each city. First of all, the data are for August, 1981, the latest summer month for which such figures were available on a city-by-city basis. It can be safely assumed that in most, if not all, of these cities, the rate was actually higher, in accordance with the nationally reported seasonally adjusted increase. In August, 1982, the national youth unemployment rate for both sexes and all races was 24 percent, up four points over the previous year. (Minority youth unemployment, as usual, was considerably higher.) In absolute numbers, that meant an additional 291,000 young people idled, for a total of over two million unemployed youths. Furthermore, the BLS counts as youths only those between the ages of 16 and 19, whereas most corporate youth programs include people up to 21. Finally, the BLS specifically excludes youths classified as "discouraged"—those who have given up looking for work after an extended period of fruitless job searches.

Small Inroads

Perhaps the outstanding finding in the present survey is that the dent in youth joblessness made by private-sector efforts was, in most cases, miniscule. Chicago, for example, placed only 730 youths out of at least 37,000 out of work—under 2 percent! And that percentage, again, is an overestimate in light of the factors cited above.

The situation was much the same for the other cities, with the exception of New York and Houston. The New York City effort was by far the most extensive of the private-sector undertakings—fully computerized, staffed by over 200 volunteers, employing a massive publicity campaign, and planned for a full year. Sponsored by the New York City Partnership, the project obtained over 15,700 jobs. But the official youth unemployment figure, underestimated, was 55,000. This means that the New York effort would have had to come close to tripling its effectiveness rate to have a substantial impact on the problem.

Asked why he thought more headway had not been made, a representative of the Partnership, Walter Heithaus, likened the problem of summer youth unemployment to "pushing a manhole cover across 42nd Street with your nose."

"Why didn't we get 100,000 jobs? Because we were not organized to get them. What we did was a start, and we are still in the process of improving the system of matching the jobs with the jobless. We have not stopped doing that." While commenting on the cooperative nature of the project—government, labor and community groups were participants—Heithaus emphasized that: "The solution lies partly in the private sector. The effort simply has to be bigger." It is likely that the New York City program will serve as a model for undertakings in other areas. Project coordinators from several cities mentioned that they had visited the Partnership headquarters during the Summer to review operations.

No matter how large or well-coordinated the effort, however, no significant improvements can be expected in cities where there are virtually no private jobs to be had. For three of the cities in this report, in fact, no private-sector positions were secured at all. Instead, project coordinators were able at best to receive cash contributions from the firms to place youths on community projects or in government agencies. In general, youths so employed were involved in neighborhood-improvement projects, in social-service delivery, or in entry-level clerical positions.

Trends

Interviews with program administrators revealed a number of emerging trends in summer employment projects. Establishment of numerical goals, in terms of youths to be employed, is no longer as popular as it had been in the past. Even in cities where the economic base is not deeply depressed, goal setting is often considered as much a drawback as a help. "It becomes a numbers game," one administrator noted, adding that the time and energy placed in developing figures for final reports would be more productively spent in securing work sites or cash donations.

In cities so severely hit by the recession that private-sector jobs could not be obtained, efforts were made to place youths on community projects that had some significance beyond merely serving as a workplace. "After the Summer we talked to the kids involved, and they really felt a sense of accomplishment in bringing back to life a park that had been neglected for about 20 years," explained a representative of the Cleveland project. "Now that park will be used for community activities." Related to the feeling of accomplishment among the youths was their reported satisfaction in being identified with specific corporate sponsors.

Satisfaction was not restricted to the employees. Numerous program administrators emphasized that employers themselves "had their own stereotypes demolished," as one coordinator said. Company managers were consistently reported to be pleasantly surprised at the quality of the young workers, in terms of high productivity and willingness to work. This is borne out by the survey finding that 70 percent of the firms indicated it was possible to carry over some summer employees to year-round jobs.

Relating jobs directly to education is a concept growing in popularity. Coordinators for projects in several cities offered their local school system a strong incentive: that students whose math and reading skills, attendance and other standards showed marked improvement would be first in line for the jobs. Boston has formalized this concept into The Boston Compact, under which cooperating businesses offer a specific number of jobs to graduates if the schools meet a set of clearly defined educational improvement goals.

Because such arrangements tend to provide for a more direct corporate involvement in the school system in terms of planning and personnel, they have been greeted with both praise and skepticism. While applauding the additional resources for the schools, some critics have raised questions concerning possible long-range effects. As one education observer noted in *The Christian Science Monitor:* "A century ago schools were built to look like factories—ensuring a tractable work force whose aspirations went no further than the local mill. Is this a return to a view that educational policy is to be guided not by the long-range needs of the students but by the immediate wishes of employers?"[10] The same reporter answered in the negative, based on a reading of the actual plan, and went on to urge the corporate sector to support the Compact.

Perhaps the most encouraging trend is that most, if not all, of the coordinated summer projects will be undertaken again in the Summer of 1983. In fact, in many cases preparations began as early as September 1982, as administrators stressed the importance of early planning and the need to secure broadly based participation. The more complete the involvement by the private, public and community sectors, the more likely the success of the endeavor, according to the coordinators.

But success is a relative term. If it means making a start, or catalyzing and coordinating the activities of a variety of companies and other organizations, all the projects described in this report were successful—at least according to the coordinators. If, however, success is measured in terms of reducing the overall youth-unemployment problem, then the private-sector operations have not been shown to be superior to the governmental programs.

Nor is it likely that the Federal Government will increase much of its own support in this area. As of this writing, the House and Senate had reached agreement on a $4.6 billion emergency jobs bill, $100 million of which would go for additional summer jobs for youth. However, the impact on summer youth unemployment, as well as on unemployment in general, was not expected to be significant. As House Minority Leader Robert H. Michel (R-Ill.) noted during the congressional deliberations: "As a matter of fact, that blip of four-tenths of one percent in the unemployment rate (from 10.8 to 10.4 percent in January 1983) created far more jobs than we're going to be able to create in this package we're talking about."[11]

Following are the highlights of corporate-administered programs for each of the 14 cities studied.

[10] Rushworth M. Kidder, "The Boston Compact: Breaking the Stalemate in the Public Schools," *The Christian Science Monitor*, September 30, 1982.

[11] Helen Dewar and Juan Williams, "Don't Alter Jobs Offer, GOP Says," *Washington Post*, February 16, 1983.

BALTIMORE

Youth Unemployment	21,000 (21.6 percent)
Numerical Goals	1,000 jobs
Youths Employed	1,740
Private Sector Jobs	800
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	940
Corporate Participants	350

Government Participants

Public school system, Mayor's office.

Other Participants

City employees donated or raised $60,000. Community groups provided openings and volunteers.

Employer Recruitment

Job-solicitation efforts were coordinated by the Private Sector Steering Committee, comprising representatives from the Private Industry Council, the Voluntary Council, the Greater Baltimore Committee, and Help Unite Baltimore (a black business leaders' organization). The PSSC secured volunteers from member companies to solicit job offers by phone.

Youth Recruitment

For private-sector jobs, youths were recruited through the public school system. Economic need and school performance were the selection criteria. For non-private sector jobs, the regular Summer Youth Employment Program, funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, was used.

Publicity

Numerous press conferences were held, one for each new phase of the project or each new major participant. One hundred thousand brochures were mailed to corporations.

Miscellaneous

Cooperation by many sectors was recognized as key to the project's success. According to a survey by the coordinator, 96 percent of the employers agreed to cooperate in the Summer of 1983.

Project Coordinator

Mayor's Office of Manpower Resources, 701 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202.

BOSTON

Youth Unemployment	17,000 (14.2 percent)
Numerical Goals	250 jobs
Youths Employed	852
Private Sector Jobs	852
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	—
Corporate Participants	152

Government Participants

Prime CETA sponsor; school system.

Other Participants

54 community organizations.

Employer Recruitment

Personal and written requests to CEO's on Private Industry Council's board of directors and in Chamber of Commerce. Each PIC board member also made personal calls to targeted CEO's. Project staff solicited jobs through phone calls.

Youth Recruitment

School system; panels of teachers and company representatives matched students to jobs and arranged for interviews.

Publicity

Start-up press conference in March resulted in articles in the daily and weekly press and a television talk show. According to the project coordinator, the media viewed the Boston summer youth project as a "soup to nuts"

program that went beyond hiring, to counseling and follow-up.

Miscellaneous

Following Boston's first summer employment program in 1981, the Private Industry Council perceived a need to sustain a year-round effort in conjunction with the public schools. Industry and education leaders developed the Job Collaborative, under which interdisciplinary teams in selected high schools provide special services for youths in career education, remedial reading and math, placement in unsubsidized jobs, and monitoring employment and education after graduation. Participating youths are those who have experienced trouble in school or in finding jobs, but they must adhere to "strict performance standards." Private employers are involved in "all aspects of the program, from guidance and instruction to job placement and financial support," according to a program description.

A second program, called The Boston Compact, is a strategy by business to use jobs as a "powerful motivator" for students, teachers and school administrators. Under the Compact, schools commit themselves to measurable goals in terms of reading ability, dropout declines, and so forth. Likewise, cooperating businesses commit themselves to the goal of "a 5 percent increase per year in the number of graduates who are placed in jobs or in further education."

Project Coordinator

Boston Private Industry Council, 110 Tremont Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02108.

CHICAGO

Youth Unemployment	37,000 (16.5 percent)
Numerical Goals	None
Youths Employed	730
Private Sector Jobs	700
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	30
Corporate Participants	45

Government Participants

Board of Education, Mayor's Office of Employment and Training.

Other Participants

Chicago Urban League, plus 25 community groups.

Employer Recruitment

Mail campaign, word of mouth.

Youth Recruitment

School system and Chicago Urban League.

Miscellaneous

Central concept was to use jobs program as an educational stimulus. Schools were informed that students with higher grades and better attendance would be first in line for summer jobs. Career counseling and course assessment were built into project. At end of project, youths addressed a number of the CEO's on their work experiences.

Plans for 1983 are considerably more ambitious, with an unofficial goal of 14,000 placements.

Project Coordinator

Chicago United, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60602.

CLEVELAND

Youth Unemployment	12,000 (18.8 percent)
Numerical Goals	None
Youths Employed	125
Private Sector Jobs	
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	125
Corporate Participants	24

Government Participants

School system, Mayor's office.

Other Participants

Cleveland Foundation, YMCA, church groups, community organizations.

Employer Recruitment

Massive mailing requested direct hires. According to the project coordinator, this effort was not successful, given a late start and Cleveland's severely troubled economy. Additional efforts included a mailing to 100 targeted major companies, plus follow-up phone calls to CEO's. Coordinator's chairman held a meeting for 20 select corporations requesting their backing.

Youth Recruitment

Youth Service Coordinating Council representing local Y's, public school system, and other groups referred youths to project coordinator.

Publicity

Public service television announcements by Mayor and other participants. Articles in business and labor publications and general media. Brochures distribution.

Miscellaneous

Aim was to stimulate as much activity within the private sector as possible—if not in jobs then in cash contributions. Youths placed on community- or city-work projects were thus sponsored by particular corporations. Each company sponsored either a complete work team consisting of four youths plus a supervisor, or a single team member.

According to project coordinator, many youths expressed satisfaction at two aspects of the project: being identified with a major corporation, and working on worthwhile tasks such as restoration of neglected city parks.

Project Coordinator

Manpower and Education Resources' Center (Metropolitan Cleveland Jobs Council), 690 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

DETROIT

Youth Unemployment	35,000 (21.0 percent)
Numerical Goals	None
Youths Employed	400
Private Sector Jobs	—
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	400
Corporate Participants	16

Government Participants

Parks and Recreation Department, school system, Department of Manpower.

Other Participants

United Auto Workers, Police Athletic League, Hudson-Weber Foundation, plus about 20 community organizations and churches. Sponsors included National Alliance of Business and Private Industry Council.

Employer Recruitment

Personal meetings with community affairs and public affairs officials of major corporations, plus follow-up mail and phone campaign.

Youth Recruitment

Referrals from community groups and churches.

Publicity

Letters sent to media resulted in radio and television spot announcements and appearances on television talk shows. Project coordinator has well-established public relations operation with ongoing cooperation from local media.

Miscellaneous

Beneficiaries of the Detroit program were senior citizens, who received free home repairs; young students, who received free tutoring service; and the general public through repairs to parks and swimming pools. According to project coordinator, efforts were made to place youths in jobs that were "meaningful, not make-work."

Funds from the Hudson-Weber Foundation allowed for additional employment of supervisors. United Auto Workers provided training staff and facilities, and corporations provided volunteer administrative staff and equipment.

Project Coordinator

New Detroit Inc., Commonwealth Building, Detroit, Michigan 48226.

HOUSTON

Youth Unemployment	7,000 (8.0 percent)
Numerical Goals	5,100 plus
Youths Employed	3,000
Private Sector Jobs	3,000
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	--
Corporate Participants	no information available.

Government Participants

Texas Employment Commission, school system.

Other Participants

National Day Care Centers of America, Volunteer Action Centers of Harris County, several church groups.

Employer Recruitment

Houston Chamber of Commerce mailed requests in April to 5,700 corporations, signed by Mayor, Chamber of Commerce chairman and local representative of President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives. A follow-up phone-a-thon was staffed by corporate and civic volunteers.

Youth Recruitment

School system established five centers throughout the city where job-search training seminars were conducted. Job applications were distributed to all school counselors.

Publicity

Television spot announcements, features and public affairs programs, plus local newspaper coverage.

Project Coordinator

Greater Houston Alliance of Business, 3637 West Alabama, Suite 340, Houston, Texas 77027.

LOS ANGELES

Youth Unemployment	56,000 (22.0 percent)
Numerical Goals	8,500
Youths Employed	6,900
Private Sector Jobs	6,900
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	
Corporate Participants	2,000

Government Participants

School system.

Employer Recruitment

Arranged by major bank in Los Angeles that served as project sponsor.

Youth Recruitment

School system; project coordinator distributed brochures on job seeking tips.

Publicity

Radio interviews with sponsor, local newspaper coverage.

Miscellaneous

Summer employment program has been in operation since 1975, and will continue into indefinite future.

Project Coordinator

Youth Opportunities Unlimited, P.O. Box 3307, Los Angeles, California 90051.

MIAMI

Youth Unemployment	9,000 (7.8 percent)
Numerical Goals	None
Youths Employed	940
Private Sector Jobs	940
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	
Corporate Participants	60

Government Participants

State Employment Service, Partners for Youth (Dade County Government), Dade Community Revitalization Board, school system.

Other Participants

Troubled Children Foundation, numerous community groups.

Employer Recruitment

Mail campaign. All jobs were listed with the State Employment Service.

Youth Recruitment

Florida State Employment Service, community organizations.

Publicity

Start-up press conference was held in April. All local television stations were contacted, and agreed to produce public-service spot announcements throughout the Summer. Radio spots were also secured. Articles appeared in daily and community newspapers. Radio and television talk shows featured staff of the Private Industry Council and other participating organizations. Additional publicity consisted of bumper stickers, aerial advertisements, and posters on bus benches and billboards. Airport computer sign flashed a "hire youths" message for 15 minutes every hour.

Miscellaneous

Major aim of project was to target all companies employing five or more people. Another aim was to locate as many jobs as possible in areas near to youths' own residences to minimize transportation expense. Both aims were accomplished—at least in part. Project coordinator attributed success of project to "comprehensiveness of the effort and the shared responsibilities and resources of separate agencies working to overcome bad times." For 1983, operations began earlier in the year, with added emphasis on active business participation. "Business appealing to business has proved to be more successful than traditional public-sector appeal to business."

Project Coordinator

Private Industry Council of Dade County, Inc., 6555 N.W. 36th Street, Miami, Florida 33166.

* * * *

NEW YORK CITY

Youth Unemployment	55,000 (28.5 percent)
Numerical Goals	15,000 jobs
Youths Employed	15,789
Private Sector Jobs	15,789
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	—
Corporate Participants	1,500

Government Participants

Board of Education, City Department of Employment, State Employment Service.

Other Participants

Career Opportunities for Brooklyn Youth (a multibusiness, labor and community partnership), Private Industry Council, New York Chamber of Commerce and Industry, several private foundations, numerous community and civic organizations.

Youth Recruitment

City Department of Employment referred youths who could not be accommodated by the regular Summer Youth Employment Program. CETA funds, however, provided public-sector jobs for about half the applicants. All youths were from families with incomes below the lowest income level of a hypothetical "self-sufficient urban family of four," as established by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. In New York City, that level was $15,704 in Fall, 1981.

Employer Recruitment

Massive outreach consisted of several million flyers accompanying utility and other bills; 55,000 letters sent to private firms; 20,000 phone calls made by 200 volunteers. Special efforts included 125 students from the City University of New York making bus trips through each of the five boroughs canvasing for jobs. (They raised 300 offers.)

Publicity

Publicity was conducted by a private advertising firm on a pro bono basis. Its aim was to make "Summer Jobs for Youth" a household phrase. Project coordinator urged business firms to devote part of their advertising budgets to run Summer Jobs for Youth public-service announcements, and to print ads asking employers for jobs. Commercials were aired between innings of New

York Yankee games. Transit posters were used, and frequent press events were held.

Miscellaneous

The New York project was probably the largest in the country. The undertaking is administered by a different company each summer, on behalf of the New York City Partnership. The 1982 coordinator was Citicorp (which made use of its branches throughout the city for employer recruitment). In 1983, Philip Morris will administer the program.

Project Coordinator

New York City Partnership, Inc., 200 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

* * * *

OMAHA

Youth Unemployment	22,598 (14.1 percent[a])
Numerical Goals	None
Youths Employed	310
Private Sector Jobs	310
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	—
Corporate Participants	10

Government Participants

Omaha Finance Department.

Other Participants

Small Business Council of Greater Omaha, Chamber of Commerce.

Employer Recruitment

Prime CETA sponsor, articles in newsletter of Small Business Council, personal contact of CEO's.

Youth Recruitment

School system, public-service media announcements.

Publicity

No specific media campaign, since summer youth employment considered inherently media worthy by project coordinator. Newspapers provided adequate coverage.

Miscellaneous

Most of the work on the program was administered by staff of local CETA sponsor. According to project director: "We principally solicit the funds from the business community here, turn the funds over to the Finance Director for the City of Omaha, and then coordinate with that director and the CETA executive director in the administration of the program. The CETA staff members do such an outstanding job that there is very little for us to do in the area of administration."

Project coordinator donated $150,000 and requested another $100,000 from the business community. In response, a local foundation provided $67,000, and corporations contributed an additional $75,000. Funds were then used to supplement regular CETA program.

Project Coordinator

Corporate Community Relations, Internorth, 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68102.

[a]Projected for full year 1982 by Nebraska Department of Labor. The 14.1 percent figure is an average of projections for two age groups: 16 to 17-year olds (18.5 percent unemployment) and 18 to 19-year olds (9.7 percent unemployment).

* * * *

PITTSBURGH

Youth Unemployment	17,000 (20.8 percent)
Numerical Goals	None
Youths Employed	210
Private Sector Jobs	—
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	210
Corporate Participants	25

Government Participants

CETA Sponsor, Parks Department, school system.

Employer Recruitment

Chairman of Private Industry Council addressed business groups and initiated a follow-up letter to corporate CEO's.

Youth Recruitment

School system, CETA sponsor.

Publicity

Newspaper articles, television talk shows, and special events coverage throughout the project.

Miscellaneous

Funds raised by the Private Industry Council were used to employ 41 supervisors, while Community Development funds (moneys made available through the Federal Community Development Block Grant program) were used to employ the 210 youths. Corporations contributed $140,000. Pittsburgh project, late under way, was specifically aimed at cleaning up rubble-strewn lots in city. Over 1,000 city-owned lots, most previously unusable, were cleared and made available for performing arts and other events. Secondary aim was pruning of city trees. Project for Summer, 1983, will begin earlier, and is placing greater emphasis on private-sector job solicitation.

Project Coordinator

Pittsburgh Private Industry Council, Room 401, City-County Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219.

* * * *

RICHMOND

Youth Unemployment	N.A.[a]
Numerical Goals	1,500
Youths Employed	1,086
Private Sector Jobs	815
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	271
Corporate Participants	300

Government Participants

Richmond Area Manpower and Planning Department, county governments, school system.

Other Participants

Urban League, ten community organizations, YMCA, Chamber of Commerce.

Employer Recruitment

Personal solicitation by PIC members, letters to CEO's, phone bank staffed by community volunteers.

Youth Recruitment

School system, through announcements by school counselors; YMCA.

Publicity

Press conference at the start of the project. Radio and television spot announcements, newspaper articles.

Miscellaneous

Coordinator obtained a small grant to fund 50 percent of the wages for youths working in small businesses. For Summer, 1983, a more formal system of job solicitation was established, and greater emphasis will be placed on recruitment of college students. Monitoring of results will be computerized.

Project Coordinator

Richmond Private Industry Council, 201 East Franklin, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

[a]According to a survey of 785 high school students in Richmond's East End—a largely black, low-income neighborhood—61 percent of the youths said they could not find a job. However, a survey spokesperson said this figure should be viewed cautiously in light of limitations in administering the survey. Source: Richmond Youth Services Commission, *Youth Needs Assessment: East End*. City of Richmond, February, 1982, p. 52.

* * * *

SAN FRANCISCO

Youth Unemployment	23,000 (8.6 percent[a])
Numerical Goals	None
Youths Employed	806
Private Sector Jobs	800
Community or Agency Jobs made possible through cash contributions	6
Corporate Participants	650