DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 772 CE 064 890

AUTHOR Gray, Maryann Jacobi; And Others
TITLE National Service: Designing, Implementing, and Evaluating a Successful Program. Rand Issue Paper.
INSTITUTION Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
PUB DATE Oct 93
NOTE 9p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Citizenship Responsibility; *Evaluation Needs; Higher Education; *Human Services; National Programs; Program Design; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Public Service; *Student Financial Aid; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *National Service

ABSTRACT

The National Service (NS) program links financial assistance for education to community service. Four issues of primary concern arise as policymakers and program planners move from the program's concept to the fine points of its design and implementation: (1) achieving balance among the program's conflicting goals; (2) expanding educational opportunities; (3) matching community needs to participants' skills and interests; and (4) avoiding conflict with existing activities and programs. These major issues suggest evaluation tasks, including determining how program goals drive program planning; comparing priorities assigned to NS goals over time and across service agencies, educational institutions, and government agencies; describing how program administrators define "civic responsibility"; tracking characteristics of NS applicants and participants; tracking the proportion of precollege NS participants who use their educational vouchers; assessing the fit between agency needs and participants' skills and interests; measuring and tracking participant attrition; assessing the cost effectiveness of various approaches to training for NS participants; describing how teachers, police, and other service professionals integrate NS workers into the workplace; determining the effects of NS on agency staffing and number and types of new service jobs; and tracking applications to and participation in other service programs. (Contains 22 endnotes.) (YLB)

RAND Issue Paper
Exploring Topics of Interest to the Policy Community

OCTOBER 1993

National Service

Designing, Implementing, and Evaluating a Successful Program

Maryann Jacobi Gray, Robert F. Schoeni, Tessa Kaganoff

The United States has a strong tradition of government-sponsored community, national, and international service; some notable examples are Franklin Roosevelt's Civilian Conservation Corps, Kennedy's Peace Corps, and Johnson's Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA). Now Congress has completed legislation to establish a National Service Program designed to represent "America at its best."[1] Yet even after it becomes law, this latest effort will face challenges. Policymakers will need to take special care with the details of implementation—and assess early efforts closely to identify and correct the inevitable problems. This issue paper identifies some of the most critical challenges, and it suggests an approach to formative program evaluation that will help overcome them.

The Proposal and Challenges to Implementation

Enlisting youthful energy on behalf of the nation's needs could address vexing social problems while developing youth to become fully contributing members of society. Presumably because of this dual promise, National Service was popular during the presidential campaign and still has broad public appeal, especially among youth. If the program succeeds, participants will gain access to postsecondary education or reduce college debt while enhancing personal development. At the same time, our communities and disadvantaged populations will receive needed assistance. National Service may also encourage citizens at large to increase their awareness of, support for, and participation in volunteer or other service work.

The National Service program passed by Congress outlined these and other objectives, detailed in Table 1. To achieve these goals, the proposal links financial assistance for education to community service. Participants will earn an annual stipend of approximately $7,500 during their period of service, which would be either one or two years. In addition, upon completing each year of the program they will receive a voucher worth approximately $4,725.[2] The voucher can be used for further schooling, a job training program, or repaying college loans. Participants will also be eligible for health insurance and child care. Although all high school graduates 17 and older will be eligible to participate, college-age youth are the target.[3] The program offers volunteers several options: part-time or full-time work; service before, during, or after college; and assisting in schools, immunizing infants,

RAND issue papers explore topics of interest to the policymaking community. Although issue papers are formally reviewed, authors have substantial latitude to express provocative views without doing full justice to other perspectives. The views and conclusions expressed in issue papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of RAND's research sponsors.

Table 1

Objectives of National Service as Presented in the Administration's Proposal to Congress

(1)	Meet the unmet human, educational, environmental, and public safety needs of the United States.
(2)	Renew the ethic of civic responsibility and the spirit of community throughout the United States.
(3)	Expand educational opportunity by rewarding individuals who participate in national service with an increased ability to pursue higher education or job training.
(4)	Encourage citizens of the United States, regardless of age or income, to engage in full-time or part-time national service.
(5)	Reinvent government to eliminate duplication, support locally established initiatives, require measurable goals for performance, and offer flexibility in meeting service.
(6)	Build on the existing organizational service infrastructure of federal, state, and local programs and agencies to expand full-time and part-time service opportunities for all citizens.
(7)	Provide tangible benefits to the communities in which national service is performed.

SOURCE: *Congressional Record*, May 6, 1993, p. S 5587.

aiding police departments, helping protect the environment, or performing other community service.[4]

The program's goals are clearly important, and its broad outlines seem well-suited to achieving those goals. But here, even more than in most policy areas, the details matter. As policymakers move from the program's concept to the fine points of its design and implementation, major questions are sure to arise. To help program planners and policymakers meet those challenges, we focus here on four issues—not a complete list of all the possible risks, but some key challenges that raise empirical questions. By conducting a rigorous and comprehensive evaluation of the program during its first years, policymakers can enhance its ultimate effect. The four issues of primary concern are:

- Achieving balance among the program's goals.
- Expanding educational opportunities.
- Matching community needs to participants' skills and interests.
- Avoiding conflict with other activities and programs.

The remainder of this issue paper describes each challenge in turn. The analysis concludes by identifying a set of issues for program evaluation that address these concerns. We believe that if program implementers examine these issues closely, assess early experience in detail, and build on the resulting lessons, this version of National Service can fulfill its promise.

Balancing Conflicting Goals

One of the program's central strengths—its broad range of important goals—also creates the first challenge: defining appropriate tradeoffs when goals conflict. Though the goals of National Service are not entirely at odds, planners *are* likely to find that certain program elements which help achieve one goal impede progress on others. Indeed, the potential for such conflicts was recognized in earlier discussions about national service; the Commission on National and Community Service, for example, recommended that national service offer a "fruitful combination" of diverse goals.[5] We suggest that a major challenge for program implementers is to develop processes and structures that minimize such conflicts. To illustrate the kinds of tradeoffs facing decisionmakers, Table 2 outlines how a focus on the first three program goals might lead to different implementation strategies. (Note that the program's additional goals, not included in this table, may add further potential for conflict.)

For example, the goal of fulfilling unmet community needs suggests that service jobs should be defined by those needs, that the volunteers selected should be those best qualified to perform these jobs, and that the major evaluation question is whether community needs are fulfilled. The goal of renewing civic responsibility, in contrast, presumably implies selecting a diverse group of participants (so that the National Service ethic and experience will be broadly distributed), developing jobs that offer a high level of intrinsic reward, and shifting the focus of evaluation from the program's effect on communities to its effect on participants. And to best achieve the goal of expanding educational opportunities, one would likely want to target those youth who would otherwise not be able to receive higher education. Moreover, the evaluation would depend heavily on the program's success in increasing enrollment among these students. The difficulty, of course, arises in reconciling specific programmatic decisions. If, as in this example, the National Service jobs best suited to building civic responsibility differ from those that best meet community needs, which should be chosen?

Although many such conflicts could arise during implementation, we believe that most can be avoided. First, as we shall discuss, the National Service Program will probably have many more volunteers to choose from than positions to award, at least in the first few years. Thus, community-service agencies should be able to select applicants who both make up a diverse cross-section of individuals and provide needed skills and abilities. For the same reason, service jobs might be developed that both fulfill community needs and foster civic responsibility. However, this problem may become

Table 2

Implementation Will Require Tradeoffs Among Goals

	Goal: Fulfill Unmet Needs	Goal: Renew Civic Responsibility	Goal: Expand Educational Opportunity
Which volunteers should be chosen?	Those with needed skills or willing to perform unskilled labor	A widespread group representative of nation's diversity	Low/middle income who want postsecondary education
What work should participants do?	Jobs targeted to community needs	Jobs with intrinsic rewards	Jobs that will maintain participation
How should the program be evaluated?	Are community needs fulfilled?	Does civic/service responsibility increase?	Do more underrepresented students enroll?

more severe when the program expands. One approach, advisable in any case, is for policymakers to consider issues of balance and tradeoffs among goals as the program evolves. The relationship among the goals will shift in response to changes in the political, economic, and social context of National Service; these inevitable shifts may provide opportunities to align the goals more fully with one another, or to define tradeoffs at a global level.

A related approach to this challenge is to develop an operational definition for the concept of "civic responsibility." A diverse range of indicators has been suggested to measure progress on this key goal: voter registration, knowledge about government, compliance with law, and participation in civic organizations and community service. Each definition and indicator for this concept has different implications for program design and evaluation; by choosing carefully, decisionmakers can minimize future conflicts among goals.

Expanding Educational Opportunities

The second challenge facing National Service is to maintain an appropriate emphasis on education. By providing educational assistance to individuals who agree to perform community service, National Service is intended to expand educational opportunity. President Clinton has described National Service as a way to "revive America's commitment to community and make affordable the cost of a college education for every American."[6] Educational vouchers may help some individuals to continue their education or repay student loans without precluding participation in volunteerism, service-oriented careers, or other service activities. In implementing the program—for example, in considering tradeoffs among the educational-access goal and other objectives—it is important to understand that there are sharp limits on the effect that National Service can have on education. This is true for three principal reasons.

The program is relatively small. At least in the near future, it does not offer a major alternative to the current student loan program, for example. The largest annual enrollment proposed by the Administration has been 150,000 youth—just over 1 percent of the total 14 million who attend U.S. colleges, and a fraction of the 4 million students who received assistance through the Stafford Guaranteed Student Loan Program in 1992.[7] Moreover, the program actually implemented will be much smaller, at approximately 30,000–40,000 participants per year.

A large proportion of those who volunteer may not wish to use the educational benefits. Many who do take part in the program may not benefit from the education vouchers, not because the program is at fault, but because they themselves do not plan to pursue higher education or training. Though education benefits are an important part of the program, they are far from the only incentive to take part. Participants will receive approximately $7,500 annually in wages, plus health benefits and child care services—modest remuneration, to be sure, but those who are currently unemployed or who earn very little may find it attractive, even if the education benefit is of no interest. Three examples illustrate the point.

First, consider an unemployed high school graduate between 20 and 25 years old. Such applicants may be attracted to National Service, not by the education voucher, but by the opportunity to earn even minimal wages and health benefits. In 1991, there were 1.2 million unemployed people in this age group.

Second, consider a high school graduate already working full-time for minimum wage, but receiving no health insurance or other benefits. Including health benefits, which have an estimated value of $1,300, a National Service participant receives total compensation of $8,800.[8] In the 20–25 age group of high-school-educated, full-time, year-round workers, 15 percent, or approximately 726,000 individuals, earn less.[9] If the $4,725 education voucher is used by the participant, the National Service compensation would increase to

$13,525, which is greater than the wages and health benefits earned by 43 percent of this group, or 2.01 million youth.

Third, consider a young single mother with two children whose source of income is Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and food stamps. If she lives in New York, a state with relatively generous AFDC benefits, and receives the maximum available benefit, she could collect approximately $10,428.[10] (She may also receive some health benefits through Medicaid.) By taking part in National Service, her cash income would drop by approximately $2,928—but she would also receive full health benefits and child care, which might well attract her to National Service.

Similar education benefits are often not used. The experience of the military suggests that many National Service participants may not take advantage of the program's educational benefits. In many cases, the benefits offered by the Army are much more generous. For example, if an enlistee who scores in the upper half of the Armed Forces Qualifications Test, enlists in an area requiring selected skills, and makes a three-year commitment also contributes $2,700 to education expenses, the Army will add $17,400. Surprisingly, previous research has found that fewer than half of such individuals who completed their time of service actually used the educational benefit.[11]

Overall, while education certainly remains a central part of the National Service program, it may not represent one of the program's primary effects. Demand to participate in National Service may be quite high among the unemployed, those with a low-paying job, or those on welfare. In fact, it is quite likely that demand among the disadvantaged alone will be greater than the number of available positions. Further, public and congressional resistance to government subsidies for middle- and upper-income youth may create political pressure to give priority to low-income youth, many of whom are not college bound.

Many implications are positive; individuals who were not college bound when they entered National Service may choose to attend college or training afterward. Likewise, individuals already receiving government benefits would be making a contribution to the community. Yet if these forces are unchecked, National Service risks losing its target audience of college students, thereby failing over time to enhance access to college or help college students reduce student loan debt. If National Service is to be more than a *de facto* jobs program, whose participants have no interest in pursuing education, program administrators will have to be aware of these possibilities.

Matching Participants with Jobs

The third challenge for those implementing National Service is, again, one of balance among goals: satisfying both those who take part in the program and the community agencies that need assistance.

The first half of this challenge revolves around the particular kinds of assistance needed. Although few would dispute that our society faces problems in each of the areas pinpointed by National Service (i.e., human, educational, environmental, and public safety), it is not clear that hiring young and, in many cases, unskilled workers will solve them. Many of the jobs require skills that most youth do not have. Indeed, representatives from some areas targeted for help have already voiced reservations about the ability of National Service participants to perform the needed work. The National Education Association, for example, states that without proper training, even college-educated students would not be qualified to teach, and temporary teachers would also probably not be used. The National Association of Chiefs of Police is likewise concerned that youth may not be qualified to assist in policing efforts.[12] If National Service is to succeed, it will need the acceptance of such groups.

Training, of course, is one solution to the skills mismatch, and will be integral to National Service. But community-service agencies may not find it cost-effective to provide extensive training, especially given the brief term of service. Though the term of the program is one or two years, many youth will probably participate for even shorter periods. Youth in general tend to switch jobs frequently. Research at RAND has shown that by the time they are 22 years old, 55 percent of males with exactly a high school degree have held three or more jobs since graduating; by age 25, 75 percent have held three or more jobs.[13] Some evidence suggests that this pattern holds for community-service activities as well; 17 percent of the participants in City Year, a small-scale service program in Boston, voluntarily or involuntarily dropped out before the end of their nine-month service obligation.[14] As attrition rates increase, the cost-effectiveness of training decreases.

The second half of this challenge lies in volunteers' preferences. Despite the objections mentioned above, many staffers of community-service agencies maintain that there are enough jobs to keep hundreds of thousands of National Service volunteers employed—jobs that would not require high levels of skill or training, and for which community-service agencies are happy to receive whatever help they can get, no matter the duration. Unfortunately, many of these jobs are not

very glamorous: clerical assistance, cooking, and trash pickup are common tasks such agencies require. If potential volunteers are not attracted by such work, they may not enter National Service; if those who do enter take such jobs but are not challenged or engaged by them, they may become dissatisfied and drop out. So while participants and community-service agencies could both benefit tremendously from National Service, satisfying both parties may be difficult.

Yet satisfying both parties is also vital. We believe that the first step is to establish a selection process that matches youth to jobs on the basis of their skills and interests. This alone should reduce attrition. Equally important, the program should strive to build a sense of commitment and belonging among participants. Research indicates that postsecondary dropout rates are inversely related to feelings of commitment to and integration into the college community.[15] By emphasizing these objectives, program administrators can help ensure that participants remain in National Service placements for longer periods. This will make training more cost-effective, thereby opening up both more extensive training opportunities and more challenging jobs—thus further lowering attrition.

Avoiding Conflict with Existing Programs

The fourth major challenge during implementation will be to avoid inadvertent damage to the many community-service initiatives already sponsored by state and local government, schools and colleges, and nonprofit agencies. The National Service legislation is intended to support and extend such local efforts, of course, and certainly can, by providing financial and technical resources, heightening awareness of community service, and strengthening students' ethic of civic responsibility. Yet there are also a number of risks: conflict between programs; redundancy in services; and confusion for service participants, clients, and agencies. We believe that carefully defining and managing the relationship between National Service, state, and local service programs can minimize such problems. A number of specific issues will need attention.

Avoiding unintentional subsidies. One concern is that community-service agencies may simply subsidize their current employees' salaries with money provided by the federal government through National Service, rather than bring in new workers as the program intends. The potential for this appears to be quite significant. Consider, for example, a worker at a community-service agency who is compensated $16,000 in wages and health benefits.[16] Unlike many National Service volunteers, such a worker presumably already has the skills required by the agency, and might be willing to stay longer than one or two years. This worker could enroll in National Service, volunteering to work in the same community-service agency for up to two years. Under the program, the agency would be responsible for paying to the federal government approximately 15 percent of the cost of the National Service compensation.[17] This amounts to about $2,029 per year.[18] The community-service agency could then supplement the worker's National Service compensation, increasing it from $8,800 in wages and health benefits to the $16,000 the worker received before National Service. This would cost the community-service agency an additional $7,200. Thus, the worker who originally cost $16,000 will now cost the community-service agency only $9,229, and will receive not only equal compensation ($16,000) but a $4,725 education voucher as well. In cases like this, rather than providing a pool of new volunteers, the government is simply subsidizing 42 percent of the cost of current employees, and adding education vouchers to their compensation.[19] Table 3 provides further detail on the shift in cost between the National Service Program and community agencies under such an arrangement.

Table 3

Costs of a Community Service Worker

Components of Cost	Cost to Employer If Employee Does Not Participate in National Service (1)	Cost to Employer If Employee Participates in National Service (2)	Cost to Government If Employee Participates in National Service (3)	Total Costs If Employee Participates in National Service (Columns 2+3)
Wage compensation	$14,700	$1,125	$6,375	$7,500
Supplemental wage		$7,200		$7,200
Education voucher		$709	$4,016	$4,725
Health insurance	$1,300	$195	$1,105	$1,300
Total compensation	$16,000	$9,229	$11,496	$20,725

One might argue that even in cases where National Service functioned as simply a subsidy to community agencies, it would still probably increase the total resources available for public service activities. In the example just described, the program's funding would free up approximately $6,771 per employee, dollars the community agency could then use to address other needs. And it would provide additional education opportunities to existing agency workers. Even so, it is important to understand that the freed resources would not be sufficient to hire an additional full-time worker. So if National Service is used to subsidize current agency staff, the increase in the number of jobs and needs being filled may not be as great as it would be if an entirely new worker filled that program slot.

Avoiding worker displacement. In a similar way, community-service agencies may find it more attractive to hire inexpensive National Service workers than workers from the normal employment pool. Thus, the program might increase the total number of workers in an agency but would do so in part by displacing workers who would otherwise have been hired. Especially in these times of tight budgets, agencies would face strong incentives to make such substitutions. Although the National Service legislation includes strong language to prohibit worker displacement, identifying and preventing such practice would be difficult. As with subsidization, then, the National Service Program's interaction with existing efforts may not lead to as many additional "unmet" jobs being performed in our communities as the program's founders envision.

Avoiding a reduction in overall volunteerism. Although National Service aims to increase the total pool of volunteer workers in the United States, there is some risk that volunteerism could decrease. Part of the risk is a matter of public perception; if a visible new government-subsidized program begins serving community needs, then those citizens already or potentially serving as volunteers outside the National Service Program may not feel as strong an incentive to provide assistance themselves. This may, in turn, impede the program's potential to foster greater volunteering in our society. The other potential threat to overall volunteerism is more direct; the program may compete for recruits with the U.S. military or with existing service programs. Some have expressed concern that over time National Service will reduce the number or quality of military recruits, since it offers an alternative means for serving one's country and receiving educational benefits.[20] Likewise, competition from National Service might lead to declines in the number or quality of Peace Corps or VISTA recruits. More subtle changes may occur as well in the characteristics and motivations of those selecting various types of service. For example, care must be taken to ensure that community college students and those attending urban institutions do not self-select into one program while students at elite private institutions self-select into another.

Clearly, the interaction between National Service and existing service programs raises complex questions. The program may represent a net gain, but a number of risks are also present. One possible method to reduce such conflicts, albeit a bureaucratic one, is to require community-service agencies to document its number of both paid and unpaid workers before and after the introduction of National Service workers. In agencies that see an extreme decline in their number of staff or volunteers, further investigation would be required to determine if National Service participants are displacing or deterring other volunteers. This type of documentation could also be used to evaluate the impact of National Service on the recruiting success of other programs, including the military, Peace Corps, and VISTA.

Unanswered Questions

Each of the four major challenges discussed here raises important questions about how the program should be implemented. Answering these questions could substantially increase the program's effectiveness. Past experience may well provide some information; the history of other federally sponsored service and job training programs, such as VISTA and the Peace Corps, illuminates some of the management problems and political risks that National Service may face.[21] In planning National Service, policymakers have no doubt considered these lessons. Unfortunately, they have surely also discovered that the fundamental differences between National Service and other service programs, coupled with a relative dearth of useful hard data, limit the value of such comparisons. Much of the experience from other programs cannot be generalized to the National Service initiative.

Nonetheless, many of the important questions about how best to implement National Service can in fact be addressed—through empirical research performed during the process of program evaluation. The need for research on how community service affects both participants and communities is recognized in the National Service legislation as well as other planning documents.[22] We agree with these observations, and emphasize that *a formative evaluation of National Service, emerging from its early years (and especially its first year), is critical to assessing and resolving the potential problems we have described.*

Although a broad range of evaluation questions can be proposed, we recommend that formative evaluation focus at least in part on the major risks to program effectiveness discussed here. In this way, the evaluation can serve as an early warning system, giving administrators the opportunity to revise and improve the program in response to observed problems in implementation. The major issues we have discussed suggest the following evaluation tasks:

Balancing Conflicting Goals

- Determine how program goals drive program planning, and identify any goals that are neglected. Describe the extent to which administrators experience conflicts among the National Service goals and, if so, how they resolve them.
- Compare the priorities assigned to National Service goals over time and across service agencies, educational institutions, and government agencies.
- Describe how program administrators define "civic responsibility," and measure the congruence between these definitions and the activities intended to bolster civic responsibility.

Expanding Educational Opportunities

- Track the characteristics of National Service applicants and participants, including any changes in the numbers or proportions of pre-college youth, college students, college graduates, and non-college-bound youth.
- Track the proportion of pre-college National Service participants who use their educational vouchers.

Matching Participants with Jobs

- Assess the fit between agency needs and participants' skills and interests.
- Measure and track participant attrition, and compare attrition rates across participant subgroups (e.g., college-bound and non-college-bound youth). Determine the primary causes of attrition, and describe effective interventions for increasing retention.
- Assess the cost-effectiveness of various approaches to training for National Service participants. Given observed rates of attrition, determine how much training and what types of training it is reasonable to provide.
- Describe how teachers, police, and other service professionals integrate National Service workers into the workplace.

Avoiding Conflict with Existing Programs

- Determine the effects of National Service on agency staffing (both professional and volunteer) and on the number and types of new service jobs.
- Track applications to and participation in military service, Peace Corps, and other service programs, including local initiatives and school-based programs. Determine the degree of overlap between applications to (and participation in) National Service and other service programs. Determine if agencies that do not participate in National Service experience any changes in their ability to attract volunteers, staff, or funding.

As we have seen, the challenges to National Service raise complex, sometimes subtle issues. Performing the evaluation program we have laid out will require significant data collection and analysis. Yet we believe it is an essential part of any strategy to resolve the issues that will arise. By obtaining this information and using it to refine the all-important details of implementation, program planners and administrators can ensure that National Service makes real progress toward each of its ambitious goals.

About the authors: Maryann Jacobi Gray is an associate behavioral scientist in the Social Policy department, Robert F. Schoeni is an associate economist in the Human Capital department, and Tessa Kaganoff is a research assistant in the Human Capital department.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments and suggestions provided by their colleagues: Beth Asch, Dick Buddin, Glenn Gotz, Liz Ondaatje, Elmer Spreitzer, and John Winkler.

[1]White House press release, June 16, 1993.

[2]Although the exact parameters of the program had not been established at press time, tentative agreements have been reached between the Administration and Congress (*Congressional Quarterly*, August 7, 1993, p. 2161) that would set the education voucher and stipend at approximately $4,725 and $7,500, respectively, which is what we assume for the purposes of this paper. Full implementation of National Service is expected to occur over three years, and the program will enroll approximately 100,000 youth. The program will receive authorization for roughly $300 million in the first year, $500 million for the second, and $700 million for the third.

[3]Those without a high school degree are eligible if they commit themselves to completing their degree after serving.

[4]White House press release, April 30, 1993.

[5]Commission on National and Community Service, *What You Can Do For Your Country*, Washington, D.C., January 1993, p. 101.

[6]Clifford Krauss, "Clinton Wins Key Votes on Plan for Service Tied to School Loans," *The New York Times*, June 16, 1993.

[7]Department of Education, Office of Student Financial Assistance, "Loan Volume Update," 1992.

[8]The estimate of the health insurance benefit was based on phone surveys of insurance agencies. We took the average of the quotes for the cost of a "standard" health benefits package for a 20-year-old.

[9]Estimates are derived from the March 1991 *Current Population Survey*. Health benefits are valued at $1,300, which is an estimate of the cost of health insurance for a young adult. The CPS determines whether each worker's employer fully covers health benefits, pays a portion of the benefits, or pays nothing. If it covers all benefits, then compensation includes $1,300; if the employer covers a portion, it is assumed that half of the cost is covered, or $650. Full-time, full-year work is defined as working 35 hours or more per week during the year.

[10]The maximum monthly AFDC benefit for a family of three in New York was $577 in January 1992, and the maximum monthly food stamp allotment was $292. Source: Committee on Ways and Means, 1992 Green Book.

[11]Paul F. Hogan and Christine M. Villa, "Factors Affecting Re-enlistment in the Army Reserves: Evidence from the 1986 DoD Survey," in Curtis L. Gilroy, David K. Horn, and D. Alton Smith (eds.), *Military Compensation and Personnel Retention Models and Evidence*, United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria, VA, February 1991, pp. 355–396. The authors note that this may be an underestimate because the enlistees have 10 years to use their benefit, and at the time of interview some had not exhausted this period. However, the majority who use the benefits package are likely to use it soon after completion of military duties; therefore, the proportion who actually use the benefits is most likely only slightly higher than the estimate of 47 percent.

[12]Elizabeth Shogren, *Los Angeles Times*, April 14, 1993, p. A5.

[13]See unpublished RAND research by Jacob Klerman and Lynn Karoly, "The Transition to Stable Employment: 'Milling Around'?" 1993.

[14]Seventeen percent represents the average attrition rate for FY90, FY91, and FY92. Source: correspondence from City Year, "City Year Demographics FY90–FY93."

[15]V. Tinto, *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

[16]Assume they receive health benefits that cost $1,300, and they earn $7 per hour, which would lead to about $14,700 per year. Therefore, their total compensation is $16,000.

[17]The legislation will most likely state that 85 percent of the costs will be paid for by the federal government. It is not clear whether community agencies will also pay for part of the educational voucher; here we assume that they do.

[18]This is assuming that the worker does use the education voucher and does not use child care services, which is most likely an upper estimate of the average compensation costs to the employer.

[19]Of course, any particular employee could enroll in National Service for a maximum of two years; therefore, we would not expect this to continue indefinitely.

[20]See, for example, Memorandum from Director of Program Analysis and Evaluation, U.S. Army Recruiting Command, to Commander, U.S. Army Recruiting Command, "Dissenting Views on the Draft Paper Effects of a National Service Program on Army Recruiting," March 1989.

[21]A thorough discussion of these programs is beyond the scope of this issue paper. Charles C. Moskos reviews these programs in *A Call to Civic Service*, The Free Press, New York, 1988.

[22]Commission on National and Community Service, *What You Can Do For Your Country*, Washington, D.C., January 1993.

RAND
1700 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, California 90407-2138 • Telephone 310-393-0411 • FAX 310-393-4818
2100 M St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037-1270 • Telephone 202-296-5000 • FAX 202-296-7960

IP-136