DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 696 CE 069 224

AUTHOR	Gruber, David A.
TITLE	Toward a Seamless System for Youth Development: A New Strategy for Integrating Resources, Programs, and Institutions.
INSTITUTION	Jobs for the Future, Boston, MA.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	May 94
NOTE	106p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Jobs for the Future, 1 Bowdoin Square, Boston, MA 02114 ($10).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Development; Change Strategies; Community Cooperation; Community Coordination; *Community Programs; Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Education Work Relationship; Models; Program Implementation; Resource Allocation; Secondary Education; Vocational Education; Youth Opportunities; Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

This report explores the potential for and obstacles to comprehensive community-level approaches to preparing young people for occupational and academic advancement. Chapter I introduces the New Workforce strategy based on a pathways design and a community framework and strategic plan. Chapter II includes the following: overview of the shaping of the current system; the key institutions and programs that educate, train, and prepare young people for adulthood; reasons for the failures of the current system; and the potential for development of a systematic school-to-work transition strategy. Chapter III describes New Workforce and the early planning and implementation in San Diego and Minneapolis. Chapter IV explores the experiences of institutions in these two cities to determine the extent to which the model has promoted changes in general perspective, patterns of programming, and resource allocation among schools, postsecondary institutions, the employment and training system, and employers. It draws lessons from this experience that should be useful for program planners, administrators, and practitioners. Chapter V recommends that federal actions should include advocacy, redirection of funding, regulatory reform, and capacity building and state actions should include a state strategy, redirection of existing resources, and capacity building. Appendixes include an overview of key elements of the existing system, and local documentation. Contains 35 references. (YLB)

Toward a Seamless System for Youth Development: A New Strategy for Integrating Resources, Programs, and Institutions

by David A. Gruber

JOBS FOR THE FUTURE

May 1994

Jobs for the Future is a non-profit organization that conducts research, provides technical assistance, and proposes policy innovation on the interrelated issues of workforce development, economic development, and learning reform. Founded in 1983, JFF's goal is to encourage policies and practices that prepare all citizens for lives of productive work and learning. Since 1990, JFF's National Youth Apprenticeship Initiative has worked at the local, state and national levels studying and assisting new models for linking school and work for young people.

Toward a Seamless System for Youth Development: A New Strategy for Integrating Resources, Programs, and Institutions

by David A. Gruber

JOBS FOR THE FUTURE

1 Bowdoin Square
Boston, MA 02114
Phone: 617-742-5995
Fax: 617-742-5767

May 1994

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

This paper was funded through the generous support of The Ford Foundation. Development of the New Workforce strategy was made possible through the support and assistance of Public/Private Ventures. Implementation of New Workforce has been the responsibility of public and non-profit institutions in San Diego and Minneapolis. Without the interest and dedication of staff in both these cities, there would be no experience to relate.

The author would particularly like to thank Richard Kazis, of Jobs for the Future, for his help in developing and refining this document, and Gary Walker, of Public/Private Ventures, for his continuing interest and contribution. The author would also like to acknowledge the skilled assistance of Linda Jucovy and Robert Cohen in shaping this material for publication.

David A. Gruber
April 1994

Preface

In the coming years, many communities around the nation will embark on ambitious strategies for improving the transition from school to work. We are now in an exciting period of experimentation with system-building at the local, state, and national levels that could ultimately change the way the United States prepares young people for productive careers and lives.

At the community level, the work will not be easy. It will involve building new working relationships and collaborative efforts among institutions and actors—schools, post-secondary institutions, employers, training providers, and community-based agencies—that have a thin history of working together. It will involve difficult choices about resource allocation, planning processes, and common vision.

Yet, after years of frustration with the uncoordinated, fragmented, "non-system" of education and training in this country, the hard work ahead holds out the promise of the creation of more comprehensive and effective youth development strategies that work for all young people. The potential exists for significant progress.

As local communities move toward creating their own school-to-work transition systems, they are thirsty for knowledge and perspective, for both a vision of what they are trying to achieve and guidance on how to increase their chances of success. This report, written by David Gruber for Jobs for the Future, is a timely and important contribution. Based on field research in several communities that are working to build more comprehensive approaches to helping young people make the transition to adulthood and on additional interviews with national policy experts, the report provides both vision and practical advice, both lessons from the field and recommendations for national and state policy.

Gruber's analysis emphasizes several important findings. He argues for melding youth development and workforce preparation perspectives into a single approach, so that the best of each perspective is incorporated into a single vision of what it takes to help young people move into adulthood and handle its challenges and responsibilities. He stresses the importance of early and ongoing interventions that build upon each other and put the interests of individual young people above those of the particular institutions that serve them. And he provides practical ideas about how existing federal funding streams and resources might be managed more coherently and effectively at the local level—and about the kinds of community-based governance structures that can facilitate such collaboration.

This report, produced with funding from The Ford Foundation, is part of Jobs for the Future's on-going series of research and policy papers on issues related to improving the school-to-work transition in this country. In the coming months, JFF will release and disseminate to practitioners and policymakers several new studies and products, including: a report on the

progress of ten innovative programs with which JFF has worked closely over the past three years as part of our National Youth Apprenticeship Initiative; a study of recent education and training reforms in Scotland and Sweden and their relevance to U.S. debates about skill standards and other strategies for driving systemic change; and *School-to-Work Toolkits* designed to help teachers, employers, and others build effective school-to-work systems in their communities through the dissemination of "tools" and case materials from successful school-to-work programs.

We hope that this report will be a useful resource for local practitioners and for state and national policymakers as they work to improve the prospects and opportunities available to this country's youth.

Hilary C. Pennington
President

Executive Summary

After years of mounting frustration with the uncoordinated, decentralized, national "non-system" for preparing young people for careers and adulthood, a consensus is emerging around the need for more comprehensive youth development strategies that build clear pathways from school to work for all of the nation's youth. This study, *Toward a Seamless System for Youth Development: A Report on a New Strategy for Integrating Resources, Programs, and Institutions*, is a contribution to that discussion. Based on the author's experience in two cities, San Diego and Minneapolis, and extensive research in other communities and at the national level, the report analyzes the shortcomings of existing youth policy, describes a model for community-level initiatives to address some of these problems, assesses the early progress of efforts to implement this model in two cities, and recommends next steps for practitioners and policymakers. This study was generously funded by The Ford Foundation.

An Emerging Consensus

There can be little disagreement with the statement that all young people in this country deserve the opportunity to develop into productive citizens, family members, and workers. Policy advocates and researchers in the youth development field have increasingly become convinced that, for this to occur, public- and private-sector leaders and institutions must work together to create not just isolated programs, but a comprehensive, coherent system of learning, work, and social supports. At the very least, youth-serving institutions—the K-12 educational system, post-secondary schools, the JTPA system, community groups and social service providers, and employers—will have to come together at the local level around institutional initiatives built upon the following design elements:

- An educational program that eliminates the dichotomy between practical and theoretical learning;
- Emphasis on young people's mastery of universal academic competencies sufficient to meet standards for entry into higher education or skilled employment;
- Work experience and work-based learning opportunities as part of young people's educational programs;
- Comprehensive social support, including sustained adult contact, case management, and family outreach; and
- The creation of more structured and obvious pathways to career employment, post-secondary training, or higher education.

Such reforms will require administrative and governance mechanisms that can coordinate different funding streams; eliminate divisive categorizations by age, economic status, or educational status; and provide incentives for mainstream educational, training, and social service institutions to look beyond themselves and work toward shared goals.

Problems and Potential of the Existing Youth Development System

The existing system to prepare young people for employment and adulthood is not a system at all, but rather an amalgam of strategies, programs, and initiatives delivered by three levels of government and a bewildering array of educational, training, and social service institutions. The lack of a comprehensive national approach is not accidental. Its roots can be traced to four historical factors: the long-standing belief that the federal government's role in youth policy should be temporary, not permanent; jurisdictional separation, since at least the 1930s, between education and training; the targeting of youth policy, and of federal education and training efforts as a whole, to the economically disadvantaged; and the devolution of education and youth policy decision-making to the local level. Because of these factors, the United States has not generated any clear national vision, mandate, or inter-institutional mechanism for uniting youth-serving institutions to provide longer-term, more effective interventions benefiting greater numbers of young people.

That we have lacked such preconditions for national action in the past does not, however, preclude the possibility of change. Among the public schools, the post-secondary educational system, JTPA providers, social service organizations, and the employer community, there exist an impressive institutional base and significant resources for serving young people more effectively. Coordination and redirection of JTPA Titles IIB and IIC, Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and Perkins Act funds can alone provide a federal resource pool of approximately $3 billion a year (as much as $2,000 to $3,000 per student for disadvantaged youth who meet eligibility requirements) for comprehensive school-to-work transition strategies extending from middle school through the transition beyond high school.

Rethinking these programs offers a base for creation of a multi-year school-to-work strategy that could reach over 500,000 middle and secondary students—equivalent to perhaps 10–12% of the economically disadvantaged student population—at no additional cost.

There is, of course, a long history of false starts and failures when it comes to efforts to encourage collaboration and coordination among recipients of federal training and education dollars. Regulatory barriers, turf fights, the inertia generated by existing programs, and political obstacles to change cannot be minimized. Yet, it is the argument of this study that there has never been a sustained national attempt to create significant integration among educational and training resources, institutions, and programs for young people. The potential for creating a more comprehensive youth development system has yet to be seriously tested.

New Workforce: A Model for Building a Comprehensive Youth Development System

During the past few years, the author of this report has worked with leaders of key local institutions in San Diego and Minneapolis to test the power of a reform strategy to encourage greater collaboration. This change model, called New Workforce, is based upon broad agreement on four basic principles:

- **A community strategy** to prepare all youth for work or post-secondary education;
- **A common framework** linking all relevant institutions in pursuit of this goal;
- **A strategic model** proposing clearly defined roles for employers, social service providers, and education and training institutions; and
- **A commitment** to use or redirect existing resources to meet community objectives.

New Workforce is based on two key elements:

1. A "Pathways" Design

New Workforce envisions a long-term, sustained pathway from middle school to the workplace. Although it does not prescribe a specific program design, New Workforce is intended to support a multi-year, year-round program framework beginning in 6th grade, extending through transitions to middle and secondary schools, and leading through college, post-secondary training, or career employment. The initiative aims to stimulate a comprehensive package of academic and social supports, including a focus on universal academic competencies, the integration of workplace competencies into school curricula, sustained adult contact, and case management.

2. A Community Framework and Strategic Plan

New Workforce proposes a youth development strategy that better realizes the potential of existing resources. It establishes basic principles undergirding a community-wide strategic framework linking employers with four key entities: K-12 schools, post-secondary institutions, the JTPA system, and community agencies. In this framework, institutions working together will seek to develop the pathways—the multi-year, year-round preparation effort leading to post-secondary education or employment. Support for this effort will primarily be achieved through redirection of existing funding, including JTPA, Perkins Act, Chapter 1, and federal and state dropout prevention programs. The model proposes the following institutional roles:

K-12 school systems will expand college preparation programs and employ existing dropout prevention funding, now mostly used for remedial efforts, to establish academic support programs. In cooperation with community colleges, JTPA, and the business community, schools will also redirect vocational training resources to support development of longer-term and more comprehensive career-oriented education. To the extent feasible, schools will use whole-school Chapter 1 strategies as a foundation for this effort.

Post-secondary institutions will offer qualifying youngsters admission and use existing resources to develop financial aid packages to subsidize the cost of education for disadvantaged youth. Colleges and community colleges will work with other institutions to develop multi-year preparation programs, expand mentoring and tutoring efforts, and enhance connections to "2+2" programs like Tech Prep.

JTPA will redirect current single-summer work experience programs to create a multi-summer preparation program for college, post-secondary training, and career employment. JTPA will also work with employers to create pre-employment training efforts and work with schools to create a multi-year, integrated approach to work and career education.

Community agencies will provide social support services to youngsters and serve as a bridge between other partners, neighborhoods, and families. The agencies will provide school- or neighborhood-based case management, conduct family outreach, and integrate program participants with existing recreational, social support, and community service activities.

Employers will work with other partners to develop a long-term pathway for entry-level jobs. Specifically, employers will work with post-secondary institutions and JTPA to create multi-year initiatives that integrate publicly-funded education and training with private-sector work experience. Such public/private partnerships could then be used to expand and enhance existing school-to-work initiatives. Businesses involved in separate and now distinct school-business partnerships will also integrate these efforts into a broader strategy, which could include work-based learning and mentoring consistent with the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, along with tutoring and business support of "last-dollar" scholarship programs.

The Early Implementation Experience in Two Cities

During the past eighteen months, San Diego and Minneapolis have explored and begun to implement the framework and program elements of New Workforce (In San Diego, the initiative is called Pipeline 6.16). While starting from essentially the same model, the two communities have taken very different approaches to planning the initiative—including differences in scope, participants, structure, and governance. While the experience in these two cities is still preliminary and limited, it highlights issues that are likely to be instructive to both practitioners and policymakers:

1. New Workforce has served as a catalyst to stimulate youth-serving institutions to move toward more comprehensive, community-wide, school-to-work strategies. New Workforce has led to changes in perspective, patterns of youth programming, and resource allocation. In San Diego, three youth-serving institutions have adopted a longer-term and more integrated approach to youth development:

- The JTPA provider, schools, and post-secondary institutions have collaborated on a multi-summer college preparation effort built on the redirection

of JTPA funding. The new program design extends from grades 7 to 11, with a direct link to college preparatory programming.

- Post-secondary institutions have been prompted to expand their traditional view of the potential student body, recognizing that active, early preparation can increase the numbers of disadvantaged youth who are ready and able to attend college. These institutions have pledged admission to program participants meeting defined academic standards. They have also developed a model for a multi-year case management and social support initiative.
- The school district has adopted or supported the New Workforce model as a means to promote broader change in both Chapter 1 programming and the implementation of a school-to-work transition initiative.

While Minneapolis is still in the planning process, New Workforce has already brought together a broad group of youth-serving institutions, community organizations, and employers to consider a community-wide strategy, and prompted a proposed redefinition of mission and operation in at least one institution.

2. Schools in the K-12 system are often the most difficult to bring into the planning process. Schools are the most important youth-serving institutions in a community. At the same time, they are also the institutions that have proven least able to commit to long-term collaborative strategic planning that requires significant change and resource reallocation. As school districts move toward greater decentralization and site-based management, promoting change within individual schools will be even more of a challenge.

3. Change of this complexity and scope requires a formal structure and an organization with the resources and commitment to advance the process. San Diego has used an informal task force to plan and implement New Workforce, and this had, to an extent, limited progress there—particularly in contrast to the early momentum generated in Minneapolis by the visible leadership of the Minneapolis Youth Trust, a non-profit organization sponsored by the business community to improve programming in the public schools. Having a strong organizational structure to manage and coordinate the initiative seems essential for gaining the level of commitment required of employers, schools, post-secondary institutions, JTPA providers, and others.

4. A systemic approach to workforce development requires an outside stimulus and significant technical assistance. To overcome institutional inertia and turf battles, it is often helpful to have some outside entity—either a credible intermediary organization or a clear government mandate—break the institutional "gridlock" by proposing new roles and collaborative mechanisms. Outside help can stimulate progress through introducing the concept of a community planning framework, assisting key institutions in envisioning and developing needed connections, assisting in the development of a planning process and a funding strategy, and providing information from other efforts nationally.

Federal and State Policy Recommendations

Both the federal government and the states can act decisively to provide the vision, mandate, and mechanisms necessary for local collaboration in youth policy and programming. The federal government should offer states and communities a broad vision and direction for youth development, work to redirect existing resources to create sustained and integrated youth programming, and reform existing regulations. Similarly, states should take a more active role. Specific recommendations include:

1. The U.S. Departments of Education and Labor should actively promote redirection of JTPA IIB and IIC, Chapter 1, Perkins Act, School-to-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA), and other funding to support more comprehensive strategies. The departments should revamp the awards process for STWOA funds so that they include the following: a strategy for development of multi-year pathways to college and work; a plan for directing JTPA IIC and Perkins Act funding so as to support this effort; and a plan to integrate school-wide Chapter 1 programming at the secondary level with school-to-work transition efforts.

In addition, the Department of Labor should restructure the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) as a multi-year workforce preparation initiative linked to a larger community-wide strategy. The department should propose these changes in SYEP: 1) training providers should be required—in concert with schools, employers, and post-secondary institutions—to develop a plan to reposition the summer jobs program as one component of a multi-year work preparation strategy; 2) training providers should be required to use SYEP resources to support initiatives that include (but are not limited to) long-term preparation for school-to-work transition, such as youth apprenticeships, Tech Prep, and multi-year skills training linked to job placement; and 3) training providers should be required to integrate SYEP programming with school district Perkins Act and Chapter 1 school-wide projects.

Similarly, the Department of Education should require school districts to develop comprehensive workforce development plans linking Perkins Act and Chapter 1 funding with JTPA and other relevant resources. The department should make a particular effort to realize the potential of whole-school, high school Chapter 1 sites as a base for comprehensive workforce preparation strategies by requiring them to develop a comprehensive workforce preparation plan in conjunction with JTPA and other community institutions.

2. The Departments of Education and Labor should provide short-term waivers and seek longer-term regulatory reform to promote integrated use of JTPA, Perkins Act, and Chapter 1 funding. STWOA calls for issuance of waivers to promote integrated workforce development efforts, and the federal government should be as responsive as possible to local requests, with particular attention given to easing certification barriers for JTPA eligibility and to promoting integrated use of JTPA and Chapter 1 funding as a key component of local strategies. In the longer term, the government should

pursue reforms designed to promote schools as the focus of workforce development strategies integrating federal, state, and local funding streams. The government should, in particular, pursue plans to lower the threshold qualification for Chapter 1 schoolwide projects to a 50 percent economically disadvantaged population.

3. States should offer direction and resources to local communities. STWOA gives states a central role in policy development, and they should use this authority—along with control of JTPA, Perkins Act, and other federal and state resources tied to education, training, and social support—to pursue two key objectives:

- Creation of a state strategy to improve youth programming: The strategy should include an expanded agenda and membership of the state STWOA task force to encompass a broad vision of workforce development extending from middle school onward; an overall plan designed to link school- and work-based learning; and a program of advocacy and outreach designed to encourage community workforce development strategies based on New Workforce principles.
- Redirection of existing resources: The mandated state planning process for federally-funded programs such as JTPA and Perkins Act initiatives has been underutilized as a means to encourage collaborative planning at the community level. State labor and education departments should use this planning process to encourage or require training providers, school districts, and post-secondary institutions to integrate JTPA- and Perkins Act-funded programming in a larger strategy. States should also use the STWOA planning process as a means to stimulate local integration of funding.

Finally, both the federal government and states should provide new resources to enhance local capacity for planning, developing, and implementing a community-wide youth development strategy. The U.S. Departments of Education and Labor should provide sustained technical assistance to communities to aid in the development of these efforts, while states should specifically designate STWOA, discretionary JTPA, and other funds to support local capacity building. States should also expand their own technical assistance capacity by training current state education and labor field staff to jointly aid communities in efforts to develop comprehensive strategies that build clear pathways from school to work for all youth.

I. Introduction: A New Framework for National Youth Policy

During the last few years, two distinct areas of research have cast considerable doubt on the nation's ability to prepare our youth for a productive adulthood of work and lifelong learning. One body of research has focused on the difficult transition between high school and employment experienced by many young Americans. A series of highly publicized commissions and reports, including *Workforce 2000*, *The Forgotten Half*, and *America's Choice: high skills or low wages!*, has argued that the United States has failed to create an effective system of educational and employment opportunities to prepare the majority of its youth for careers in an increasingly competitive and demanding economy. Critics point to a "haphazard non-system" which lacks a coherent strategy for workforce preparation (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1992); a set of institutions and incentives biased toward college preparation and college-directed students to the exclusion of other career pathways and other students (William T. Grant Foundation Commission, 1988); and an educational system which offers young people few effective connections to the adult labor market (DeLone, 1992). According to many analysts, while these systemic deficiencies have an impact on all students, they are especially damaging to the career hopes and prospects of disadvantaged and minority youth (Osterman, 1991).

A second body of research has focused more broadly on the shortcomings of the various institutions and systems that prepare young people, especially disadvantaged youth, for full participation in society. Beginning with *A Nation at Risk*, the 1983 report critical of the United States educational system, numerous studies have lamented the poor quality of, and the lack of coordination among, the nation's many youth-serving educational, training, and social support institutions. Evaluations of the federal government's largest and most significant interventions for disadvantaged youth—Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which focuses on academic remediation, and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), which funds short-term job search and training—have found little if any lasting impact on participants (U.S. Department of Education, 1993; U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1992). Even thoughtful, well-designed interventions, such as the Summer Training and Education Program (STEP—a two-summer employment, remediation, and social support program), show only slightly more encouraging results; while STEP participants experienced significant short-term learning gains, these gains disappeared over time (Walker and Vilella-Velez, 1992).

Studies by the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, the National Commission on Employment Policy, and organizations such as Public/Private Ventures and the Academy for Educational Development concur that existing fragmented, largely short-term, and reactive efforts to address the challenges of youth development are inadequate. There is a growing frustration with the traditional national approach to helping disadvantaged youth—a "problem-by-problem" and group-by-group approach that creates

specific new programs to remedy specific disadvantages (such as teen pregnancy, poor educational preparedness, drug dependency, or lack of job skills) and compartmentalizes interventions according to targeted population groups. In fact, a consensus is emerging—reflected in and reinforced by recent national policy initiatives—that may signal a new and promising era in youth policy in this country.

Two Themes: Workforce Preparation and Youth Development

In the 1980s, policy debates and initiatives focusing on two key areas—workforce preparation and youth development—were largely, and surprisingly, unconnected. Recently, though, this has begun to change. Increasingly, research and writing on both career preparation and youth development emphasize the same basic theme:

> *All young people in this country deserve the opportunity to develop into active, productive citizens, family members, and workers. For this to occur, public- and private-sector leaders and institutions must work together to create not just isolated programs, but a comprehensive, coherent system of learning, work, and social supports designed to meet that objective.*

This theme is based in the belief that the two main strands of youth programming—workforce preparation and youth development—can, and must, be woven together.

The Workforce Preparation Approach: Proponents of improved workforce preparation efforts for young people generally believe that creation of a system where none now exists is a prerequisite to effective school-to-work transitions in the U.S. If all young people are to have a more motivating educational experience and be better connected to the labor force, the nation must develop administrative and governance mechanisms that can coordinate different funding streams; eliminate divisive categorizations by age, economic status, or educational status; and provide incentives for mainstream educational, training, and social service institutions to look beyond themselves and work toward shared goals.

This view is at the core of the Clinton Administration's School-to-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA), which is intended to create a national framework for linking school and work for young people and to encourage states to put in place key building blocks for a comprehensive school-to-work transition system. Beyond STWOA, there is growing evidence of a desire to reduce the fragmentation and improve the coherence of youth-related policy at the federal level. The U.S. Department of Labor is looking at ways to increase the educational impact of the summer jobs program and other components of JTPA, and to bring some flexibility into program administration and implementation. The U.S. Department of Education has proposed reforms of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that stem from the same impulse. In Congress, at least at the level of rhetoric, both Republicans and Democrats are signaling their frustration with the poor performance of individual programs and the lack of any systemic approach. And at the state

level, the same concern is evident in many of the dozen or more recently enacted state laws that promote more systematic and coordinated strategies for preparing young people for careers.

These new efforts target public resources to engage employers, schools, post-secondary educational institutions, and labor and community organizations in programs that encourage linkages and integration along three dimensions: 1) the integration of academic and vocational learning; 2) the integration of school-based and work-based learning; and 3) the integration of secondary and post-secondary learning. At the very least, these initiatives propose to create more clearly defined, varied, and easier-to-negotiate pathways to career advancement for in-school youth, beginning in the last few years of high school. At its most expansive, the vision is one of "a seamless system of skill development beginning in early childhood and continuing through school, post-secondary training and adult education" (Kazis, 1993).

The Youth Development Approach: Many youth development practitioners and theorists are also beginning to embrace more comprehensive visions and approaches to serving young people. Moving away from narrowly targeted and limited programming, advocates increasingly call for a more comprehensive framework—the kind of framework that was traditionally provided by families and communities—that can offer support and opportunities to develop all youth. Karen Pittman, of the Academy for Educational Development, notes the need for "a massive conceptual shift" (1991), while others call for a youth policy system "rooted in an understanding of the basic human and developmental needs of youth" (Youth Development Institute, 1993).

As articulated in a number of recent reports, this developmental approach focuses on the need for strategies to create long-term, comprehensive, and clearly defined pathways to maturity and opportunity, beginning in childhood and extending throughout adolescence and beyond high school (National Governors' Association, 1993; Youth Development Institute, 1993). Similar to the "seamless system" envisioned for workforce preparation, newly proposed models construct a web of supports that extends from the family outward into the schools, workplaces, and other essential social and economic institutions in our communities.

Convergence: Toward a Comprehensive, Long-Term Youth Strategy

How far the United States will go toward building a new youth development system—in policy and in practice, in communities and states nationwide—remains to be seen. While there is evidence of a desire for change, the existing interests and institutions are large and entrenched and have few incentives to act collaboratively. The best programs and initiatives around the country are still relatively small and isolated and are viewed primarily as demonstration efforts. Inertia, isolation, and turf battles remain serious obstacles to significant change.

But despite these obstacles, advocates of both improved workforce preparation and improved youth development services are building on divergent foundations to arrive at a broad—and powerful—consensus around the need for a system that provides young people with the educational and social supports that can help them move forward along any of a diverse set of career pathways. Advocates envision a system driven by the developmental needs of youth and containing these key elements:

- **Comprehensive social support,** including sustained adult contact, case management, and family outreach;
- **Emphasis on a mastery of universal academic competencies** sufficient to meet standards for entry to higher education or skilled employment;
- **Career-oriented education** that eliminates the dichotomy between practical and theoretical education;
- **Work experience and work-based learning opportunities** in private-sector firms, public or community agencies, or school-based enterprises; and
- **A structured transition** to career employment, post-secondary training, or higher education.

New Workforce: A Strategy for Systemic Change

In the past few years, the author of this report has been involved in an attempt to begin to put these basic principles into operation in two communities. The New Workforce initiative, as this effort has been called, is designed to explore the potential for redirecting the resources of youth-serving institutions around the emerging consensus that effective youth development should be based on long-term and sustained interventions that integrate education, training, and social services. As tested in Minneapolis and San Diego during the past two years, New Workforce is a strategic intervention structured to help the various educational, training, employment, and other youth-serving community institutions design their own systemic approach to helping their young people move into productive roles as citizens, workers, and family members.

The model is built upon two principles that are consistent with the general direction of innovation in youth policy as endorsed both by advocates of better workforce preparation and those focusing on youth development. These are: 1) the importance of a long-term, sustained, and clear set of pathways for all young people that lead them toward decent careers and further learning; and 2) the need for a broad-based process involving the key actors in a community, including employers, the K-12 educational system, post-secondary educational institutions, the JTPA system, and community-based organizations. The New Workforce strategy emphasizes the importance of articulating and agreeing to a common vision, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of different institutions and actors in the community, and identifying and using existing resource bases in strategic, coordinated ways. In practice, New Workforce:

- Proposes an overall planning design that furthers the missions and objectives of participating institutions, and is consistent with federal workforce development initiatives;

- Suggests roles that employers and educational, social service, and training institutions might fill in the context of a larger, integrated policy framework; and
- Offers guidance to participating institutions in the redirection of existing resources and programs.

This report explores the potential for—and obstacles to—such comprehensive community-level approaches to preparing young people for occupational and academic advancement. It looks at the strengths and weaknesses of existing youth-serving institutions and systems; describes the pathways approach that is at the heart of the New Workforce strategy; and analyzes the initial experience in two cities, San Diego and Minneapolis, that have begun to implement this approach. Although this experience is still preliminary and modest, it holds important lessons for others as they conceptualize and implement community-wide strategies for coordinating youth resources and programming. Thus, the report includes a discussion of lessons for local planners and concludes with recommendations for next steps at the national and state levels. The aim is to help policymakers and practitioners as they think through both the process and the content of new efforts to create systemic approaches to preparing young people for productive adulthood.

II. The Current System: Institutions, Programs, Potential

A central contradiction in youth policy is that most reformers in the field ignore what should be the main focus of their attention: the structure of our human services system, including both the formal system of educational and training institutions and the informal network of employers, and community and business organizations that exists around it. In fact, underlying many of the failures in youth policy is the reality that the current "system" is not a system at all, but rather an amalgam of distinct strategies, programs, and initiatives delivered by three levels of government and at least four distinct youth-serving entities: the K-12 educational system, post-secondary institutions, the employment and training system, and social service providers.

For all intents and purposes, all of these institutions, regardless of their particular objective, share the same mission: to prepare youth for a productive adulthood. Yet it is apparent to even a casual observer that the prevailing pattern of delivering education and other services to youth does not allow for a common perspective or framework. Services are typically funded, planned, and delivered in isolation; and the disappointing outcomes of recent attempts to improve the integration of youth services, such as the Annie E. Casey Foundation's New Futures Initiative suggest the difficulty of bringing these disparate resources together.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that many of the barriers preventing collaboration among the institutions and programs that educate and train youth are not inherent, but rather *de facto*: the result of a "system" comprised of separate institutions that have rarely collectively sought a more comprehensive, collaborative strategy for youth development. While substantial barriers to collaboration clearly exist, there may also be more potential than is commonly thought for breaking through the needlessly narrow perspectives and limited objectives of key youth-serving institutions.

This chapter explores that potential by providing a "road map" to the current system and evaluating its possibilities as a foundation for building comprehensive school-to-work strategies. The chapter is organized into four parts:

- A general overview of the shaping of the current system;
- A brief look at the key institutions and programs that educate, train, and prepare young people for adulthood;
- A discussion of the reasons for the failures of the current system; and
- An assessment of the potential for development of a systemic school-to-work transition strategy, including a review of the barriers and incentives to change.

The material in this chapter is drawn from a review of the literature, interviews with policymakers, and discussions with local officials in four cities: Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Sacramento.

The Making of the "System"

Our national experience in preparing youth for employment has been shaped to a great extent by four factors:

1. Deliberate Fragmentation: The United States educational and training system is, above all, not a system. It is instead a "galaxy of planetary systems each with its own unique history, policy debates, and linkages with other systems" (Hahn et al., 1992), and a "collection of separate institutions with varied motives and funding incentives and without the integration that the term 'system' implies" (Grubb et al., 1991). A U.S. General Accounting Office examination limited solely to job training showed 125 federally-funded programs, administered by fourteen different federal agencies and delivered mostly through states and localities (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1991).

This fragmented "non-system" is no accident, but rather the result of a long-standing federal aversion to creating a national youth training strategy or system. As Hahn et al. (1992) note about youth training: "There is a...belief that government should step in only when unusual circumstances dictate its presence. This involvement is then seen as transitory rather than as part of the permanent policy landscape....Fragmentation of responsibility at the federal level has been a cornerstone of youth policy."

2. Separation of Education and Training: Education and training have developed as parallel systems since the 1930s, when the Roosevelt Administration established job training programs outside the educational system (Grubb et al., 1989). This dualism persists at all levels of government and is reflected in the continuing separation between the K-12 educational system and the employment and training system, and between academic and vocational education.

3. Targeted Services/Limited Reach: Although the education and training systems offer some services to all, they are targeted toward the economically disadvantaged. Major federal programs and initiatives, including the federally-funded Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, emphasize economic disadvantage as a criterion for funding or service.

These programs, moreover, are inadequately funded to reach the entire eligible population. JTPA, for example, serves an estimated 5 percent of eligible participants program-wide (Hahn et al., 1992)—perhaps 10 percent in summer programs under projected funding levels. Although ESEA's Chapter 1 programming has a considerably broader base, serving 5.5 million educationally disadvantaged students—more than 10 percent of all school-age children and a considerably higher percentage of the 8.1 million school-age children in poverty—it too fails to reach all poor children (U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

4. Local Decision Making: Perhaps the most enduring legacy of the Reagan era's "New Federalism" has been the continuing reluctance of government at both the federal and state levels to exert control or direction over youth

training policy. To a great extent, discretion over planning, programming, and resources for youth training now lies at the local level (Grubb et al., 1989, 1991; Hahn et al., 1992). Local governments also have discretion over education spending, which is the result of a long-standing, largely successful struggle for community autonomy in this area.

Together these factors have shaped a youth-serving system that is better described as a collection of separate institutions with related interests. The historical policy separation between education and training, combined with a national reluctance to develop a comprehensive youth policy that would bridge this gap, has, by default, left institutions like schools and training and social service providers to develop their own independent programs and strategies.

Beginning with the way in which money moves through the welter of conflicting programs and agencies, this "non-system" resists the creation of structured pathways based on the developmental needs of children and youth. Because youth policy is conceived not as an overall strategic response to youth needs, but rather as a means to provide specific educational, training, or social services, money flows downward from federal, state, and local governments to institutions that deliver those specific services or activities. Thus, schools offer remedial education and vocational preparation programs, training providers offer work experience and work-readiness programs, and community-based organizations provide counseling, health, and social services programs. And rarely are these efforts, often serving the same young people, coordinated at the local level.

The System in Brief

The creation of a pathway from school to career employment depends primarily upon the individual efforts of and interactions among employers and four youth-serving entities: the K-12 system, post-secondary institutions, the JTPA system, and social service providers and community-based organizations. Each of these entities has resources available that could be harnessed for greater impact. (A longer discussion of the existing system can be found in Appendix A.)

The K-12 Educational System: In addition to the $274 billion expended annually on elementary and secondary education nationwide, schools operate three additional activity streams designed to help students, particularly disadvantaged students, prepare for life after compulsory education.

1. **Dropout prevention:** Almost all large schools operate local, state, and federally-financed programs aimed at providing remedial basic skills and keeping students in school. The largest of these is the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act's Chapter 1 program, which is currently budgeted at $6.3 billion dollars (proposed $6.7 billion FY '95). The funding is predominantly employed for short-term "pull-out" programs that a recent Department of Education study found "largely ineffective" in substantially raising student achievement levels (U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

2. **Transitional programming:** Some of the nation's high schools sponsor specific transitional programs, such as Jobs for America's Graduates, Career Beginnings, Compacts, and other programs designed to create a link between high school and either higher education or the workplace. While some of these programs are effective or have effective elements, others are limited in that they start comparatively late in a student's career (10th grade or later), provide relatively narrow services (e.g., college counseling with no link to academic preparation), and are relatively short-term in duration (McMullan and Snyder, 1987; National Alliance of Business, 1989).

3. **Vocational education programming:** Schools traditionally have used funding under the federal Perkins Act, now approximately $600 million, as well as a much larger base of state and local funding, to operate high school vocational programs. In the face of widespread perception that these programs have failed to prepare enough students adequately for the changing workplace, 1990 amendments to the Perkins Act require that funding be used to "integrate academic and vocational education." However, vocational education still appears to be poorly integrated with more broadly based educational preparation (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1993).

Post-Secondary Institutions: Both two- and four-year colleges operate a variety of initiatives designed to improve connections with secondary schools and students, including curriculum reform efforts, mentoring efforts, early outreach programs, and participation in federally-funded preparation initiatives such as the Upward Bound and Talent Search programs. Many of these efforts have been criticized as narrowly targeted, restricted in scope and reach, and poorly coordinated with community programs. Others, such as the 50,000-student Upward Bound program, provide sustained preparation, but still are operated largely in isolation from other educational and training initiatives.

In recent years, community colleges have come to be seen as the most important institutional link between higher education and the workplace. Although many of these institutions have begun to develop ties to high schools through "2+2" programs, which begin in the 11th grade and link the last two years of high school with the first two years of post-secondary training, efforts are often poorly integrated with preparation programs targeted at younger grades.

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) System: The JTPA system is the primary employment and training system for disadvantaged adults and youth. Community entities—private industry councils (PICs)—manage this $4-billion effort, which, in addition to training for adults and out-of-school youth, includes approximately $1.2 billion in programs directed primarily to in-school youth. The largest of these programs, the $900 million Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP), is the nation's single largest training program for disadvantaged young people, expected to serve about 625,000 youth nationwide this summer. This program, with projected average cost per participant of

$1,475 for summer '94, typically provides relatively limited academic remediation combined with a summer work experience placement at a public or non-profit institution. Just released federal guidelines also allow funding for private-sector internships. A much smaller in-school program provides employability training—including general work readiness, job counseling, and limited work experience placements—for about 200,000 youth.

JTPA programs for both youth and adults have been widely criticized. A recent study of programs for out-of school youth showed that JTPA had little or no effect on earnings (U.S. Department of Labor, 1992) of female youth and no statistically significant negative effect on earnings of male youth (U.S. Department of Labor, 1992). Although there is now new emphasis on enhancing academics in the summer program, SYEP to date has frequently been viewed as providing "make-work" to teenagers, and limited or uninspiring academic support (*Education Week*, April 21, 1993).

Social Service Providers/Community Organizations: City agencies contract with neighborhood-based social service providers and community organizations to deliver a wide variety of services for youth, including job training, health care, counseling, and other social services. The advantages offered by these organizations—that they are closely linked to neighborhoods and that they concentrate a variety of services in a single place—are undermined by the fact that they serve only as agents for a larger system that does not itself coordinate services.

Employers: Employers interact with the youth development system in three ways: through partnerships with individual schools, through systemic educational reform efforts, and through work and training opportunities for in- and out of-school youth. To date, the reach and impact of all these efforts has been limited. A 1987 report noted few examples of business promoting systemic educational reform (McMullen and Snyder, 1987). Employers tend to offer young people short-term job placements, for a summer or a semester, and most of these jobs are unconnected to either JTPA job training programs or school-based vocational programming. A new area of employer interest, longer-term training through youth apprenticeship and other school-to-work initiatives, is still in an early developmental phase.

How the System Fails

One would search in vain to find a community in this country that has used the resources of existing funding streams to create a long-term and comprehensive approach to preparing all its young people for productive work and citizenship. Interviews with officials in three of the nation's largest cities showed that none of the three had: created a mechanism to effectively link employers, schools, and training institutions in the design of a common school-to-work and youth development strategy; substantially integrated the three main federal sources of funding now directed toward disadvantaged youth (JTPA, the Perkins Act, and Chapter 1); or found a means to integrate developing school-to-work or school-to-college initiatives, such as

Tech Prep, intc the broader system. While outside factors—lack of resources, broad problems of family and community, and lack of employment opportunities—have undercut the development of effective interventions, the system's inability to use its own resources well is, in many ways, a more conspicuous failure.

The current system is handicapped by three critical flaws:

1. Institutions Don't Work Together

All the institutions described above—schools, colleges, training providers, social service providers, and employers participating in training programs—share a common mission: to prepare youth to make the transition to productive adulthood. To achieve the long-term and comprehensive approach to youth development advocated in this report, these entities must work collaboratively, linking social services, training, and academic and vocational education in a sustained, structured approach. Yet, this kind of synergy is rare, limited primarily to partnerships between only two institutions and to demonstration projects that seldom reach a significant percentage of eligible students.

Consider the use of federal funding targeted to the disadvantaged. JTPA, the Perkins Act, and Chapter 1 are, in effect, resources with the same target group, much the same mission and a shared history of legislative mandates to increase planning and coordination. There are no inherent barriers to better integrating the use of these dollars; in fact recent legislation explicitly encourages this goal. Despite these encouraging conditions, few communities appear to direct federal funding streams to support broad collaborative initiatives. Instead, funding is typically used for separate and limited initiatives, independently designed and developed. Thus, opportunities to build a systemic approach go unrealized.

2. Institutions Don't Work Separately

The most critical flaw in our current system—the failure of separate institutions to share resources and programming—is not a surprising one. Fragmentation, lack of coordination, and limited efforts to make effective use of resources are widely thought to be endemic to public systems. More striking, however, is that these same issues also affect the internal workings of youth-serving institutions. In the absence of a clear community mission or standards for preparing youth for productive adulthood—and of an explicit national youth development strategy—JTPA providers, schools, and postsecondary institutions appear to have little incentive to use their separate resources to promote goals beyond their own program standards. Frequently, these institutions do not link their own related programs and choose short-term and limited program options. Given the arguments in favor of "empowerment" of local communities, it is significant that few federally supported local institutions take full advantage of the discretion allowed them under federal regulations to develop comprehensive youth programming.

JTPA, for example, is a relatively flexible source of funding, allowing local program operators wide discretion in spending decisions. As one researcher

notes, as long as gains can be documented "you can do anything you want... you can develop any system you want" (Interview, Alexandra Weinbaum, 1993). Even under regulations in force prior to recent amendments, operators of JTPA's summer program could direct federal funding to support a multi-summer preparation program for college or work including academic and vocational enrichment and links to post-secondary education and training. Program operators have taken incremental steps in this direction, developing multi-summer models for some participants. However, despite increasing awareness that summer funding can be used more effectively, the majority of communities continue to underemploy these resources, funding limited, single-summer efforts that appear to do little to prepare participants for a transition beyond high school.

Operators also have the discretion to link summer and school year programs, raising the potential for year-round initiatives. To date however, few SDA's have incorporated year-round service as an integral part of program provision (Preliminary findings from the national study of the 1993 SYETP by Westat).

Schools have likewise underutilized resources under their control, including both Chapter 1 and Perkins Act funding. Chapter 1 funds, averaging approximately $1,000 per participant, can be used for a variety of services supporting long-term youth development, including counseling, advanced academic support, and social support. Instead, as the Department of Education has recently noted, "resources are used to address narrow categories of need instead of addressing the broad learning needs of children" (*Education Week Forum*, October 20, 1993). This funding is further limited in that it is seldom integrated with other school-based resources to promote expanded youth development programming. As one vocational administrator noted, "Chapter 1 and the Perkins Act are paying for the exact same kid—people haven't figured that out."

Schools have also failed to take full advantage of new federal provisions for development of "whole-school" strategies. Chapter 1 regulations currently allow funding of services to the school at large, rather than individually targeted youth, if the economically disadvantaged population of the school is 75 percent of the total. Such schoolwide projects offer the opportunity for schools to develop innovative multi-year development strategies. Recent JTPA amendments also promote the creation of whole-school strategies, at schools that combine high levels of economic and education disadvantage. DOL has proposed that all participants in these schoolwide strategies also have eligibility for summer programming.

Although some schools have begun to make use of whole-school strategies, the full potential of this opportunity to create a school-based comprehensive approach to youth development goes unrealized. In fact, only one-third of eligible schools are participating in Chapter 1 schoolwide projects (U. S. Department of Education, 1993).

Post-secondary institutions, too, have been slow to recognize the potential of combining existing resources. Universities are a collection of fiefdoms, often operating a bewildering number of separate and disconnected part-

nership efforts. Temple University, for example, is reported to have thirty different partnership programs (Interview, Rochelle Solomon, 1993), while other institutions have as many as fifty. This lack of coordination often prevents effective use of federal and state funding sources—including financial aid, federal work/study, community service funding, and other resources that could support expanded youth development initiatives.

3. Efforts At Coordination Do Not Redress Old Mistakes

Federal, state and local governments, recognizing that services are delivered at the local level, have all taken steps to improve community-level coordination. Federal efforts include requirements for coordination written into the JTPA and Perkins acts. But even when coordination is formally mandated, the effect has been mostly to stimulate the sharing of papers rather than of resources. Most evaluations agree that these federal requirements have had a limited effect at best, citing compliance-oriented *pro forma* documents that may promote "consciousness raising" but have little if any impact on the planning or delivery of services (Grubb et al., 1992; Bailis, 1992).

Responding to the deficiencies of existing institutions, government and other entities have also developed a number of new school-to-work initiatives specifically designed to create the kinds of linkages between high schools, post-secondary institutions, and employers that are lacking in our current system. These initiatives, which include programs such as Tech Prep, youth apprenticeships, and high school-based career academies, are generally still in relatively early stages of development, but they have attracted significant attention from employers and policymakers as new and better ways to prepare youth for work.

In some respects, these initiatives clearly advance a long-term, comprehensive youth development strategy through linking academic and work experience, establishing a multi-year training pathway, and providing a direct connection to employment and post-secondary education. At the same time, because these efforts have largely been developed as distinctly separate from the traditional programming offered by schools and training providers, they do little to advance a systemic approach for the much larger pool of youth.

Many Tech Prep and youth apprenticeship programs, for example, tend to start relatively late (11th or 12th grade), require prerequisites for admission, and have poor or non-existent connections to school-based programming for disadvantaged youth. One result of this separation is that disadvantaged youth, as reported in one recent study, are likely to be underrepresented in innovative programs like Tech Prep (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992b). Another outcome is that federal resources such as JTPA, the Perkins Act, and Chapter 1, which could be specifically directed to preparing students for these initiatives, are instead inefficiently employed in meeting lesser objectives. Some of the same concerns apply to the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. The new legislation, while offering a vision for creation of a pathway for youth, defines this pathway as extending only from grade 10 onwards. More fundamentally, STWOA does not require communities to integrate existing JTPA and school-based programs within any new community school-to-work strategy.

States, too, have made attempts to promote coordination including the development of human resource investment planning councils. Such councils, however, including State Job Training Coordinating Councils (SJTCCs) mandated by JTPA legislation, have apparently had little effect. One study discussing a state coordinating council comments, "But each program remains, for the most part, autonomous. Like most other such mechanisms, this council lacks the teeth or will to do much more than talk" (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992a).

Local-level collaboration has been somewhat more promising. Grubb notes several examples of effective collaboration around primarily adult-oriented vocational education and training (1991). The Louisville initiative (see Appendix A) provides mixed news; it has promoted linkages between JTPA and Perkins Act funding as well as enhanced ties to employers, but it has yet to produce a community-wide comprehensive strategy designed to substantially integrate youth resources and institutions. Overall, in fact, the predominant experience in local collaboration, as reflected in the replication of the Boston Compact and other recent initiatives, has not been a successful one. The Annie E. Casey Foundation's $40-million New Futures Initiative, for example, built around community collaborative organizations, was found in a recent study to have resulted in little structural and institutional change, and relatively modest program improvement (Wehlage et al., 1992).

There is little literature on why coordination initiatives fail. One contributing factor, however, may be the tendency of many such initiatives to accept the current system as a given rather than test or rethink its boundaries and component parts. Instead of serving as vehicles for considering changes in the mission, resource allocation, and basic programming of participating institutions, many initiatives have settled for being a forum for improving connections between existing services. However, if the chief impediment to a comprehensive youth policy is the fragmentation that has encouraged separate institutions to make autonomous decisions about resources and programs, then the remedy lies in a much more active approach to system building.

The Potential for Change: Incentives and Barriers

On the whole, the factors that have shaped the current youth-serving system have undermined its ability to change. Fragmentation and lack of leadership, the continuing divide between education and training, and the placement of effective responsibility for youth policy in a patchwork of local service providers have left the current system lacking the policy tools needed to stimulate a collaborative approach to youth needs. Particularly noticeable is the absence of three important catalysts for change:

A Vision: Researchers and policymakers interviewed for this report consistently noted the absence of a national vision and direction for youth policy. The need is clear. In a system where separate institutions serve a common pool of youth, there can be no larger strategy without what Public/Private Ventures Executive Vice-President Gary Walker calls "a concrete picture" to impel diverse institutions to support a systemic approach. To date, however,

neither government, at any level, nor any other entity has advanced a template or model that would place individual institutions within a larger, youth-serving system. One policy analyst at the Council of Chief State School Officers succinctly framed this dilemma: "No one has ever articulated that different [institutions] have mutual responsibilities" (Interview, 1993).

A Mandate: Despite numerous legislative provisions for joint consultation and planning, the federal government has traditionally avoided imposing any requirement that educational and training institutions receiving federal funds collaborate on comprehensive service delivery to youth. States, too, have largely avoided such requirements.

A Mechanism: Few states or communities have sought to develop a structure or strategy that would encourage institutions to rethink their mission, roles, or programming. Although virtually every state and many communities have created coordinating councils or task forces, these have tended to focus primarily on improving linkages among existing programs and services.

Incentives to Change

Given the level of fragmentation and lack of strategic coordination that now exist among key youth-serving institutions, could this system as it now stands be redirected so that existing institutions would be encouraged to support a collaborative, long-term, and comprehensive youth strategy? Could this be done without significant new resources or legislative initiatives? When we view the separate institutions, initiatives, and resource streams as elements of a single system, there is some reason for optimism. Two points are striking:

1. There is a significant resource base.

Integration of JTPA IIB and (in school) IIC, Chapter 1 (in middle and high schools), and Perkins Act funding provides a national resource pool of approximately $3 billion dollars per year to create comprehensive school-to-work transition strategies extending from middle school onward (see Table I).

There are a number of political and program barriers which prevent immediate or complete redirection of these dollars. However, local communities have the discretion, now, to begin combining these resources to fund more effective programming. The potential for change is especially strong in schools and communities with a high population of disadvantaged youth: federal dollars are concentrated there, and recent federal initiatives are intended to promote new strategies that cut across traditional program barriers.

Communities can make better use of federal funding in a number of ways. For example, JTPA summer spending can be redirected to support multi-summer initiatives in place of single summer interventions. Employing whole-school strategies or other means (common eligibility; waivers) to link summer programming with school-based resources such as Chapter 1, Perkins Act and JTPA IIC can create a pool of $2,000–$3,000 per participant to support year-round programming for eligible students. Redirecting state and local resources increases the potential funding base significantly.

Although there appear to be no definitive studies, a conservative estimate based on current enrollment suggests that rethinking these programs offers the potential to develop multi-year school-to-work interventions that could reach over 500,000 middle and secondary students—equivalent to perhaps 10–12% of the economically disadvantaged student population—at no significant added cost. While this is still a small percentage of students in need, no current similarly comprehensive youth intervention comes close to this scale of service.

Beyond the primary federal resources are a number of other funding sources, both state and federal, that greatly expand the funding base for comprehensive and sustained programs. Approximately $600 million per year of federal work/study funding, for example, is now employed by post-secondary institutions to subsidize a wide variety of work positions for students. This funding can be at least partially redirected to enable college students to work directly with secondary schools and students, and funding available through the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993 can be used for the same purpose. Federal resources for Upward Bound and Talent Search programs, now separate efforts funded at nearly $200 million per year, can be integrated with a more broad-based systemic approach.

A much larger potential base is the billions of dollars in state and local funding now used to support dropout prevention, work experience, social service, and community service programming. Much like federally supported programming, these initiatives are frequently short-term, limited, and poorly coordinated with other programs. Like federal resources, state dollars supporting these initiatives can be redirected to fund a more comprehensive strategy.

TABLE I: Federal Support for a Youth Development Strategy

Categorical federal funding for disadvantaged youth ages 14-21 (in millions of dollars):[1]

	FY '94	Proposed FY '95
JTPA (Summer)	877	867
JTPA (Year-Round)[2]	325	300
Chapter 1, ESEA[3]	1,323	1,407
Perkins Vocational Educational Act[4]	600	600
Total Funding	**3,125**	**3,174**

1 *Funding streams distributed by formula to schools and SDAs.*

2 *Estimate of funding for in-school youth programs based on 50 percent of total funding.*

3 *Based on 1990 estimated participation by youth in grades 7–12 in Chapter 1 programs. Chapter 1 is renamed Title I in the new legislation.*

4 *Based on reported percentage of Perkins funding spent on secondary education.*

2. There is a significant institutional base.

Existing institutions have the capacity to work together as a system to a much greater extent than they now do. New school-to-work transition initiatives have the potential to be integrated with now separate secondary education and training programs. At the same time, short-term and limited education, training, and social support efforts can be restructured to support long-term and sustained preparation for youth.

Initiatives in two policy areas, vocational training and adult welfare-to-work transition, reveal the potential strength of joining a community goal for service delivery with a strategy that allocates responsibility for its achievement among a number of institutions. In both cases, the strategy is built around the concept of a pathway. The first example is the way in which some communities link the institutions that deliver vocational education. A 1991 survey by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (Grubb, 1991) describes a number of communities where secondary and post-secondary vocational education providers, concerned about duplication and gaps in services, jointly developed a framework for vocational education based upon the creation of pathways between institutions at various levels. Under this design, providers developed a rational sequence of services—a pathway—and then allocated specific functions to given institutions: the community college, the school district, and so on. Although vocational education is a relatively narrow arena, it is notable that envisioning a "concrete picture" worked to stimulate a systemic approach.

A second example can be seen in Pennsylvania's Job Link initiative. The state used a request for proposals (RFP) to stimulate creation of a pathway to career employment for welfare recipients, linking welfare agencies, economic development entities, JTPA agencies, and post-secondary institutions. This new system was based on a clear division of labor between four component institutions: the welfare system provided support services; the JTPA system provided basic skills training; the post-secondary institution provided advanced skills training; and the economic development institution offered a link to the private sector (Council of State Community Affairs Agencies, 1988).

Recent federal initiatives provide incentives for coordinating resources and providing a more comprehensive approach to services. In addition to the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, JTPA amendments passed in 1993 are designed to promote more of a continuum with respect to youth education and training. The amendments allow JTPA providers to link summer and year-round programming; use JTPA funds to support school-to-work transition, including pre-apprenticeship programs and college preparation; and promote coordination of JTPA with other funding sources, including the Perkins Act and Chapter 1. (For example, amendments allow Chapter 1 participation, as well as economic disadvantage, to serve as an initial eligibility criterion for JTPA in-school programs). Amendments also allow JTPA program providers to serve all youth, regardless of income, in schools based in a poverty area and served by a local educational agency eligible for Chapter 1, where 70% of the students meet one of seven additional barriers largely related to educational disadvantage.

At the same time, a wave of recent reports and assessments appears likely to move the Chapter 1 program toward longer-term and more comprehensive interventions when ESEA is reauthorized during this Congressional session. Reacting to findings that show little gain to participants from the remedial, predominantly "pull-out" programs that characterize most Chapter 1 efforts, the Commission on Chapter 1 (1992) has recommended changes that address the multiple needs of students, emphasize universal standards of achievement for all students, and coordinate Chapter 1 services with those funded

under the Perkins Act, JTPA, and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. To put these recommendations into effect, the administration is planning fundamental changes that would shift resources from remedial attention for individuals to interventions in high-poverty schools that use Chapter 1 (to be called Title I under the proposed legislation) as a catalyst "to comprehensively reform the entire instructional program in these schools" (*Education Week Forum*, October 20, 1993).

Barriers to Change

Despite the potential for reform and the momentum in its favor, efforts to improve program coordination and develop systemic policy approaches have a long history of false starts and failure. Researchers often cite four generic obstacles to coordination (Bailis, 1992; Trutko et al., 1990; Grubb et al., 1991): 1) regulatory and technical barriers, including administrative and funding restrictions; 2) turf barriers resulting from differing perspectives on performance and service, resistance to loss of autonomy, distrust, and dislike; 3) inertia, or the desire to maintain current programs and established ways of doing things; and 4) political barriers, caused by opposition from constituencies threatened by loss of funding or services (particularly relevant in any redirection of major funding sources).

To these general obstacles can be added several others that are likely to beset any strategy for academic and occupational advancement for all young people: a funding base that is relatively large but too small to meet the absolute need; a paucity of funding for non-disadvantaged youth; the stigma attached to disadvantaged youth by employers and others; and a trend toward school decentralization that makes city-wide collaboration more difficult to achieve. A larger barrier, and one that goes beyond the scope of this report, is the nature of schools themselves. While redirecting funding and improving linkages with outside institutions will provide a framework for a community strategy, lasting change will depend upon schools' effectively re-organizing themselves to meet the developmental needs of youth.

Although these barriers pose significant challenges to the development of a comprehensive strategy, they do not preclude the creation of pilot efforts aimed at those disadvantaged youth already served by existing programs and resources. Moreover, the developing consensus on the need for a systemic approach, and recent legislation specifically designed to ease obstacles to collaboration, may mean it is time to reassess conventional wisdom regarding some of these potential obstacles.

Regulatory barriers: This obstacle is frequently cited as precluding coordination and more effective use of current resources. However, while some systems, particularly JTPA, are governed by certification and performance standards, and all have differently defined target groups, these differences have seldom in themselves wholly blocked collaborative or innovative programming. JTPA-funded intensive college preparation, the Louisville Compact's linkage of JTPA and Perkins Act funds, and the two-summer design of the JTPA-supported STEP program are examples of communities

using existing funding to support ambitious interventions for youth. The legislative and regulatory changes completed (or promised) in federal school-to-work legislation, JTPA, ESEA, and Perkins Act reform are likely to relax these constraints further. The new emphasis on whole-school strategies, for example, while not entirely consistent between programs, will allow Chapter 1 and JTPA to serve all students in schools that meet thresholds for poverty and educational disadvantage.

Turf barriers and inertia: The most frequently cited barriers to a collaborative approach to youth strategy are those of "turf" and inertia—the related tendencies of individual institutions, in the absence of a more powerful outside stimulus, to defend or continue their traditional patterns of operation. There is, however, some reason to hope that turf battles can be better contained and inertia resisted. There are already a number of examples of states mandating collaboration between JTPA and welfare agencies or communities organizing their own vocational training systems wherein turf issues and inertia have been overcome and integrated service delivery between previously separate institutions successfully promoted.

A second argument is more speculative, but from the perspective of this study may be more significant. In a system that was built on the deliberate separation of education and training providers, it is important to distinguish the absence of a collaborative approach from the absence of any sustained attempt to create one. At every level, government seems to avoid concerted efforts to forge a systemic approach. Federal reluctance to provide systemic guidance has been mimicked in many states, passive throughout the 1980s despite their increased authority over education, training, and social support resources. With discretion over resources passing increasingly to the local and institutional level, cities, too, have taken little action to promote systemic change. Few if any large cities have tested the potential of a common framework for youth; a similar passivity is evident at the institutional level. One Chicago vocational administrator replied, when asked about the obstacles to linking JTPA and Perkins Act programming, "I don't see any barriers, if it is decided that they be integrated."

Without minimizing the more tangible obstacles, it may be that the most critical barrier to collaboration is that no government or institution requires or effectively promotes it. Seen in this perspective, the potential for creating a system, or even integrating closely related programming, has not yet been truly tested. As Esther Schaeffer of the National Alliance of Business noted, "We really need to sit down and look at the whole community...[and] there's no pressure to do that."

III. A Community-Level Model for Youth Development

In a recent paper, Andrew Hahn and Evelyn Ganzglass (1992) make the point that "most [youth] policy development...is based on shoring up parts of the present system rather than considering how all the pieces fit together or how alternatives to the system might work." Prior efforts at coordination have not addressed this fundamental issue. Rather than encouraging institutions to redefine their role, programming, and resources in the context of the larger system, most collaborative efforts have instead focused on the much less ambitious goal of simply better coordinating existing programs.

Since this strategy has been met with only very limited success, it seems essential to introduce a new approach: a single community perspective and framework that can define a common goal broad enough to encompass all community institutions and promote change in the ways that each institution plans. programs, and allocates resources. The lessons drawn from prior experiences in more narrowly focused policy areas—vocational education and welfare-to-work coordination—suggest the need to begin these reforms with an approach that emphasizes four basic principles:

- **A community strategy** to prepare all youth for work or post-secondary education;
- **A common framework** linking all relevant institutions in pursuit of this goal;
- **A strategic model** proposing clearly defined roles for employers, social service providers, and education and training institutions; and
- **A commitment** to use or redirect existing resources to meet community objectives.

The New Workforce initiative, which is discussed in the following two chapters, is one attempt to build a new approach based on these principles.

The Strategy

The New Workforce model is designed to be a "next step" towards the goal of creating a comprehensive, community-level strategy for youth development. Moving beyond coordination of existing services, this strategy proposes that youth-serving institutions redirect their resources to respond to the emerging consensus that effective youth development should be based on long-term and sustained programming that integrates training, education, and social services.

New Workforce was originally based on a Pennsylvania initiative, developed by the author in his capacity as a consultant to the State Human Services cabinet, which linked JTPA and post-secondary institutions in a multi-year pathway to college. The model evolved further in a paper, sponsored by Public/Private Ventures, that explored the possibilities of creating

a public alternative to the "I Have a Dream" program. Over the last three years, in consultation with staff at Public/Private Ventures and Jobs for the Future, the model has been expanded to incorporate pathways to post-secondary training and work. Through an initiative sponsored by Public/Private Ventures, the author has worked with officials in San Diego in implementing the basic New Workforce design; that experience and the contributions of San Diego collaborators have further refined the model. The New Workforce model described here is now also being implemented in Minneapolis.

New Workforce is specifically intended to build on the four key principles identified above, offering a concrete picture of what a comprehensive strategy might look like, combined with a template for changes in institutional roles and programs. The initiative is not designed to be a rigid structure, but rather a framework intended to support a systemic approach appropriate to local communities. More specifically, the strategy:

- Proposes an overall planning design which furthers the missions and objectives of participating institutions, and builds on national incentives for workforce development;
- Suggests roles that employers and educational, social service, and training institutions would ideally fill in the context of a larger framework; and
- Offers guidance to participating institutions in the redirection of existing resources and programs.

This community youth development strategy is based on two key elements:

1. A "Pathways" Design

New Workforce envisions a long-term, sustained pathway from middle school to the workplace. Although not prescribing a specific program design, the framework is intended to support a multi-year, year-round program beginning in 6th grade, extending through transitions to middle and secondary schools, and leading through college, post-secondary training, or career employment. The initiative aims to stimulate a comprehensive package of academic and social supports, including a focus on universal academic competencies, the integration of workplace competencies into school curricula, sustained adult contact, and case management. (See Table II for one example of what a pathways design might look like.)

2. A Community Framework and Strategic Plan

New Workforce proposes a youth development strategy that better realizes the potential of existing resources. It establishes basic principles to undergird a community-wide strategic framework linking employers with four key entities: K-12 schools, post-secondary institutions, the JTPA system, and community agencies. In this framework, institutions working together will seek to develop the kinds of pathways suggested by youth advocates. Support for this effort will primarily be achieved through redirection of existing funding, including JTPA, Perkins Act, Chapter 1, and federal and state dropout prevention programs.

TABLE II: A Sample Pathway

While the particular form of a multi-year, year-round effort will be shaped by each community's particular circumstances, this is one city's proposed pathway design, beginning in the summer after 8th grade. The pathway is built on five program objectives:

1. Orientation, education, and work experience in the surrounding community.
2. Familiarity with the full range of options after high school, including four-year college, two-year college, youth apprenticeship, Tech Prep, and other career options.
3. Experience in both work and post-secondary settings.
4. An enriched curriculum integrating academic preparation and community-based work experience. Each year of the pathway includes enrichment in English, math, social studies, and science.
5. Transition to post-secondary education and training and/or career employment opportunities.

Year 1 (students entering 9th grade): Introduction to the City and the Neighborhood

Summer: JTPA-sponsored 6-week program familiarizing students with the neighborhood and the city at large, including field trips, mapping, and neighborhood development projects.

School: Components in each academic subject area built on community study and mapping.

Social support and other programming: Mentoring, counseling, community-based work placements, and an entreprenuership module.

Year 2 (students entering 10th grade): Introduction to College and Post-Secondary Training

Summer: JTPA-sponsored 6-week program to explore college and career options, including field trips to area colleges and training programs, academic enrichment, and neighborhood-based work experience.

School: Components in each academic subject area built on exploring requirements, opportunities, and career paths associated with education and training options.

Social support and other programming: Mentoring, counseling, community-based work placements.

Year 3 (students entering 11th grade): Pre-Career, Pre-College

Summer: JTPA-sponsored 6-week program held on a college campus, including academic enrichment, counseling on college and training options, and appropriate work placements.

School: Components in each academic subject area based on study of local industry, community development, and area labor markets.

Social support and other programming: Mentoring; career and college counseling; Tech Prep, youth apprenticeship, and other career-related placements as appropriate.

Year 4 (students entering 12th grade): Further Education, Training, and Work Experience

Summer: JTPA-sponsored 6-week program tied to school-year education/career focus areas, including Tech Prep and youth apprenticeship placements; college credit courses and campus-based work placements; related private-sector placements; counseling on post-high school choices.

School: Components in each academic subject area focused on post-high school futures, including resume writing, budgeting, labor markets, economic and technological trends.

Social support and other programming: Mentoring; career and college counseling; Tech Prep, youth apprenticeship, and other career-related placements as appropriate.

Year 5 (12th-graders following graduation): Further Education, Training, and Work Experience

Summer: JTPA and private-sector placements related to training/educational choice, including counseling, life skills modules, and educational and training placements.

Social support and other programming: Additional support services after enrollment at post-secondary institutions.

(Adapted from a proposed pathways design in Philadelphia.)

The model proposes the following institutional roles:

K-12 school systems will expand college preparation programs and employ existing dropout prevention funding, now mostly used for remedial efforts, to establish academic support programs. In cooperation with community colleges, JTPA, and the business community, schools will also redirect vocational training resources to support development of longer-term and more comprehensive career-oriented education. To the extent feasible, schools will use whole-school Chapter 1 strategies as a foundation for this effort.

Post-secondary institutions will offer qualifying youngsters admission and use existing resources to develop financial aid packages to subsidize the cost of education for disadvantaged youth. Colleges and community colleges will work with other institutions to develop multi-year preparation programs, expand mentoring and tutoring efforts, and enhance connections to "2+2" programs such as Tech Prep.

JTPA will redirect current single-summer work experience programs to create a multi-summer preparation program for college, post-secondary training, and career employment. JTPA will also work directly with employers to create appropriate pre-employment training efforts, and work with schools to create a multi-year, integrated approach to work and career education.

Community agencies will provide needed social support services to youngsters and serve as a bridge between other partners, neighborhoods, and families. Community agencies will provide school- or neighborhood-based case management, conduct family outreach, and integrate program participants with existing recreational, social support, and community service activities.

Employers and business will work with other partners to develop a long-term pathway for entry-level jobs. Specifically, employers will work with post-secondary institutions and JTPA to create multi-year initiatives that integrate publicly funded education and training with private-sector work experience. Such public/private partnerships could then be used to expand or enhance existing school-to-work initiatives such as youth apprenticeships and Tech Prep. Businesses involved in separate and now distinct school-business partnerships will also integrate these efforts into a broader strategy, which could include work-based learning and mentoring consistent with the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, along with tutoring and business support of "last-dollar" scholarship programs.

The Introduction of New Workforce in Two Communities

During the past eighteen months, San Diego and Minneapolis have explored and begun to implement the framework and program elements of the New Workforce model. The two cities are characterized by very different environments. San Diego is large and geographically dispersed, with relatively few

major corporate headquarters, an economy hard-hit by recent cuts in defense and aerospace, and no real history of broad-based community partnerships. The city has approximately 125,000 students in its school system, of whom 52 percent are economically disadvantaged. Minneapolis is relatively compact, has a strong corporate community, a diverse and relatively successful economy, and one of the nation's strongest traditions of community collaboration. The city has approximately 45,000 students in its school system; 54 percent are economically disadvantaged. These distinctions have clearly influenced the direction, scope, and evolution of New Workforce efforts in the two communities.

In both communities, the New Workforce model was brought to the attention of planners against a background of dissatisfaction with youth policy—a background that had been articulated and studied more extensively in Minneapolis, owing to its relatively tight-knit community structure and history of collaboration, but that was not far beneath the surface in San Diego, either. The model was introduced in the two cities under three broadly similar circumstances: 1) It was presented more or less whole and complete, as a fully developed model; 2) It was presented by an outside entity; and 3) It was adopted by a group or organization that was initially seeking more limited reform.

In San Diego, consideration of the model grew out of a series of informal discussions held between the author, representatives from the school district and San Diego State University (SDSU), and the San Diego JTPA program operator. The initial focus was on expanding and improving an existing college preparation program, but this was shifted because JTPA program operators did not feel that the program was sufficiently targeted to disadvantaged youth. Instead, the San Diego State University Office of Equal Opportunity Programs and the San Diego City Schools Instructional Strategies Unit chose the New Workforce model (called Pipeline 6.16 in San Diego) as the organizing structure for an emerging partnership between SDSU and the city schools, an effort that was soon expanded to include JTPA.

In Minneapolis, the New Workforce strategy was initiated through the efforts of the Minneapolis Youth Trust (MYT), a non-profit intermediary organization sponsored by the business community to improve programming in the public schools. Prior to New Workforce, MYT had focused on three areas: building mentoring programs, expanding school-business partnerships, and creating career preparation programs in the schools. The New Workforce model came to the attention of MYT through conversations with the author. Seeing the need to develop longer-term and more sustained programs, recognizing the potential of a broader collaborative approach, and intrigued by the San Diego experience, MYT agreed to test the model in Minneapolis as a basis for a city-wide strategy for workforce development.

Thus, in both San Diego and Minneapolis, New Workforce was not adopted in the service of an existing program or initiative, but was chosen as a means to stimulate both a strategic design and the establishment of new connections

among institutions. In other words, the model itself was to serve as a catalyst to effect a community-wide strategy. This was important for both cities because they share, with much of the rest of the nation, youth policy and programming that are characterized by the fragmentation and multiplicity of overlapping initiatives, along with the failure to develop a sustained and comprehensive approach to youth development.

Both cities also shared a growing recognition of the need for change. Former San Diego Schools Superintendent Tom Payzant (now U.S. Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education) spoke of a prevailing "project mentality" involving short-term programs focused on limited objectives and cited a widely felt need to "tie all the pieces together to have a more focused impact." Similar themes were voiced in Minneapolis. A survey of business, community, and public institutional leaders, conducted by the Minneapolis Youth Trust to test the community's readiness for New Workforce, revealed a number of broadly shared perceptions and beliefs about youth policy:

- Minneapolis lacked a common vision and strategy for youth policy;
- Good programs were already in place, but they ran in "parallel tracks"—so that there was no clear need for new programs, but rather a need to "move beyond just another program for at-risk kids";
- No one organization could resolve the fragmentation;
- A community strategy required "bottom-up" input;
- Resources of all kinds—money, people, and time—were limited; and
- Change in K-12 schools was at the heart of reform.

In response to the perceived need for change, coalitions of institutions in both communities have adopted the core principles of the New Workforce model, including:

1. A pathways approach beginning in 6th grade, extending through the transitions to middle school and high school, and culminating in a transition to higher education, post-secondary training, or career employment;

2. A commitment to multi-year, year-round service provision built around four key themes: academic enrichment, sustained social service provision, world-of-work preparation and experience, and preparation and transition for a future beyond high school; and

3. A community framework linking employers and key youth-serving entities, including schools, post-secondary institutions, the employment and training system, and social service providers, in a redirection of resources and programs in support of a common strategy.

The two communities have also chosen a similar demonstration approach, with an initial focus on school clusters—geographically linked middle schools and high schools.

The Early Planning and Implementation Experience

The San Diego initiative began planning in early 1992 and has, to date, implemented summer program components of the larger design. Minneapolis began considering the initiative in the fall of 1992 and is in the middle of its planning process. While starting from essentially the same model, the two communities have taken very different paths, and the extent of these differences can be seen through comparison of some of the key elements of the process:

Scope: The San Diego process has involved four institutions—San Diego City College (SDCC), San Diego State University, the school district, and JTPA—as well as seven demonstration schools. To date, there has been no substantive involvement by business, social service providers, or city government and little attempt to involve parents or community groups. The initiative is focusing on implementation of programs for a designated demonstration population of disadvantaged youth.

The Minneapolis process currently embraces fourteen separate institutions, including key educational and training institutions, business, social service providers, the mayor, and representatives of related initiatives, such as youth apprenticeship and human service redesign efforts. Minneapolis is now seeking broader community input and has expanded its process to include parents, students, and representatives of community groups. The Minneapolis initiative is attempting to develop a strategy that will serve all of that community's youth.

Project Management: San Diego has taken a relatively informal approach to implementing New Workforce. The project is managed by a task force comprised of middle-management-level representatives of participating institutions; there is currently no full-time staff, and decision making is by informal consensus among task force members. San Diego has not yet advanced beyond its general strategic design to develop a carefully defined long-term planning strategy or a funding base to support a more structured approach, although the project is now under consideration for a major funding grant that would support full-time administration.

Managed by MYT, the initiative has taken a more formal approach in Minneapolis. MYT has provided staff, conceived a structured three-stage planning process geared to the community at large, attempted to foster decision making by community consensus, and sought and received short-term funding. MYT is currently developing a long-term funding strategy.

Outside Assistance: Both initiatives received relatively extensive technical assistance from the author. Technical assistance in San Diego was underwritten by Public/Private Ventures, while in Minneapolis support was provided by MYT through foundation and corporate sources.

As the differences in scope and project management suggest, the two cities have moved along distinct paths in their approach to New Workforce.

Some details about the approach in each city are useful because, as the following chapter will discuss, elements of the planning process are inevitably a crucial influence on how, and how effectively, New Workforce will be implemented.

San Diego

The San Diego planning process has been continually redefined as it has evolved. Initially intended to encompass approximately a one-year period, followed by implementation, the process has now stretched to eighteen months, with planning and implementation activities occurring simultaneously. (The first programs were implemented after six months.) In retrospect, this process has comprised three stages following the initial decision to proceed with the model.

1. Selecting Schools and Seeking Outside Support

The first stage of the San Diego experience focused simultaneously on defining the community model and seeking outside support. Planners began by recruiting schools to participate in the demonstration, with recruitment decisions based primarily on pre-existing personal ties between principals and New Workforce planners. Seven schools were selected and organized into three clusters: two based on high school-middle school pairings and one embracing a 7-12 school as well. During this time, planners, in conjunction with school principals, also decided that the New Workforce initiative would focus on a primarily disadvantaged population, and that institutions and schools would use the next year as a time to formally plan the demonstration. This phase closed with a formal meeting designed to affirm institutional support for the initiative. At this meeting, CEOs or high-ranking staff of post-secondary institutions, the schools, and JTPA agreed to commit their institutions to the planning process.

2. Planning and Development

The next phase, lasting roughly one year, was intended to further develop the New Workforce strategy for implementation in 1993-94. The overall process was to be guided by a common vision and framework that was developed by the planning committee and subsequently modified by the schools (see Appendix B). To provide a phased implementation, it was decided that initial planning would focus on grades 7 and 10, with the remainder of the pathway to be implemented sequentially in the following three years.

This phase of the planning was divided into two areas: an institutional planning process linking SDSU, SDCC, and JTPA in the development of multi-year, year-round summer and after-school activities, and a school-based planning process built around cluster teams, intended to focus on needed changes in curriculum, class size and scheduling, and teaching. As initially conceived, the two processes were to be largely separate, with monthly retreats held to jointly review progress and raise common issues. Although this separation fit the program model, it was primarily intended to conform to the San Diego school district's recent decentralization and emphasis on site-based governance.

The results of this phase revealed some of the strengths and weaknesses of San Diego's planning process. Working together closely, institutions were able to design and implement much of their mandate for the outside-school portion of New Workforce, including developing a multi-year summer preparatory program extending from grades 7 to 12, and a model for a case management and mentoring program. School clusters, by contrast, proved unable to develop a plan. Although institutional representatives attempted to provide guidance through regular meetings, clusters, operating under the relatively autonomous process designed by San Diego, were unable to fill the role that was initially anticipated for them. Though two of the three clusters did develop a plan for summer programming, only one school and no whole cluster attempted to address the much more complex and difficult challenges involved in developing a demonstration that could work to integrate academic and vocational learning, ensure that students could meet designated competency standards, and change class structures to accommodate work experience and work-based learning.

3. Rethinking the Schools' Role

The results of the first year convinced San Diego's planners of the need to redefine the schools' portion of the planning process. Recognizing that prior deference to the principle of site-based governance had complicated the larger changes required by an initiative of this complexity and scope, that the schools' lack of dedicated resources and time for planning undermined the overall process, and that the initial selection process—which had been based on personal ties rather than clear commitments—also diminished overall planning effectiveness, San Diego planners proposed that schools meet three commitments for continued participation. These commitments focus on:

- **Philosophy**—agreement that New Workforce would be viewed as a whole-school change process, rather than an isolated program;
- **Staffing**—agreement to designate a planning team comprised of an administrator, staff, and teachers; and
- **Resources**—agreement to designate available resources, such as Chapter 1 funding, to support New Workforce programming.

The institutions also agreed to jointly seek or provide support for a staffer to assist the schools in planning.

Minneapolis

Like San Diego, Minneapolis is currently in the midst of revising its original design for a planning process. Initially, planners envisioned a three-step process involving testing receptivity to the concept, developing an overall design, and planning for program implementation. The first two steps would be managed through a central community process, while the third would be conducted by two or three cluster-based planning teams, including both school and institutional representatives, who would work to put New Workforce in place.

While Minneapolis planners still adhere to this overall model, planning has been considerably slower than anticipated. In addition, the perceived need to involve more of the community has led to an additional planning phase. The process has lasted approximately one year; it is now anticipated that implementation planning will begin in spring 1994, with the first programming planned for fall 1994.

1. Testing the Concept

After deciding to pursue the New Workforce model, MYT initiated the planning process by surveying schools, business organizations, post-secondary institutions, and community and city agencies to assess current impressions of youth programming in Minneapolis and receptivity to the New Workforce model. As discussed above, the essential findings were that Minneapolis had a great number of existing youth programs, but that these ran on "parallel tracks"; that there was no common vision or strategy; and that there was a need for a third-party facilitator to help develop a community strategy.

2. Initial Planning and Design

Convinced by these results of the need for a larger framework for youth development, MYT put together a planning team comprised of the mayor; city officials, including the JTPA director; representatives of seven post-secondary institutions, including community colleges, technical institutes, and four-year institutions; representatives of the Minneapolis Public Schools and the teachers' union; local employers; local social service providers; organizations promoting youth apprenticeship initiatives; and community organizations. Membership included high-ranking and mid-level officials, with approximately twenty representatives participating at each meeting. Meetings were held monthly from September 1992 to April 1993.

During this period, the planning team agreed upon an overall vision and mission (see Appendix B): they agreed to set outcomes and goals; to focus on two school clusters, each including one or two middle schools and a high school; to set criteria for school selection; and to choose the participating clusters based on apparent commitment and school leadership. Other accomplishments included plans for linkages with Tech Prep and youth apprenticeship programming and with a community social service redesign initiative, commitment of school district support, and the award of a planning grant from the Bush Foundation.

Two related issues that surfaced prominently at this stage of the planning process were whether New Workforce should specifically target disadvantaged youth, rather than all students, as its initial focus, and whether the New Workforce planning process, to that point, represented the interests of the community as a whole. After fairly intensive discussion, both these issues were resolved in favor of an expanded base for development of a community-wide strategy. Although serving all youth, rather than just the

disadvantaged, would increase both the scope of the model and the time needed to implement it, the task force felt that too direct a focus on the disadvantaged would stigmatize the initiative as a whole and run counter to broader community interests.

The issue of obtaining broader community consensus and support has been more difficult to resolve and has resulted in a modification of the initial planning process. While conceding that the "top-down" design of New Workforce was needed to bring disparate institutions together, a number of task force members also saw the need for a "bottom-up" process—one that would encourage community input into New Workforce planning. The result has been the insertion of a third stage into the original planning design.

3. Getting Community Input

In an attempt to gain additional input to and support for New Workforce, the community was divided into "sectors" comprised of defined interest groups—parents, students, post-secondary institutions, and business—and each was asked to review the New Workforce design, develop individual-sector "commitments," and, through cross-sector meetings, arrive at a broader consensus as to the shape of the model.

4. Implementation Planning (to begin April 1994)

With this phase, planning will move to the two school-based clusters. As currently planned, school-based teams comprised of teachers, administrators, and staff will participate in a larger, cluster-based process that will bring together representatives of New Workforce institutions, MYT, parents, and students.

IV. The Potential of New Workforce as a Catalyst for Change

Given the early stages of implementation, it is obviously much too soon to draw conclusions about the relative impact of New Workforce as a programmatic model and its effects on participating youth. However, it is possible to begin to answer two questions that are central to the basic argument of this report as a whole: *that there is an inherent potential for the creation of a systemic approach to youth development that has been masked by the failure to develop effective strategies for institutional collaboration.*

These questions are:

1. Does a strategy that combines a pathways approach with a community framework to achieve it have the potential to overcome the system's traditional resistance to change of this kind?
2. How do the particular elements of the planning process—including its scope, participants, structure, and governance—promote and/or hinder the implementation of this strategy?

To address these questions, this chapter explores the experience of institutions in San Diego and Minneapolis in order to determine the extent to which the New Workforce model has promoted changes in general perspective, patterns of programming, and resource allocation among schools, post-secondary institutions, the employment and training system, and employers. It concludes by drawing some lessons from this experience that should be useful for program planners, administrators, and practitioners. All judgments are, of course, preliminary: San Diego's initiative began within the last eighteen months, with program implementation still limited, and Minneapolis, with less than a year's experience, is still in the planning stage. The material in this chapter reflects events at these sites from spring 1992 to autumn 1993.

Redefining Perspectives/Reallocating Resources

To what extent has the New Workforce strategy served as a catalyst to stimulate movement toward a pathways approach to workforce development? It seems clear that the model has demonstrated, at least in part, the potential to redefine the perspectives and the patterns of resource allocation of educational and training institutions, and to stimulate new programming that provides longer-term, more sustained, and more comprehensive services. In San Diego, specific changes have included a redefinition of the mission and perspective of three youth-serving institutions involved in the initiative, causing them to adopt and promote a longer-term and more integrated approach to youth development:

- The JTPA provider adopted a multi-summer perspective on service delivery to disadvantaged youth. The provider now views the New

Workforce strategy as a model for overall service delivery—even beyond the demonstration initiative—and has focused to a greater degree on collaborative programming with schools and post-secondary institutions. The JTPA provider, schools, and post-secondary institutions have collaborated on a demonstration multi-summer college preparation and work effort built on the redirection of JTPA funding and programs. The new program design extends from grades 7 to 11, with a direct link to college preparatory programming.

- Post-secondary institutions have been prompted to expand their traditional view of the potential student body, recognizing that active, early preparation can increase the numbers of disadvantaged youth who are ready and able to attend college. These institutions have pledged admission to New Workforce participants who meet defined academic standards. They have also developed a model for a multi-year case management and social support initiative.
- The school district has adopted or supported the New Workforce strategy as a means to promote broader change in both Chapter 1 programming and the implementation of a school-to-work transition initiative.

While Minneapolis is still in the planning process, New Workforce has already prompted consideration of a redefinition of mission and operation in at least one institution. The JTPA provider is currently considering development of a multi-year, year-round programming initiative focused on New Workforce schools. In addition, representatives of youth apprenticeship programs have recognized the need to connect to programs that begin before 11th grade, and are exploring a direct connection to New Workforce.

The Institutional Response

The specific institutional responses to New Workforce in the two communities have depended primarily on the degree to which the initiative meets their individual interests or needs. Each of the institutions—the JTPA system, schools and post-secondary institutions, employers, and social service providers—has its own set of incentives and barriers surrounding participation in the initiative.

The JTPA System: In both cities, and in San Diego particularly, JTPA providers have viewed New Workforce as a model for institutional change. Prior to the implementation of New Workforce, San Diego's $4-million Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) and $250,000 in-school program were largely viewed as limited efforts that were separate from other resources and initiatives targeted to disadvantaged youth.

Although nationally noted for some of its program operations, San Diego's JTPA was also subject to some criticism in the community and on its own board for operating short-term and often ineffective programs. Seeking to change direction, and influenced by the strong urgings of the San Diego

School Board president (who was also the Private Industry Council youth committee chair), JTPA was an early and enthusiastic supporter of the New Workforce model. The chief incentive for JTPA participation, according to one official interviewed, was that the model "crystallized the type of delivery system that should be in place...and provided an overall approach with all key components." The official further noted that "you could take this framework to any community...and bring [institutions] together."

New Workforce has had a clear influence on JTPA funding allocation in San Diego. To date, JTPA has redirected over $200,000 in program administration and participant wage funding to sponsor development of a post-secondary preparation program, has redirected other summer programming to fit the New Workforce design, and perhaps most significantly, has shown a willingness to increase average per-participant costs by over 50 percent to support more comprehensive programming. Although the New Workforce demonstration itself is still small, JTPA program planners in San Diego credit the model with encouraging change in other JTPA-supported initiatives in the direction of longer-term and more sustained programming.

Similar pressures have impelled JTPA participation in Minneapolis. In the last few months, the New Workforce strategy has come to be seen as one means to help link JTPA programs with schools and post-secondary institutions. Minneapolis officials credit New Workforce, along with recent legislative amendments and an increased focus on comprehensive service provision, for the likely decision of JTPA to provide more intensive and longer-term services through in-school programming, and to redirect summer and school-year funding so as to support a year-round model centered on demonstration schools.

To date, there has been little evidence of regulatory barriers to JTPA participation in New Workforce, apart from some difficulties in adequately certifying eligible youth. The only criticism JTPA operators offer of the New Workforce model is its lack of emphasis on defined outcomes, which staff feel are necessary for effective implementation.

Schools: Schools have shown a mixed response to New Workforce, with strong support at the district level diluted by structural barriers at the building level. At the district level, school officials initially embraced New Workforce, with formal endorsements from superintendents in both communities. Interviews with school officials revealed three incentives to New Workforce participation:

1. **Expansion of school programming:** School staff in both cities cited the need to bring new resources into schools in a time of budget cuts. Officials in Minneapolis noted that post-secondary institutions could provide the kind of preparation, training, and linkages to the workplace that were beyond the current capacity of schools.

2. Rationalization of school programming: District officials in both cities noted the fragmentation in programming that frequently characterizes schools, including both the lack of effective transition between middle schools and high schools and the separations between dropout prevention, workforce preparation, and social support programming. Officials in both districts see the New Workforce model as a means to break down at least some of these internal barriers and replace traditional short-term and limited programming with a multi-year, year-round design.

The potential ability of New Workforce to serve as a mediating force between the district and local schools, which have become increasingly independent since decentralization, was another selling point. In San Diego, for example, the district's new school-to-work transition strategy, advocating integration of academic and vocational learning and experience, currently depends on voluntary acceptance by local schools. As a result, the school-to-work transition team at the district level has formally aligned itself with New Workforce, hoping to use the model as an instrument to bring about the adoption of the district's school-to-work strategy.

District officials also see New Workforce as a means to promote more effective use of funding sources targeted to disadvantaged youth, such as Chapter 1. The district currently distributes over $1.5 million by formula to New Workforce schools, with officials noting that the money is frequently spent on ineffective remedial programming or not spent at all. In fact, one New Workforce school had over $100,000 in unspent Chapter 1 funds.

3. Linking local schools to the community: A third incentive was the need to better connect local schools with the community at large. Some school district officials, in both San Diego and Minneapolis, see site-based management as isolating schools from the larger community even as it integrates them with the surrounding neighborhood. This concern is grounded in the diminishing role of the central school district. Where district officials once were the point of contact with post-secondary institutions, employers, and community-based organizations, this liaison responsibility, by default, increasingly rests with local schools. At the same time, however, there has been no complementary increase in staffing or capacity at the school level to take on the additional burden of integrating school programs with those sponsored by community institutions. Officials hope New Workforce can bridge the gap between local schools and city-wide institutions.

School resources in the two districts with the potential of offering support to New Workforce include Chapter 1 (San Diego only), the Perkins Act, community service funding, summer school funding, and staff development funding. In San Diego, officials at the district level support redirection of Chapter 1 to help fund New Workforce and are also considering the provision of Perkins Act funding. In Minneapolis, officials have indicated that they will support, in principle, some redirection of Perkins Act, summer school, and staff development resources.

At the same time, a serious obstacle to the success of New Workforce—one that is evident in San Diego and of concern in Minneapolis—is the response of local schools. Despite initial enthusiasm, schools in San Diego have proven unable to conduct an effective planning process. To date there has been little evidence of a focused attempt to support New Workforce, despite the earlier commitment of principals in participating schools. Three barriers are evident:

1. **Lack of leadership/capacity:** In virtually all participating schools, principals, teachers, and staff exhibited a relatively narrow perspective on school-to-work issues and a limited capacity for collaborative planning with other institutions. School staff seemed unfamiliar with the concept of a strategic planning process and inexperienced in developing objectives and translating them into a practical program design. Recognizing the need for sustained outside support, New Workforce planners are committed to providing increased assistance, and perhaps *de facto* leadership, to school-based planning efforts. Minneapolis officials also recognize the lack of school planning capacity as a major factor in program success and plan to target their initiative accordingly.

2. **No strategy for school funding:** Decentralization issues also affected school-based funding. San Diego planners had expected that New Workforce could be funded with school-based federal resources that were now largely controlled by individual schools. Although these resources were available to a number of New Workforce schools, it appeared that school staff did not have a strategic plan for deployment of either Chapter 1 or Perkins Act funding, and did not fully realize the potential of these dollars to support long-term and comprehensive programming. It is notable, for example, that more than one New Workforce school had unspent Chapter 1 resources, and at least one did not seek Perkins Act funding to which it was entitled.

3. **Inadequate staff commitment:** Effective planning also requires a commitment on the part of school-based staff and the resources to pay for teacher time. This need, recognized by Minneapolis planners, was not fully anticipated by those in the San Diego effort.

It is still too early to assess the likely effect of New Workforce on local schools in Minneapolis. A much more extensive planning process there, including a considerably greater focus on school planning, may promote more significant change.

Post-Secondary Institutions: Post-secondary institutions in San Diego—San Diego State University and San Diego City College—initially viewed the New Workforce model as a means to rationalize existing outreach and social support programming, to expand their reach to encompass a greater number of economically disadvantaged students, to better prepare students for college, and to seek additional resources. In addition, officials at SDCC saw the model as a means to recruit more students directly out of

high school—a goal reflective of the late start of many community college students (average age 28 in San Diego) and the low rate of students entering directly after high school (3.8 percent of the SDCC student body).

SDCC also hoped to enhance their Tech Prep programming. New Workforce has had a strong influence on post-secondary institutions in San Diego, leading both SDSU and SDCC to redirect existing resources and collaborate on new programming. To date, the two institutions, in conjunction with schools and the JTPA provider, have initiated a multi-year preparatory program that is held on college campuses and financed with JTPA dollars. They have also jointly developed a model for long-term case management and mentoring. In addition, New Workforce was credited by SDSU's representative on the planning committee with a broader change in mission and perspective among those responsible for minority and disadvantaged student recruitment at San Diego State. Speaking of the early New Workforce planning and programming experience, he noted, "It has caused us to reconsider who is college-bound....At-risk in 7th and 9th grade does not mean permanently at-risk....It changed our philosophy."

It appears likely that many of the same incentives will apply to institutions in Minneapolis. Although the environment is considerably more complex, with at least six post-secondary institutions participating, New Workforce is now in the process of developing formal linkages with at least two of these institutions.

Post-secondary officials interviewed in San Diego cited no major institutional barriers to New Workforce beyond the general difficulty of collaboration. One potential issue, however, voiced by SDSU's representative, is a perception that the initiative is too heavily concerned with preparation for work, rather than for higher education.

Employers: There has been limited direct employer involvement to date in the San Diego New Workforce initiative. In Minneapolis the private sector is involved in three separate capacities:

1. **Business/community partnerships:** The Minneapolis Youth Trust, sponsor of New Workforce, was established to help link employers with the educational system. MYT is representative of a strong "culture of collaboration" in Minneapolis, where there have been approximately 130 partnerships between businesses and schools, promoting activities such as mentoring, tutoring, and internships.

2. **Corporate participation:** ADC Communications, a local manufacturer, is directly involved in the planning process through a representative on the planning group, and has additionally underwritten support for outside consultants and staff.

3. **Youth apprenticeship initiatives:** Representatives of a number of institutions and non-profits exploring development of apprenticeship programming, including the Minnesota High-Tech Council and Minnesota Technology, are participating in the planning process. The primary incentive, according to one representative, is to improve the ability of schools to prepare students for apprenticeships and to foster pre-apprenticeship programming linked to the apprenticeship efforts now under consideration or development in Minneapolis.

Interviews in Minneapolis suggest that the business community is "tired of being nickeled and dimed" for support of short-term job placements and summer internships and would prefer a long-term strategy. While this is a strong incentive for employer involvement in a strategy like New Workforce, a barrier to full participation may be one that has been seen nationally: the apparent lack of business interest in direct involvement in youth training. As one Minneapolis official noted, "They don't see [training] as part of their responsibility."

Social Service Providers: To date, there has been little involvement of social service providers in San Diego. In Minneapolis, representatives of a multi-sector, collaborative, social service initiative and of neighborhood social service agencies have been involved in the planning process. Incentives for involvement have included the need to connect and sustain now-separate social services for youth and to improve youths' access to social service providers. One potential barrier to social service provider involvement is the strong competition for funding among current providers and a subsequent reluctance to enter collaborative networks.

The Effect Of The Planning Process

Along with the responsiveness of individual institutions involved in New Workforce, the form of the overall planning process—including its scope, structure, and governance—has played a crucial role in the initiative's successes and challenges to date. San Diego's informal task force approach, focused on key youth-serving institutions, has resulted in relatively quick and significant institutional change in JTPA and post-secondary institutions—a change that was stimulated in large part by the concrete opportunity for collaboration presented to them. At the same time, the early focus on these relatively flexible entities has, so far, limited the ripples felt in the community at large. New Workforce has barely touched schools, business, and other actors needed for effective youth development. Similarly, the San Diego initiative has not attracted the broad community attention accorded to other local initiatives, such as school-based social service reforms and a fledgling youth apprenticeship program.

This mixed record in San Diego stems less from a lack of vision than from a lack of structure and resources. San Diego's inability to address the more difficult tasks of school and community change is rooted in large part in

the lack of a full-time planning staff, and the absence to date of a foundation more sturdy than the current loose institutional coalition.

Minneapolis, by contrast, began with a structure designed to foster a community approach to youth development. Building on its prior experience and contacts, and its capacity to provide some staff support to a complex and demanding effort, MYT has brought with it the ability to engage relevant actors, public and private, in the most extensive effort of its kind in the city; to develop linkages with related youth-serving initiatives; and to raise local funds sufficient to initiate a long-term planning process.

The Minneapolis wide-ranging approach to developing New Workforce has carried with it additional burdens as well. The community-wide scope and extensive planning process has slowed the pace of institutional change, so that one year after the concept was first presented, no specific programs have yet been put in place. Moreover, New Workforce has yet to be tested in Minneapolis schools. Although planners have anticipated the same kinds of problems found in San Diego and have consequently developed a process that will offer school planning teams greater community involvement and support, it is likely that analogous barriers of some sort will arise. The more complex post-secondary environment of Minneapolis may also preclude the initially intensive institutional involvement seen in San Diego. To date, the large number of post-secondary institutions has appeared to delay the emergence of strong commitment on the part of any one college or university. The breadth of the program in Minneapolis has also proven resource- and staff-intensive; at this point, MYT is seeking additional foundation funding to continue the planning process next year. As in San Diego, New Workforce also faces competition from other youth-serving initiatives.

Lessons for Communities

Although the New Workforce experience in both San Diego and Minneapolis is, thus far, limited, it offers a number of lessons for other communities as they look to develop a collaborative and comprehensive approach to youth programming.

1. A systemic approach to workforce development requires an outside stimulus.

Although some communities, such as Louisville, Kentucky, have begun to develop an integrated community plan for workforce development without outside assistance, the experience of both San Diego and Minneapolis suggests the need for a defined framework, developed outside the community itself, to stimulate change. Prior to New Workforce, strong interest in a more developmentally-based approach in both cities had proved insufficient to overcome inertia, the lack of any structure for community or inter-institutional planning, and the lack of a clearly defined priority with respect to long-term and comprehensive youth programming. Officials in

both cities noted that they did not feel that the communities themselves would generate a workable structure for institutional integration. At the same time, they noted that the youth-serving institutions they represented could readily respond or adapt to a well-defined model or framework. In both communities, institutions appeared to be engaged by a combination of three elements critical to New Workforce: a program design that extended throughout adolescence; a defined planning framework built around this design; and an identification of resources that could support the strategy.

While there is nothing to suggest that the particular design of the New Workforce model is the only means of stimulating change of this kind, implementation experience to date lends weight to the argument that some outside entity—the federal or state government or a credible intermediary—is needed to provide impetus and direction for community-based systemic reform.

2. There is a significant resource base available to support creation of a pathways strategy for disadvantaged youth.

The experience of San Diego reveals a broad pool of resources, currently expended in short-term and limited programming, that can be used to support a longer-term and more comprehensive strategy tied to developmental needs. In San Diego, redirection of just Chapter 1 and JTPA IIB programming, for example, offers a base of approximately $2,000 per year in additional funding for program development. Although there clearly are political barriers to wholesale redirection of these programs (particularly Chapter 1), it should be noted that a significant proportion of the $1.5 million in Chapter 1 funding allocated to New Workforce schools remained unspent last year, while JTPA program operators were willing to markedly increase per-participant summer spending in order to develop a more comprehensive program model for New Workforce participants. At the same time, it is not apparent that significant resources can be readily obtained for students not meeting federal program guidelines as economically disadvantaged.

3. There is a need for a whole-community strategy.

Experience to date suggests that effective implementation of the New Workforce model requires engaging the community as a whole, rather than limiting the focus to change in specific institutions. In an environment characterized by dispersed authority and a large number of competing youth initiatives, it seems necessary to define a comprehensive youth development initiative such as New Workforce as inherently community-wide in scope, and as the logical umbrella for training and education strategies directed at youth.

This lesson is becoming apparent in the contrasting experiences of San Diego and Minneapolis. In San Diego a relatively narrow focus led to quick change, but has also appeared to limit the impact of the program on

the community at large and on schools in particular. While it is too early to judge the effectiveness of the Minneapolis strategy, its broader reach has seemingly involved elements of the community—business, developers of apprenticeship efforts, social service providers—that have remained outside the San Diego effort.

Development of a whole-community approach calls for at least four separate audiences to be engaged:

Political and business leaders: Although this group can seldom commit resources, their specific and continuing endorsement is required to provide overall legitimacy and define the initiative as a community priority. This endorsement is particularly important given the likelihood of a wide range of related initiatives (youth apprenticeship, social service reform, school reform) competing for community attention and resources.

Institutional managers: Federal and state resources to support initiatives aimed at disadvantaged youth, particularly outside of schools, are frequently controlled by mid-level managers, one or two levels below the CEO. The long-term success of a pathways model depends in large part on the decisions made by these managers, and consequently on the degree to which they view a comprehensive youth development model as the most direct way to improve the quality of programs financed by the resources they control.

Early commitment of these continuing funding streams gives an initiative an immediate place in the community and commands the attention of others. This lesson was made clear in San Diego, where early commitment of JTPA resources gave the initiative credibility with other actors, and where the continued involvement of middle managers, both as funders and as directors of related program operations, has been the initiative's greatest strength.

Service deliverers: Agencies directly serving youth, particularly local schools, have increasing autonomy in shaping youth-related programs. The San Diego experience underscores the need to involve principals, teachers, and counselors early in the planning process, and to gain their input and support in any community-wide effort.

Parents, students, neighborhood advocates: Experience with a number of national youth initiatives points to significant difficulties in involving parents, students, and community residents in community-level reforms. At the same time, community opposition can be a significant barrier to development of initiatives of this kind. The Minneapolis experience points to the need to develop specific outreach programs, extending beyond individual institutions, to assess community opinion and to build support.

4. School decentralization has inherently altered community planning.

Schools, the most important youth-serving institutions in the system as a whole, also tend to have the least capacity for inter-institutional strategic planning. The prevailing isolation of schools, their focus on traditional educational objectives, the wide range of competing initiatives, and limitations on staffing may all act as barriers to effective planning.

The recent trend toward site-based management, which shifts authority for planning and resource allocation from the district to local schools (without adding additional staffing capacity), makes it even more difficult for schools to participate in community-wide planning. Where the previous structure allowed school districts to negotiate with employers and other youth-serving institutions in developing integrated programming for the community as a whole, site-based management now requires that this process take place separately at each participating school. Because individual schools tend to lack both the expertise and the capacity to engage in this level of planning, effective strategic development now requires that the school district and other community institutions work directly with each individual school to design and develop a local strategy.

The experience of San Diego and Minneapolis suggests that a comprehensive youth development strategy should be built on a clear commitment from participating schools and their agreement to create planning teams that incorporate outside institutions and staff in school-based planning.

5. A formal structure should be in place to manage a community-wide initiative.

The experience of the two cities underlines the need for a managing organization that has the capacity to administer the planning process. It seems clear that the community-wide scope and complexity of the initiative require a sponsoring entity with a high community profile, links to other institutions, the ability to raise outside funds, and the capacity to devote full-time staff to the planning process. It is less clear whether this entity can be created for the purpose of managing New Workforce, or whether it needs to be a pre-existing organization. It is also unclear if this role can be fulfilled by an established youth-serving institution, such as the Private Industry Council or the schools, or whether it requires a third-party convener.

6. Effective implementation requires a multi-stage planning process.

From the perspective of eighteen months, it is clear that planners in neither Minneapolis nor San Diego fully appreciated the complexity of putting a comprehensive school-to-work model in place. Reflection on experience to date suggests the need for four separate stages before youth can take their first steps on the pathway. Planners should:

A. Seek basic support from key education and training institutions. As a first step, a community strategy requires CEOs from schools and post-secondary and training institutions, employers, and other community entities to make a general commitment to the principles of the model and to agree to participate in a planning process to achieve them.

B. Define the strategy and adapt it to the local community. After obtaining general support, planners must shape the model to fit community needs. This will include:

- Defining a target group—communities need to decide whether they will seek to serve only disadvantaged youth or the community at large, how many youth they will begin to serve in a demonstration, and how to define these youth, e.g., by age, by grade, or by school.
- Recruiting additional community institutions—communities need to seek out local schools interested in participating in the demonstration, and to recruit additional institutions and employers so as to broaden the task force.
- Defining standards and outcomes—communities need to determine what specific educational and employment objectives and desired participant outcomes should drive the strategy.
- Articulating institutional commitments and responsibilities—communities need to adapt the larger framework to the capabilities and interests of local institutions and employers. Relevant questions include: What resources can be contributed? How will current initiatives and services be incorporated? What new services are necessary?

C. Refine the model and seek broader input and support. Communities need to evaluate the results of the initial planning process with the community at large in order both to develop realistic commitments and to gain the support of groups—such as parents, students, and neighborhood and community leaders—who have not participated in the planning to date.

D. Develop an implementation plan. As in any program or initiative, the final step to implementation is to translate general commitments into a specific plan with defined participation, funding, and roles and responsibilities, as well as a broader timetable. This task is made much more complex in a community school-to-work initiative because of its scope and parameters—a multi-year initiative that involves a multiplicity of institutions. Experience to date suggests that this process should center on schools or school clusters, with planning teams drawn from the community as a whole working with school-based teams to put the strategy in place.

7. There is a need for ongoing, outside technical assistance.

Despite prevailing good will and interest, it appears that many local communities do not have the capacity to implement a community school-to-work initiative without ongoing, outside support. Narrow institutional perspective, the lack of staff available for systemic planning, lack of experience, and limited knowledge about the mechanics of structural reform will likely prevent or hamper the development of effective collaborative strategies.

Experience to date suggests that outside technical assistance can stimulate development of a community strategy by introducing the concept of a community framework, assisting institutions in envisioning and developing needed connections, assisting in the development of a planning process and a funding strategy, and providing information about related national developments.

V. Conclusion: Lessons and Recommendations

The following recommendations for change are driven by the overarching conclusion of this report—*that communities have the potential to create a comprehensive strategy for youth development, but are discouraged by the nature of our current system from pursuing this goal.* At the heart of these recommendations is the conviction that communities should replace the current fragmented system for workforce development with a strategic approach based on the key elements of a community-wide strategy such as New Workforce—pathways extending from middle school to the workplace, supported by a framework linking employers with educational and training institutions. Ideally, these changes would occur through community initiative alone. But, because some form of outside stimulus seems to be a prerequisite to enable communities to effect these changes, much of the responsibility for shaping a community-based system for workforce development rests outside the community itself, primarily in government at the federal and state level, but also in foundations and other public and private entities.

Government should use its influence to stimulate broad-based community change. As noted earlier, some steps are now being taken in this direction, such as the School-to-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA) and the recent recommendations of the Gore Commission to improve integration of federal funding streams. These changes, however, while clearly increasing the potential for communities to create a systemic approach to workforce development, do not fully address three key structural issues which now act to preserve a fragmented and ineffectual system: the lack of a compelling vision for a long-term, comprehensive, and integrated approach to workforce development; the continuing institutional separation between training and education; and the lack of any institution or body at the community level with the mandate and capacity to plan and implement a community-wide approach.

Foundations, too, should serve as a catalyst for innovation through grants designed to encourage development of a community framework based on the principle of clearly defined pathways. Too often, foundation grants in this area have focused on promoting a coordination *process*—supporting coalitions of key players charged with broad reforms in areas such as schools or social services—rather than addressing the structural obstacles barring integration of a community's educational, training, and social service *systems*.

Federal and state governments can take a number of specific steps to actively encourage the creation of comprehensive workforce development strategies.

The Federal Government

The federal government should offer states and communities a broad vision and direction for youth development, work to redirect existing resources to

create sustained and integrated youth programming, and provide new resources to enhance local capacity for planning and development. Actions should include:

1. Advocacy: The Departments of Education and Labor should promote a community planning process based on the principle of establishing clear pathways from school to work.

The departments should make specific and directed efforts targeted to post-secondary institutions, schools, and employment and training providers to encourage the creation of a long-term and sustained youth development strategy based upon a community framework linking educational and training institutions. Through conferences, working papers, and departmental guidelines, the two departments should build upon the foundation provided by the School-to-Work Opportunities Act to encourage community workforce development plans that would include the following elements:

- Participation of educational and training institutions, including employers, post-secondary institutions, the Private Industry Council, and social service providers;
- Multi-year, year-round programming extending from middle school through the transition to higher education or work;
- Linkage of JTPA summer and school-year programming with current school-based efforts; and
- Linkage of Perkins Act-funded programming with broader workforce efforts.

2. Redirection of Funding: The Departments of Education and Labor should actively promote redirection of JTPA IIB and IIC, Chapter 1, Perkins Act, School-to-Work Opportunities Act, and other funding to support comprehensive youth development strategies.

The federal government has traditionally been wary of providing excessive direction to localities in the use of federal funds. Current regulations for JTPA, the Perkins Act, and Chapter 1, while encouraging coordination and joint planning, do not call for a community approach to workforce development, nor do they require a collaborative approach to planning and implementation. STWOA similarly encourages development of a system without *requiring* integrated planning of federal funding streams.

Experience to date suggests that this approach is not sufficient to overcome traditional barriers between educational and training institutions. The Departments of Education and Labor should require, through regulation, that PICs and educational institutions receiving federal funds participate in a common planning process. The federal government should further require that PICs and schools develop integrated programming strategies for expenditure of JTPA, Perkins Act, and where appropriate, Chapter 1 funds.

Specific recommendations include:

- **The Departments of Education and Labor should revamp the awards process for School-to-Work Opportunities grants to require communities**

to create long-term and comprehensive youth development strategies linking federal resources such as JTPA, the Perkins Act, and Chapter 1 as a precondition to the award of additional federal funds. As currently envisioned, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act falls short of its potential as a catalyst for development of a community system for youth development. Although the bill takes some important steps—including advocating a systemic approach to school-to-work transition, a closer connection between education, training, and work, and a better integration of existing funding streams—its design does not now address some key barriers to the creation of an effective workforce preparation strategy.

Specific flaws include:

- inadequate emphasis on preparation, or pathways, below the 10th grade level;
- no requirement for a community planning framework that would link school and JTPA strategies in a single overarching plan;
- no requirement for integration of funding streams such as JTPA IIB and IIC, the Perkins Act, and Chapter 1; and
- no link to related federal education initiatives proposed in ESEA reauthorization, such as expanded Chapter 1 (to be renamed Title I) schoolwide project strategies.

As a major initiative of the Clinton Administration, STWOA presents a clear opportunity for reform, particularly in the context of related developments in educational policy and funding. The failure of the federal government to use this opportunity to promote a long-term, sustained, and integrated approach to youth development, however, means that this potential will likely be dissipated in favor of more limited, self-contained school-to-work efforts.

To realize the potential of STWOA to stimulate broader community strategies, the departments should make awards of funds to communities under the proposed high-risk and direct application pools contingent upon the design of a community plan for workforce development, prepared jointly by the private industry council, the school district, and other key players. The plan should include strategies for developing multi-year pathways to college and work, for directing JTPA IIB and IIC and Perkins Act funding so as to support this effort, and for integrating school-wide Chapter 1 (Title I) programming at the secondary level with workforce development efforts.

- **The Department of Labor should restructure the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) as a multi-year workforce preparation initiative linked to a larger community strategy.**

The current design of the Summer Youth Employment Program—as a single-summer effort providing limited remediation and public-sector work experience—is almost universally viewed as an ineffective use of scarce youth program dollars. The nation's largest youth training program should be rethought and its resources joined with school-year programs to support a multi-year, year-round preparation for post-secondary training and work.

The Department of Labor should propose the following changes to SYEP: 1) training providers should be required to develop a plan in concert with schools, employers, and post-secondary institutions to reposition the summer jobs program as one component of a multi-year work preparation strategy; 2) training providers should be required to use SYEP resources to support initiatives including, but not limited to, long-term pre-apprenticeship programming, long-term college preparation programming, and multi-year skills training linked to private-sector job placement; and 3) training providers should be required to integrate SYEP programming with school-district Perkins Act and Chapter 1 schoolwide projects.

- **The Department of Education should require school districts to develop comprehensive workforce development plans linking Perkins Act and Chapter 1 funding, where applicable, with JTPA and other relevant resources.**

  The Department of Education should make a particular effort to realize the potential of Chapter 1 schoolwide projects as a basis for development of comprehensive workforce preparation strategies. The whole-school strategy offers an ideal opportunity for integrating educational and training efforts through new curricula linked to summer work experience, expanded vocational counseling, and advanced skills training. New strategies proposed for ESEA reauthorization enhance these opportunities by lowering eligibility thresholds, over time, to 50 percent of the school population, emphasizing whole-school strategies as a priority for school districts, and channeling funding to schools with the largest population of disadvantaged students. To fully realize these opportunities, the department should require eligible schools at the secondary level to develop a comprehensive workforce preparation plan in conjunction with JTPA and other community institutions.

3. Regulatory Reform: The Departments of Education and Labor should provide short-term waivers and seek longer-term regulatory reform to promote integrated use of JTPA, Perkins Act, and Chapter 1 funding.

STWOA calls for issuance of waivers to promote integrated workforce development efforts. The federal government should be as responsive as possible to local requests, with particular attention to easing certification barriers for JTPA eligibility, and to promoting integrated use of JTPA and Chapter 1 funding as a key component of local strategies. Efforts should include development of common standards for schoolwide interventions. In the longer term, the government should pursue reforms designed to promote whole-school strategies, and in particular, adopt plans to lower the threshold qualification for whole-school Chapter 1 programs to a 50 percent economically disadvantaged population.

4. Capacity Building: The federal government should provide communities with funds to establish structures to plan, develop, and implement a community workforce development strategy.

Currently, no single organization or entity at the community level is charged with responsibility for the creation of a workforce development system. Although STWOA allows funding that can be used for such an entity, it does not require its establishment, nor does it make it a major priority. To remedy both the lack of capacity and the lack of perceived need for strategic planning at the community level, the Departments of Education and Labor should actively offer support to communities willing to create or designate an entity with responsibility for conducting and overseeing a community planning process.

State Government

States, too, should take a more active role in promoting effective workforce development. The "New Federalism" pursued by the Reagan Administration gave states a significantly greater role in determining the use and direction of a number of federal funding streams. Since the early 1980s, states have had the potential to stimulate creation of community workforce development strategies through state control of federal education and training resources. Few if any states, however, have used this capacity as a basis for change, with most states viewing the mandated state planning process for federal funding streams as largely a formality. By default, decision making in this area has remained with local communities.

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act again gives states a central role in policy development. States should use this authority, along with control of JTPA, Perkins Act, and other federal and state resources tied to education, training, and social support, to offer direction and resources to communities in order to spur creation of community-based strategies. States should pursue three objectives:

1. A State Strategy: State labor and education departments, in cooperation with state human resource investment planning councils, should shape a state framework for youth development that integrates education and training resources and provides clearly defined pathways from school to work.

STWOA, while encouraging a state plan for workforce development, does not fully address longer-term youth development issues. State agencies—and the governor's office—should build on the base of STWOA to create a state-based strategy that includes these elements:

- Expansion of the agenda and membership of the state STWOA task force to encompass a broad vision of workforce development, extending from middle school onward;
- An overall plan designed to integrate state-supported and directed education with training programming from the 8th grade onward; and
- A program of advocacy and outreach designed to encourage community workforce development strategies based on the principle of pathways.

2. Redirection of Existing Resources: State labor and education departments should use the state planning process for federal funding streams to stimulate integration of JTPA and Perkins Act funding.

The mandated state planning process for federally funded programs such as JTPA and the Perkins Act has been underutilized as a means of encouraging collaborative planning at the community level. States should use their discretion over federal and state resources to encourage or require training providers, school districts, and post-secondary institutions to integrate both JTPA- and Perkins Act-funded programming in a larger community strategy. The state JTPA planning process, for example, should be employed to require local training providers, in conjunction with other youth-serving institutions, to develop a strategy for multi-year, integrated, summer and school-year programming.

3. Capacity Building: State labor and education departments should provide funds to communities to support new or existing entities that will have as their goal the creation of a community workforce development strategy.

States should specifically designate STWOA, discretionary JTPA, and other funds to support PICs or other entities in planning, developing, and implementing a comprehensive community strategy. States should build this form of support into their awards process, and should, in addition, provide support through other federal funding streams designated for local administrative costs.

Finally, both the federal government and states should provide technical assistance to communities as they plan, develop, and implement their comprehensive youth strategy. The U.S. Departments of Education and Labor should offer sustained technical assistance to aid in the development of these efforts, while states should also expand their own technical assistance capacity, training current state education and labor field staff to jointly aid communities in efforts to develop comprehensive strategies that build clear pathways from school to work for all of their youth.

References

American Association of Higher Education. 1993. "AAHE's New Agenda on School/College Collaboration." *AAHE Bulletin*, 45:9.

Bailis, Lawrence. 1992. "Coordination, Collaboration and Linkages." *Dilemmas in Youth Employment Programming: Findings from the Youth Research and Technical Assistance Project*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

Commission on Chapter 1. 1992. *Making Schools Work for Children in Poverty*. Washington D.C.: Commission on Chapter 1.

Council of Chief State School Officers. 1992. "A Concern About...Preparing Students for Employment: Youth Apprenticeship as One Approach." *Concerns*, 28:1-7. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Council of State Community Affairs Agencies. 1988. *Using Education, Employment and Training Resources to Expand Economic Opportunities*. Washington, D.C.: Council of State Community Affairs Agencies.

DeLone, Richard H. 1992. "School-to-Work Transition: Failings, Dilemmas and Policy Options." *Dilemmas in Youth Employment Programming: Findings from the Youth Research and Technical Assistance Project*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

Education Week. April 21, 1993.

Education Week. July 30, 1993.

Education Week. October 20, 1993.

Gore, Albert. 1993. *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less*. New York: Times Books.

Grubb, W.N., Cynthia Brown, Philip Kaufman, and John Lederer. 1989. *Innovation vs.Turf: Coordination between Vocational Education and Job Training Partnership Act Programs*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

_____. 1990. *Order Amidst Complexity: The Status of Coordination Among Vocational Education, Job Training Partnership Act, and Welfare-To-Work Programs*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Grubb, W.N., and Lorraine M. McDonnel. 1991. *Local Systems of Vocational Education and Job Training: Diversity, Interdependence and Effectiveness*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Grubb, W.N., Tory Dickenson, Lorraine Giordano, and Gail Kaplan. 1992. *Betwixt and Between: Education, Skills and Employment in Sub-Baccalaureate Labor Markets*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

Hahn, Andrew, Evelyn Ganzglass, and Gloria Nagle. 1992. "The Mission and Structure of National Human Resource Policy for Disadvantaged Youth: A Synthesis with Recommendations." *Dilemmas in Youth Employment Programming: Findings from the Youth Research and Technical Assistance Project*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

Kazis, Richard. 1993. *Improving School to Work Transition in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: American Youth Policy Forum.

Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs. 1993. *Bridging the Gap: Implementing School-to-Work in Austin, Texas*. Austin: Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs.

McMullan, Bernard J. and Phyllis Snyder. 1987. *Allies in Education: Schools and Businesses Working Together for At-Risk Youth*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

National Alliance of Business. 1989. *The Compact Project: School-Business Partnerships for Improving Education*. Washington, D.C.: National Alliance of Business.

National Center for Research in Vocational Education. 1992a. *Education and Training in the Fifty States: A Compendium of State Policies*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

National Center for Research In Vocational Education. 1992b. *Tech Prep: An Embryonic Idea and Divergent Practice*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California at Berkeley.

National Governors' Association. 1993. *A New Paradigm for Youth Employment and Training Programs*. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.

Orfield, Gary. 1992. "Money, Equity and College Access." *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(3):337-369.

Osterman, Paul. 1991. *Is There a Problem With the Youth Labor Market and If So How Should We Fix It?* Cambridge: M.I.T. Sloan School of Management.

Pittman, Karen. 1991. "A New Vision: Promoting Youth Development." Testimony before the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Education l Development.

Trutko, John, Lawrence Bailis, Burt Barnow, and Stephen French. 1990. *An Assessment of the JTPA Role in State and Local Coordination Activities: Final Report*. Arlington, VA: James Bell Associates.

U.S. Department of Education. 1993. *Reinventing Chapter 1: The Current Chapter 1 Program and New Directions*. Final Report of the National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1992. *National JTPA Study*. Interim Findings—Executive Summary. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1993. *Summer Challenge Model Programs.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

U.S. General Accounting Office. 1991. *Overlapping Federal Employment and Training Programs.* Briefing for the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office.

U.S. General Accounting Office. 1993. *Vocational Education: Status in School Year 1990-91 and Early Signs of Change at the Secondary Level.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. General Accounting Office.

Walker, Gary, and Frances Vilella-Velez. 1992. *Anatomy of a Demonstration.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Wehlage, Gary, Gregory Smith, and Pauline Lipman. 1992. "Restructuring Urban Schools: The New Futures Experience." *American Educational Review,* 29:52-92.

William T. Grant Foundation, Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship. 1988. *The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America.* Washington D.C.: William T. Grant Foundation.

Youth Development Institute. 1993. *Strengthening Youth Employment Programs Through Youth Development: A Report with Recommendations to the New York City Department of Employment from the New York City Youth Employment Consortium.* New York: Youth Development Institute.

People Interviewed

Pam Anderson, Jefferson County Private Industry Council
Adrian Beverly, Chicago Public Schools
David Brown, National Governors' Association
Nevin Brown, American Association of Higher Education
Sandra Bryne, National Alliance of Business
Ellen Burbank, The Pew Charitable Trusts
Gary Burtless, The Brookings Institute
Mary Jane Clancy, Philadelphia Public Schools
Augie Diego, Chancellor, San Diego Community College
Marcelle Fox, San Diego City College
Byrna Shore Fraser, National Institute for Work and Learning
Julie Gibson, Department of Labor
Robert Glover, University of Texas
Kati Haycock, American Association of Higher Education
Maureen Hoyler, National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations
Pat Irving, Philadelphia Private Industry Council
Peter Joyce, National Alliance of Business
Bruce Keitel, San Diego State University
Lily Keyser, Sacramento Public Schools
Robert Knight, National Association of Private Industry Councils

People Interviewed continued

James Konantz, Los Angeles Public Schools
Alvin C. Lyles, Chicago Public Schools JTPA Coordinator
Al MacMahill, Center for Corporate and Educational Initiatives
Arnold Mitchem, National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations
Gloria Moore, Los Angeles Community Development Department (JTPA)
Glenda Partee, Council of Chief State School Officers
Brene Patrick, San Diego Consortium (JTPA)
Tom Payzant, Superintendent, San Diego Public Schools
David Pierce, American Association of Community Colleges
Bonnie Politz, Academy of Educational Development
Libby Queen, Department of Labor
Bob Raines, San Diego Public Schools
Paul Ruiz, American Association of Higher Education
Esther Schaeffer, The National Alliance of Business
Drew Schlosberg, San Diego Public Schools
Robert Schwartz, The Pew Charitable Trusts
Rochelle Solomon, North Philadelphia College Compact
Jan Somerville, Philadelphia Schools Collaborative
Carol Stoel, American Association of Higher Education
Ellen Tenenbaum, Westat
Carol Truesdell, Minneapolis Youth Trust
Angelo Vaccaro, Louisville Education and Employment Partnership
Gary Walker, Public/Private Ventures
Gary Warrington, Minneapolis Public Schools
Alexandra Weinbaum, Academy for Educational Development
Chip Wells, Minneapolis Employment and Training Program
Dan Wilhoit, Council of Chief State School Officers
Joan Wilkoscz, Minneapolis Public Schools
Alan Zuckerman, National Youth Employment Coalition

Appendix A: The Existing System

This appendix presents an overview of the key elements of the existing school-to-work and youth development "system," and an assessment of the incentives and barriers that might promote or discourage their collaborative participation in a comprehensive, integrated system built on the principle of clearly defined pathways for youth. The material is drawn from a review of the literature, interviews with policymakers, and discussions with local officials in four cities: Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Sacramento.

The Job Training Partnership Act System (JTPA)

The JTPA system is the primary employment and training system for disadvantaged adults and youth. Private Industry Councils (PICs) based in 620 Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) nationwide fund a variety of training programs, including efforts targeted at both in- and out-of-school youth who meet federal guidelines for economic disadvantage (for example, income under approximately $17,000 for a family of four). JTPA sponsors two programs directed primarily at in-school youth: the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) (Title IIB) and the in-school, year-round training program (Title IIC). Total funding for these programs is approximately $1.2 billion per year.

SYEP: The Summer Youth program, with projected 1994 enrollment of 625,000 and funded in FY '94 at approximately $900 million, was initially established in 1965. Originally conceived largely as a means of keeping disadvantaged youth off the streets, the program has evolved into a six- to eight-week work experience, with program placements at various public and non-profit institutions. The summer program is also designed to incorporate some remedial education. Average JTPA spending has been approximately $1,350 per participant in 1993, and is projected to increase to $1,475 in the summer of 1994.

A recent report issued by the Department of Labor Inspector General termed the SYEP program for the summer of 1992 a "success," although noting that remedial efforts were frequently optional or limited. In the past few years, the program has come under widespread criticism for providing "make-work" for teenagers, along with limited or uninspiring school courses. As Robert Woodson has noted, "The summer work program is treated as a social program and not as a real work experience" (*Education Week*, April 21, 1993). Echoing this point, Brookings Institution economist Gary Burtless commented that the JTPA summer program "is hurting kids in the long term" (Interview, 1993). No study has shown any significant positive effect on participants, while the program's size and status as the nation's largest employment program for disadvantaged youth have made it a natural target for critics.

Much of the criticism directed at JTPA for ineffectual summer programming can be seen as a by-product of the lack of a national framework for workforce development, with the consequent lack of guidance and direction for this billion-dollar program. Even under the more restrictive regulations in force prior to recent amendments, program operators had relative freedom to design and operate a summer effort. Under these regulations, for example, there were no specific barriers to providing intensive academic or vocational training, developing integrated programs with post-secondary institutions, or creating a multi-summer—rather than a single-summer—design. But few program operators have capitalized on this freedom to develop longer-term or otherwise innovative programs.

The largest nationwide effort to extend beyond the single-summer model has been the Summer Training and Education Program (STEP), which has involved approximately 14 percent of the nation's SDAs in a two-summer program offering participants a combination of remediation, life skills, and work experience. Although this effort resulted in significant short-term gains for participants, evaluation shows that these faded over time (Walker and Vilella-Velez, 1992). Another notable effort, known as the YOU program (a separate initiative from the similarly-named Department of Labor demonstration effort) and implemented by SDAs in eight southern states, uses JTPA summer dollars to fully subsidize a summer residential semester at a college or university. This program, which costs as much as $3,000 per participant, offers an intensive summer academic enrichment and work experience for 14- and 15-year-olds.

Beyond these efforts, however, it appears that the majority of summer program operators have continued to operate the traditional single-summer program model. This trend was underlined at the recent Summer Challenge conference sponsored by the Departments of Labor and Education, where the great majority of "innovative" programs cited in the program handbook retained a single-summer design (U.S. Department of Labor, 1993). Moreover, even more comprehensive efforts such as YOU have failed to develop a multi-summer design or to integrate programming effectively with other institutions beyond the initial summer of services.

The School-Year Program: The in-school portion of the JTPA year-round youth (IIC) program is significantly smaller than the summer effort, serving approximately 200,000 youth at an overall budget that can be conservatively estimated at $300 million. Typically this funding supports a variety of in-school work readiness efforts, job counseling, and occasional work experience. While little study has been done on the effectiveness or overall use of the in-school portion of JTPA youth funding, interviews in four cities suggest that this funding is seldom integrated with school-based vocational programming, such as efforts sponsored through the Perkins program or Chapter 1, despite common eligibility. One notable exception to this trend is found in Louisville, where school-year funding is blended with Perkins dollars to help support a multi-year remediation/work experience effort (see below).

Assessment

JTPA summer and school-year funding is an underutilized resource which can be redirected to support a comprehensive youth development strategy. Although the program is limited by its target group (economically disadvantaged youth) and its scope 1.4 to 1.2, its funding pool of approximately $1.4 billion dollars has the potential to subsidize many of the elements of a pathways strategy, including development of multi-year, year-round academic enrichment and work preparation programs.

The potential use of JTPA funding for more comprehensive strategies has been considerably enhanced by recent passage of amendments to the JTPA program, effective July 1993, which promote the following:

- Development of year-round programming;
- Use of funding for school-to-work transition activities;
- Increased linkage with schools and with related federal funding streams including eligibility for IIC in-school programs for Chapter 1 participants; and
- Development of school-wide projects serving all school students if the school is served by a local education agency that is Chapter 1 eligible, located in a poverty area and where 70% of students meet one of seven barriers including basic skills deficiency; reading one grade below the average; pregnant or parenting teen; learning disability; homeless or runaway youth; offender; locally established barrier schoolwide projects requirements (i.e., 75 percent economically disadvantaged).

Although few insurmountable barriers exist to using JTPA funding for a collaborative approach to comprehensive youth development, at least four obstacles are frequently cited:

- The large number of administrative requirements for JTPA participation, including the need for extensive certification of participant family income, residence, and citizenship status;
- The need to develop performance standards for some programming—as one national policymaker closely involved with JTPA noted, "Meeting something that can be measured gets priority";
- The political pressure in some communities to serve the largest number of youth possible in the summer program; and
- The political pressure in some urban communities to deliver services through selected community-based organizations.

One less tangible barrier may be JTPA program operators who traditionally have not seen themselves as part of a wider local youth development system. Of the program operators interviewed, none had made significant efforts to integrate JTPA programming with any broader youth strategy, despite the presence of widely publicized school reform efforts in two of their cities; more significantly, the only (limited) multi-year programs in evidence originated not through the initiative of the operators themselves, but rather through the efforts of other actors, such as state agencies.

Post-Secondary Institutions

Reflecting, perhaps, continuing concern over the underrepresentation of economically disadvantaged and minority students on campus, virtually all four-year colleges have engaged in a variety of individually sponsored and partnership initiatives with the goal of developing improved connections with secondary schools. As the American Association of Higher Education has noted, "Almost every large campus in the country now boasts numerous engagements with schools...many touch hundreds of students per year" (American Association of Higher Education, 1993). Common initiatives include curriculum reform efforts, early outreach efforts, summer preparatory programming, mentoring, and participation in federally funded initiatives such as Talent Search and Upward Bound.

Despite the large numbers of such initiatives, four-year institutions have come under considerable criticism for failing to develop an effective pathway between schools and college. One publication commented, "While schools and universities throughout the country have established programs . . . few go beyond the level of simple mentoring programs and teacher exchanges" (*Education Week*, July 14, 1993). A researcher at the American Association of Higher Education described higher education institutions as "stuck in an adopt-a-school mentality," and noted that these institutions had made little effort to develop systemic connections.

In terms of making these kinds of broader connections, existing programs are deficient in four ways:

- **They fail to reach students early:** Many outreach efforts do not extend below the tenth grade, while those that do are often focused on curricular reform rather than on providing pathways for individual students;
- **They fail to target low-achieving students:** University-school partnerships aimed at individual students often target middle-achieving youth, ignoring the lower-achieving population;
- **They fail to make disadvantaged students and families aware of financial aid options:** Post-secondary institutions, both four-year and two-year, have considerable federal, state, and local financial aid available for economically disadvantaged students, including funding derived from the $6-billion Pell grant program, the $600-million State Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) program, and the $600-million work-study program. Although the proportion of this funding available for grants and subsidized loans has recently declined sharply, it can still amount to 85 percent of the cost of attending a public institution. Many students and their families, however, particularly those from economically disadvantaged or minority backgrounds, are unaware of such aid or are unable to master the system without assistance (Orfield, 1992); and
- **They fail to use resources effectively:** Universities themselves are fragmented entities, often operating a bewildering number of separate and disconnected partnership efforts. This lack of coordination often prevents effective use of federal and state funding sources. In addition, the federal work-study program, which now supports a wide range of student jobs,

could be directed, at least in part, to subsidizing college students in mentoring or other assistance programs tied to school partnership efforts. Community service grants, funded under the National Service Trust Act of 1993, could be turned to similar purposes.

One exception to the narrow programs typically sponsored by universities is the federally supported Upward Bound program (see below). Upward Bound is a multi-year, long-term program that includes school-year services, summer preparatory programming held on a university campus, and extensive guidance and counseling support. Although widely considered effective, Upward Bound is limited by funding constraints to serving an estimated 1 percent of the eligible population.

Community Colleges: In recent years, community colleges have increasingly come to be seen as the most important institutional link to the workforce. One report, for example, places them at the top of the hierarchy of vocational institutions (Grubb et al., 1991). For this reason, close connections between community colleges and schools are a critically important element in any school-to-work strategy.

Community colleges, however, have had a mixed record in developing these connections. In recent years, the colleges have apparently made significant progress in developing links to high school vocational programs through a variety of "2+2" efforts (see below), many encouraged by the federal Carl Perkins Act. The $1-billion Perkins program also includes a new $100-million initiative, known as Tech Prep, specifically designed to link secondary and post-secondary institutions. A recent survey showed 354 Tech Prep linkages in place around the country, while noting that many of these were still in the "embryonic" stage (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992b).

Community colleges have been less successful in developing pathways for the larger population of high school students not enrolled in specific vocational programs. With an average student age of 29, many community colleges have long seen themselves as serving the community at large. Although they often operate outreach programs similar to those of four-year institutions, they direct less attention to high schools as a primary recruiting source than do other institutions, such as technical institutes or four year-colleges, with younger student populations. This lack of a connection beyond narrow vocational programs is beginning to be seen as a problem by state officials (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992a); a second, and equally serious, concern is emerging evidence of underenrollment of economically disadvantaged and minority students in some "articulation programs"—programs that link high school and post-secondary institutions. A recent study of Tech Prep showed that programming for at-risk students was minimal and that those students are not well represented in current Tech Prep programs (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992b).

Assessment

Redirection of current post-secondary programs and resources offers a potential basis for a long-term and sustained approach to youth development. By building on the numerous and fragmented outreach programs currently in place and on existing federal funding streams—including Carl Perkins, Pell, SEOG, and work-study efforts—a pathways strategy could considerably extend current post-secondary/secondary collaborations. Collaborations could be further supported through redirecting JTPA and other funding to create long-term summer and after-school college preparatory programming.

However, one immediate barrier to improved articulation is increased pressure on financial aid sources. As Gary Orfield of the Harvard School of Education notes in a recent article (1992), rising tuition and the declining availability of financial aid, particularly in grant form, have combined to raise the barriers facing economically disadvantaged students. A second and more general obstacle may be the low priority apparently attached by many post-secondary institutions to developing a systemic approach. Although virtually all major four-year institutions have entered into some form of partnership with secondary or middle schools, few have thus far taken the initiative to expand or consolidate their efforts—despite evidence that shows declining numbers of economically disadvantaged and minority youth attending four-year schools.

Schools

Schools, of course, are at the center of the workforce preparation effort. Most urban school districts currently have responsibility for remedial and dropout prevention programs, as well as vocational education, social support, and college preparation programs. As numerous reports, beginning with *A Nation at Risk*, have made clear, schools do not now effectively employ the $274 billion expended annually on elementary and secondary education. The reports include criticisms that schools are unable to impart basic skills; supplementary programs are fragmented and ineffective; vocational and academic education are deliberately segregated; and too many students develop neither the competencies nor the knowledge base needed to enter the workforce and pursue careers.

While effective workforce preparation clearly requires a far-ranging school reform effort to redress these deficiencies, a more immediate focus of attention, for the purposes of this report, is on three areas related to preparing students in middle schools and above for the workplace: dropout prevention programming, including federal Chapter 1 programs; vocational education and workforce preparation efforts, particularly Carl Perkins programs; and school-sponsored or school-based transitional programs designed to lead to college or work.

Dropout prevention programs: Almost all large schools operate local, state, and federally financed programs aimed at providing remedial basic skills

and keeping students in school. The largest of these is the federal Chapter 1 program, budgeted at $6.7 billion dollars and targeted to low-performing students. The program currently serves approximately 5.5 million students, primarily in elementary schools. However, 21 percent of the total number served are in middle schools or above, with estimated funding of $1.4 billion available for this population.

The U.S. Department of Education has recently completed a series of evaluations of the Chapter 1 program. Findings include the following:

- Funding is predominantly employed for separate "pull-out" programming focused primarily on basic skills remediation;
- Funded programs are largely ineffective in substantially raising student achievement levels; and
- The current pattern of funded programs in high schools does not meet the need of students for challenging courses, high standards, career counseling, and social support (U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

These criticisms appear to apply to many, if not most, of the Chapter 1 programs. A second criticism with wide application is the failure to link these programs and resources effectively with other, similar efforts to develop a pathways approach. Thus, Chapter 1 could supplement or support a variety of youth interventions, including those funded with JTPA and Perkins dollars, but both anecdotal evidence and results from surveyed cities suggest that this does not occur. Significantly, the Commission on Chapter 1, a panel of experts convened by the Department of Education to review this program, has recommended "coordinating Chapter 1 services with those funded under Perkins, Tech Prep, JTPA, and new initiatives for youth apprenticeship" (Commission on Chapter 1, 1992).

A second, and equally compelling, opportunity for support of a pathways approach can be found in the proposed expansion of school-wide projects financed under Chapter 1. Chapter 1 regulations currently allow funding of services to the school at large, rather than to individually targeted youth, if the economically disadvantaged population of the school is 75 percent of the total. Such whole-school certification offers the opportunity for schools to develop innovative strategies; recent JTPA amendments allow JTPA to develop a similar whole-school strategy. Proposed legislation will drop this threshold to 50 percent, greatly expanding the potential of this provision to finance more comprehensive strategies.

Vocational education and Carl Perkins funding: In a long-established line of demarcation, vocational education has traditionally been seen as separate and distinct from academic education. Today, this separation has largely continued even as vocational programming within comprehensive high schools has declined in favor of area specialized schools that function much like magnet programs, offering a sequential series of courses in a specified occupational area (Grubb et al., 1991). While these institutions can provide a pathway to work for enrolled students, they also exacerbate distinctions

between academic and vocational learning, narrowing opportunities and diminishing the likelihood of both academic and vocational students receiving a broad-based preparation for adulthood.

To address these issues, the 1990 Carl Perkins legislation mandated that the $972 million in federal funding provided (approximately $600 million to secondary schools) "integrate academic and vocational education in coherent series of courses so that students achieve both academic and vocational competencies." To date, implementation of these provisions has been encouraging but limited. Grubb and others have found some states and localities pursuing a diverse group of approaches to meet these priorities, including development of new curricula and approaches to teaching. At the same time, a number of states and local districts have yet to adopt Perkins priorities, or have yet to make compliance with these provisions mandatory. A survey of state officials also shows resistance among some academic teachers to the new provisions and difficulty in getting schools to adopt new materials made available by states (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992a).

Supporting other such findings, anecdotal evidence and inquiries in the surveyed communities suggest that Perkins funding is seldom integrated with other funding sources, such as JTPA and Chapter 1, despite similar goals and target populations and legislative requirements for joint planning.

Transitional programs: Schools currently sponsor or host a number of specific transitional programs supported through national, state, and local efforts—including Jobs for America's Graduates, Career Beginnings, Compact programs (see below), college access centers, and JTPA and other vocational counseling initiatives. While a number of these programs are effective or have effective elements, many others are limited in that they start relatively late in a student's career (10th grade or later); provide relatively narrow services (e.g., college counseling with no link to academic preparation); and are relatively short-term in duration (McMullan and Snyder, 1987; National Alliance of Business, 1989). Moreover, many of these programs, although offering similar services, are planned and delivered separately.

Assessment

As the potentially dominant institution in workforce preparation, schools also offer the greatest potential base of support for a pathways strategy. The direction of change in both Perkins and Chapter 1 funding is toward virtually the same set of principles as those guiding a comprehensive approach to youth development; together, these funding sources offer a $2-billion potential foundation for a comprehensive workforce strategy. Pathways principles are also congruent with broader trends in school reform; thus, the commitment of discretionary federal dollars and the development of school-wide strategies may increase the likelihood of additional state and local funding.

At the same time, there are a number of barriers to significant change in the schools. Like universities, schools themselves are fragmented, most obviously in the frequent disjunction between middle and secondary schools. Other barriers include:

Targeted or categorical funding: Chapter 1 funding is currently directed toward low-performing students; Carl Perkins focuses on "high concentrations of educationally and economically disadvantaged students"; transitional and social support programs are often also targeted. Although school-wide strategies offer a means to broaden program reach, redirection of current programming will of necessity focus on the disadvantaged.

Current constituencies: Chapter 1 funding is widely used to support school aides, raising the likelihood of obstacles to its redirection. Perkins redirection is already raising some resentment among academic teachers.

Inertia: Schools tend to have entrenched bureaucracies and may be more resistant than other institutions to changes of this magnitude.

Employers

The role of employers in youth development has evolved considerably over the last decade, shifting from a widespread 1980s perception that business could serve as an agent and catalyst for systemic change to the current and narrower view of employers as job providers and partners in long-term training efforts. Employers have participated in youth development initiatives that can be roughly divided into three areas:

- Individual partnerships with schools or other youth-serving institutions, where business provides mostly short-term services, such as job slots, cash contributions, or mentoring. The value of these efforts, long the most common form of business intervention, has been estimated at several hundred million dollars;
- Long-term job training efforts, such as apprenticeship programs, where employers focus on developing a training path for specific jobs; and
- Systemic reform initiatives, with employers jointly developing interventions with schools and other institutions to encourage or improve the overall provision of training and skills development.

Spurred by the great increase in individual partnership programs, the early success of efforts like the Boston Compact and its subsequent replications, and the Reagan administration's emphasis on public/private partnerships, business in the mid-to-late 1980s was often viewed, unrealistically, as an agent for systemic change. A 1987 report, however, while noting that business had significantly improved the employment prospects of disadvantaged youth participating in partnership programs, could point to few examples of business' promoting systemic change through community partnerships and little if any effect on educational reform—for example, by reducing dropout rates, refocusing curricula, or promoting other school-wide change (McMullen and Snyder, 1987). The failure to realize early expectations, along with the subsequent recession and business downsizing, have apparently diminished both the interest and the ability of business to participate in systemic change of this kind. As one National Alliance of Business (NAB) staff person noted, many employers "can't begin to sort through the issues out there...they're beaten down" (Interview, 1993).

The remaining, and perhaps growing, focus of interest for employers is in the more tangible area of jobs, apprenticeships, and training. Employers continue to provide short-term job placements through schools and youth-directed programs. Typically these have remained short-term work experience slots, created for a summer or semester and unconnected to either JTPA job training programs or school-based vocational programming.

A second area of potential interest is in longer-term job training efforts, such as co-op programming, Tech Prep, and youth apprenticeships. However, early reports indicate that employer interest in Tech Prep has been weak, and employer sponsorship of school-to-work programming is still also relatively modest. At the same time, as a NAB official noted, there have been growing indications of interest in apprenticeship efforts, an interest that may well increase with the implementation of the federal school-to-work transition policy.

Assessment

Linkage of business-sponsored placements and job training programs with federally sponsored JTPA, Chapter 1, and Perkins programming offers the potential to enhance both short- and long-term training efforts. Through redirection of JTPA and other federal funding streams, for example, a three-to-four-year pre-apprenticeship or co-op initiative could be developed, customized to employer needs, and supported by as much as $10,000 in federal subsidies of participant training costs. Similarly, shorter-term business placements could be tied to school-year training and JTPA-sponsored skills development in order to create a more extensive work preparation strategy for youth.

However, the recession and the apparent reluctance of business to participate extensively in training programs with high school youth remain as obstacles to this kind of integration. Another clear barrier is the stigma attached to JTPA and, to a lesser extent, to vocational education, which might make employers wary of such partnerships. The fragmentation of the employer community, and corporate interest in maintaining clearly identifiable programs, might also block partnership efforts.

Related Initiatives

Over the years, several initiatives have attempted to promote some degree of coordination among youth-serving institutions in order to create a connection between school and work or post-secondary education. These have included:

Tech Prep: The Tech Prep initiative, funded by the 1990 Carl Perkins Act, was designed to expand "2+2" programs—initiatives, in specific occupational areas, that link the last two years of high school with the first two years of post-secondary training in community college. The goal was to smooth this transition by better coordinating curriculum, teaching, aca-

demic credits, and work experience, with the hope of creating a common core program. Ideally, this new program would be characterized by links between faculty across institutions and a "seamless path" for enrolled students. Beyond the goal of promoting this "articulation," Tech Prep is designed as a key strategy in the larger effort to develop a skilled workforce. Tech Prep programs are intended to attract the "forgotten half," and the initiative is expected to speed development of the kind of applied, integrated, and competency-based curricula that experts see as necessary to educational reform (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992b).

The Perkins Act earmarks approximately $100 million annually as a funding base for the establishment and support of Tech Prep efforts, in addition to funds that can be used under the larger $1 billion Perkins appropriation. The Perkins Act sets as a priority that Tech Prep programs be made available to special-needs and minority students.

A study by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (1992b) of the earliest stages of Tech Prep implementation found 354 Tech Prep programs, mostly in an "embryonic" stage. These were among the key findings:

- Strong connections have developed among faculty at middle, secondary, and post-secondary institutions.
- Powerful attitudinal barriers have been exhibited by nonparticipating academic and vocational faculty.
- Connections between school personnel serving the at-risk and Tech Prep programs are, in most cases, underdeveloped.
- Programming for at-risk students is minimal, and they are not well-represented in current Tech Prep programs.

The Tech Prep program is in some ways emblematic of the larger issues facing the education and training system. Tech Prep itself is a promising initiative that has apparently attracted a good deal of support from participating institutions and faculty. However, early indications suggest that links with employers are weak. Moreover, the initiative is isolated from the system as a whole, and poorly connected to youth development programming that could potentially serve to prepare both disadvantaged and other youth for participation in this transitional program. As a bridge to the workplace, the larger potential for this initiative is apparent. JTPA IIB and IIC, as well as school-based Perkins programming, could be redirected to both prepare students for and connect them to Tech Prep programs.

Community Compacts: In 1982, the Boston Public Schools signed an agreement with business, universities, city government, and unions that promised increased opportunities for job training and higher education for Boston students in return for improved school achievement. The Compact succeeded in placing over a thousand Boston students in jobs following graduation, with surveys suggesting that 90 percent of them were still on the job or pursuing higher education six months later. The Compact has also been

credited with keeping youth unemployment rates in Boston lower than the national average, although some have suggested that this was owing to other economic factors (National Alliance of Business, 1989).

The initial success of this model in promoting enhanced employment opportunities for Boston youth prompted the National Alliance of Business to sponsor an effort to replicate the Compact in twelve cities. Replications were based on the development of coalitions linking government, school, and business representatives in each city.

Although there has been some limited success, continuing experience with both the Boston Compact and its replications suggests that these efforts have not stimulated the level of community collaboration and institutional involvement that was initially hoped for. While the Boston effort has helped improve access by public school graduates to jobs with major employers (McMullen and Snyder, 1987), and has shown that business and schools can develop linkages that go well beyond more prevalent "adopt-a-school" models, it has seemingly not led to substantial school improvement. Moreover, evaluation of both Boston and the majority of other Compact sites suggests that there has been little systemic collaboration. For the most part, institutions like JTPA, schools, and universities have not redirected resources or programs to better prepare youth for work.

One significant exception to this pattern has been in Louisville, Kentucky. There, a partnership of the school district, the JTPA provider, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Greater Louisville Economic Development Partnership has created a community strategy that incorporates a number of the critical components of a school-to-work transition strategy. Working together, the partners have created a multi-year, year-round approach beginning in grade 9, extending through grade 12, and including the following elements:

- A school-year component providing academic enrichment and vocational readiness;
- A summer jobs program offering subsidized public- or private-sector employment;
- Job development and placement beyond high school; and
- Links to developing apprenticeship programs.

The program is largely delivered through full-time career counselors based at twenty Louisville high schools. Each counselor has a caseload of approximately fifty students and is responsible for providing or ensuring social support, academic enrichment, and job placements for these students. Counselors are funded through a combination of JTPA IIC and Carl Perkins funds, while summer programming is delivered through placements subsidized by JTPA IIB funding.

Louisville is apparently rare among communities in developing a strategy to redirect vocational funding streams in order to provide longer-term and more comprehensive programming. Through linking JTPA and Perkins

funds, the effort provides many of the preparatory services required by youth, while linkage with developing apprenticeship efforts will offer a pathway beyond high school.

At the same time, the Louisville experience itself is mixed. The partnership has clearly begun to show the potential for a community-based workforce strategy, but its impact so far has mostly been programmatic rather than systemic. The strategy is still limited in that it focuses on economically disadvantaged youth only and relies primarily on additional staff, rather than broader institutional changes in schools and elsewhere, to better educate youth. So far, this effort has not stimulated institutional change in at least three important areas:

- There has been no apparent integration with Chapter 1 funding or rethinking of how these resources could be used;
- There is no link to post-secondary institutions beyond referring students to existing district outreach efforts; and
- There has been, to date, no fundamental rethinking of the role of JTPA summer programming, nor any redirection of these resources. JTPA is still seen as a provider of single-summer job experiences rather than as a multi-year preparation for work. However, there is now some discussion of this issue, and there may be some efforts in this direction this summer.

Upward Bound: Upward Bound is a federally sponsored college preparation program, initiated in 1964 and currently serving 49,000 youngsters across the country, an estimated 1 percent of the eligible population. Operated by the Department of Education, Upward Bound was funded at approximately $157 million, with per-capita participant costs of $3,500, in FY 1993. The program, targeted to low-income youngsters and those whose parents did not attend college, provides a six-to-eight-week summer-on-campus academic support program combined with school year, after-school, and Saturday programs. The program, by design, requires no tuition and includes no admission guarantees.

Upward Bound programs are operated by approximately 500 institutions—primarily colleges and universities, but also other organizations. Program size varies from 50 to 150 students. Services typically include instruction in reading, writing, study skills, math, and other subjects; cultural events; college and career counseling; and general aid in assistance and financial aid procedures.

Upward Bound students typically enter the program in the 10th grade, although some students enter in the 9th grade. Students are recruited through 3,300 feeder high schools. Although the program has no uniform entry standards, evidence suggests that participating students tend to be more motivated than comparable non-participants. A study based on Upward Bound enrollments of ten or more years ago found that the program increased reading achievement scores, educational aspirations, and the likelihood of college entrance, but had no effect on college persistence or graduation rates.

Upward Bound appears to provide an effective intervention that realizes many of the elements of a pathways design. The program is a discrete initiative, however, largely isolated from other preparatory efforts and from related federal funding streams such as Chapter 1. While it provides apparently effective services to its current participants, it is limited in size by federal funding constraints. Its most promising role within a larger pathways design may be as a model of the way resources can be redirected to create a similar kind of pathway for a population greater than the 1 percent Upward Bound now serves.

Appendix B: Local Documentation

Minneapolis—New Workforce

San Diego—Pipeline 6.16

NEW WORKFORCE: VISION AND FRAMEWORK

VISION: We are a community of business, education, and human services leaders who believe that our collective futures are inextricably tied to better preparing our youth for the workplace of tomorrow. Winning is preparing our youth to meet the economic and community challenges of their future.

MISSION: All youth in the City of Minneapolis will have, as their birthright, opportunities through education and employment at both the secondary and post-secondary levels so that they are empowered to shape their own future.

GOAL 1: To create a new community-wide strategy designed to provide Minneapolis youth a pathway to a future beyond high school.

GOAL 2: To secure the commitments necessary to prepare youth behaviorally, educationally and experientially.

PRINCIPLES: New Workforce is based on three key principles:

1) A Future Beyond High School

The demands of a changing economy increasingly require that all students advance beyond high school to one of three long-term objectives: four year college, post-secondary vocational training or preparation for career track employment.

2) Long-term, Sustained and Comprehensive Support

Effective youth development programs must start early—in middle school or before; provide continuing assistance—encompassing the school years and summers from middle school onward; and offer comprehensive services — including academic assistance, continuing adult contact and social support.

3) A Single Community Strategy

Scarce resources and need require that employers and youth-serving institutions create a common strategy for youth development. The community's potential to support a long-term, sustained and comprehensive intervention can only be realized through a single framework large enough to encompass the full range of programs—academic, vocational and social—now directed toward youth.

FRAMEWORK: New Workforce will link businesses with Minneapolis youth-serving organizations—schools, post-secondary institutions, training and social service agencies—in a single strategic plan to ready students for post secondary education and work. Working together, partners will create a framework of existing and new programs extending from sixth grade to post-secondary education, advanced training and/or career-track employment.

81 South 9th Street, Suite 200, Minneapolis, MN 55402 (612) 370-9185 fax (612) 370-9195

For students, New Workforce will offer a clear and compelling goal: post secondary education or a career track job — combined with the long term and sustained preparation required to achieve it. New Workforce will provide:

- an individualized education and career development plan.
- a comprehensive preparation effort including academic enrichment, career and occupational education, work experience and social support.
- admission and financial support for qualifying students at post-secondary institutions or entry into a career training program.

For the community, New Workforce will offer a strategic approach to workforce development based on better use of existing resources. New Workforce will provide:

- a single community strategy linking employers, colleges, community colleges, schools, training agencies and social service providers.
- creation of new programs and services, where needed, including expanded post secondary preparation and recruitment programs, employer sponsored apprenticeships and internships and improved summer and after-school activities.
- access to increased outside funding.

HOW IT WILL WORK: To create a multi-year, year-round preparation program leading to college admission or employment, employers and youth-serving institutions — colleges, schools, the Minneapolis Employment and Training Program and community agencies — would establish a common framework to which each would contribute. In general, existing public funding streams targeted to economically disadvantaged youth would be directed to support this strategy.

Post-secondary institutions will guarantee admission and appropriate need based financial aid to qualified youth who successfully participate in the New Workforce strategy. Postsecondary institutions will participate with other partners in the development of a package of early preparation programs. Participating post-secondary institutions will provide youth with a comprehensive collection of retention services.

Schools will provide all Minneapolis youth post-secondary preparation programs and direct career and occupational resources that will enable them to become work ready through the development of the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed for continued education and employment.

Employment and training providers will create a multi-summer preparation program for post-secondary education, training and career employment.

Community agencies will work with other partners to provide youth needed social support services and will serve as a link among families, schools, neighborhoods and communities.

Employers and businesses will work with other partners to develop comprehensive preparation for entry-level jobs. Employers will work with schools, post-secondary institutions and employment training providers to develop new curricula, multi-year training and skills development opportunities, including apprenticeships, summer work and internship programs, as part of a broader introduction to the workplace.

October 2, 1992

NEW WORKFORCE

GOALS AND STRATEGIES

DRAFT: 1/27/94

INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

GOAL 1

CHANGE THE WAY INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS WORK INTERNALLY AND WITH EACH OTHER TO HELP YOUTH SUCCEED.

A. Promote the responsibility of the entire community to prepare youth to succeed after high school and become self-supporting, contributing adults.

B. Promote the values of cultural diversity and equality.

C. Identify and support existing programs that are working for youth.

D. Redirect existing resources and obtain new resources to fill gaps in services to youth and their families.

E. Coordinate with existing community initiatives designed for the success of children and families. (e.g., School/Human Service Redesign Initiative, Minneapolis Initiative Against Racism, Pathways Initiative)

STUDENT PREPARATION

GOAL 2

PREPARE STUDENTS FOR GOOD JOBS AND ACCESS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION/TRAINING.

A. Develop institutional strategies to keep youth in school.

B. Emphasize academic achievement by setting high academic standards for all students and teaching in ways to insure that students can achieve them.

C. Integrate academic and career/work readiness skills.

D. Encourage students to participate in Tech Prep and preparation for youth apprenticeships.

E. Link schools with the workplace to provide exposure/experience for students, teachers, and families.

F. Link schools with post-secondary institutions to increase awareness and readiness to meet admissions standards.

G. Provide ongoing staff development to implement outcome-based education through interdisciplinary, experiential teaching and learning, and use of individual learning styles.

H. Use the experience and expertise of community-based organizations to enrich curriculum, strengthen linkages with neighborhood families and support cultural differences.

I. Develop public sector youth employment programs that provide sequential work experiences, combined with educational enrichment and exposure to post-secondary opportunities.

GOAL 3

INCREASE CAREER-ORIENTED EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND ENTRANCE INTO POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS.

A. Make opportunities after high school (e.g., employment, college, technical training, youth apprenticeship), and the standards to access them, clear to schools, students and families at early ages to encourage adequate preparation.

B. Increase employers and community involvement in Tech Prep, youth apprenticeships and youth service.

C. Increase the number of Minneapolis Public School students hired for entry-level, career-oriented employment.

D. Increase the number of students of color and low-income students from the Minneapolis Public Schools that are hired, retained and promoted.

E. Increase admissions and financial aid to students of color and low-income students from the Minneapolis Public Schools in post-secondary education and training.

F. Increase retention and transfer of students of color and low-income students from two-year to four-year post-secondary institutions.

GOAL 4

MAKE STUDENT TRANSITIONS BETWEEN GRADES, AND BETWEEN SCHOOL AND WORK SMOOTH, APPROPRIATE AND EFFECTIVE.

A. Address issues arising during transitions between schools, beginning at the end of elementary school, in areas including magnet or school choice, quality of counseling, tracking by race, gender or class, and family involvement.

B. Address issues arising during transitions from high school and post-secondary education to employment, in areas including appropriateness of choice, quality of counseling, tracking by race, gender or class, family involvement and nature of work opportunity.

GOAL 5

PROVIDE PERSONAL AND SOCIAL SUPPORT TO STUDENTS SO THEY CAN BE SUCCESSFUL AT LEARNING.

A. Encourage and support involvement by parents, families and youth in decisions that affect their lives.

B. Develop accessible, family-focused social and human services to assure that students are ready for school and successful at learning.

C. Create a mentor-rich environment that provides caring adults in every part of young people's lives, including schools, neighborhoods, agencies, religious institutions, and the workplace.

D. Provide ongoing enrichment, after-school activities and youth service opportunities through community and public agencies.

E. Develop and support community-based strategies to keep youth in school.

F. Establish policies and practices to increase the number of employees, students, seniors, and community members working with Minneapolis Public School students.

COLLABORATIVE PROCESS

GOAL 6

SUSTAIN A COMMUNITY-WIDE COLLABORATIVE PROCESS FOCUSED ON PREPARING STUDENTS TO BECOME SELF-SUPPORTING AND CONTRIBUTING ADULTS.

A. Promote continuing, cross-sector collaboration in decision-making and implementing strategies to achieve the goals of New Workforce.

B. Develop and maintain long-term commitments by individuals, institutions and sectors through ongoing community collaboration.

C. Develop and implement a comprehensive evaluation plan that adequately assesses the multiple aspects of New Workforce as a systems change initiative.

NEW WORKFORCE INITIATIVE

EVOLVING TIMELINE:

Concept Development: Sept. '92–April. '93 — New Workforce Planning Team

- Decided upon New Workforce vision, mission, sector partners, methodology, scope and demonstration schools. Held meetings with school staff. Raised funds for Community Planning Phase.

Community Planning: May–December. 1993 — Cross Sector Council

- In process of revising New Workforce vision and mission and developing background paper, policy guidelines, goals and strategies, outcomes and evaluation design. Convened planning and data-gathering meetings with partner institutions and community-based organizations.

- Providing technical assistance to help establish Pathways, the post-secondary collaboration funded by The Ford Foundation (Phase I Planning). Convene institutions to plan for grades 6–12.

- Designed school planning process; need to raise funds for School Planning Phase.

School Planning: January–August. 1994 — City-Wide Visioning Team
Demo School Teams

- Develop vision for pathway of integrated, sequential activities between grades 6–12 to prepare students for career-oriented employment and/or post-secondary education and training.

- Adapt vision to each demonstration school, with emphasis when possible, on grade 8 in Middle Schools and grade 9 in High Schools.

- Provide technical assistance to Phase II (Implementation) for Pathways; implement involvement of post-secondary institutions in planning for grades 6–12.

Implementation: Sept. '94–August. '97 — City-Wide Steering Committee
Demo School Teams

- Continued development and implement pathway of integrated, sequential activities, developed by multi-sector school teams.

RESOLUTION OF THE MINNEAPOLIS SCHOOL BOARD

IN SUPPORT OF THE NEW WORKFORCE INITIATIVE

WHEREAS, it is important to prepare youth for a transition beyond high school to college, post-secondary training and/ or career oriented employment.

WHEREAS, preparation of youth for this transition can be achieved by a long-term, sustained and comprehensive support program, providing academic assistance, work readiness, continuing adult contact and integrated social support beginning in sixth grade and extending beyond high school.

WHEREAS, the Minneapolis Youth Trust has facilitated a collaborative effort, New Workforce, to address these issues that includes representation and participation of the Minneapolis School District, business, foundations, youth, parents, community agencies, city and county governments, and post-secondary institutions.

WHEREAS, the New Workforce Initiative seeks to redirect existing resources and services to support students in successful completion of high school and in the transition to post-secondary options.

WHEREAS, several middle and high schools of the Minneapolis School District have expressed interest in beginning school-based planning for New Workforce in September.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Minneapolis School Board affirms its its commitment to support collaborative efforts focused on improving the outcomes for students of the Minneapolis Public Schools.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Minneapolis School Board supports the New Workforce Initiative, as facilitated by the Minneapolis Youth Trust, as a method for preparing youth for effective transition beyond high school

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that as a partner in the New Workforce Initiative, the Minneapolis School District will, where appropriate, commit existing resources to support the New Workforce Initiative.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Superintendent is directed to provide administrative leadership and oversee the involvement of appropriate District management and program staff, as well as that of individual demonstration schools in New Workforce planning, implementation and evaluation.

NEW WORKFORCE PLANNING TEAM

(as of *4/16/93*)

Charles Anderson, President
Augsburg College
731 21st Avenue S.
Minneapolis, MN 55454
330-1212
fax: 330-1330

John Bergford, Director
Public Affairs
Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce
81 South 9th Street, Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
370-9159
fax: 370-9195

William C. Brumfield, Director
Training and Employment Assistance
1st Level S. Gov't. Center
300 South 6th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55487
348-5203
fax: 348-3932

Dr. Mary Charles, Interim President
Minneapolis Technical College
1415 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55403
370-9400
fax: 370-9428

William H. Ellis, President & COO
Piper Jaffray Companies,Inc.
222 S.9th St.
Minneapolis, MN 55402
342-6050
fax: 342-6085

*Wallace J. Franklin, Director
Community Educational Services
Minneapolis Public Schools
807 NE Broadway
Minneapolis, MN 55413
627-2929
fax: 627-3103

Donald M. Fraser, Mayor
City of Minneapolis
331 City Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55415
673-2100
fax: 673-2305

Richard Green, Interim President
Metropolitan State University
700 East 7th Street
St. Paul, MN 55106-5000
772-7638
fax: 772-7632

Jean Greener Assoc. Director
Loring Nicollet Bethlehem Community Center
1925 Nicollet Avenue
South Minneapolis, MN 55403
871-2031
fax: 871-8121

David Gruber, Public Affairs Consultant
2 Fifth Avenue, Apt.17N
New York, NY 10011
(212) 982-1848
fax: (212)924-9055

Carole A. Gupton, Director
MPS - Dept. of Instruction
807 NE Broadway
Minneapolis, MN 55413
627-2165
fax: 627-2164

Donna Harris, Director - Dept. of Neighborhood Services
310 1/2 City Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55415
673-5701
fax: 673-2108

*Louis Hohlfeld, Director - Services & Funding
United Way Mpls. Area
404 S.8th St.
Minneapolis, MN 55404
340-7437
fax: 340-7675

Pat Kowalski, OSM
Director of Community Partnership
University of St. Thomas
52 10th Street South
Minneapolis, MN 55403
962-4520
fax: 962-4810

Dr. Sallye McKee, Assistant Professor - Educational Psychology
U of MN, Dept. of Education
249 A Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
624-2544
fax: 626-7496

Ron McKinley, Executive Director
MN Minority Ed. Partnership
Augsburg College
731 21st Avenue S.
Minneapolis, MN 55454
330-1645
fax: 330-1510

Nick Maras, Dean - Community Services
Minneapolis Community College
1501 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55403
341-7023
fax: 341-7229

Lee Ann Murphy, Executive Director
Pillsbury United Neighborhood Services, Inc.
1201 37th Avenue N.
Minneapolis, MN 55412
522-0390
fax: 522-4503

Dr. Michael Murphy, Director of Minneapolis Campus
University of St. Thomas
1000 LaSalle Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55403
962-4001
fax: 962-4125

Pam Nichols, V.P. - Human Resources
ADC Telecommunications, Inc.
4900 W.78th St.
Minneapolis, MN 55435
946-3425
fax: 946-3423

Cy Pontillo, VP - Academic Affairs
Dunwoody Institute
818 Wayzata Blvd.
Minneapolis, MN 55403
374-5800
fax: 374-5366

Harvey Rucker, Manager
MN State Board of Technical Colleges
312 Capitol Square Bldg.
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
296-7577
fax: 296-4217

Louise Sundin, President
Mpls. Federation of Teachers
1300 Plymouth Avenue N.
Minneapolis,MN 55411
529-9621
fax: 529-0539

Tom Triplett, Executive Director
MN Business Partnership
4050 IDS
Minneapolis, MN 55402
370-0840
fax: 334-3086

(OVER)

NEW WORKFORCE PLANNING TEAM *continued*
(as of *4/16/93*)

Carol B. Truesdell, Executive Director
Minneapolis Youth Trust
81 S.9th St., Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
370-9185
fax: 370-9195

Colleen Walker Burns, Director
Youth Coordinating Board
202 City Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55415
673-2060
fax: 673-2346

Kathy Ward, Program Coordinator
Minneapolis Youth Trust
81 S. 9th St. Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
370-9185
fax: 370-9195

Gary Warrington, Assistant to the Superintendent
807 NE Broadway
Minneapolis, MN 55413
627-3081
fax: 627-3095

Chip Wells, Director - Mpls. Employment & Training Program
310 1/2 City Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55415
673-2630
fax: 673-2108

Joan Wilkosz, Vocational Education - Special Projects
807 NE Broadway
Minneapolis, MN 55413
627-2141
fax: 627-3095

Michael Winer, Management Support Svcs.
Amherst H. Wilder Foundation
919 Lafond Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104
642-2031
fax: 642-2088

LIAISONS:

* Louise Thorsen, Apprenticeship Consultant
Greater Mpls. Chamber of Commerce
7810 66th St., N.
St. Paul, MN 55115
777-1783

Hugh Yamamato, Associate Dean - Educational Services
Minneapolis Community College
1501 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55403
341-7025
fax: 341-7075

* Interested in being part of the planning process, but as yet has not participated in meetings of the planning team. It is anticipated that more people will be added to this list over the next three months.

Harlan Anderson
Principal
North High School
1500 James Avenue North
Minneapolis,MN 55411
627-2778 fax: 627-3095

Elsa Batica
Director, Social Action & Community Education
YWCA
1130 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, MN 55403
332-0501, ext. 3146

Sharon Sayles Belton
Mayor
City of Minneapolis
331 City Hall
Minneapolis,MN 55415
673-2100 fax: 673-2305

Sue Bennett
3440 Northome Road
Deephaven, MN 55391
475-1254

Thomas Berg
MN Dept. of Education
Capitol Square Bldg.
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
282-6277

John Bergford
Director, Public Policy Greater Minneapolis
Chamber of Commerce
81 South 9th Street, # 200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
370-9159 fax: 370-9195

Louise Brown
Public Policy Director Family & Children's
Services of Minneapolis
414 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55404
339-9101

William C. Brumfield
Director, Training & Employment Assistance
1st Level South Gov't. Ctr.
300 South 6th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55487
348-5203 fax: 348-3932

Colleen Bums
Executive Director
Youth Coordinating Board
202 City Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55415
673-2060 fax: 673-2346

Jim Cook
Executive Director
Sabathani Community Center
310 East 38th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55409
827-5981

Belinda Davis
Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board
310 4th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55415
661-4875

Nancy Devitt
Senior Planner
Hennepin County Office of Planning & Development
300 South 6th Street A-2308
Minneapolis, MN 55487
348-5109

William H. Ellis
President & COO
Piper Jaffray Companies Inc.
222 South 9th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
342-6050 fax: 342-6085

Marion Etzwiler
President
The Minneapolis Foundation
500 Foshay Tower
821 Marquette Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55402
339-7343 fax: 672-3846

Donald M. Fraser
821 SE 7th Street
Minneapolis,MN 55414

Paul Gaston
Chairman and CEO
Premier EDS Corporation of St. Paul
4500 Park Glen Road, #120
Minneapolis, MN 55416
926-4241 fax: 922-3010

Tonia Hannah
3724 3rd Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55409
823-2722

Donna Harris
Director, Department of Neighborhood Services
310 1/2 City Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55415
673-5701 fax: 673-2108

Garry Hesser
Professor of Sociology
Director, Experiential Education
Augsburg College
731 21st Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55454
330-1664 fax: 330-1649

Louis Hohlfeld
Program Officer
The McKnight Foundation
600 TCF Tower
121 South 9th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
333-4220

Pat Hoven
Director Community & Government. Affairs
Honeywell, Inc.
Honeywell Plaza
MN 12-5259
PO Box 524
Minneapolis, MN 55440
951-0430 fax: 951-0433

Peter Hutchinson
Superintendent
Minneapolis Public Schools
807 NE Broadway
Minneapolis,MN 55413
627-2010 fax: 627-2005

Louis King
Executive Director
Two Or More
PO Box 8495
Minneapolis, MN 55408
827-0488

Marge Kostouros
Volunteer Services/Family Partnerships
Minneapolis Public Schools
807 NE Broadway
Minneapolis,MN 55413
627-2242(w)/824-5991 (h)

Larry Lucio
Principal
Northeast Middle School
2955 NE Hayes
Minneapolis, MN 55418
627-3042 fax: 627-3100

Ron McKinley
Executive Director
MN Minority Education Partnership
Augsburg College
731 21st Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55454
330-1645 fax: 330-1510

Pam Nichols
VP Human Resources
ADC Telecommunications, Inc.
4900 West 78th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55435
946-3425 fax: 946-3423

Jane Plihal
Associate Professor, Home Economics & Education
University of Minnesota
325 VoTech Building
1954 Buford Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
624-3069

Nathalie Pyle
Learning Readiness Associate
United Way of Mpls. Area
404 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55404
340-7550 fax: 340-7629

Gary Reierson
Executive Director
Greater Minneapolis Council Of Churches
122 West Franklin. Rm. 218
Minneapolis, MN 55404
870-3660

Harvey Rucker
Special Projects
MN Technical College Sytem
4728 Portland Avenue
South Minneapolis, MN 55407
822-1383

Rebecca Saito
Research Associate
Search Institute
700 South 3rd Street, # 210
Minneapolis, MN 55415
376-8955 fax: 376-8956

Louise Sundin
President
Minneapolis Federation of Teachers
1300 Plymouth Avenue
N Minneapolis,MN 55411
529-9621 fax: 529-0539

Tom Triplett
Executive Director
MN Business Partnership
4050 IDS
Minneapolis, MN 55402
370-0840 fax: 334-3086

Ray Waldron
President MN State Building & Construction Trades Council
312 Central Avenue, #556
Minneapolis, MN 55414
379-7046 fax: 379-4479

Gary Warrington
Director - Special Students Support Services
Minneapolis Public Schools
807 NE Broadway
Minneapolis, MN 55413
627-3081 fax: 627-3095

Chip Wells
Director - Mpls. Employment & Training Program
310 1/2 City Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55415
673-2630 fax: 673-2108

Lee Pao Xiong
Executive Director
Hmong American Partnership
405 N. Syndicate, #35
St. Paul, MN 55104
642-9601

Hugh Yamamoto
Associate Dean, Educational Services
Minneapolis Community College
1501 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55403
341-7025 fax: 341-7075

CONSULTANTS/STAFF:

David Gruber
Public Affairs Consultant
2 5th Avenue, Apt. 17N
New York, NY 10011
(212) 982-1848
fax: (212) 924-9055

Kathleen McKown
Project Director
Minneapolis Youth Trust
81 South 9th Street, # 200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
370-9185 fax: 380-9195

Carol B. Truesdell
Executive Director
Minneapolis Youth Trust
81 South 9th Street, #200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
370-9185 fax: 370-9195

Kathy Ward
Program Coordinator
Minneapolis Youth Trust
81 South 9th Street, #200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
370-9185 fax: 370-9195

Michael Winer
Synoptics
480 Desnoyer
St. Paul, MN 55104
659-0900

San Diego City Schools
School Services Division Area V
PARTNERSHIPS IN EDUCATION

PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT
1993–94

"PIPELINE 6.16"

To promote understanding and cooperation among different institutions of public education, the business community, and other private sector advocates for effective education...
San Diego State University [SDSU], San Diego City Schools [SDCS], San Diego City College [SDCC], and the San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council [PIC], through the leadership of SDSU's office of Educational Opportunity/Ethnic Affairs and the SDCS's School-to-Work Transition Team, with support from community organizations, *hereby agree to enter into a partnership in education.*

Mission

The intent of this partnership is to provide mutual assistance and benefit through shared time and resources. The partners agree that it will be their mission to challenge students with a clear and compelling goal beyond high school—higher education, post-secondary training, and/or work—and to provide the sustained and comprehensive preparation needed to achieve these outcomes.

More specifically, it will be the partners' mission...

- to work with middle schools, junior high schools, high schools, community colleges, and four-year institutions, and business and industry to create a pipeline from elementary school to productive adulthood for economically and educationally disadvantaged students;
- to increase the quality and effectiveness of instruction for disadvantaged students in the San Diego City Schools;
- to assist schools with restructuring, development of special programs, and staff development directed at making teachers effective student advocates;
- to enhance the existing Summer Training and Education Program [STEP] to include expanded school-year activities, coordinated an linked with other partnership classes and activities.

The partners further agree that...

- the partnership will develop and implement intensive programs for disadvantaged students, working close the gap between these students and their more successful classmates, providing intellectual, personal, social and cultural growth activities, and helping students prepare for highly skilled employment and citizenship;
- the long-term goal is to provide disadvantaged students with a pathway through high school to community college, a four-year college, or highly skilled employment. For example, SDSU personnel will assist qualified "Pipeline" alumni in the admissions process and application for student aid. In general, advising, specially designed programs, and classes will work to ensure that these students have opportunities to choose and pursue life-goals through the sixteenth grade, would work to ensure students' success in higher education and employment;
- during academic year 1993–1994, the partners, along with business and industry, will continue to engage in intensive planning, solicitation of funding, experimentation with programs on a limited scale, and research. During this continued planning year, the partners will develop program models in meetings of the schools with the Executive Planning Committee.

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of our partnership will be measured by...

- continuation of the Advisory Board to monitor the partnership's progress and effectiveness; the Advisory Board will help to form and administer policies and guarantee the partnership's compliance with SDCS policies and legal requirements;
- compliance with a partnership timeline, including timely completion of partnership activities, curriculum development projects, appropriate reports to the institutions involved; the community, and professional organizations and publications;
- regular evaluations of classroom activities and special events; these evaluations will solicit response from students, parents, teachers, and personnel involved in the partnership;
- completion of an end-of-year partnership evaluation form distributed by the Partnerships in Education Office, SDCS.

Activities

Cooperation and collaboration among the partners will include, but will not be limited to, curriculum development, staff development and in-service training, cross-age mentoring, special activities for students of the SDSU and SDCC campuses, and development of long-term support programs for students. Support will include both summer programs and special services during the academic year.

In order to develop models for effective service, the partners have identified four culturally diverse junior high or middle schools, and three high schools located throughout San Diego but all characterized at "the educational centers of their communities." The partners agree to work with "site-based management teams" at these schools, developing models for effective service to academically challenged students; and the partners agree to provide economic and personnel resources for implementation of the provisions in these models.

The partners are committed to responding to individual schools' assessments of their special needs, and to collaborating in development of innovative strategies for overcoming the obstacles to exemplary instruction.

The partners have agreed that they will work with SDCS's School-to-Work Transition Team, and business and industry to develop curriculum, school programs, and activities to prepare students for effective participation in the workforce. As the partners develop models and designs for these special programs, they have agreed to enlist technical assistance and support from agencies, such as Public/Private Ventures, a national non-profit research and development organization focused on service to disadvantaged youth. The partners also will solicit and apply for external funding for these programs: educational grants, grants and endowments from private industry, and contributions and sponsorships from community organizations.

The following partnership activities are planned:

Working with the middle, junior high, and high schools, the partners will work to develop and implement models of effective instruction for academically challenged students. These models may include...

- "blocks" or "houses" for junior high school students, built around special, fully-integrated math/science and English/social studies curricula, and complemented by personal growth and career exploration programs, developed in concert with school counselors and psychologists;
- summer "bridge" programs to help students with transitions from elementary school to junior high, from middle/junior high to high school, and from high school to work and/or post-secondary education; these summer programs would be coordinated with on-going efforts such as STEP;
- creation of a Summer Institute, a series of monthly retreats, and a peer support network for teachers, allowing time for reflection and planning, and creating opportunities for specialized staff development;

• tutoring and mentoring programs designed to reduce the faculty/student ratio in overcrowded classrooms, and supported by extensive training for the mentors and tutors;

• "learning on location" activities at SDSU, SDCC, and in the community;

• to educate students about technology, helping them become proficient with computers, educational software, and other technologies widely used both in schools and the workplace;

• parent education programs and parents' institutes, designed to foster truly effective collaboration among parents, teachers, and students; these programs may "take the school into the community;" they may involve creative use of cable television, and they may derive from on-going initiatives in community organizations;

• "articulation" activities among the junior high and high schools, the community colleges, the California State University and University of California, and business and industry; these activities would be devoted to generating a paradigm of "the ideally prepared student," and to subsequent exploration;

• other innovations and special activities, which individual schools regard as especially appropriate for serving the needs of their communities and fostering the success of their students.

Recognition and Reciprocity

• Representatives from the partner institutions will regularly visit the partner schools, working closely with students, teachers, counselors, and administrators.

• The partners will work with local media to publicize and promote the partnerships' activities and accomplishments.

As partners in education, we pledge our commitment to achieving the mission and goals outlined in this document.

San Diego State University	San Diego City College
San Diego City Schools	San Diego Consortium/ Private Industry Council
Drew Schlosberg	

February 10, 1994

PIPELINE 6.16
Planning Framework

	Middle/ Junior High School		High School		Higher Education High-Tech Training Employment
	12–13	13–16	16–18	18–-	ADULT
	middle/ junior high transition	middle/ junior high transition	preparation for high education/ technical training	early-adult transition	continuing education
CAREER EXPLORATION AND CONNECTION	*seventh grade careers class*		*STEP PROJECTS— three summers, sequential*	*BRIDGE TO FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE*	
ACADEMIC PREPARATION	*sixth grade orientation and transition program*	*BRIDGE TO HIGH SCHOOL*	*STEP PROJECTS— year-round, integrated academics and work experience*	*BRIDGE TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE*	
WORLD OF WORK PREPARATION				*High-Tech Apprenticeship Programs*	
SOCIAL SUPPORT/ LIFE SKILLS	*student grouping in houses and block scheduling for special support*				

SCHOOL-TO-WORK

- ☐ *School-to-Work Toolkit: Building a Local Program* (1994) **$149.00 each; 5–24 copies $130.00 each; 25–49 $115.00 each; 50 or more $100.00 each**
- ☐ *Newsletter: Student Apprenticeship News* (4 issues per year) **$60.00**
- ☐ *Learning That Works: A School-to-Work Briefing Book* (1993) **$35.00, multiple copies: $20.00**
- ☐ *Learning Through Work: Designing and Implementing Quality Worksite Learning for High School Students* (1994) **$12.00**
- ☐ *Improving the Transition from School to Work in the United States* (1993) **$5.00**
- ☐ *Steps to Creating a School-to-Work Program: A General Guide for Program Design and Implementation* (1993) **$10.00**
- ☐ *From High School to High-Skilled Health Careers: New Models of Work-and-Learning in Health Care* (1992) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Building A National System For School-to-Work Transition: Lessons From Britain and Australia* (1991) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Youth Apprenticeship, American Style: A Strategy for Expanding School and Career Opportunities* (1991) **$10.00**
- ☐ *School-to-Work Transition: Reaching for Scale in Big Cities* (1993) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Union Perspectives on New Work-based Youth Apprenticeship Initiatives* (1992) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Effective Professional Development: A Guide for Youth Apprenticeship and Work-based Learning Programs* (1992) **$5.00**
- ☐ *Improving the School-to-Work Transition: A Chicago Perspective* (1993) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Wisconsin Focuses on Career Guidance: Focus Group Discussions on School-to-Work and Career Counseling* (1993) **$5.00**
- ☐ *Voices from School and Home: Wisconsin Parents and Students Focus on Youth Apprenticeship* (1992, **$5.00**
- ☐ *Pennsylvania Youth Apprenticeship Program: A Historical Account From its Origins to September 1991* (1991) **$5.00**
- ☐ *Voices from School and Home: Pennsylvania Students and Parents Talk About Preparing for the World of Work and a Youth Apprenticeship Program* (1990) **$5.00**
- ☐ *A Feasibility Study of Youth Apprenticeship in Arkansas* (1991) **$5.00**
- ☐ *Voices from School and Home: Arkansas Parents and Students Talk about Preparing for the World of Work and the Potential for Youth Apprenticeship* (1991) **$5.00**

ECONOMIC & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

- ☐ *Toward a Seamless System for Youth Development: A New Strategy for Integrating Resources, Programs, and Institutions* (1994) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Skills Assessment, Job Placement, and Training: What Can Be Learned From the Temporary Help/Staffing Industry* (1994) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Skill Standards and Skill Formation: Cross-National Perspectives on Alternative Training Strategies* (1994) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Strategies for High Performance Work and Learning In Small- and Medium-sized Firms* (1993) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Work Organization, High Skills, and Public Policy: Report of a Conference* (1993) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Economic Change and the American Workforce: A Report for the U.S. Department of Labor* (1992) **$5.00**
- ☐ *New Training Strategies for a High Performance Metalworking Industry* (1991) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Raising Workforce Issues on the Public Agenda: An Issues Brief* (1994) **$5.00**
- ☐ *Pioneers of Progress: Policy Entrepreneurs and Community Development, Volume I* (1991) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Pioneers of Progress: The Network of Pioneer Organizations, Volume II* (1991) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Closing the Gap: Meeting The Small Business Training Challenge in Connecticut* (1989) **$10.00**
- ☐ *The Bridgeport Initiative: The Lessons of One Community's Pioneering Attempt to Move the Poor from Welfare to Work* (1991) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Voices From Across America: A Series of Focus Groups on the Economy From Colorado, Indiana, Missouri & Mississippi* (1989–1990) **$10.00**

Arkansas:
- ☐ *Jobs for Arkansas' Future* (1986) **$5.00**

Colorado:
- ☐ *A Call to Action* (1990) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Education & Training in the Colorado Economy* (1990) **$5.00**
- ☐ *Developing a Competitive Workforce in Colorado: A Community Workbook* (1990) **$10.00**

Connecticut:
- ☐ *Jobs for Connecticut's Future* (1986) **$5.00**

Indiana:
- ☐ *Executive Report of the Jobs for Indiana's Future Program* (1989) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Education & Training in the Indiana Economy* (1989) **$5.00**

Mississippi:
- ☐ *Seizing the Future: A Commitment to Competitiveness* (final report of the Mississippi Special Task Force on Economic Development Planning, 1989) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Globally Competitive People* (report to the Human Resource Committee, Mississippi SpecialTask Force on Economic Development Planning, 1989) **$5.00**
- ☐ *Report on the Mississippi Employer Survey* (1989) **$5.00**

Missouri:
- ☐ *The Missouri Challenge* (1991) **$10.00**
- ☐ *Education & Training in the Missouri Economy* (1991) **$5.00**

J • F • F
JOBS FOR THE FUTURE

PRODUCTS ORDER FORM

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM AND SEND IT TO:

JOBS FOR THE FUTURE, INC.
1 Bowdoin Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02114
617 742-5995 Fax: 617 742-5767

All orders must be accompanied by payment.
Please make check payable to Jobs for the Future, Inc.

QUANTITY:	TITLE:	COST:

SUBTOTAL: _____

Add $3.50 for postage if ordering more than three publications **SHIPPING:** _____

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED: _____

PLEASE SHIP TO:

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Organization

_____
Address

_____
City *State* *Zip Code*

_____
Telephone

JOBS FOR THE FUTURE
1 Bowdoin Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02114