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Good afternoon, Councilmember Silverman and members of the Committee on Labor and Workforce Development. I am Kathy Patterson, the District of Columbia Auditor. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to be here today to discuss the work my office has done on the Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Program (MBSYEP) over the past two years. I hope that this work will assist the Committee in its ongoing oversight of this important program and also inform your deliberations on Bill 22-54, the “Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Expansion Act of 2017” and Bill 22-111, the “Safe Way Home Act of 2017.”

As you know, Madam Chair, this body of work on the summer youth program started with an amendment that you proposed – and the Council adopted – to the fiscal year 2016 Budget Support Act. Specifically, the Council directed the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor (ODCA) “to conduct an evaluation of multiple years of the summer youth jobs program to assess whether the program has met and is meeting program objectives,” and provided us with funding to carry out this directive.

I am joined today by Jason Juffras, our program evaluation director who oversaw this work, and Ron Gaskins, whom we hired as a contract auditor based on his own extensive experience in D.C. government, including having served as the agency financial officer at the Department of Employment Services.

Evaluating the summer youth program is a complex task because the program has a broad set of objectives. As stated by the Department of Employment Services, the summer youth program seeks to give youths the opportunity to (1) earn money and gain meaningful work experience, (2) learn and develop the skills, attitudes, and commitment needed to succeed in the workforce, (3) explore career options, and (4) interact with professionals in a supportive work environment. To ensure that our evaluation work captures the program’s complexity, we examined the program from a number of different angles, looking intensively at program data and management and operations, while also studying summer youth employment programs nationwide to learn about what we are doing well and where we could do better. The products of this work were four separate reports released over the past year, and I will briefly summarize the key points from each report.

On April 21, 2016, we released a Review of Summer Youth Employment Programs in Eight Major Cities and the District of Columbia, which noted that the District’s program is far larger, per capita, than other programs, but that other city programs draw to a larger extent on non-local government resources, including private grants and unsubsidized private sector jobs or work experience. I describe some of the innovative approaches later in my testimony.

Our Review of Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Program Data and Activities released June 2, 2016, summarized the 2015 program with special attention to the experiences of older youths, ages 22 to 24, and one of our recommendations was that DOES improve its tracking of the employment outcomes for these youths. I will come back to that issue shortly.
In December we published the report, *Site Visit Observations: 2016 Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Program* which summarized the observations of ODCA teams that visited 13 sites offering work readiness training or work experience in diverse settings (public, non-profit, private for-profit). We found considerable variation in staffing and supervision, worksite activities, and youth engagement. At some sites, youths were engaged in enriching activities under the guidance of attentive adults, while at other sites, some of the youths were disengaged and the activities were less structured.

Some of the problems we observed may reflect the program’s broad scope. Providing enriching activities to 13,000 young people at approximately 500 sites is a major undertaking, and site supervisors were sometimes stretched too thin to guide and engage all of the youths under their care. In addition, administrative glitches, often pertaining to youths’ assignments or compensation, diverted the resources and attention of both DOES staff and site supervisors.

Because many MBSYEP sites, particularly for 14- and 15-year-olds, offer classroom-based instruction, we recommended that DOES, DCPS, and the public charter schools continue to develop summer youth activities that combine work readiness activities with academic skills development, which may also help to address the problem of summer learning loss.

Finally, on March 21 we released our final report, *Internal Control Weaknesses Found in Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Program*, which concluded that despite its long history and significant funding, the summer 2016 program appeared ad hoc, with very limited planning, and numerous shortcomings that created a risk of waste, fraud and abuse. We found $43,000 worth of SmarTrip cards unaccounted for, confirmed that some youths were paid at higher than authorized wage rates, and established the lack of an audit trail in DOES information systems. I have included at the end of my testimony the executive summary from each report (but not the letter report summarized above) and am happy to answer questions on our findings and recommendations.

I would now like to turn to specific comments on the two bills before the Committee.

**The Safe Way Home Act of 2017**

Bill 22-111, the Safe Way Home Act of 2017, appears designed, in part, to use District-funded job training programs as a means to reduce violent crime. While this is not an issue we addressed directly in our four MBSYEP reports, there is information in our 8-city comparison that might be useful. Several of the cities we reviewed have innovative programs or policies that target youths at risk which might be usefully adapted by MBSYEP.

The best example is Chicago’s One Summer Chicago Plus program, which connects youths who are identified to be at risk for involvement in violence with a 20-hour per week summer job, a mentor, and training in civic leadership, decision making, and job readiness. This program targets youths aged 16 to 19 enrolled in public high schools located in high-crime areas who have missed six to eight weeks of school or have been involved in the juvenile justice system.
Chicago served 1,880 youths in One Summer Chicago Plus in 2015 and planned to expand to 3,000 youths last year based largely on a two-year, $10 million grant from Inner City Youth Empowerment, LLC, formed by Earvin “Magic” Johnson, and Mark and Kimbra Walter. In 2015, 697 participating youths were assigned to a public works maintenance program in which they painted more than 300 viaducts and infrastructure locations, including boarded-up houses. A randomized, controlled study by the University of Chicago’s Crime Lab and the University of Pennsylvania found that youths who participated in the program experienced a 43 percent reduction in violent-crime arrests over a 16-month period. The study also found “suggestive evidence” that arrests fell by a larger percentage among youths at a higher risk of violence.

The MBSYEP Permanent Expansion Amendment Act of 2017

Serving Older Youths

Bill 22-54, introduced at the request of the Mayor, would permanently include youths up to age 24 in the summer program, an option that began in 2015 and is authorized to continue this summer. Our comparison with programs in other cities found that six of the eight other large cities were serving youths up to age 24: Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York City, Seattle and San Francisco. In most instances the proportion participating is much lower than that of other age groups. Federal funding incentives in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 encouraged programs to expand to serve older youths, and some programs like the one in New York City opted to continue the program after the federal stimulus funding ended.

The Mayor’s letter submitting the bill states that 844 such older youths participated in the summer of 2015. Of the first class, 174 returned to school in August 2015 and 37% seeking employment secured jobs, surpassing the agreed upon 35 percent benchmark, according to the letter. Our review found this claim to be problematic, and DOES has yet to publish comparable findings from the 2016 program, although a report on the 2016 program was due on February 1.

A year ago DOES reported that 247 of the 2015 participants in the 22 to 24 age group were placed in jobs by December 31, 2015. We found, however, that these placements included 32 applicants who already had the jobs when they began the summer 2015 program. Another 13 listed employment start dates in 2014 or earlier, and 19 indicated they gained employment between January and June 2015. In addition, according to agency officials, the data was entirely self-reported by participants and not verified further by the agency.

As a result of our review, we recommended that DOES work more closely with employers to track the employment outcomes of program participants, including those in the 22 to 24 age group. If gaining non-subsidized employment remains the goal of the program for youths 22 to 24, we recommend that such information be carefully tracked and documented. We would also encourage you to consider the issue of eligibility for 22- to 24-year-olds within the broader context of other potential expenditures. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer estimated that serving 1,500 participants between 22 and 24 years of age would cost $3.4 million in Fiscal Year 2018. With funding flexibility, is this the best programmatic option to help ensure gainful
employment for those in this age group, or are there other potential investments, such as expanded offerings at the community college, or other DOES initiatives?

**Varying Program Wage Rates**

The legislation would provide greater statutory flexibility in wage rates, and create a floor of $5.25 per hour for youths aged 14 and 15; $8.25 per hour for youths aged 16 to 21 and the District’s minimum wage (now $11.50 and set to rise to $15 by 2020) for those aged 22 to 24. It also would stipulate that program youths who serve in supervisory positions regardless of age would be paid at least the minimum wage.

An overall finding from our work is that some youths were paid outside the current statutory limits and we documented several instances of this in the March 21 report. For example, more than 150 youths aged 14 to 15 assigned to the Youth Leadership Institute were paid $8.25 an hour rather than the lower limit established for the age group by D.C. law. A handful of youths with summer positions at the Department of Insurance, Securities and Banking were paid $14 and $15 an hour, also well outside the statutory limits for their age groups. The bill before you would essentially make legal in the future the wage violations we documented in our reports.

Madam Chair, the MBSYEP wage rates clearly are a policy decision for your consideration. At the same time, our work suggests that the potential for disparate treatment among participating youths could be increased with the significantly greater flexibility on wages. In addition, potentially arbitrary decisions on an individual’s payment rate have been exacerbated by the lack of controls within the DOES information systems. Earlier audits of the program found instances where non-employees were able to access the information systems and make changes to individual files. And the lack of an audit trail — which documents who made what change and when in the system — was a major concern in our report. The Department contends that they have implemented database auditing to address this concern, and in our ongoing compliance reporting we will seek to document that claim, which would be a very positive step.

**Extending Program Length**

Again, the legislation would permit additional flexibility for some youths to participate beyond the 6-week program timeframe and this also would authorize practices that we documented as violations of current law. In both 2015 and 2016, we found individuals who were paid beyond the 6-week program limit. DOES officials explained that the youths were being “transitioned” to other DOES programs, indicating that they were fully aware of the actions that were in violation of current statutory limits.

**Setting Registration Deadlines**

In the report released two weeks ago we faulted DOES for failing to adhere to deadlines for youths to sign up for the program, which are statutory. The legislation would remove the statutory provisions outlining registration dates and leave it to the Mayor to set program dates each year. We noted in our report that “operational matters may be more appropriately addressed by program administrators rather than being required by law.” Also in the March 21
report, we faulted DOES for failing to engage in serious advance planning, including committing program policies and plans to paper. The Committee may wish to consider requiring the agency to submit a comprehensive plan for a summer’s program including registration deadlines by a time certain each year, after which the agency can be held accountable to its own designated timeframe for meeting program benchmarks.

In this vein, you may want to review Section 32-243 of the D.C. Code, “Development of plans for the delivery of workforce development services.” This section outlines a requirement that the Mayor develop plans for the summer jobs program including a review of the previous year’s program and what worked and what did not work, and other outcome measures. While the provision reads as if it is something required on an annual basis, by the letter of the law it is a one-time plan that was due 120 days from September 24, 2010. This may be a provision that you can build on if you do choose to require an annual program plan with registration and other dates.

**Best Practices – Role of the Private Sector**

In addition to commenting on the legislation, the Committee asked that ODCA cover best practices in summer employment programs based on our research, and particularly the findings from our eight-city review. We found that, generally speaking, other programs have more coordination with private sector employers than does the District’s summer program in terms of job training, job placement, and corporate funding.

Three of the cities we studied – Baltimore, Los Angeles, and New York City – established specialized programs to help older youths (often near the age of high school graduation) obtain private-sector positions that could lead to full-time employment. Although these programs are generally small and involve a competitive application process, they may offer a valuable option for youths to gain a permanent foothold in the labor market.

- **Baltimore’s “Hire One Youth” program** was created in 2012 as a partnership between the Greater Baltimore Committee (a business group) and the Mayor’s office. As the name of the program would suggest, businesses are asked to hire at least one youth 16 to 21 who is “responsible, motivated, and engaged.” Businesses interview applicants and make hiring decisions based on the interviews. The youths are pre-screened for skills and interests and must complete six hours of job readiness training and prepare a resume before they can be referred to participating employers for an interview. In 2015, 180 private-sector employers hosted approximately 500 youths through Hire One Youth. Among the participating employers are the Johns Hopkins Health System and Johns Hopkins University, which have hired 200 youths in past summers.

- The “L.A. Youth at Work” (LAYAW) program in Los Angeles seeks to help youths aged 16 to 24 gain entry-level employment. Administered by the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce and UNITE-LA, a non-profit that specializes in business-education partnerships, LAYAW awards a work readiness certificate to young people who undergo a job skills workshop (which includes resume writing) and perform well in a practice
interview. Described as a “stepping stone to future high-skill, high-wage employment,” the initiative has offered approximately 2,000 summer youth employment positions annually with companies including Vons/Safeway, The Gas Company, JPMorgan Chase, AT&T, Cedars Sinai, Kaiser Permanente, Carl’s Jr., UPS, Pacific Parks, Levi’s, Adidas, and McDonald’s.

- New York’s Ladders for Leaders offers high school and college students summer internships in the private and public sectors that may lead to permanent employment. Like the Baltimore initiative, Ladders for Leaders is a competitive program. Youths interview with employers and receive pre-employment training before reporting to a work site. A report on New York City’s 2015 summer youth employment program states that 35 percent of Ladders for Leaders participants received an offer of employment at the end of the program.

The D.C. Chamber of Commerce sponsored a private-sector placement effort, similar in many respects to the programs described above, for as many as 250 summer youth participants each year, from 2006 to 2009. Youths aged 17 or older were screened by the Chamber and placed in a week of work readiness training before being assigned to a summer employer. Officials in other cities who were interviewed for this report emphasized that private-sector employers will be reluctant to grant opportunities to youths without the screening and training that a private-sector partner can provide. D.C. policymakers could seek to re-establish a similar program in order to help youths who are ready to seek full-time employment find private-sector positions with good wages and prospects for career growth.

More than half of the District’s MBSYEP placements are with District government agencies and in 2015, another 37 percent were with private non-profit organizations. Private, for-profit firms provided just 10 percent of that summer’s positions. Today the District has a significant private-sector employment base. Our report mentioned that in November 2015, the professional, business, and other services sector accounted for 239,800 District jobs, more than the federal and local governments combined. Other large sectors of the District’s employment base include health care (71,300 jobs) and leisure and hospitality (69,900 jobs). Developing a private-sector component of MBSYEP could help young people begin career paths in these industries.

Coordination with private sector employers can also serve as a strategy for diversifying funding and relieving pressure on local funds. The Los Angeles summer jobs program received 41 percent of its funding from federal and private sources. New York City received 29 percent of funding from federal and private sources. The District’s program reports just one percent of funding from non-District sources.

Coordination with the private sector in other cities has helped place some participants in unsubsidized summer positions, something the District has done in the past. But the number of unsubsidized positions — reported at 1,726 in 1999 — declined until there are none today. Employers who participate in the Baltimore “Hire One Youth” program pay the participants’
wages. Boston’s Private Industry Council placed 3,310 youths in unsubsidized jobs in 2015—more than a third of those participating that summer. Participants in New York City’s Ladders for Leaders program receive unsubsidized employment from private firms and government agencies.

Other examples of programs with stronger coordination with private sector employers include:

- Detroit’s summer youth employment program, Grow Detroit’s Young Talent, raised nearly $7 million in external funding for its 2015 program from the following sources: The Skillman Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Bank of America Charitable Foundation, DTE Energy Foundation, JPMorgan Chase Foundation, Marjorie S. Fisher Fund, Fifth Third Bank, the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, the Wayne Metropolitan Community Action Agency, and the Detroit Wayne Mental Health Authority.

- Los Angeles’ summer youth employment program expended private grant funding from the Citi Foundation, AT&T, and Bank of America for its summer 2015 program. Los Angeles generated $713,000 in total private funding for 2015 and has in prior years also received funding from the Disney Corporation.

- San Francisco’s Youth Jobs+ program cited private-sector contributions totaling $542,000 in 2015, including donations by JPMorgan Chase, the Walter S. Johnson Foundation, the Stupski Foundation, Starbucks, Bank of America, Enterprise, Sunset Development, Prologis, SMG Moscone, and Ernst & Young.

- Seattle’s summer youth employment program received $855,000 in private-sector contributions in 2015, including donations from JPMorgan Chase, Russell Investments, and Russell Wilson’s Why Not You Foundation.

A key factor that may enable other cities to generate more private donations to support their summer youth employment programs is the presence of a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization to accept the contributions.

**Ongoing Evaluation**

I mentioned the Chicago program that serves as a violence-prevention initiative which is noteworthy in part because it has been evaluated in a randomized control trial and found to have produced desirable outcomes. In the FY 2011 Budget Support Act of 2010 the Council adopted an amendment to the Youth Employment Act of 1979 to require an annual evaluation of the District’s summer youth employment program to be conducted by an independent contractor and according to “nationally accepted standards.” It is required to include “a sense of progress as it relates to job readiness and specific work skills gained by participating youths” and estimates of the proportion of youths engaged in work experience, academic and youth enrichment. The Department did not contract for and produce an evaluation for the 2015
program, and contracted for an evaluation of the 2016 program one week prior to the end of
the program.

The department shared evaluation reports covering the years 2010 through 2014 but only the
2010 evaluation, conducted by researchers at Brandeis University’s Heller School for Social
Policy and Management, could be considered independent. The evaluations submitted for
2011 through 2014 were prepared in whole or in part by the Children and Youth Investment
Trust Corporation, a non-profit established by the D.C. government that helped administered
the summer youth employment program in those years. In addition, the 2012 and 2013
evaluations pertained to the One City Summer Initiative, an umbrella program covering
recreation, food, summer school, and other services in addition to the summer youth
employment program. The 2012 and 2013 evaluations included only brief descriptions of the
summer youth employment program and cannot qualify as program evaluations. The 2015
evaluation was prepared by DOES. I include as an attachment to this testimony a chart
prepared by ODCA staff that describes the shortcomings of the evaluations.

One concern reflected in our March 21 report was the failure of DOES to comply with statutory
requirements, but the underlying programmatic issue is that evaluation is a means to improve
the program itself. The current administration did not conduct the independent evaluation
required by law and thereby lost an opportunity for program improvement. In his response to
our draft report DOES Acting Director Odie Donald said the agency would contract for a 2017
evaluation timely -- that is, by June 1, so that the evaluation can include a pre-program survey.
You may want to ask him about the status of that procurement.

I would also note that: the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) based in
New York is completing an extensive evaluation of New York City’s summer jobs program and
its labor market and academic impact, from 2005 through 2015 and following more than
400,000 individuals. The study is effectively a randomized trial based on the program’s own
lottery structure and it will provide valuable information for District and national policymakers.
MDRC is conducting the multi-year evaluation on contract with the Department of Labor. One
specific value the MDRC study may have for this committee would be to provide guidance on
the kinds of measurements that could be required on an ongoing basis. Because the current
evaluation language in the code is not as specific as it could be, you might consider a revision,
using what can be learned from the MDRC study as a guide.

That concludes my prepared testimony, Madam Chair, and I would be happy to discuss any of
the other elements of the proposed legislation or answer any other questions.
April 21, 2016

Review of Summer Youth Employment Programs in Eight Major Cities and the District of Columbia

What ODCA Found

The Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Program (MBSYEP) is notable for its broad scope, serving more youth per capita than any of the eight other cities included in this study and reflecting D.C. leaders’ commitment to the program. Due to MBSYEP’s broad scope (more than 13,000 young people enrolled in 2015), the program has a larger budget than similar programs in other cities. Other cities draw more on non-local resources, including federal and private grants as well as in-kind support, to support their programs to a greater extent than the District does.

MBSYEP’s program structure (length of program, hours worked per week, and wage rates) is similar to that of summer youth employment programs in other cities, but some cities have more diversified program options both for job-ready youth and youth who are at high risk because they live in high-crime neighborhoods, are in foster care, or face other challenges. Six of the eight cities studied include young people up to the age of 24 in their summer youth employment programs, as the District did in 2015 and will do again in 2016 and 2017. Four of the eight cities studied limited participation in their summer youth programs to youth who are low-income or face other types of disadvantage, as defined by the federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

Several of the eight cities studied in this report also benefited from more extensive private-sector involvement in their summer youth employment programs. In Baltimore, Boston, and Los Angeles, for example, business groups helped place youth in unsubsidized private-sector positions that could lead to full-time employment. Business and non-profit organizations also assisted with private fundraising.

Finally, ODCA found that the executive branch has not complied with statutory requirements, enacted in 2010, to commission an annual, independent evaluation of MBSYEP.
June 2, 2016

Review of Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Program Data and Activities

What ODCA Found

During the summer of 2015, 13,969 youth between the ages of 14 and 24 participated in the Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Program (MBSYEP) and program expenditures totaled $19.3 million. In its review of available data on program activities, support services, budget and finances, management, participants, and outcomes, ODCA found the following:

- Most MBSYEP placements (78 percent) in the summer of 2015 were with District government agencies and community-based non-profit organizations.

- The Department of Employment Services (DOES) contracted with 21 community-based non-profits to provide enrichment services such as workplace readiness, financial literacy, and career exploration. DOES also signed memorandums of understanding with six D.C. government agencies to provide structured summer programs for MBSYEP participants.

- Although reported FY 2015 MBSYEP expenditures (covering the summer 2015 program) were $18.0 million, $1.3 million in MBSYEP expenditures were charged to DOES’ Year Round Youth Program and Local Adult Job Training budgets. Therefore, actual MBSYEP expenditures for FY 2015 totaled $19.3 million.

- The total FY 2016 budget for the MBSYEP has grown from $15.2 million to $20.3 million through a $4.8 million allocation from the District’s contingency reserve fund and a $250,000 inter-agency transfer. The additional funds were needed to continue serving youth ages 22 to 24 in the summer of 2016 and to reflect wage increases and a transportation subsidy.

- Although the summer 2015 MBSYEP ended on August 7, 2015, DOES made adjustments in youth participant data until late January 2016.

- The vast majority of youth (93 percent) enrolled in the summer 2015 MBSYEP were between the ages of 14 and 21, and almost three-quarters lived in Wards 5, 7, or 8.

- Although DOES reported that 247 summer 2015 MBSYEP participants between the ages of 22 and 24 were placed into jobs by December 31, 2015, the placements were not sufficiently documented.
March 21, 2017

Internal Control Weaknesses Found in Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Program

What ODCA Found

ODCA found that the Department of Employment Services (DOES) must significantly strengthen internal controls for the Marion S. Barry Summer Youth Employment Program (MBSYEP), a six-week program that serves approximately 13,000 youths at 500 work or classroom sites. Internal controls comprise the plans, methods, policies, and procedures used to fulfill the mission, strategic plan, goals, and objectives of the entity and to achieve desired results through effective stewardship of public resources.

Although strong internal controls are particularly important for a large program such as MBSYEP, which represented an investment of more than $17 million in youth development during fiscal year 2016, many of MBSYEP’s policies, procedures, and systems were ad hoc or underdeveloped during the 2015 and 2016 programs. These shortcomings created a risk that waste and fraud would go undetected while impeding the program’s goal of providing youths with the skills, attitudes, and experience needed to succeed in the workforce.

ODCA identified instances when DOES exceeded legally-mandated wage rates, and hours of work for MBSYEP participants while also failing to abide by statutory registration periods. The lack of written policies, procedures, and training governing youth enrollment, online registration, payroll processing, and other key program elements may have contributed to these violations.

Another critical weakness is the People First management information system that supports MBSYEP operations, which lacks an audit trail needed to document decisions about enrollment, assignments, and pay rates. This weakness was compounded by inadequate access controls and a failure to segregate duties so that no one individual can control all aspects of a transaction. These deficiencies pose risks for waste, fraud, and abuse.

Payroll processing is also inefficient: 18 payrolls were processed for the six-week program in 2016 due to host employer failures to enter participant work hours on time as well as possible system overload. These failures diverted the time of MBSYEP program staff who review payroll resolution tickets.

DOES has failed to comply with MBSYEP accountability and evaluation requirements prescribed by law. Although DOES is required to contract for an independent evaluation of MBSYEP by June 1 of each year and to present the results to the Council by December 30 of each year, DOES did not contract for such an evaluation in 2015 and had not issued the 2016 evaluation report as of this writing. DOES is also required to publish on its website summary data about the demographics of MBSYEP participants, their activities in the program, and their employment after the program by February 1 of each year, but once again this mandate had not been met by the time of this writing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year and Evaluation</th>
<th>Compliance with D.C. Official Code §32-244</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong> – “Unfinished Work: Building Excellence in Washington D.C.’s Summer Youth Employment Program,” Susan Curnan, Director, Center for Youth and Communities at Brandeis University’s Heller School for Social Policy and Management, principal investigator</td>
<td>Independent evaluation: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre- and post-program surveys of youth and employers: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews of local stakeholders and experts: Participating youth and employers were interviewed as part of worksite visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other requirements: Study discussed employer satisfaction, job responsibilities, support mechanisms, progress on job readiness and specific work skills, and efforts to correct problems from prior years, but did not assess youth satisfaction or youth participation in different activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong> – “Summer Youth Employment Program Evaluation Report: Summer 2011,” by Nisha Sachdev, George Washington University, and the Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation</td>
<td>Independent evaluation: No, because the Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (CYITC) funded 2,000 summer employment slots and provided technical assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre- and post-program surveys of youth and employers: Pre- and post-program surveys of youth, and post-program survey of employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews of local stakeholders and experts: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other requirements: Study discussed client satisfaction, job responsibilities, support mechanisms, progress on job readiness and work skills, and efforts to correct problems from prior years, but did not assess youth participation in different activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Evaluation Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td>Independent evaluation: No, because CYITC coordinated the OneCity Summer Initiative, which included the summer youth program. Pre- and post-program surveys of youth and employers: No. There was a post-program survey of youth participants, but it was not specific to the summer youth employment program. Interviews of local stakeholders and experts: No Other requirements: Study discussed client satisfaction with workforce development activities of the OneCity Summer Initiative and progress on job readiness and work skills, but did not assess job responsibilities, support mechanisms, job responsibilities, youth participation in different activities, or efforts to correct problems from prior years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> This is not an evaluation of the summer youth employment program, but rather an evaluation of a host of programs comprising the “One City Summer Initiative.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013</strong></td>
<td>Independent evaluation: No, because CYITC coordinated the OneCity Summer Initiative, which included the summer youth program. Pre- and post-program surveys of youth and employers: No. There was a post-program survey of youth participants, but it was not specific to the summer youth employment program. Interviews of local stakeholders and experts: No Other requirements: Study discussed client satisfaction with workforce development activities of the OneCity Summer Initiative and progress on job readiness and work skills, but did not assess job responsibilities, support mechanisms, job responsibilities, youth participation in different activities, or efforts to correct problems from prior years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> This is not an evaluation of the summer youth employment program, but rather an evaluation of a host of programs comprising the “One City Summer Initiative.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2014   | "What Can Available Data Tell Us About Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) Work Force Development Effectiveness?" by Nisha Sachdev, Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation | **Independent evaluation:** No, because the Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation (CYITC) funded summer youth employment slots in 2014.  
**Pre- and post-program surveys of youth and employers:** Post-program surveys of both youth and employers, but no pre-program surveys  
**Interviews of local stakeholders and experts:** No  
**Other requirements:** Study discussed client satisfaction, job responsibilities, and progress on job readiness and work skills, but did not assess support mechanisms, youth participation in different activities, or efforts to correct problems from prior years. | **Pre- and post-program surveys of youth and employers:** Data from a post-program survey of youth were reported  
**Interviews of local stakeholders and experts:** No  
**Other requirements:** Study discussed youth satisfaction and support mechanisms, but did not assess employer satisfaction, job responsibilities, support mechanisms, progress on job readiness and work skills, or youth participation in different activities. The study did not explicitly address problems identified in previous evaluations, but discussed program improvement efforts more generally. |
| 2015   | "MBSYEP Summer Report," by the Department of Employment Services              | **Independent evaluation:** No – conducted by DOES.  
**Pre- and post-program surveys of youth and employers:** Data from a post-program survey of youth were reported  
**Interviews of local stakeholders and experts:** No  
**Other requirements:** Study discussed youth satisfaction and support mechanisms, but did not assess employer satisfaction, job responsibilities, support mechanisms, progress on job readiness and work skills, or youth participation in different activities. The study did not explicitly address problems identified in previous evaluations, but discussed program improvement efforts more generally. |