Evaluation of the Young Adult Internship Program (YAIP): Analysis of Existing Participant Data

July 7, 2009

Westat®

Table of Contents

Tables

Appendix

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide information about the Young Adult Internship Program (YAIP), a Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) initiative designed to reengage youth who are disconnected from school and work through employment internships. The goal of YAIP is to reduce the risk of long-term economic hardship among disconnected youth in the city by increasing their education and labor force preparation. Analyses conducted using existing participant data focused on who participates in the program, predictors of internship completion, and predictors of success after the conclusion of the internship.

We find that the majority of participants in the program are between 18 and 20 years of age and tend to be either African-American or Hispanic. The gender of the participants is almost evenly divided between males and females. Roughly half of participants have an education level of less than a high school diploma, a third of participants have attained a high school diploma or better, and 15% have a GED.

Internship completion rates are fairly high across all program sites. By contrast, the internship attendance rates are much more varied, with only one site getting more than half of their participants into the high attendance category (greater than 90%). Average overall internship attendance percentages tended to fall between the mid-60s and mid-70s.

Sixty percent of participants have a verified employment, education, or training placement outcome following internship completion. When placements not verified by documentation are included, the post-internship placement rate increases to 76%. The placement immediately following the conclusion of the internship is most likely to be in an employment position, followed closely by enrollment in an education program. With a few exceptions, participants are far less likely to be placed in a training program.

At the 9-month retention follow-up, 50% of participants have a verified positive outcome recorded. This increases to 63% when unverified outcomes are included. The majority are employment outcomes.

Younger participants (age 16-17) are more likely to be in education for the placement and retention outcomes while older participants are more likely to be employed. Those with a high school diploma or more education are also more likely to be placed in education than those who are not high school graduates.

Turning to the predictors of internship completion and of success after the conclusion of the internship the story is one of general equality of treatment on the part of contractor sites. Very few participant characteristics are associated with significantly different outcomes. We found no differences by gender, race, or age. Similarly, very few contractor sites have significant differences in rates of positive outcomes for their participants. Only two factors are significantly associated with the successful completion

of the internship program – being a high school graduate, as compared to being a high school dropout, and family income.

Our models of the variables related to positive placement and retention outcomes produced different results depending on whether verified or verified plus unverified outcomes were used as the dependent variable. Both models have their short-comings. Models with verified outcomes count all outcomes that do not have paper documentation as negative outcomes (e.g., lack of employment, education or training) when in reality many of these unverified outcomes are truly positive placements but simply lacking documentation. However, counting both verified and unverified outcomes may overestimate positive outcomes if not all participants are truthful about their placement status.

Just three predictors had a statistically significant relationship to having a positive verified placement outcome: cumulative internship attendance, family income and disability status. While unverified outcomes are included, just internship attendance and applicant assistance index are positively related to having a positive placement.

At the 9-month retention following internship completion, initial internship attendance continues to be significantly and positively associated with the probability of having a positive outcome for both verified and unverified retention outcomes. A participant's number of family members and residence in the Brooklyn, Staten Island, and Queens boroughs are associated with a higher positive verified outcome probability as well. Along with internship attendance, family assistance and family income are positively associated with having a positive retention outcome when unverified outcomes are included along with the verified.

The data suggest there are few common predictors of program or outcome placement success. The one variable strongly related to all outcomes of interest is internship attendance. While this is a positive sign, it cannot be definitively identified as a casual relationship. It is possible that internship attendance is serving as a proxy for participant motivation, or some other personality trait, rather than directly associated with later outcomes. More generally, the lack of consistent predictors of internship completion or later outcome placements could suggest that the contractors are serving their diverse participants equally, resulting in no one type of participant doing better than others.

Finally, the program requirement of differentiating between outcomes reported by participants with and without documented verification has a substantial impact on descriptive performance statistics. In particular, because there is not currently a way to distinguish between a missing (unreported) outcome and a negative outcome (i.e. knowledge that the participant is not engaged in employment, education or training), program performance and placement rates vary based on whether we allow only verified outcomes or verified and self-reported outcomes in our analyses. The contractor sites have demonstrated improvement in their ability to collect documentation to verify outcomes over the first three program cohorts and we hope that this improvement will

continue through future program cycles so that differences between verified and unverified outcomes continue to diminish.

1. Introduction and Overview

The Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) has funded approximately 40 initiatives across some 20 sponsoring agencies aimed at reducing the number of working poor, young adults, and children living in poverty in New York City. CEO is committed to assessing the impact of its programs through rigorous evaluation and close program monitoring.

The Young Adult Internship Program (YAIP) is an innovative employment internship program designed to reengage youth who are disconnected from school and work. The program is intended to reach young adults who are already equipped with necessary skills to enter the labor market and need only a short-term intervention to connect to sustainable employment or educational and training opportunities to advance their career potential. This program arose from one of the recommendations of Mayor Michael Bloomberg's Commission on Economic Opportunity September 2006 report: That the city increase the number of work opportunities such as internships to promote re-engagement among disconnected youth.[1] Following this recommendation, the New York City Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD) Interagency Coordinating Council's subcommittee on disconnected youth developed the concept of YAIP. The YAIP design draws upon the program elements of two existing DYCD programs, the Out-of-School Youth (OSY) program and the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP).

The goal of YAIP is to reduce the risk of long-term economic hardship among disconnected youth in New York City by increasing their educational opportunities, career preparation, labor force participation, wage earnings, job retention, and level of educational attainment.

An initial program review report conducted by Westat and Metis Associates provided an overview and assessment of the program on several dimensions, including its goals, fidelity to the program model, target population and clients served to that point, program services, and agency management.[2] A central finding of that report was that the YAIP program was in alignment with the CEO mission and was generally meeting key CEO criteria. With each cycle, DYCD and the providers appeared to be gaining new insights into the operation of the program. The providers are evaluated against several performance milestones and outcomes: 1) placement in an internship of all participants who complete orientation; 2) successful completion of internships by at least 75% of participants; 3) placement of at least 70% of enrolled participants in post-internship employment or enrollment in secondary or post-secondary education, a GED program, and/or an occupational training program, and 4) retention of at least 60% of enrolled participants in an approved placement during the third quarter following program

---

[1] Center for Economic Opportunity. (December 2007). Strategy and Implementation Report. New York: Center for Economic Opportunity.

[2] Westat and Metis Associates (2008). Young Adult Internship Program (YAIP): Program Review Report. Rockville, MD: Westat.

completion.[3] Each of the YAIP providers but one is expected to enroll 30 participants during each of the three program cycles per year (the last provider enrolls 33 participants) for a target of 453 enrollees per cycle. YAIP has been very successful in meeting this target.

A vast amount of administrative data has been collected by YAIP providers and is available through the DYCD online data system. We have downloaded the participant data from the DYCD system, cleaned and coded it, and created an analytic database. The analysis of these data is intended to provide information about several research questions of interest regarding who participates in the program, predictors of program attendance, and predictors of success following completion of the program.

The second section of this report reviews the research design, the data and analytical techniques, used to assess the research questions relating to YAIP usage patterns and program influence on outcomes. The third section presents results of initial descriptive analyses of participants and outcomes. It provides a general overview of the characteristics of participants and the types of outcomes they are placed in. The fourth section contains more detailed, correlational analyses of the predictors of program completion and later success. Finally, the report concludes with a brief discussion of recommendations.

2. Research Design

The evaluation questions that can be answered by the available data are listed in section 2.1.

2.1 Study questions

The following questions are the focus of this analysis:

a) What are the demographic characteristics of participants at each site?
b) What are the attendance and completion rates for the internship?
c) What are the placement and 9-month retention outcomes for participants by contractor site?
d) What are the characteristics of youth who successfully complete the internship, obtain employment, or obtain additional education or training?
e) Are there differences in 9-month retention depending on the type of post-internship placement (i.e., whether placed in employment, education or advanced training)?
f) What is the relationship between internship attendance and outcomes?
g) Are there significant differences among sites in terms of outcomes (controlling for differences at the individual level)?

---

[3] Department of Youth & Community Development and the Center for Economic Opportunity. (September 2008, revised). Young Adult Internship Program: Policies and Procedures. New York: Department of Youth and Community Development.

The first three questions are answered in the third section of the report covering descriptive analyses. The fourth section of the report covers the final four questions listed above.

2.2 Outcome measures

An array of outcomes has been tracked by the YAIP providers. These are listed below in Table 1 along with a brief description. Outcome I refers to a participant's placement immediately following the conclusion of their internship. Outcome II refers to their status 9 months after the conclusion of their internship. More specifically, Outcome I (placement) happens after the internship ends and providers have three months to place participants into employment, education, or training (until the end of the month in which the internship concludes plus an additional 3 months). Outcome II (9-month retention) happens between the 7th and the 9th month after the participants complete their internships. Throughout the remainder of the report, Outcome I will be referred to as "placement" and Outcome II will be referred to as "retention."

Table 1: Outcome measures and definitions

Outcome Measure	Definition / Operationalization
Internship Attendance	Cumulative percentage of required internship hours completed
Internship Completion	Designates whether a participant completed the internship
Outcome I & II Type	Employment, Education, and/or Training
Industry	Within employment there are 19 categories of job types
Education Type	Within education there are 5 categories of education programs
Outcome I & II Wages	In employment, the product of hourly pay rate and hours per week
Part / Full Time	Designates whether employment is full- or part-time
9-Month Retention	Designates a recorded positive outcome (Employment, Education, and/or Training) for both Outcome I & Outcome II

2.3 Data

The data analyzed were downloaded from the DYCD online data system on May 21, 2009. In addition, DYCD's data vendor provided a special extract of verified retention wage and hourly data not readily available from the on-line system. The data were contained in 15 separate reports which were combined by the research team into a single analytic database with 250 variables and 2,265 cases. Each participant in the program has a unique numeric identifier, which was used to merge the myriad reports. The data system provided information on participant demographics such as ethnicity, age, education level, and disability status, program attendance and completion, as well as the outcomes described above. No personally identifiable information about participants were collected.

Some cleaning of the dataset was required, in particular those reports relating to outcome measures. First, outcome files contained 44 duplicate records (separate cases with the same ID number). Similarly, multiple outcome entries were observed for some participant IDs most likely due to individuals holding both employment and

education/training positions at the same time or changing jobs or education programs during the follow-up time periods. To accommodate these cases, multiple outcomes were moved into separate variables, allowing a single case to have more than one outcome at each time period (placement and retention). Also, employment outcomes contained numerous discrepancies between pay rate (a dollar figure) and pay type (hourly, weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, or yearly) which were corrected by creating a new weekly pay rate variable to standardize wage reporting.

It is important to note that the program requires documented verification of reported outcomes by participants. For employment, such documentation includes pay stubs or an "official employment letter." Participants pursuing education or training can provide, for example, a student ID, bursar's receipt, or an official transcript. Sites have collected information they receive from participants about their post-internship status, and then separately attempted to collect verification documents. Because not all self-reported outcomes are subsequently verified (documented) there are fewer verified outcomes reported in the dataset. Table 2 provides detail on the magnitude of the discrepancy.

Table 2: Differential outcome rates by verification

	Placement	Retention
Verified	59.7%	50.4%
Unverified + Verified	75.8%	63.0%
	N = 1358	N = 906

The verified outcomes provide the most reliable data for answering the research questions at hand. However, assuming that participants have no incentive to mislead site staff when self-reporting their post-internship status, we are reticent to discard a large volume of valuable information about program participants. To balance these concerns we ran the same analyses on a partial dataset that only contains verified outcomes as well as a full dataset that includes unverified outcomes as well. Lastly, it should be noted that for participants who did not complete the internship, outcome information may be collected, but it is not verified.

A final data issue concerned participants who de-enrolled from the program, for any reason, before completion of the orientation. De-enrollment is defined as a participant who has applied and been accepted into the program, but who then leaves the program for any reason prior to completion. There were 429 participants identified as having de-enrolled from the program. This represents 9% of the 4,601 total applicants to the program and 16% of the 2,724 participants who were accepted into YAIP. [4] Table 3 below presents the de-enrollment rates disaggregated by cycle. The records indicate a relatively low de-enrollment rate in the first program cycle, nearly doubling by the second and third program cycles, but then showing a decline in the last two cycles. However, these figures do not represent a decrease in the number served by the program.

---

[4] Of the 4,601 applicants in the YAIP database, 881 (19%) had an incomplete application, 741 (16%) had a complete application but did not enroll, 285 (6%) were rejected, 429 (9%) were de-enrolled, and 2,265 (49%) were enrolled.

In each cycle, the contractor sites continued to enroll the same number of participants to meet their enrollment targets. The providers can de-enroll participants during the first two weeks of orientation if staff members believe the participants will not be successful in the program or if the participants drop out. After the first program cycle, providers became more comfortable with de-enrolling participants who they felt were not appropriate for the program (particularly those with spotty attendance during orientation). Providers either over-fill or back-fill placements to ensure full enrollment.

To provide some context for why participants have de-enrolled, Table 4 presents the proportion of de-enrolled participants in each of the six reporting categories used by YAIP. The significant majority of the participants who de-enrolled fall into the "loss of contact with participant" or "not available for current cycle" categories. The latter category is a catch-all for any participant who provides a reason for discontinuing their involvement or for a contractor decision to de-enroll a participant. Loss of contact is used to designate a participant who has stopped attending and has not provided any reason for their leaving the program.

Because de-enrolled participants never reached the internship stage of the program they have been excluded from our analyses. Results presented in this report represent only those participants who were designated as being enrolled in the program, meaning they completed the orientation phase.

Table 3: De-enrollment rates by cycle

Cycle	Status		
	Enrolled	De-Enrolled	Total Enrolled
Year 1 Cycle 2	90.6%	9.4%	453
Year 1 Cycle 3	81.9%	18.1%	453
Year 2 Cycle 1	80.6%	19.4%	452
Year 2 Cycle 2	83.3%	16.7%	453
Year 2 Cycle 3	84.7%	15.3%	454

Table 4: Reported de-enrollment reasons

Reason	Percent
Duplicate application	0.6%
Gained employment	8.1%
Loss of contact with participant	35.8%
Not available for current cycle	46.8%
Out of community district	5.8%
Went back to school	2.9%

2.4 Analysis approaches

Deriving the basic descriptive statistics about the characteristics of participants and the basic contours of participant outcomes was done using simple frequency cross-tabulations. Participant characteristics results reported in the proceeding tables represent all five program cycles with data currently available (Year 1 Cycle 2, Year 1 Cycle 3, Year 2 Cycle 1, Year 2 Cycle 2, and Year 2 Cycle 3) combined. Internship covers the

first four cohorts, placement results cover the first three program cycles and retention results cover the first two program cycles.[5] Table 5 provides a summary of the data availability. In each case, reporting is disaggregated by contractor site or by program cycle and for outcome measures by verification status (see description above for details).

Table 5: Data availability

Cycle	Start Date	Data Availability			
		Demographic	Internship	Placement	Retention
Year 1 Cycle 2 (N = 453)	November 2007	X	X	X	X
Year 1 Cycle 3 (N = 453)	March 2008	X	X	X	X
Year 2 Cycle 1 (N = 452)	July 2008	X	X	X	
Year 2 Cycle 2 (N = 453)	November 2008	X	X		
Year 2 Cycle 3 (N = 454)	March 2009	X			

To generate information about predictors of various outcomes, regression analyses were utilized. The regression provides information about the independent relationship between any given predictor (ethnicity, education level, age, etc.) and the outcome of interest, controlling for the potential influence of every other factor specified in the model. Examining which participant characteristics were related to internship attendance (a continuous measure) a simple OLS regression approach was applied. All of the other outcomes of interest were dichotomous in nature, meaning they could only take one of two values. For example, a participant either reported a placement in employment, education, or training (a positive outcome), or they did not. For these outcome variables a logistic regression approach was taken, as it is the most appropriate technique for modeling dichotomous dependent variables. Both approaches provide estimates of the relative influence of selected covariates (provided in Table 6) although interpretations of results are somewhat different.

Table 6: Predictor variables

Applicant Assistance Index	Ethnicity (Black)
Family Assistance Index	Ethnicity (Hispanic)
Age	Family Income
Education - GED	Number of Family Members
Education - High School Grad	Borough (Bronx)
Education - Some College	Borough (Brooklyn)
Gender (Male)	Borough (Staten Island)
Individual with Disability	Borough (Queens)

---

[5] As of the time the online data were downloaded (May 2009), only the two year 1 cohorts had passed the 9-month post-internship mark and had retention data available. The year 2 cycle 2 cohort finished their internships in February 2009 and the sites had until May 31, 2009 to enter their data on placement outcomes. A large percentage of year 2 cycle 3 participants (58%) had no outcome data entered as of the time of the data download. Because of the large amount of missing data this cohort had to be excluded from placement analyses.

Covered By Health Care

The family and applicant assistance indices are an aggregation of five yes/no responses to whether the applicant or their family respectively receives support from the following public assistance programs: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, S.S.I., Safety Net, or Other Assistance. In the regression models the index is simply a count of the number of programs from which a participant, or their family, receives support, ranging from 0 to 5.

The education covariates are categorical, identifying the highest level of education a participant has achieved. There are four categories: being a high school dropout, having a GED, being a high school graduate, or having attended some college. The first category, being a high school dropout is the excluded comparison group in the regression models.

Predictors are also included for the participant's borough of residence. The program enrolled participants from five boroughs: Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Staten Island, and Queens. Manhattan is the excluded comparison group in the regression models.

A number of categorical covariates have been converted to 1/0 dummies with the name reflecting the category recoded as a 1: Male, Individual with Disability, Black, Hispanic, and Covered By Health Care.

Lastly, family income was recorded as the nearest $10,000 increment, up to $50,000. Thus, family income takes on the value of 0, $10,000, $20,000, $30,000, $40,000, or $50,000+. The small number of values available for recording family income reduces the precision of correlational analyses and suggests caution in interpreting coefficients. Regression results are reported in thousands for clarity and simplification.

2.5 Limitations and challenges

The goal of these preliminary analyses is to provide descriptive information about participants, contractor sites, and outcomes along with exploratory examinations of the predictive power of certain participant characteristics. Because existing participant data does not include a comparison group, and participants self-select into the program as well as outcome placements, serious threats to internal and external validity preclude using any results to make causal claims. The results reported here are merely correlational in that they show which characteristics co-vary, and to what extent, with various outcome measures. It would be inappropriate to conclude that any of these characteristics are the cause of those outcomes.

A particular concern involves missing data for the several outcome measures. In each case, the contractor sites have only reported positive outcomes. As a result, it is impossible to distinguish between missing data and a participant not having a positive outcome. Ideally, the contractors would note if a participant has reported not finding employment or an education or training program (a negative outcome). Without such a designation all missing data have to be assumed to be negative outcomes, although it is

likely that in a nontrivial number of cases those missing values represent a contractor losing touch with the participant.

One way to examine how many reports of non-outcomes are actually *negative* outcomes (no placement in education, employment or training) and how many non-outcomes are *missing data* because of the program's inability to maintain contact with the participants is to look at the report of Follow-up Services. Sites are to report every contact made with a participant in the Follow-up Services Report.[6] For placement, we looked at whether the sites had been successful in reaching the participants during the first 3 months after internship completion. For retention, we looked at whether the sites had been successful in reaching the participants during months 7-9 after internship completion, the time period during which the sites are required to collect and report retention data.

We found that the sites did not generally keep good records of Follow-up Services for the first two YAIP cohorts during the first 3 months following internship completion. In fact, there were many more reports of outcomes (including both verified and unverified) than there were reports of the program successfully reaching participants in months 1-3. For example, for the Year 1 Cycle 2 cohort, 347 enrollees were reported as having a positive outcome while the Follow-up Service report says that the sites had contact with only 72 of these participants. Clearly, the sites did reach all participants for whom they were able to record a positive outcome, even if this information was not correctly recorded in the online system as a Follow-up Service.

Reporting of Follow-up Services during months 1-3 improved markedly with the Year 2 Cycle 1 cohort where the program reported Follow-up Services for 89% of participants (335). Of these, 83% had a positive outcome. For the participants where the program did not report contact, 17 had a positive outcome reported. In total, there is missing information for just 7% of Year 2 Cycle 1 participants where the program said that they either did not reach the participant or failed to report positive outcomes 1-3 months after internship completion.

Reporting of Follow-up Services for months 7-9 was much better than for months 1-3. The Year 1 Cycle 2 cohort reported Follow-up Services for 318 of the 453 participants, 74% of whom had a positive outcome. Another 43 participants were reported as having a positive outcome although there were no Follow-up Services recorded in the system. We have no information on retention or Follow-up Services during months 7-9 for just 20% of Year 1 Cycle 2 participants. For the next cohort (Year 1 Cycle 3), the program reported service contacts with 362 participants (80%) and there is no information on a positive outcome or follow-up services for just 13% of enrollees.

While the number of participants who were unreachable for placement was small (7%), for the Year 2 Cycle 1 cohort, we do not know how great the problem was for the first

---

[6] Sites are required to record a note on their attempts to follow-up with each participant in the Case Flow Notes each month following the internship. These Case Flow Notes include both successes and failures in reaching the participant. In contrast, the Follow-up Service Report records only services actually delivered, which could be in the form of a phone call with the participant.

two YAIP cohorts. Missing data for retention ranges from 13 to 20%. Counting all of these as negative outcomes may underestimate the impact of the program. Therefore, we strongly advocate that the online system be modified so that placement and retention outcomes are recorded as "Employment," "Training," "Education," "Military," "No positive outcome" or "Not located." This will allow a more accurate reporting and analysis on program outcomes.

3. Descriptive Overview of Participants and Outcomes

The following tables in section 3 provide a descriptive overview of participants and outcomes, in most cases disaggregated by contractor site or by program cycle.

3.1 Participant characteristics

Tables 7 and 8 indicate some, but not substantial, variation among the sites in terms of the demographic make-up of participants. However, a small number of sites vary considerably from the overall averages for age, education, gender, and racial composition. Overall, we see that the majority of participants are between 18 and 20 years of age and tend to be either black or Hispanic. The gender of the participants is almost evenly divided between males and females. Roughly half of participants have an education level of less than a high school diploma, a third of participants have attained a high school diploma or better, and 15% have a GED.

Table 7: Age and educational attainment of participants by contractor site

Contractor Site	Age			Educational Attainment		
	16-17	18-20	21-24	Left HS Before Graduating	GED Recipient	HS Graduate or More
Arbor – NY	17%	57%	26%	55%	13%	31%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	23%	46%	31%	55%	18%	27%
Good Shepherd Services	22%	57%	21%	54%	9%	37%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	19%	63%	18%	61%	16%	23%
Henry Street Settlement	13%	51%	36%	47%	18%	35%
Italian American Civil Rights League	12%	54%	34%	38%	17%	44%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	30%	47%	23%	71%	13%	15%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	7%	52%	41%	43%	13%	45%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	15%	53%	32%	57%	13%	31%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	19%	53%	28%	59%	17%	24%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	11%	55%	34%	33%	26%	41%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	20%	57%	23%	53%	15%	33%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	14%	51%	35%	40%	15%	45%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	19%	55%	25%	54%	9%	37%
Wildcat Service Corporation	11%	55%	35%	53%	19%	29%

		17%	54%	29%	51%	15%	33%
AVERAGE (N = 2265)							

Table 8: Gender and race of participants by contractor site

Contractor Site	Gender		Race		
	Male	Female	Black	Hispanic	Other
Arbor – NY	43%	57%	82%	15%	3%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	45%	55%	53%	44%	3%
Good Shepherd Services	47%	53%	55%	36%	9%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	55%	45%	68%	23%	9%
Henry Street Settlement	51%	49%	36%	54%	10%
Italian American Civil Rights League	46%	54%	84%	10%	6%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	48%	52%	29%	61%	11%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	63%	37%	54%	20%	26%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	39%	61%	45%	50%	5%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	43%	57%	39%	54%	7%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	71%	29%	93%	3%	4%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	55%	45%	84%	8%	8%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	47%	53%	48%	47%	5%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	58%	42%	94%	5%	1%
Wildcat Service Corporation	49%	51%	43%	51%	6%
AVERAGE (N = 2265)	51%	49%	60%	32%	8%

3.2 Attendance rates

Table 9 reports the internship completion rates and the internship attendance levels for each contractor site. The internship attendance levels represent the cumulative attendance rate grouped into one of three categories: Low = < 60%; Medium = 60% to 90%; and High = > 90%. Internship completion is defined by the program as a cumulative average attendance of at least 50% and leaving the program in the 11th week or later for placement in an outcome. Internship completion rates were fairly high across all sites. By contrast, the internship attendance rates were much more varied, with only one site getting more than half of their participants into the high attendance category. Average overall internship attendance percentages tended to fall between mid-60s and mid-70s.

Table 9: Attendance levels at internship by contractor site

Contractor Site	Percentage of Participants by Level of Completion at Internship		Percentage of Participants by Level of Attendance at Internship			
	Incomplete	Complete	Low	Medium	High	Average
Arbor – NY	14%	86%	26%	37%	38%	75%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	16%	84%	33%	44%	23%	67%
Good Shepherd Services	10%	90%	31%	37%	33%	72%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	15%	85%	27%	43%	30%	70%
Henry Street Settlement	15%	85%	32%	44%	24%	68%
Italian American Civil Rights League	8%	92%	18%	45%	36%	77%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	7%	93%	20%	40%	40%	78%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	10%	90%	22%	46%	32%	75%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	5%	95%	19%	53%	28%	77%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	15%	85%	18%	23%	59%	84%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	3%	97%	11%	36%	53%	84%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	17%	83%	31%	38%	31%	71%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	15%	85%	21%	41%	38%	76%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	7%	93%	24%	41%	35%	74%
Wildcat Service Corporation	15%	85%	15%	48%	37%	79%
AVERAGE (N = 1811)	11%	89%	23%	41%	36%	75%

3.3 Outcomes

The placement immediately following the conclusion of the internship (placement) was most likely to be in an employment position, followed closely by enrollment in an education program (see Table 10).[7] With a few exceptions, participants were far less likely to be placed in a training program. The outcome type figures can add up to more than 100% because we allow cases with multiple placements (employment and education for example) to be counted separately. For most contractor sites a plurality of cases have no documented outcome reported. However, the outcome figures disaggregated by cycle indicate steady improvement in reducing the number of cases without an outcome reported (see Table 11).

As discussed earlier, Tables 10 and 11 provide details for only those cases with verified (which is to say documented) outcomes. Tables 12 and 13 provide information about the same characteristics, but using the full database of both verified and unverified cases. Sixty percent of participants had a verified positive placement outcome. When unverified placements are also included, the percentage increases to 76%.

---

[7] Another possible positive outcome is entry into the military but less than 1% of participants across the entire sample had military service recorded as an outcome. There was just 1 report of military as a placement verified outcome and just 4 as a retention verified outcome.

It is worth noting that the percentage of participants with no placement outcome recorded remains fairly consistent over the first three program cycles when both verified and unverified reports are considered, ranging between 22% and 27% (Table 13). However, when only verified outcomes are considered, the percentage of cases with no verified outcome drops significantly from 50% in Year 1 Cycle 2, to 40% in Year 1 Cycle 3, to 31% in Year 2 Cycle 1 (Table 11). This indicates that the program significantly improved in its ability to document outcomes though the percentage of participants actually placed did not change. Relying on only verified outcomes, particularly for the first two program cycles, tends to underestimate the program's success in post-internship placements.

Examining the documented placement types by cycle, Tables 11 and 13, we see some evidence of a shift toward education placements in the most recent cycle with data available with about equal numbers placed in education and employment. This same pattern was observed during the first cycle. Therefore, it is tenuous to ascribe the shift in education placements to changes in the broader economic climate based on these figures. The inclusion of undocumented placements does, by contrast, indicate a slight decline in employment along with the increase in education placements.

Table 10: Placement averages by contractor site (verified)

Contractor Site	Outcome Type				Part / Full Time		Wages
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome	Part-Time	Full-Time	Weekly Average
Arbor – NY	23%	8%	20%	52%	50%	50%	$257.46
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	28%	6%	26%	41%	61%	39%	$234.34
Good Shepherd Services	22%	4%	31%	42%	57%	43%	$321.80
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	20%	16%	33%	31%	56%	44%	$257.45
Henry Street Settlement	31%	6%	19%	47%	67%	33%	$229.17
Italian American Civil Rights League	33%	3%	30%	36%	73%	27%	$243.03
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	23%	1%	46%	30%	67%	33%	$232.15
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	61%	4%	1%	34%	58%	42%	$240.62
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	36%	2%	36%	30%	55%	45%	$288.19
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	36%	0%	33%	34%	23%	77%	$400.09[8]
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	29%	1%	43%	28%	33%	67%	$324.62
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	19%	2%	20%	59%	57%	43%	$151.47
The Citizens Advice Bureau	33%	2%	2%	62%	70%	30%	$250.40
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	28%	6%	33%	33%	27%	73%	$312.08
Wildcat Service Corporation	22%	4%	28%	46%	25%	75%	$276.46
AVERAGE (N = 1358)	30%	4%	27%	40%	53%	47%	$267.96

[8] The SCAN-NY site had a small number of participants with an employment outcome, but of those participants several had among the highest wage rates in the entire sample. The site also had a larger than average proportion of employed participants working full-time. The result is an average weekly wage rate that is considerably higher than the program average.

Table 11: Placement averages by cycle (verified)

Cycle	Outcome Type				Part / Full Time		Wages
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome	Part-Time	Full-Time	Weekly Average
Year 1 Cycle 2	21%	5%	24%	50%	55%	45%	$269.98
Year 1 Cycle 3	34%	5%	23%	40%	52%	48%	$282.49
Year 2 Cycle 1	34%	4%	33%	31%	53%	47%	$260.86

While the inclusion of unverified (undocumented) outcomes significantly increases the percentage of cases with an outcome reported, the additional cases do not significantly change the overall distribution of outcomes across the three types. The DYCD database does not contain information about part- and full-time distinctions or wages for unverified outcomes.

Table 12: Placement averages by contractor site (verified + unverified)

Contractor Site	Outcome Type				Part / Full Time		Wages
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome	Part-Time	Full-Time	Weekly Average
Arbor – NY	38%	14%	29%	30%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	33%	7%	38%	28%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Good Shepherd Services	34%	9%	42%	26%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	38%	18%	41%	21%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Henry Street Settlement	44%	11%	30%	24%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Italian American Civil Rights League	42%	3%	38%	25%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	34%	2%	58%	17%	N/A	N/A	N/A
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	67%	6%	4%	24%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	44%	12%	37%	20%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	41%	1%	38%	27%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	32%	2%	51%	18%	N/A	N/A	N/A
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	41%	7%	28%	34%	N/A	N/A	N/A
The Citizens Advice Bureau	53%	11%	14%	32%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	34%	11%	46%	16%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wildcat Service Corporation	42%	7%	32%	22%	N/A	N/A	N/A
AVERAGE (N = 1358)	41%	8%	35%	24%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 13: Placement averages by cycle (verified + unverified)

Cycle	Outcome Type				Part / Full Time		Wages
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome	Part-Time	Full-Time	Weekly Average
Year 1 Cycle 2	43%	10%	35%	23%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Year 1 Cycle 3	43%	9%	30%	27%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Year 2 Cycle 1	38%	6%	39%	22%	N/A	N/A	N/A

By the retention period, 9 months after the conclusion of the internship, 50% of participants had a documented positive retention outcome which increases to 63% when undocumented outcomes are included as well. Participants were just as likely to be in employment, and slightly less likely to be in an education program (see Tables 14 and 16). The odds of a participant being in a training program remained low. A modest shift toward having a full-time placement is also evident between the first and second outcome periods. Given that change, it is not surprising to see that average weekly wages were also slightly higher for retention than for placement.

Table 14: Retention averages by contractor site (verified)

Contractor Site	Outcome Type				Part / Full Time		Wages
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome	Part-Time	Full-Time	Weekly Average
Arbor – NY	28%	5%	7%	60%	47%	53%	$260.16
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	20%	2%	17%	62%	50%	50%	$231.03
Good Shepherd Services	35%	2%	12%	52%	38%	62%	$299.11
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	22%	8%	30%	40%	46%	54%	$305.29
Henry Street Settlement	28%	2%	15%	57%	71%	29%	$250.50
Italian American Civil Rights League	22%	0%	32%	48%	69%	31%	$252.31
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	32%	0%	27%	42%	47%	53%	$308.02
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	52%	5%	2%	42%	59%	41%	$263.56
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	37%	2%	8%	53%	41%	59%	$283.12
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	28%	0%	23%	48%	18%	82%	$336.23
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	28%	23%	23%	27%	29%	71%	$289.64
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	20%	8%	18%	53%	67%	33%	$180.31
The Citizens Advice Bureau	35%	2%	8%	55%	52%	48%	$253.12
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	18%	7%	35%	40%	36%	64%	$305.46
Wildcat Service Corporation	23%	3%	8%	65%	7%	93%	$295.82
AVERAGE (N = 906)	29%	5%	18%	50%	46%	54%	$274.25

Table 15: Retention averages by cycle (verified)

Cycle	Outcome Type				Part / Full Time		Wages
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome	Part-Time	Full-Time	Weekly Average
Year 1 Cycle 2	29%	2%	17%	52%	41%	59%	$292.40
Year 1 Cycle 3	28%	7%	19%	47%	50%	50%	$257.93

Table 16: Retention averages by contractor site (verified + unverified)

Contractor Site	Outcome Type				Part / Full Time		Wages
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome	Part-Time	Full-Time	Weekly Average
Arbor – NY	47%	10%	28%	18%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	23%	2%	18%	58%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Good Shepherd Services	43%	2%	15%	38%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	38%	15%	35%	28%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Henry Street Settlement	35%	2%	22%	43%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Italian American Civil Rights League	23%	2%	45%	37%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	38%	0%	40%	35%	N/A	N/A	N/A
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	61%	5%	2%	33%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	43%	3%	10%	45%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	32%	2%	27%	38%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	37%	27%	27%	15%	N/A	N/A	N/A
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	22%	10%	22%	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A
The Citizens Advice Bureau	40%	2%	10%	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	27%	10%	40%	25%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wildcat Service Corporation	38%	10%	13%	40%	N/A	N/A	N/A
AVERAGE (N = 906)	37%	7%	23%	37%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 17: Retention averages by cycle (verified + unverified)

Cycle	Outcome Type				Part / Full Time		Wages
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome	Part-Time	Full-Time	Weekly Average
Year 1 Cycle 2	38%	5%	22%	39%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Year 1 Cycle 3	35%	9%	25%	35%	N/A	N/A	N/A

Along with descriptive analyses disaggregating outcome types by contractor sites and cycles, we also examine differences based on two particular demographic characteristics: age group and education level. The placement outcome types show some variation based on age group, with older participants more likely to be entering employment and less likely to be entering an education or training placement (see Tables 18 and 19). The reverse was true for the younger age groups. This pattern held in the retention period as well, although to a lesser extent (see Tables 20 and 21).

Outcome types also varied by participant education level. Those with a high school diploma or more of education were almost twice as likely to be in an education placement as less educated participants at the placement period. By contrast, those who left high school before graduating and those with a GED were more likely to be in an employment placement as more educated participants. The same pattern holds for the retention period as well, though by the retention period those with a high school diploma or more were equally likely to be either employed or in school.

Table 18: Placement averages by demographic characteristics (verified)

Demographic	Outcome Type			
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome
Age Group				
16-17	17%	2%	42%	39%
18-20	29%	4%	28%	41%
21-24	39%	6%	15%	41%
AVERAGE (N = 1358)	30%	4%	27%	40%
Education Level				
Left HS Before Graduating	31%	5%	18%	46%
GED Recipient	44%	4%	18%	35%
HS Graduate or More	22%	4%	34%	42%
AVERAGE (N = 1358)	30%	4%	27%	40%

Table 19: Placement averages by demographic characteristics (verified + unverified)

Demographic	Outcome Type			
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome
Age Group				
16-17	23%	4%	51%	28%
18-20	42%	8%	36%	24%
21-24	52%	11%	22%	23%
AVERAGE (N = 1358)	41%	8%	35%	24%
Education Level				
Left HS Before Graduating	44%	9%	24%	28%
GED Recipient	56%	8%	25%	18%
HS Graduate or More	33%	8%	43%	26%
AVERAGE (N = 1358)	41%	8%	35%	24%

Table 20: Retention averages by demographic characteristics (verified)

Demographic	Outcome Type			
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome
Age Group				
16-17	17%	6%	25%	53%
18-20	30%	4%	20%	47%
21-24	34%	5%	9%	52%
AVERAGE (N = 906)	29%	5%	18%	50%
Education Level				
Left HS Before Graduating	34%	7%	10%	48%
GED Recipient	40%	5%	15%	42%
HS Graduate or More	22%	4%	21%	54%
AVERAGE (N = 906)	29%	5%	18%	50%

Table 21: Retention averages by demographic characteristics (verified + unverified)

Demographic	Outcome Type			
	Employment	Training	Education	No Outcome
Age Group				
16-17	22%	9%	32%	41%
18-20	38%	5%	25%	36%
21-24	43%	8%	15%	37%
AVERAGE (N = 906)	37%	7%	23%	37%
Education Level				
Left HS Before Graduating	45%	10%	16%	32%
GED Recipient	50%	7%	17%	29%
HS Graduate or More	28%	6%	28%	42%
AVERAGE (N = 906)	37%	7%	23%	37%

The following tables provide information about education and employment types, both for the placement and retention periods. On average, a plurality of participants in an education placement were in a GED program for both outcome time periods (49% at placement, 50% at retention). The second most likely education placement differed between the first and second outcome period. Immediately following the completion of the internship the second most likely education placement was in a pre-GED program. However, by the 9-month follow-up period post-secondary 2-year programs had higher enrollments than the pre-GED programs. Secondary and post-secondary 4-year programs were the least utilized in both outcome periods.

Table 22: Placement education type by contractor site (verified)

Contractor Site	Pre-GED	GED	Secondary School	Post-Secondary 2-Year	Post-Secondary 4-Year
Arbor – NY	30%	15%	0%	30%	25%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	0%	77%	8%	8%	8%
Good Shepherd Services	3%	50%	20%	10%	17%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	3%	71%	3%	17%	6%
Henry Street Settlement	19%	6%	6%	38%	31%
Italian American Civil Rights League	14%	36%	4%	36%	11%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	17%	72%	7%	2%	2%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	0%	100%*	0%	0%	0%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	30%	58%	9%	3%	0%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	46%	36%	7%	11%	0%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	0%	57%	16%	16%	11%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	0%	74%	11%	5%	11%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	43%	14%	0%	43%	0%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	17%	34%	14%	17%	17%
Wildcat Service Corporation	56%	16%	4%	16%	8%
AVERAGE (N = 361)	18%	49%	9%	15%	10%

* Only a small percent of placements (1 participant) for NYSARC are in education

Table 23: Placement education type by contractor site (verified + unverified)

Contractor Site	Pre-GED	GED	Secondary School	Post-Secondary 2-Year	Post-Secondary 4-Year
Arbor – NY	36%	20%	0%	24%	20%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	3%	74%	9%	9%	6%
Good Shepherd Services	5%	46%	19%	16%	14%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	3%	73%	3%	16%	5%
Henry Street Settlement	23%	14%	9%	32%	23%
Italian American Civil Rights League	12%	41%	3%	32%	12%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	19%	70%	6%	2%	4%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	0%	100%*	0%	0%	0%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	30%	58%	9%	3%	0%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	48%	32%	6%	13%	0%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	0%	60%	14%	14%	12%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	0%	77%	12%	4%	8%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	23%	23%	0%	46%	8%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	13%	33%	13%	20%	22%
Wildcat Service Corporation	55%	17%	3%	17%	7%
AVERAGE (N = 563)	18%	49%	8%	15%	10%

 * Only a small percent of placements (1 participant) for NYSARC are in education

Table 24: Retention education type by contractor site (verified)

Contractor Site	Pre-GED	GED	Secondary School	Post-Secondary 2-Year	Post-Secondary 4-Year
Arbor – NY	20%	40%	20%	20%	0%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	0%	70%	0%	30%	0%
Good Shepherd Services	0%	14%	43%	14%	29%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	5%	80%	0%	10%	5%
Henry Street Settlement	0%	42%	8%	33%	17%
Italian American Civil Rights League	10%	45%	5%	30%	10%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	13%	74%	4%	0%	9%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	0%	100%*	0%	0%	0%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	79%	7%	0%	14%	0%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	0%	50%	0%	29%	21%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	0%	55%	18%	18%	9%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	0%	48%	5%	29%	19%
Wildcat Service Corporation	40%	0%	0%	60%	0%
AVERAGE (N = 159)	11%	50%	7%	22%	10%

 * Only a small percent of placements (1 participant) for NYSARC are in education

Table 25: Retention education type by contractor site (verified + unverified)

Contractor Site	Pre-GED	GED	Secondary School	Post-Secondary 2-Year	Post-Secondary 4-Year
Arbor – NY	22%	61%	6%	11%	0%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	0%	73%	0%	27%	0%
Good Shepherd Services	0%	33%	33%	11%	22%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	10%	76%	0%	10%	5%
Henry Street Settlement	0%	62%	8%	15%	15%
Italian American Civil Rights League	7%	56%	4%	26%	7%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	13%	75%	4%	0%	8%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	0%	100%*	0%	0%	0%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	81%	6%	0%	13%	0%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	0%	44%	6%	31%	19%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	8%	54%	15%	15%	8%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	0%	54%	4%	25%	17%
Wildcat Service Corporation	50%	13%	0%	38%	0%
AVERAGE (N = 212)	14%	54%	6%	19%	8%

* Only a small percent of placements (1 participant) for NYSARC are in education

An interesting question arises as to whether education placement types change between the first and second outcome periods. To examine this, Tables 26 and 27 provide the percentage point changes between placement and retention by contractor site. What we see is that on average there is little change in education placements overall, but that substantial variation is observed at individual contractor sites. In most cases there appears to be movement away from pre-GED programs, but other placements show far less consistency across sites.

Table 26: Education type change by contractor site (verified)

Contractor Site	Pre-GED	GED	Secondary School	Post-Secondary 2-Year	Post-Secondary 4-Year
Arbor – NY	-10%	25%	20%	-10%	-25%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	0%	-7%	-8%	22%	-8%
Good Shepherd Services	-3%	-36%	23%	4%	12%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	2%	9%	-3%	-7%	-1%
Henry Street Settlement	-19%	35%	2%	-4%	-15%
Italian American Civil Rights League	-4%	9%	1%	-6%	-1%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	-4%	2%	-2%	-2%	7%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	-30%	-24%	24%	30%	0%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	32%	-29%	-7%	4%	0%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	0%	-7%	-16%	12%	11%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	0%	-19%	8%	13%	-1%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	-43%	36%	0%	7%	0%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	-17%	13%	-10%	11%	2%
Wildcat Service Corporation	-16%	-16%	-4%	44%	-8%
AVERAGE (placement N = 361; retention N = 159)	-7%	1%	-2%	7%	0%

Table 27: Education type change by contractor site (verified + unverified)

Contractor Site	Pre-GED	GED	Secondary School	Post-Secondary 2-Year	Post-Secondary 4-Year
Arbor – NY	-14%	41%	6%	-13%	-20%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	-3%	-1%	-9%	18%	-6%
Good Shepherd Services	-5%	-13%	14%	-5%	9%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	7%	3%	-3%	-7%	-1%
Henry Street Settlement	-23%	48%	-1%	-16%	-7%
Italian American Civil Rights League	-4%	14%	1%	-6%	-4%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	-6%	5%	-1%	-2%	5%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	-30%	-24%	24%	30%	0%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	33%	-26%	-6%	0%	0%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	0%	-17%	-8%	17%	7%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	8%	-23%	4%	12%	0%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	-23%	27%	0%	4%	-8%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	-13%	22%	-9%	5%	-5%
Wildcat Service Corporation	-5%	-5%	-3%	20%	-7%
AVERAGE (placement N = 563; retention N= 212)	-4%	4%	-2%	3%	-2%

For those participants placed in employment positions at either the first or second outcome period, the most common type of work was in the retail sector. A large number of participants were reported under the "Other" category. This is a catch-all for jobs that do not fit in any of the other categories, and according to program staff was mostly in the security, restaurant, and messenger service fields. Other notable industry types include community or social services, educational services, and hospitality/tourism.

Table 28: Employment industry placement

Industry	Placement (N = 357)	Retention (N = 260)
Arts & Recreation	1.4%	1.5%
Community/Social Services	9.2%	6.5%
Construction	3.6%	2.7%
Cultural Institution	2.2%	0.8%
Educational Services	6.4%	8.5%
Financial Services	3.6%	1.2%
Government	0.3%	1.5%
Health and Fitness	1.7%	1.9%
Healthcare/Medical	3.9%	4.6%
Hospitality/Tourism	6.4%	8.1%
Legal Services	1.7%	3.1%
Manufacturing	1.4%	1.2%
Marketing/Public Relations	3.4%	0.8%
Media/Entertainment	2.2%	0.8%
Other	24.6%	25.8%
Real Estate/Property	2.2%	0.8%
Retail	22.4%	28.5%
Science & Technology	0.8%	0.4%
Transportation	2.2%	1.5%

Lastly, we have compared the frequency of cases with a positive outcome (employment, education, or training program) based on whether the participant completed the internship, disaggregated by contractor site and by program cycle (see Tables 29 to 32). Various sites appear to have been more or less successful in recording positive outcomes for those completing the internship. Few sites have had much success at recording positive outcomes for those not completing the internship. Not surprisingly, the figures are significantly higher when including unverified outcomes as well. Of note, sites appear to be collecting more placement information from internship completers over time, but less placement information from non-completers. In Year 1 Cycle 2, providers collected placement information on 25% of internship non-completers, but providers collected this information from only 5% in the most recent cycle for whom these data are available. This is not surprising, as the sites are required to follow-up with all internship completers but do not get credit for outcomes reported for internship non-completers. There is little incentive, then, to follow-up with internship non-completers.

The data from the Follow-up Services report indicate that the programs do stay in touch with some internship non-completers. For the Year 2 Cycle 1 cohort, the contractor sites

overall reported a successful contact with 44% of internship non-completers at the time of measurement of the placement outcome. Of these, only 2 had a positive outcome. As shown in Table 30, Mosholu Montefiore Community Center recorded positive outcomes for more than half of their internship non-completers.

Table 29: Positive placement frequency by contractor site and internship completion (verified)

Contractor Site	Internship	
	Complete	Incomplete
Arbor – NY	55.3%	7.1%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	70.7%	0.0%
Good Shepherd Services	63.3%	18.2%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	82.4%	6.3%
Henry Street Settlement	62.3%	0.0%
Italian American Civil Rights League	68.7%	0.0%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	74.7%	14.3%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	72.2%	0.0%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	73.3%	0.0%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	74.7%	0.0%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	75.6%	0.0%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	50.0%	0.0%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	45.9%	0.0%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	71.4%	0.0%
Wildcat Service Corporation	68.1%	0.0%
AVERAGE (N = 1192 and N = 166)	67.5%	3.0%

Table 30: Positive placement frequency by contractor site and internship completion (verified + unverified)

Contractor Site	Internship	
	Complete	Incomplete
Arbor – NY	80.3%	14.3%
Federation Employment and Guidance Service, Inc., Health and Human Services System	84.0%	13.3%
Good Shepherd Services	79.7%	36.4%
Henkels & McCoy, Inc.	91.9%	18.8%
Henry Street Settlement	85.7%	15.4%
Italian American Civil Rights League	80.7%	0.0%
Mosholu Montefiore Community Center	85.5%	57.1%
NYSARC, Inc., NYC Chapter	82.2%	11.1%
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	83.7%	0.0%
Supportive Children Advocacy Network (SCAN)-NY	83.5%	0.0%
Southern Queens Park Association-NY	86.0%	0.0%
The Child Center of NY, Inc.	77.0%	12.5%
The Citizens Advice Bureau	77.0%	25.0%
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	90.5%	0.0%
Wildcat Service Corporation	91.7%	22.2%
AVERAGE (N = 1192 and N = 166)	84.0%	16.9%

Table 31: Positive placement frequency by cycle and internship completion (verified)

Cycle	Internship	
	Complete	Incomplete
Year 1 Cycle 2	56.3%	7.0%
Year 1 Cycle 3	70.0%	0.0%
Year 2 Cycle 1	76.0%	2.3%

Table 32: Positive placement frequency by cycle and internship completion (verified + unverified)

Cycle	Internship	
	Complete	Incomplete
Year 1 Cycle 2	84.1%	24.6%
Year 1 Cycle 3	82.2%	18.2%
Year 2 Cycle 1	85.6%	4.7%

4. Analysis

The remaining research questions require more advanced analytical approaches than the general descriptives provided above. In this section, each research question is the focus of a subsection. As noted, the first analysis of internship attendance rates involves a simple OLS regression. Directions for interpretation are provided in the description of the results. All of the other analyses are conducted using a logistic regression, which has a unique interpretation of the output. As such, it is preferable to explain how to interpret the logistic results before moving to the research questions.

A logistic regression is used when the dependent variable being analyzed is dichotomous (can only take the values 1 or 0). In this case we are interested in what characteristics are related to completing the internship or attaining a positive outcome. In both cases there are only two possible values, either the internship was completed (1) or it was not (0) and either the participant had a positive outcome (1) or they did not (0). The coefficients for the predictor variables in the logistic models represent the log odds by which that characteristic increases or decreases the probability of an individual being in the 1 category. For the positive outcome models, a positive coefficient means the characteristic is related to an increase in the probability of a participant having a positive outcome, while a negative coefficient is related to a decrease in the probability of a participant having a positive outcome.

4.1 What are the characteristics of youth who successfully complete the internship?

Table 33 presents the results of an OLS regression that examines the predictors of internship attendance rates. Interpretation of the coefficients is fairly straightforward; a one unit increase in the independent variable of interest is related to a β (coefficient) increase in percent attendance. For example, we see that moving from one family assistance program to two is related to a roughly 7 percentage point increase in attendance. For dichotomous variables such as gender, we see that males have a higher attendance rate, by roughly 2.9 percentage points, than females, all else equal. Characteristics found to be significantly related to attendance rates are the family assistance index, education levels of GED recipient, high school graduate and some college (as compared to high school dropouts), gender, and family income. By contrast, the applicant assistance index, participant age, disability status, ethnicity, health coverage, family size, and borough of residence are not significant predictors of internship attendance rates.

Looking at predictors of internship completion (Table 34) a murkier picture appears. The only two factors significantly associated with the successful completion of the internship program are being a high school graduate, as compared to being a high school dropout, and family income.[9] None of the other variables (including gender, race, age, or disability status) exhibited a statistically significant relationship.

Table 33: Characteristics of internship attendance rates

Predictor	Coefficient	t	p
Intercept	56.57	8.66	0.000
Applicant Assistance Index	-1.13	-0.77	0.441
Family Assistance Index	6.93	3.81	0.000
Age	0.52	1.82	0.069
Education - GED	3.23	1.99	0.047
Education - High School Grad	11.01	8.34	0.000
Education - Some College	15.67	4.40	0.000
Male	2.90	2.54	0.011
Individual with Disability	2.63	0.78	0.434
Black	2.57	1.22	0.223
Hispanic	1.90	0.85	0.394
Covered By HealthCare	-1.68	-1.41	0.160
Family Income (thousands)	0.13	2.72	0.007
Number of Family Members	-0.04	-0.14	0.887
Bronx	-0.36	-0.18	0.853
Brooklyn	-1.30	-0.68	0.496
Staten Island	-3.73	-1.25	0.213
Queens	-2.41	-1.14	0.254
N = 1702			

---

[9] As noted earlier, family income is reported in $10,000 increments which reduces the precision of analyses and suggests caution in interpreting coefficients.

Table 34: Characteristics of youth who successfully complete the internship

Predictor	Coefficient	Wald	p
Intercept	0.33	0.14	0.704
Applicant Assistance Index	-0.01	0.00	0.964
Family Assistance Index	0.38	2.35	0.125
Age	0.03	0.61	0.436
Education - GED	0.19	0.77	0.379
Education - High School Grad	1.11	23.91	0.000
Education - Some College	1.21	2.69	0.101
Male	0.11	0.44	0.506
Individual with Disability	-0.42	0.84	0.360
Black	0.41	2.36	0.124
Hispanic	0.27	0.92	0.337
Covered By HealthCare	-0.11	0.41	0.523
Family Income (thousands)	0.02	3.88	0.049
Number of Family Members	0.00	0.01	0.904
Bronx	0.08	0.12	0.733
Brooklyn	0.45	3.22	0.073
Staten Island	0.62	2.00	0.158
Queens	0.09	0.11	0.739
N = 1702			

4.2 What are the characteristics of youth who obtain employment, additional education, or training (a positive outcome)? What is the relationship between internship attendance and outcomes?

Only three predictors showed a statistically significant relationship with having a positive verified placement immediately following internship completion: the cumulative internship attendance rate, disability status, and family income (see Table 35). Higher internship attendance rates and family income are associated with higher probabilities of having a verified positive outcome. Being disabled is associated with a lower probability of having a verified positive outcome. However, the negative association between disability status and having a positive outcome does not extend to the analysis of unverified (all) positive outcomes (see Table 36). Of note, in the unverified positive placement model, the applicant assistance index appeared to have a positive relationship with the probability of having a positive outcome.

Table 35: Characteristics of youth who obtain a positive
verified placement outcome

Predictor	Coefficient	Wald	p
Intercept	-1.54	4.20	0.041
Internship Attendance	0.04	164.81	0.000
Applicant Assistance Index	0.11	0.46	0.496
Family Assistance Index	0.39	3.13	0.077
Age	-0.06	2.93	0.087
Education - GED	-0.25	1.88	0.170
Education - High School Grad	-0.07	0.21	0.646
Education - Some College	-0.04	0.01	0.935
Male	-0.08	0.33	0.565
Individual with Disability	-0.74	4.13	0.042
Black	-0.40	2.65	0.104
Hispanic	0.01	0.00	0.962
Covered By HealthCare	-0.05	0.14	0.711
Family Income (thousands)	0.02	7.07	0.008
Number of Family Members	0.05	1.81	0.178
Bronx	-0.26	1.39	0.238
Brooklyn	0.16	0.55	0.460
Staten Island	0.64	3.28	0.070
Queens	0.32	1.63	0.201
N = 1285			

Table 36: Characteristics of youth who obtain a positive
verified or unverified placement outcome

Predictor	Coefficient	Wald	p
Intercept	-1.85	4.49	0.034
Internship Attendance	0.05	202.31	0.000
Applicant Assistance Index	0.38	3.85	0.050
Family Assistance Index	-0.15	0.36	0.547
Age	-0.03	0.55	0.458
Education - GED	-0.24	1.33	0.248
Education - High School Grad	-0.01	0.00	0.945
Education - Some College	-0.80	1.97	0.161
Male	-0.13	0.64	0.422
Individual with Disability	-0.45	1.11	0.293
Black	-0.19	0.43	0.511
Hispanic	0.10	0.11	0.736
Covered By HealthCare	0.11	0.47	0.494
Family Income (thousands)	0.01	3.66	0.056
Number of Family Members	0.02	0.22	0.640
Bronx	0.03	0.01	0.905
Brooklyn	0.31	1.39	0.238
Staten Island	0.35	0.71	0.401
Queens	0.32	1.19	0.276
N = 1285			

Examining the second outcome period, 9-months following internship completion, we see
that initial internship attendance continues to be significantly and positively associated
with the probability of having a verified positive outcome (see Table 37). A participant's
number of family members is also positively associated with the probability of having a
verified positive outcome. Three of the boroughs, Brooklyn, Staten Island, and Queens
were associated with a higher positive outcome probability as compared to Manhattan.

Table 37: Characteristics of youth who obtain a positive
verified retention outcome

Predictor	Coefficient	Wald	p
Intercept	-2.38	6.86	0.009
Internship Attendance	0.04	100.48	0.000
Applicant Assistance Index	-0.08	0.19	0.666
Family Assistance Index	-0.07	0.05	0.820
Age	-0.05	1.86	0.172
Education – GED	0.19	0.78	0.376
Education - High School Grad	0.29	2.45	0.117
Education - Some College	-0.62	0.56	0.455
Male	0.11	0.48	0.490
Individual with Disability	-0.15	0.11	0.737
Black	-0.10	0.13	0.721
Hispanic	-0.14	0.21	0.646
Covered By HealthCare	-0.21	1.64	0.200
Family Income (thousands)	0.00	0.02	0.876
Number of Family Members	0.11	6.16	0.013
Bronx	0.11	0.19	0.664
Brooklyn	0.51	3.97	0.046
Staten Island	0.82	3.95	0.047
Queens	1.00	11.66	0.001
N = 870			

When utilizing the dataset of all reported positive outcomes, both verified and unverified, only the internship attendance rates, family assistance, and family income continue to have a significant relationship (see Table 38).

Table 38: Characteristics of youth who obtain a positive
verified or unverified retention outcome

Predictor	Coefficient	Wald	p
Intercept	-1.74	3.84	0.050
Internship Attendance	0.03	88.77	0.000
Applicant Assistance Index	0.17	0.78	0.376
Family Assistance Index	0.65	4.49	0.034
Age	-0.02	0.42	0.519
Education - GED	-0.32	2.34	0.126
Education - High School Grad	-0.21	1.22	0.270
Education - Some College	0.78	0.49	0.483
Male	0.02	0.02	0.893
Individual with Disability	-0.24	0.30	0.582
Black	-0.39	1.71	0.191
Hispanic	-0.07	0.05	0.830
Covered By HealthCare	-0.27	2.83	0.093
Family Income (thousands)	0.00	5.31	0.021
Number of Family Members	0.05	1.21	0.271
Bronx	-0.32	1.51	0.219
Brooklyn	0.31	1.50	0.220
Staten Island	0.51	1.57	0.211
Queens	0.27	0.87	0.351
N = 870			

4.3 Are there differences in 9-month retention depending on the type of post-internship placement (i.e., whether placed in employment, education or advanced training)?

This research question focuses on whether differences in 9-month retention are observed based on whether a participant was placed in employment, education or advanced training. At issue is the percentage of cases for which an outcome has been reported at both the placement and retention time periods and whether these percentages differ based on the type of outcome reported for placement. Results indicate that participants placed in an employment setting following internship completion were more likely to have a 9-month follow-up outcome reported as well, followed by education and training. The same patterns emerge for both verified and unverified datasets. It should be noted that reporting fidelity (whether the program could find the participant) greatly affects retention figures.

Overall rates of retention, however, are below target for verified outcomes regardless of outcome type.

Table 39: Retention rates between placement and 9-month outcomes (verified)

Outcome Type	Retention Rate
Employment (N = 390)	52.3%
Education (N = 296)	49.0%
Training (N = 83)	45.8%

Table 40: Retention rates between placement and 9-month outcomes (verified + unverified)

Outcome Type	Retention Rate
Employment (N = 390)	80.3%
Education (N = 296)	72.3%
Training (N = 83)	72.3%

4.4 Are there significant differences among sites in terms of outcomes (controlling for differences at the individual level)?

To determine whether differences existed between the contractors in terms of their positive outcome rates the same logistic regression models as those used in section 4.2 were analyzed, but with the addition of a series of dummy variables for each site. The excluded comparison group is Mosholu Montefiore Community Center, because it has the highest unverified positive placement rate. Thus, the results presented below represent the difference between a given contractor and the Mosholu Montefiore Community Center, the highest performer in terms of unverified placement rates. Full results tables are provided in the appendix.

Three contractors had positive, verified placement rates significantly lower than the highest performer, controlling for the characteristics of participants: SCAN – NY, The Child Center of NY, Inc, and The Citizens Advice Bureau. Upon expanding the analysis to include unverified positive placement rates only one contractor still had a significantly lower result, SCAN – NY.

A slightly different pattern of results was observed for positive retention rates. For the verified retention analyses, the only contractor with a significantly lower result was the Wildcat Service Corporation. Expanded to include unverified positive outcomes as well, five sites (including the same three observed for verified placement rates) exhibited significantly lower success rates: Henry Street Settlement, SCAN – NY, The Child Center of NY, Inc, The Citizens Advice Bureau, and Wildcat Service Corporation.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

The report has presented a large and varied amount of information about the YAIP program to this point. A few conclusions and recommendations can be drawn from the analyses presented.

We find that internship completion rates are fairly high across all program sites. However, internship attendance rates are much more varied with average overall internship attendance percentages at most sites tending to fall between the mid-60s and mid-70s.

There were substantial differences in the percentage of participants counted as having positive placement or retention outcomes, depending on whether only verified outcomes are included or both verified plus unverified outcomes. Sixty percent of participants have a verified employment, education, or training placement outcome following internship completion. When placements not verified by documentation are included, the post-internship placement rate increases to 76%.   At the 9-month retention follow-up, 50% of participants have a verified positive outcome recorded. This increases to 63% when unverified outcomes are included.

Younger participants (age 16-17) are more likely to be in education for the placement and retention outcomes while older participants are more likely to be employed. Those with a high school diploma or more education are also more likely to be placed in education than those who are not high school graduates.

Very few participant characteristics are associated with significantly different outcomes. We found no differences by gender, race, or age. Similarly, very few contractor sites have significant differences in rates of positive outcomes for their participants. Only two factors are significantly associated with the successful completion of the internship program – being a high school graduate, as compared to being a high school dropout, and family income.

Our models of the variables related to positive placement and retention outcomes produced different results depending on whether verified or verified plus unverified outcomes were used as the dependent variable. Both models have their short-comings. Models with verified outcomes count all outcomes that do not have paper documentation as negative outcomes (e.g., lack of employment, education or training) when in reality many of these unverified outcomes are truly positive placements but simply lacking documentation. However, counting both verified and unverified outcomes may overestimate positive outcomes if not all participants are truthful about their placement status.

Just three predictors had a statistically significant relationship to having a positive verified placement outcome: cumulative internship attendance, family income and

disability status. While unverified outcomes are included, just internship attendance and applicant assistance index are positively related to having a positive placement.

At the 9-month retention following internship completion, initial internship attendance continues to be significantly and positively associated with the probability of having a positive outcome for both verified and unverified retention outcomes. A participant's number of family members and residence in the Brooklyn, Staten Island, and Queens boroughs are associated with a higher positive verified outcome probability as well. Along with internship completion, family assistance and family income are positively associated with having a positive retention outcome when unverified outcomes are included along with the verified.

Overall, there are few reliable predictors of positive outcome attainment, other than internship attendance. However, despite the intuitive appeal of such a connection, we should be chary of facile claims of causality. It is possible that internship attendance is serving as a proxy for participant motivation, or some other personality trait, rather than directly associated with later outcomes. The lack of consistent predictors of internship completion or later outcome placements could suggest that the contractors are serving their diverse participants equally, resulting in no one type of participant doing better than others. Or, the results could suggest that the factors related to success aren't currently being measured or recorded.

The concern over missing data and the lack of reporting on negative outcomes is paramount. The conflation of missing data and negative outcomes limits our ability to distinguish program effects with certainty. Adding a reporting category for not having a placement, and one for outcome unknown, would be an important improvement in the data collection process. The addition of these outcome categories would also greatly facilitate the ability of an impact evaluation to measure the effectiveness of YAIP against a comparison group. Similarly, we recommend that providers track completion of an education program (for example receiving a GED) or receiving certification for a training program. This would provide an important measure of program success.

The contractor sites demonstrated improvement in their ability to collect documentation to verify outcomes over the first three program cohorts and we hope that this improvement will continue through future program cycles. Some programs, such as the CEO's Career Advancement Program (administered by SBS and operated by Seedco), provide incentives to participants to bring in their documentation of employment or educational enrollment. This is an approach that YAIP may also want to consider. Documentation of outcomes is important for programmatic and contractual reasons. However, due to the difficulty of collecting this information, we feel that greater latitude in considering both verified and unverified outcomes should be considered in evaluations of the effectiveness of YAIP. Self-report is a widely accepted means of determining outcomes in program evaluations.

We also recommend that YAIP track outcomes for all enrollees, including internship non-completers, at both the placement and retention measurement periods.

Currently, DYCD encourages service providers to place all participants into an outcome but only gives credit for participants who complete the internship. There is little incentive for the providers to record outcomes for internship non-completers. However, knowing what happens to internship non-completers can provide important information on the effects of YAIP. Do the majority on non-completers end up without employment or do they leave the internship early because they are able to gain and maintain a better job? Given that the great majority (89%) of YAIP enrollees complete the internship, following up on the few who do not (an average of 3.3 per site) should not be an undue burden. It is possible that even a small dose of YAIP could prove to have a positive effect on employment outcomes in the future, particularly when compared with having no work history at all.

Appendix

Full results tables for analyses of contractor site outcome differences.

Table A1: Site differences in positive verified placement outcome

Predictor	Coefficient	Wald	P
Arbor – NY	-0.72	1.23	0.267
FEGS Health and Human Services System	0.04	0.01	0.923
Good Shepherd Services	-0.08	0.01	0.906
Henkels & McCoy, Inc	-0.11	0.03	0.874
Henry Street Settlement	-0.76	2.21	0.137
Italian American Civil Rights League	-0.06	0.01	0.926
NYSARC, Inc NYC Chapter	0.60	0.49	0.486
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	0.16	0.05	0.817
SCAN – NY	-1.02	4.28	0.039
SQPA	-0.30	0.17	0.677
The Child Center of NY, Inc	-1.58	5.00	0.025
The Citizens Advice Bureau	-1.28	12.45	0.000
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	0.23	0.11	0.735
Wildcat Service Corporation	-0.64	3.16	0.076
N = 1285			

Table A2: Site differences in positive verified or unverified placement outcome

Predictor	Coefficient	Wald	P
Arbor – NY	-1.37	2.80	0.094
FEGS Health and Human Services System	0.03	0.01	0.944
Good Shepherd Services	-0.74	0.77	0.379
Henkels & McCoy, Inc	0.18	0.05	0.831
Henry Street Settlement	-0.25	0.17	0.682
Italian American Civil Rights League	-1.36	2.60	0.107
NYSARC, Inc NYC Chapter	-0.93	0.86	0.354
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	-0.96	1.27	0.260
SCAN – NY	-1.62	7.78	0.005
SQPA	-0.16	0.03	0.856
The Child Center of NY, Inc	-0.80	0.88	0.347
The Citizens Advice Bureau	-0.75	3.07	0.080
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	-0.36	0.17	0.677
Wildcat Service Corporation	-0.29	0.42	0.518
N = 1285			

Table A3: Site differences in positive verified retention outcome

Predictor	Coefficient	Wald	p
Arbor – NY	-0.90	1.57	0.210
FEGS Health and Human Services System	-0.38	0.80	0.371
Good Shepherd Services	-0.48	0.44	0.508
Henkels & McCoy, Inc	-0.40	0.27	0.603
Henry Street Settlement	-0.24	0.18	0.674
Italian American Civil Rights League	-0.49	0.45	0.503
NYSARC, Inc NYC Chapter	-0.33	0.15	0.703
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	-0.76	1.09	0.297
SCAN – NY	-0.67	1.48	0.223
SQPA	-0.19	0.05	0.816
The Child Center of NY, Inc	-1.40	3.06	0.080
The Citizens Advice Bureau	-0.47	1.18	0.277
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	0.14	0.03	0.853
Wildcat Service Corporation	-1.06	5.96	0.015
N = 870			

Table A4: Site differences in positive verified or unverified retention outcome

Predictor	Coefficient	Wald	p
Arbor – NY	-1.32	3.32	0.068
FEGS Health and Human Services System	-0.13	0.08	0.772
Good Shepherd Services	-0.46	0.39	0.533
Henkels & McCoy, Inc	-0.04	0.00	0.962
Henry Street Settlement	-1.26	4.58	0.032
Italian American Civil Rights League	-0.55	0.55	0.459
NYSARC, Inc NYC Chapter	-0.09	0.01	0.923
Opportunities for a Better Tomorrow	0.00	0.00	0.998
SCAN – NY	-1.21	4.68	0.031
SQPA	-0.54	0.46	0.499
The Child Center of NY, Inc	-1.80	5.17	0.023
The Citizens Advice Bureau	-2.18	20.34	0.000
Vannguard Urban Improvement Association	0.01	0.00	0.988
Wildcat Service Corporation	-1.19	7.30	0.007
N = 870			