

Youth Policy : A Year of Observations, Practices and Lessons Learned



Annual Report 1998 – 1999



American Youth Policy Forum
“Bridging youth policy, practice and research”

Table of Contents

<i>About the American Youth Policy Forum</i>	3
<i>Letter from the Directors and Staff</i>	5
The American Youth Policy Forum Staff	7
<i>Summary of Forum Activities: July 1, 1998 – June 30, 1999</i>	8
<i>Summary: Observations, Practices and Lessons Learned</i>	9
Improving Education and Academic Performance.....	9
Preparation for Careers	9
Youth and Community Development	10
<i>Improving Education and Academic Performance</i>	13
High standards and expectations, and clear systems of accountability.....	13
Creative partnerships.	16
Individualized, safe and caring school communities.	17
Large scale education reform and public policy experiments	19
Professional development	20
New, innovative and sometimes recycled approaches to schooling.....	21
High School Reform.....	21
Observations from Site Visits	24
<i>Preparation for Careers</i>	28
Improving the skills of the workforce.....	28
Employers and high quality school-to-work initiatives.....	28
The future of school-to-work initiatives.....	30
Workforce development--a shared responsibility.....	32
<i>Youth and Community Development</i>	37
Observations on the Federal Role	39
Observations on the needs of youth and necessary program components	40
Recommendations for policy	40
<i>Chronology of AYPF Activities: July 1, 1998 – June 30, 1999</i>	42
<i>American Youth Policy Forum Financial Statement</i>	46
<i>AYPF Board of Directors</i>	48

About the American Youth Policy Forum

“To improve opportunities, services, and life prospects for youth, we provide learning experiences for national, state, and local policymakers and practitioners.” AYPF Mission

The American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF) is a non-profit professional development organization based in Washington, DC. AYPF provides nonpartisan learning opportunities for individuals working on youth policy issues at the local, state and national levels. Participants in our learning activities include:

- Government employees--Congressional staff, policymakers and
- Executive Branch aides
- officers of professional and national associations
- Washington-based state office staff
- researchers and evaluators
- education and public affairs media.

Our goal is to enable policymakers and their aides to be more effective in their professional duties and of greater service--to Congress, the Administration, state legislatures, governors and national organizations--in the development, enactment, and implementation of sound policies affecting our nation's young people. We believe that knowing more about youth issues—both intellectually and experientially--will help them formulate better policies and do their jobs more effectively. AYPF does not lobby or take positions on pending legislation. We work to develop better communication, greater understanding and enhanced trust among these professionals, and to create a climate that will result in constructive action.

Each year AYPF conducts 35 to 45 learning events (forums, discussion groups and study

tours) and develops policy reports disseminated nationally.

Forums provide opportunities for large groups of participants to have dialogue with experts in research, evaluation, policy and program implementation.

Special meetings provide opportunities for a more intimate group of individuals to delve deeper into a topic or policy.

Domestic and international study missions put participants in direct contact with young people, program administrators and city/district leaders who share their experiences and concerns relating to local, state and national policies, and illustrate tested practices and program implementation strategies. Study missions represent opportunities for participants to reflect on new facts and experiences and test their assumptions and conclusions among themselves (typical groups represent a cross-section of federal and congressional staff, national associations and state and local policy aides from other parts of the country). International study missions also help participants extend their knowledge base while providing a comparative perspective on issues common to other countries and communities.

Internet-based publishing provides easy access to our forum briefs, study mission and field visit summaries, and selected publications on our website.

Policy publications--carefully crafted, non-technical publications provide information on practices, research and evaluations of what works and is useful for youth--are disseminated widely. Findings from our publications have formed the basis of conference presentations and workshops as well as the content of related forums. Several are used as supplementary readings in college courses.

AYPF has a well established dissemination network for our publications, including a substantial and current database of policymakers in Washington, DC and across the United States, and a popular, well linked website visited by over 26,000 hits per month--and growing.

For more information, visit our web site at www.aypf.org.

Letter from the Directors and Staff

The American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF) was founded in January 1993 and initially based at the Institute for Educational Leadership, with the goal of improving policies, services and interventions affecting our nation's young people. Through the years, AYPF has established itself within the Washington, DC community as an organization that provides flexible, timely, non-partisan continuing education opportunities to national, state, and more recently, local policymakers and their aides, helping them become more effective in their professional duties.

AYPF has developed a well-respected record of service to the youth policymaking community. This has included over 270 programs (lunch-time forums, discussion groups, domestic and international study missions) attended by over 12,000 participants from the youth policy community. This is an average of 35-45 events each year, currently serving over 2,000 participants annually. AYPF has published over two dozen policy documents used by policymakers, practitioners, researchers and the media in their professional work. Requests for publications come from sources as diverse as state and local education and employment service agencies, youth workers and national youth affiliates, college and public libraries, "think tanks," graduate schools and university professors, and from researchers and visitors to our website. Summaries of these learning events and lists of AYPF activities by year can be found here: www.aypf.org.

In July 1998, AYPF moved into a new building shared with the National Youth Employment Coalition. Here, we are better positioned to focus our combined efforts on improving opportunities, services and life prospects for young people. June 30, 1999 marked the anniversary of our first full year as an

independent, non-profit organization. This publication is a retrospective look at that year of operation.

The staff of the American Youth Policy Forum is grateful to the many presenters, practitioners, researchers, field trip hosts, and participants who have supported our efforts to collectively extend and share our knowledge and understanding. They have attended our learning events, suggested topics to explore, identified resources, shared insights with us, and contributed to our discussion groups, to the development and dissemination of policy reports and to our efforts to learn more about effective youth policy and programming.

Looking ahead, we will continue our efforts to help bridge youth policy, practice and research. Our activities in 2000 include a continued focus on:

- high school reform (including visits to nationally recognized *New American High Schools*, *New Urban High Schools* and *High Schools that Work* sites), as well as charter and alternative schools;
- initiatives that improve student achievement and prepare young people for postsecondary education, including School-to-Work, Tech Prep, Career Academies and other interventions;
- comprehensive community approaches for youth programming, including prevention, community education and out-of-school time activities; and
- the role of service learning and community service in supporting education reform and employment preparation for youth in school and community learning environments.

We will continue to organize and support the dialogue of discussion groups focused on addressing emerging and continuing issues, such as the evolution of school-to-careers after the federal legislation sunsets in 2001 and the changing role and structure of the American high

school. Our seminar series on at-risk and out-of-school youth continued throughout the summer of 1999, and resulted in a list of topics to address in future forums or additional seminars. We have recently introduced informal “chats”--part of our summer salon series where participants of field trips and selected lunchtime forums have opportunities to reflect on the information provided and participate in an AYPF staff-led discussion. These informal discussion groups have been organized on Workforce Development, Education Reform and Service Learning.

We will also continue to focus on what research and practice conclude works for young people through the compilation of program evaluations focused on a number of topical areas. Extensive dissemination and follow-up activities for **MORE Things that DO Make a Difference for Youth: A Compendium of Evaluations of Youth Programs and Practices**, will continue to ensure that this publication reaches a wide audience of policymakers and practitioners. The success of the publication and the recognized need in the field to provide information on best practices and research-based strategies suggests the possibility of repackaging a number of the evaluations for use by specific youth-serving audiences and producing additional new compendia. Evaluations on student achievement, juvenile justice, and community-based, out-of-school and service-learning programs are topics, which may be addressed in this manner.

In addition, we plan to continue dialogue among evaluators and program leaders on improving research and evaluation of youth interventions. This activity has grown out of our recognition of the importance of sensible evaluation measures and the need for generating ideas about how best to conduct evaluations of youth interventions to share with practitioners in the field and policymakers who fund evaluations.

Much of what we do can be replicated at the state level and extended to benefit state policy

aides. As more federal responsibility devolves to the states, AYPF plans to increase our already substantial efforts to collaborate with state-based organizations. Finally, AYPF will continue to support and target the participation of Congressional and state aides, particularly at those events that fall within their jurisdictional area of interest (e.g., staff from the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Senate Committee on Labor, Health, Education and Pensions, state and local policy aides representative of areas where projects/models/issues are showcased).

We recognize the need for systematic professional development and renewal of staff at both the national and local levels. This is particularly critical for local practitioners and state policy aides to help them transcend provincialism, expand their knowledge of programs and practices and ways of linking parts of the system, and ensure ongoing access and opportunities to dialogue with policy aides at the national level. We will deepen and expand our information and distribution strategies to include a wider circle of state and local policy aides and practitioners.

As AYPF moves into the year 2000, we do so with a strong staff capable of helping to further our mission and support planned activities. We continue to expand our in-house library of research and programs on youth and our computer network to share the information and knowledge we amass through our learning events, increasing our audience base monthly.

The AYPF activities and publications detailed in this report would not be possible without the generous support provided by a consortium of private foundations:

Annie E. Casey Foundation
Commonwealth Fund
Ford Foundation
Ford Motor Company Fund
William T. Grant Foundation

General Electric Fund
M. and S. Halperin Charitable Trust
James Irvine Foundation
Walter S. Johnson Foundation
Ewing Marion Kauffman
W.K.Kellogg Foundation
Lilly Endowment
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
Pew Charitable Trust
San Diego Foundation
Wallace-Readers Digest Fund
An anonymous donor

The American Youth Policy Forum Staff

Betsy Brand and Glenda Partee, Co-directors
Samuel L. Halperin, Founder and Senior Fellow
Donna Walker James, Senior Program Associate
Sarah Pearson, Program Associate
Steve Estes, Research Associate
Peter Hannibal, Intern
Lucille Easson, Chief Administrative Officer

Summary of Forum Activities: July 1, 1998 – June 30, 1999

- Twenty-five lunch-time forums (usually held on Capitol Hill)
- Seven one- or multi-day field visits
- A one-week international study mission, *Preparation for Employment: The Partnership of Schools, Employers and Government*, to Munich and Friedrichshafen, Germany; Bregenz and Hochst, Austria and Zurich and Baden, Switzerland (partially supported by the German Marshall Fund of the United States)
- Two special focus sessions--a dinner conversation with Hon. Raymond Bramucci, Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, on the new Workforce Investment Act; and with Daniel Domenech, Superintendent of Fairfax County, VA Public Schools
- Four evening seminars (in a five-part series of discussions on programs serving out-of-school youth)
- Two discussion group meetings on “High Schools of the Millennium” (to review and make recommendations for the changing structure of secondary-level schooling)
- One discussion group meeting (of a series of four) on the future of school-to-work after the School to Work Opportunities Act sunsets in 2001
- Two meetings of our Board of Trustees to review next steps for AYPF and to identify future programs of interest to our constituents and generally inform the work of AYPF
- Extensive dissemination of the well-received publication **Some Things DO Make a Difference for Youth: A Compendium of Evaluations of Youth Programs and Practices** (1997)
- Publication and dissemination of **AMORE Things That DO Make a Difference for Youth: A Compendium of Evaluations of Youth Programs and Practices**
- Developed, published and widely disseminated **The Forgotten Half Revisited: American Youth and Young Families, 1988-2008** (ed. Samuel Halperin); two monographs, *Ten Years of Youth in Service to America* by Shirley Sagawa, and *Reflections on a Decade of Promoting Youth Development* by Karen Pittman and Merita Irby; and **Youth Policy in the United States: A Year of Observations, Practices and Lessons Learned** (a summary of AYPF activities for the 12-month period July 1, 1997 - June 30, 1998)
- Participants at AYPF events (not including resource persons and other guests), totaling 2,307.

Summary: Observations, Practices and Lessons Learned

Following are summary observations, practices and lessons that surfaced through learning events in each of our three thematic areas—**Improving Education and Academic Performance**, **Preparation for Careers**, and **Youth and Community Education**. A chronological list of all learning activities is provided at the end of the report.

Improving Education and Academic Performance

- There is an increasing need for high standards and expectations, and clear systems of
- accountability. However, concerns remain about improving outcomes for low-performing students and ensuring that higher standards result in improved opportunities and access to continued learning.
- Creative partnerships involving intermediary groups, parents and community groups continue to evolve. These groups are integral for establishing high standards and expectations for students, providing additional supports for students and families, and implementing clear systems of accountability.
- There is a relationship between individualized, safe and caring school communities and student achievement.
- Large scale education reform and public policy experiments are being played out at the state and local levels that have inconclusive and unforeseen impacts on education and services for young people.

- New, innovative and sometimes recycled approaches to schooling abound, including efforts to restructure high school education. Still, more attention needs to be devoted to the structure and effectiveness of the American high school.
- Developing effective programs and reforms takes time, as does making cultural shifts in the way teachers, administrators, students and parents think about schooling, and adapting to new relationships, responsibilities and lines of authority.
- Education reform must be systemic, requiring sustained leadership, a coordinated vision and support.
- Professional development remains a critical issue in improving schools and preparing teachers to address the range of student needs.

Preparation for Careers

- The health of our economy can be sustained by improving the skills and knowledge of the workforce through enhancements in K-12 education and employer investment in training.
- Employers can be and are key players in creating incentives for students to perform well in school. Many view high quality school-to-work as a resource for providing future skilled workers. Employers also feel that intermediary organizations are important in bridging the cultural gap between schools and employers for the success of school-to-work efforts.
- There have been major advances in developing systems of school-to-work preparation since the passage of the 1994 School to Work Opportunities Act, including changes in the structure of schools to integrate school and work-based learning, and successful efforts to incorporate education reform and school-to-work strategies and to develop partnerships with

businesses, community based organizations and postsecondary institutions. There have also been advances and methods developed to ensure that students learn critical SCANS skills. Still, there is concern about the future of the national school-to-work initiative.

- Career and workforce development are responsibilities of community-based organizations, employers, parents and government. Career development must be considered as part of a holistic response by the community to preparing young adults for productive lives. As schools raise standards and expectations of the skills and knowledge young people bring to employment, elements of career preparation must be increasingly comprehensive, building on what we know about academic and occupational skills as well as the social and healthy development of young people.
- At the core of supporting and sustaining any reform is the need for consistent leadership, a coordinated vision, and the knowledge that reforms take time to develop.

Youth and Community Development

- There is great consensus among practitioners and researchers about the basic principles of effective youth programs. Increasingly, principles supporting positive youth outcomes are reflected in federal programs and initiatives of national organizations through:
 - A focus on continuous program assessment and improvement to better address participant needs and to make programs more accountable to funding sources.
 - Recognition that traditional outcome measures used in many youth employment programs do not reflect real, long-term markers to success, and youth

development strategies used traditionally by youth-serving organizations should be integral parts of youth employment and training activities.

- Efforts to develop youth leadership, ensure their participation in the design and direction of programs, and recognize youth as assets to their communities, with activities and expectations commensurate with these expectations.
- Investment in the professional development of program staff, with the recognition that staff competence is important to program quality, sustainability, and continuity of leadership.
- Efforts to connect youth to caring adults and to provide programs that are comprehensive, including education and training, multiple strategies to ensure success, including work-based learning; support services or access to them; and follow-up activities.

There is great need for collaboration of the education, employment and training, and youth-serving communities. Strategies for a more successful youth policy require a common vision across these systems, combined resources and the “un-funded” sources of youth programming inherent in community, faith-based and volunteer efforts. Above all, we must work from the premise that all youth need a quality educational experience and high levels of social supports.

Making an Impact

For the period July 1, 1998 – June 30, 1999, the American Youth Policy Forum met and exceeded our goals in the number of learning activities implemented, production of policy documents and service to the national policymaking community. Over 2,300 participants attended our forums, special sessions, discussion groups and study missions. Through this range of learning events and vehicles for distilling and disseminating what we know about youth programming, AYPF provided up-to-date continuing education and professional development for individuals working with virtually all aspects of youth policy and practice.

Feedback from forum and study mission participants is used to continuously assess the impact of our efforts on participants, document how the information will help them in their professional work, and help in the continuous improvement of our efforts.

Participants on *study missions* told us the information provided was useful in:

- providing concrete references when negotiating, formulating and developing public policy
- verifying policies and practices that they felt were important
- reexamining their assumptions about various educational reforms and youth interventions
- seeing how legislation translates into practice
- helping improve their technical assistance capabilities
- providing information on the implementation of specific programs
- meeting and making important connections with colleagues in Washington and important players in the field.

From their responses, we learned the different levels of expectations and uses to which

participants apply what they learn at our *forums* to their work--extending from very broad policy levels to very program specific topics and issues. Participants used this information for:

- understanding the context and background of issues, helping to clarify their thinking and developing a multi-disciplinary perspective
- researching a topic and formulating research priorities
- creating policy and recommendations for their superiors
- helping establish priorities for investments in education
- understanding the realities and limitations of public policy
- assisting in the development of national-level surveys
- assisting in site reviews with local and state education agencies
- learning about interventions communities are taking to address educational and work-related issues for youth
- staying informed on the school district efforts in standards reform
- conceptualizing an effective school report card as part of legislative reauthorization
- learning about techniques for engaging parents and taxpayers in issues of education accountability
- gaining insight into how to frame ongoing investigations of policies and practices

Interest in AYPF activities is evident in the increasing requests for publications from sources as diverse as schools of education, state and local education and employment service agencies, college and public libraries, youth workers and national youth affiliates, juvenile justice agencies, and through the increasing popularity of our website which has grown steadily from 5,841 hits per month in July 1998 to 16,527 in June 1999. Through our publications and world wide website (<http://www.aypf.org>), we are able

to share our experiences with the youth policy community worldwide.

Publications developed and disseminated during this period documented lessons learned; informed policymakers and their aides about current trends and issues, effective practices and program outcomes for youth; and provided this information to a wider audience of local, state and national policymakers and program practitioners. Publications included:

- **MORE Things that DO Make a Difference for Youth: A Compendium of Evaluations of Youth Programs and Practices.** 1999 (ed. Donna Walker James). The compendium includes positive findings from 46 youth interventions based on 64 evaluations and is a follow-up to the 1997 publication of youth program evaluations cited in **Some Things DO Make a Difference for Youth**. Both volumes provide a handy resource of empirical findings for policymakers and program practitioners as they craft and implement strategies to improve services and support for our nation's youth.
- **The Forgotten Half= Revisited: American Youth and Young Families, 1988-2000.** 1998 (ed., Samuel Halperin). This 200-page report reviews what our nation has accomplished for late-adolescents and youth adults (especially ages 18-24) in the decade since the publication of the predecessor reports of the William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, **The Forgotten Half: Non-College Youth in America** and **The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America=s Youth and Young Families** (both 1988), which called the nation=s attention to their shaky prospects for successful passages to productive adult lives. Most key indicators in the 1998 publication--as examined in essays by 15 prominent experts and commentators on such topics as public schooling, postsecondary education, family

life, preparation for employment, youth and community development and national service, show either disturbing stagnation or, in some areas, marked retrogression.

- Two monographs, **A Ten Years of Youth in Service to America@** by Shirley Sagawa, and **A Reflections on a Decade of Promoting Youth Development,@** by Karen Pittman and Merita Irby, individually reprinted chapters from **The Forgotten Half Revisited**, tailored for and distributed to the national/community service and youth development communities.
- **Youth Policy in the United States: A Year of Observations, Practices and Lessons Learned** (1998). A summary of AYPF activities for the 12-month period, July 1, 1997 - June 30, 1998.

Improving Education and Academic Performance

There is an increasing need for high standards and expectations, and clear systems of accountability. However, concerns remain about improving outcomes for low-performing students and ensuring that higher standards result in improved opportunities and access to continued learning.

A dinner discussion with **Daniel Domenech**, Superintendent of Fairfax County (VA) Public Schools (6/15/99) provided a rare opportunity for AYPF participants to explore some of the above issues and concerns with an administrator on the front line. Fairfax County is the 12th largest school system in the U.S. with an enrollment of 152,000 students. The County has wide disparities in income and educational levels, and a diverse population where a variety of native languages are spoken in the home. The school system is in the midst of aligning its curriculum to meet the new Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL), integrating technology into classrooms, creating opportunities for choice for students and families, and developing a well-qualified teaching corps. Dr. Domenech provided his thoughts on education reform, the process of change, and the implementation of the Virginia Standards of Learning.

According to Domenech, the alignment of the curriculum with the SOL assessments will take time and, in the near term, many schools will perform poorly on the SOLs. In the first year of testing, significant discrepancies in achievement between high income and low

“The challenge is to figure how to create an environment where all teachers believe it is their job to help all children learn and to determine how the system can best help teachers do this.” Daniel Domenech, Superintendent, Fairfax County Public Schools

income students were noted. Domenech used the SOL test results to determine which schools needed the most help to focus on ways to ensure high academic achievement for all students. He wanted to instill an attitude of equal achievement for all students, not just an attitude of equal education for all students. He is building strategies around the following concepts: children need extended learning opportunities and have different learning styles so teachers must understand how to teach to those different learning styles, and extra resources, professional development, and support from parents and the community will be needed to reach the goal of achievement for every student.

As local districts grapple with the implementation of new standards and their effect on classroom activities and student achievement, there is often a lack of consensus on how student progress should be reported, on what indicators we hold schools and communities accountable for success, and the implications of these efforts for at-risk and disadvantaged children and youth. Presenters at forums raised issues related to the lack of equitable compensatory education funding for school-age students; the importance of improvements in pre-college education to increase access and attainment of disadvantaged students in postsecondary education; and the concern that the GED should be considered a stepping stone to continued education for young people who have not persevered in traditional schools rather than a terminal educational accomplishment. Presenters also discussed the relationship of sound school disciplinary policies to academic achievement.

Differing perspectives on accountability was the topic of the forum **“Demanding Accountability for Better Schools: What Parents, Teachers and Taxpayers Want to Know”** (3/12/99) with public opinion pollster **Andy Plattner** of A-Plus Communications. When surveyed, parents, taxpayers, and educators agree that safety is the most important school indicator, but the three

groups hold very different opinions on other matters related to education.

Parents and taxpayers consider it more important to know how a child is doing against a set standard, while

Comment from forum participant: "Interesting to compare approaches to these issues from perspectives of parents of school-age children, taxpayers, and educators. So often in DC we only hear one side or another, not a comparison."

educators prefer to evaluate the child relative to other children. Educators generally prefer a focus on inputs to education, while parents and taxpayer groups emphasize outcomes. They want to see how the schools are doing and how students are performing; they want trend data, rather than data on numbers of students, staff, suspensions, expulsions, and parental involvement. They want to see how their schools and students compare with a fixed standard and to other schools and students within the same district and state.

The impact of state accountability systems on disadvantaged student populations and the use of federal compensatory education dollars to improve student success were topics of the forum "**The Reauthorization of ESEA Title I: Key Findings from the Civil Rights Project**" (4/12/99). According to **Gary Orfield**, The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University, "The current emphasis on test scores has the potential of increasing dropout rates among minorities, who are concentrated in impoverished, low-performing schools. State accountability systems that fail to look at performance of minority and low-income students are incomplete. High quality curriculum and professional development are influential to the performance of low-income students."

Comments from forum participant: "Excellent timing in view of pending reauthorization of ESEA. Will certainly stimulate not only dialogue within the department about enforcement activities, but also internal collaboration to promote

Jim McPartland of the Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, observed that high school students rarely benefit from federal compensatory education funds,¹ although most problems with dropout and student achievement occur in the upper grades. During School Years 1993-94 and 1994-95, 28 percent of public school students were in grades nine through twelve, but only eight percent of these students received Title I aid. McPartland notes that high school problems are more severe than what is being reported and more Title I compensatory education dollars should go to secondary schools.

Improving outcomes and providing greater access for disadvantaged youth issues were discussed at the forum "**A Review of Early Intervention Programs to Promote Access to Postsecondary Education**" (5/14/99). **Larry Gladieux** and **Scott Swail** of The College Board argued that the issue for education policymakers is how to equalize opportunities for postsecondary education. Students from disadvantaged backgrounds enroll in higher education at rates less than those of other groups, but their enrollment also appears to be concentrated at two-year institutions. Improving the ability of parents and students to finance postsecondary education has been the primary focus of federal policy, but there are more fundamental strategies needed to increase degree completion. Education reform efforts aimed at increasing student achievement are essential so that students come to college better academically prepared. Postsecondary institutions also need to be concerned with what happens to students outside of school, and also ensure a positive relationship or support from an adult. Finally, postsecondary education institutions must look at persistence in college as a critical issue and find ways to help students complete their degrees.

¹ Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

The issue of improved educational outcomes was also addressed in the forum “**The Educational and Labor Market Performance of GED Recipients**” (10/23/98). The report of the same name co-authored by **Dave Boesel**, Senior Research

Associate, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education,

The educational and labor market performance of GED recipients indicates that the GED should be seen as an opportunity for more education, but not as a substitute for it.

analyzed more than 50 years of research on the GED. According to Boesel, it is important to continue encouraging prospective dropouts to stay in high school, put more emphasis on high school completion programs and provide counseling for GED recipients to enter or remain in college. To improve outcomes for high school dropouts, some states, such as Rhode Island, Tennessee, and California, are experimenting with adult programs geared toward obtaining a regular high school diploma. Fifty years of research on GED shows that a high school diploma is still the best tool for a better future.

AYPF participants previewed “**Lost in Transition: Latinos, School and Society**” (9/18/98), a documentary film by **John Merrow**, the award-winning educational journalist and host of The Merrow Report with **Sonia Slutsky**, producer. The program explored issues of why Latino students have high dropout rates (inadequate resources, lack of opportunities, poverty, the lure of the streets, as well as language barriers); explored the impact of California’s Proposition 227 requiring the placement of all limited English students (currently more than 1.4 million in California) in English-immersion programs; and examined the experience and quality of teachers available to the Latino community.

A subsequent forum “**Immigrant Adolescents with Limited Schooling and Literacy:**

Developing Responsive Programs” (6/25/99) highlighted programs and instructional strategies available for these students in secondary schools and the challenges that their education create for schools. These students have had little formal schooling before they come to the U.S. and their literacy skills (in their native language and in English) are limited. Immigrant children, most of whom speak a language other than English, are the fastest-growing segment of the U.S. school-age population. Between 1986 and 1994, the number of students designated as limited English Proficient (LEP) increased by 45 percent to over 3 million. Many of these students speak no English at all when they arrive in this country. Almost half enter school at the secondary level.

Ann Jaramillo, Associate Director of the Center for Applied Linguistics’ Demonstration Immigrant Education Program in Salinas, California, provided unedited samples of students’ work illustrating their level of written expression in English at the end of one year of schooling in the U.S. which included two hours of English language development a day. These were compared with samples of middle school students who, in contrast to the underschooled students, had arrived in the U.S. with good prior schooling in their native language. The contrast was great and showed clearly the extreme needs and major challenges faced by the underschooled youth and their teachers.

Among the policy implications cited by panelists from programs in California and Maryland are the need to:

- understand better the magnitude of the problem;
- re-examine the structure and design of secondary schools in light of the extended time students needed for acquisition of English and subject matter mastery;
- re-think teacher preparation in terms of what secondary teachers need to know to respond to this challenge—including training in basic literacy instruction and metacognitive

approaches to reading; and

- ensure access to the core curriculum through the use of native language when possible.

Creative partnerships involving intermediary groups, parents and community groups continue to evolve. These groups are integral for establishing high standards and expectations for students, providing additional supports for students and families, and implementing clear systems of accountability.

Creating new and innovative school structures was a focus of the forum **The Developing Field of School-Community Initiatives** (02/05/99). School community initiatives involve many organizations working to assist schools and communities. The Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) and the National Center for Community Education analyzed 20 school-community initiatives across the country to identify key characteristics and emerging trends. The findings were published in the report *Learning Together: The Developing Field of School-Community Initiatives*.

Preliminary findings presented by **Martin Blank, Staff Coordinator of the Coalition for Community Schools at IEL**, show increased school attendance and test scores, decreased student mobility, and improved social and emotional behaviors of participant students. The findings

Comments from forum participant: "I would like to see another forum on this topic. Maybe with panelists who took a different approach, or ones who hit challenges and restructured to become successful."

also indicated: increased parental participation in the schools, reduction in crime rates in the areas served, and increased employment rates for graduates. The services and activities are not parallel add-ons to the regular school programs. They bring fundamental changes to the school culture, influencing all aspects of school life, such as policies, curriculum, instructional

methods, and communication between parents and staff.

In the field trip to New York City (5/6-7/99), participants were able to observe school-community partnerships first-hand at Washington Heights Intermediate School 218, an innovative community school designed in partnership with the Children=s Aid Society (CAS). Here, community partnerships work to combine academic study with health services, youth development activities and parental involvement. I.S. 218 is open 10 – 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, year around (except for traditional holidays). This represents 300+ days per year, compared with 180 days at regular public schools.

The partnership with the NYC Board of Education recognizes that the facility belongs to the community. Through the partnership, the \$6,500 to \$8,500 per student investment from the Board of Education in the students' education is augmented by approximately \$900 per student raised by CAS from private foundations (about 80 percent) and other public funds (20 percent from sources, such as 21st Century Learning Community Schools, Safe and Drug Free Schools, etc.) for health, optical, dental, and mental health services, before and after school, summer programs and staff development. The Technical Assistance Center operated by CAS helps replicate the IS 218 model at other schools and share the Society's accumulated wealth of experience learned in operating community schools.

The importance of establishing creative partnerships involving parents and community groups, high standards and expectations, and clear systems of accountability was addressed at the forum **"The El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence: Is it Possible to Turn Big City School Systems Around?"** (1/8/99).

According to **Anne T. Henderson**, co-author of *The Urgent Message: Families Crucial to School Reform*, healthy communities involved with

school reform exhibit the following characteristics:

- parents are active and press for accountability and good results;
- school improvement is ongoing and parents are always involved; and
- parents work with their children at home as well.

The *Urgent Message* report includes examples of how low-performing schools achieved significant improvement after parents and the community become involved. El Paso, Texas was one of those communities.

The El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence, represented by **Alicia Parra**, Deputy Director, includes the top leadership of the K-12 system, the University of Texas at El Paso system, the local community colleges, the mayor, business and community leaders, and parents. The goal of the Collaborative is to focus efforts of all these groups on integrated and aligned standards-based reform, driven by data. In six years, the Collaborative has seen dramatic increases in student participation in challenging courses and in achievement in academic courses.

Participants learned how an intermediary organization, community groups and parents have worked to reform low-performing schools and fuelled the small schools movement in District 8 in the Bronx, New York City (forum: **“Creating New Small Schools: Do They Work? Can We Afford Them? Can They Drive the System?”** 10/30/98).

The Center for Collaborative Education (CCE), explained **Heather Lewis**, its co-director, got involved with the District 8 reform through its Campus School Project. CCE is a non-profit network of schools where parents, teachers and principals share similar values and beliefs about the learning process. Although the organization represents a network of public schools, its outside structure makes CCE a powerful advocate and fundraising tool for innovation in

education. In partnership with the New York Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers, CCE raised \$3 million from private foundations to its Campus School Project, which aims to replace large comprehensive but low-performing high schools with small schools driven by high standards.

While CCE represents concerned educators working to improve school outcomes, Mothers on the Move (MOM), represents a new generation

“Systemic school changes can occur only if based on grassroots movements, for which parental power, rather than parental involvement, is the answer for attaining policy changes.” Milli Bonilla, co-founder, Mothers on the Move.

of parents struggling to bring reforms to their children’s schools. MOM is an independent nonprofit organization that currently includes about 700 parents, explained co-founder **Milli Bonilla**. The organization grew out of adult literacy classes attended by graduates of South Bronx schools who could barely read or write. Realizing that the literacy classes were a consequence of their failing schools, a few parents decided to fight for school reforms, so their children would not graduate without even a basic education, as they had done. Through a door-to-door campaign, MOM organizers mobilized parents to address the issue of failing schools. MOM also mobilized the community to vote at the School Board elections and elected two of their members to the Board. MOM members were instrumental in getting new leadership into the District and many needed reforms.

There is a relationship between individualized, safe and caring school communities and student achievement.

Among the reforms initiated in District 8 by the new superintendent was the closure of a large high school and its replacement with smaller

academies. In New York City, “small schools” contain 600 students or less. For **Edwina Branch** (founder and principal of New School for Arts and Sciences, an alternative school with 350 students in grades 9-12, part of the James Monroe Education Complex Schools in the Bronx), the advantage of small schools is

“Schools are more than buildings--they are communities. This is what ensures that a school can be small even when it is located in a large building.” Edwina Branch

that staff can be more attentive to individual students’ needs. The small size allows for the development of a strong feeling of community where parents, teachers and students can work together. Parental involvement is essential to build this community, says Branch, and principals and teachers are responsible for making parents feel welcome in the schools. She advocates an open door policy for principals and encourages teachers to call parents not only to complain, as they usually do, but also to share their children’s success.

According to **Betty Rosa**, Superintendent of Community School District 8, “one size fits all” cannot be the motto when children are involved and small schools allow for greater flexibility in tune with the changes that situations require. One problem she has had to address is the impact of gang membership on the school environment. Students join gangs during middle school and often refuse to move to an assigned high school because this forces them to enter another gang’s turf. One solution was to provide high school courses in the middle school after 2:30 p.m. Schools are now open from 7:30 a.m. to 10 p.m., six days a week. Rosa urges educators to stop thinking about education in the old ways; given today’s possibilities, it is unfair to tie ourselves to the past. For Rosa, small schools are not only about buildings. They imply new perspectives for the role of schools, including curriculum, schedules, and other aspects of students’ lives,

such as health, mental health and social problems. The advantage of small schools is that they push people into trying new ideas.

Norm Fruchter, Director of the Institute for Education and Social Policy, New York University, discussed an evaluation of over 100 small schools, half of which were high schools, showing positive outcomes for students. Fruchter cited close relationships with adults, counseling services, a curriculum focused on a smaller number of key courses, and the interaction between parents and schools as contributing factors for the success of small schools.

In the forum “**Order in the Classroom–Violence, Discipline, and Student Achievement**” (3/26/99), school discipline and safety were discussed in the context of student achievement. According to **Paul Barton** of the Policy Information Center, Educational Testing Service, between 1991 and 1997, the number of disciplinary infractions went up, except for alcohol use. Although serious offenses are still less frequent, more than half of the public schools nationwide reported that a crime had been committed on the premises and 10 percent reported a serious violent crime such as rape or sexual battery, suicide, robbery, or physical attacks with the use of a weapon.

Declines in serious offenses at schools are related to the severity of the punishment. Schools with lenient discipline tend to have more incidents, particularly involving alcohol and drug abuse. The study also found that the lack of school discipline erodes not only the school environment, but also the learning process for all students. The frequency of drug offenses is negatively related to low academic achievement in math and science (but not in social science or reading). Therefore, a sound disciplinary policy is a prerequisite for a sound academic policy.

The importance of values in promoting a more positive learning environment was the topic of the forum “Character Education Makes A

Difference: Reinvigorating the Work of Schools” (12/4/98). According to **Esther Schaeffer**, CEO and Executive Director of the Character Education Partnership, Americans consider the following four issues of most concern in today’s society: crime and violence; decline in ethics, morals, and family values; education; and drugs (1998 Gallup Poll).

Character education holds that core ethical values, such as respect, responsibility, honesty, and caring, are an essential foundation for creating environments that promote learning. Schools that adopt these practices show improved behavior among students (such as increased attendance); schoolwork integrated with community service; strong relationships between students and teachers; improved student academic performance; and a strong climate of responsibility and respect. Principal **Tim Smith** of Mound Fort Middle High School in Utah indicated that after implementing a character education program at his school, not only did the environment improve, but scores on their reading comprehension tests increased from 35 points to 63 points, and math scores increased from 31 points to 45 points.

Large scale education reform and public policy experiments are being played out at the state and local levels that have inconclusive and unforeseen impacts on education and services for young people.

Issues of local control, flexibility and different governance structures were the topics of the forum, “**A Revolution in School District Governance: The Chicago Experience**” (12/11/98). **Dorothy Shapps**, formerly a Director of the Consortium on Chicago School Reform, provided an overview of the two major reform efforts undertaken by the Chicago Public Schools. The first wave of reform in 1988 gave new power to local school councils, consisting primarily of parents and community representatives. The second wave of reform in 1995 focused on creating a system of accountability by instituting standardized tests of

student performance.

Shapps indicated that after almost a decade of reform efforts, there has been little positive change in student performance; almost 10,000 students have been retained once at their grade level; the dropout rate is 46 percent; and 116 schools have been placed on probation for failure to meet prescribed levels of student performance. The reforms have been very political and many school personnel were transferred or left the system, resulting in a lack of continuity and experience. One positive aspect of the reform, however, was the infusion of large amounts of funds to support reform efforts from foundations and the corporate sector. According to Shapps, the jury is still out on whether these massive reform efforts have improved student achievement.

California’s success in engineering education policy through the ballot box provided lessons on the unintended consequences of voter impact and control. The effect on education services of voters’ direct participation in the decision-making process through ballot initiatives

“California moved from a community ethic, where everyone pays their fair share to support public services, to a market ethic, where only those who use the services should pay. Policy decisions affecting education are being made through the ballot box, and there is an increasing split between users of social services—mostly the young, the poor and minorities—and the voters—older, wealthier and more white.” Peter Schrag

was the topic of the forum “**Paradise Lost: California’s Experience, America’s Future: A Conversation with author Peter Schrag**” (3/5/99).

In 1978, to halt the rise in property taxes, Californians approved Proposition 13. This Proposition capped property taxes at one percent of the assessment value, which could be re-assessed only if the property was sold. With

little provision for the future, Proposition 13 made it difficult for local governments to address the needs of the state's growing population. It also moved the decision-making power and its accountability from local governments to the state capital. Finally, it started a trend of having major political decisions--from environmental protections to a minimum wage--resolved through ballot measures. These actions served to reduce the discretion of elected representatives, restrict budget decisions and limit the authority and discretion of both the state and local governments.

The impact of Proposition 13 has been felt acutely. In the mid-1970s, California was 5th in expenditure per pupil among the states, now it is the 37th or 38th.² Not surprisingly, Californian fourth graders tied for last place with Louisiana in the most recent National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) reading tests. Ten percent of Californian teachers do not have credentials, and those who are more qualified move into better schools in wealthy districts, while the poor districts retain the least qualified personnel. On the other hand, while the public schools struggle to survive, Californian universities and community colleges thrive with the help of large investments from the aerospace and defense industries.

Proposition 48 required the state to put 40 percent of its revenues into K-12 schools, but most of that money was used to reduce class sizes in grades K-3. Without the resource of property taxes, the local governments have relied on developers' fees and other initiatives, mostly paid by those who are the potential beneficiaries of the schools. The large elderly population in the state has voted against taxes that help schools, since they see no profit from them. This system has brought sharp divisions among young and old, wealthy and poor communities, and has

² Between 1970 and 1997, spending per pupil in California fell more than 15 percent relative to spending in the rest of the country (Research Brief, Public Policy Institute of California, February 2000).

strained racial relations within the state, since 60 percent of the state school enrollment is made of minority students.

Professional development remains a critical issue in improving schools and preparing teachers to address the range of student needs.

Why professional development is a critical issue in improving our schools was the topic of the forum **“What You Always Wanted to Know About the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards”** (11/20/98). Created in 1987, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to establishing high and rigorous standards for excellence in teaching. According to James Kelly, President and CEO, the Board was created to address the limitations in the licensure process and bring professionalization into teaching.

Research indicates that accomplished teachers can be defined by five dimensions or core principles:

- teachers are committed to students and their learning;
- teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to all students;
- teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring students' learning;
- teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience; and
- teachers know how to bring parents and other professionals into the practice of teaching to help learning.

The certification process has become a tool for learning for many candidates. Currently, nearly 20 states have agreed to pay the \$2000 certification fee for individual teachers. In addition, 15 states are providing some type of compensation for board-certified teachers.

New, innovative and sometimes recycled approaches to schooling abound, including efforts to restructure high school education. Still, more attention needs to be devoted to the structure and effectiveness of the American high school.

A number of forums and field trips focused on issues of how to structure new and innovative approaches to schooling, particularly the high school experience. Participants heard and discussed radical recommendations for the abolition of high schools as we know them, learned about old but reemerging trends in instituting residential schools, and visited high schools in various stages of reform.

In the forum **“Is the American High School Obsolete? A University President’s Vision of a New Future for High Schools”** (10/16/98), **Leon Botstein**, President of Bard College in New York, contended that American public schools, particularly its high schools, have not changed since the beginning of the century, when they became the dominant mode of secondary education. The problem is that the students have changed--physically, emotionally, and culturally--and the schools are no longer able to meet the educational needs of the new generation. Botstein feels that high schools are so ill designed to serve adolescents that any form of educational reform will not work--the system cannot be fixed. He therefore proposes eliminating high schools as we now know them.

He suggested condensing the high school curriculum in grades seven through ten and then allowing students to enter the work place, volunteer or attend further education. Discontinuing formal public schooling at 10th grade would affect the significant numbers of young people who already drop out of school around that time--the group currently least served by high schools. Their need for alternatives (e.g., in service activities, through new structures formed on the model of career

academies, and apprenticeships, as well as early college admission) will be more obvious and meeting their needs can, perhaps, be better coordinated. According to Botstein, “If high school ends early, there will be greater opportunities to structure interactions between youth and adult practitioners in particular fields, for example with business, arts, sciences and other professional communities, thus equipping them better for adulthood and providing access to a different caliber of instructor—teachers who know their field well and love it.”

The revival of the “orphanage” as an alternative school structure was the topic of the forum **“Rethinking Orphanages for the 21st Century: Residential Schools for At-Risk Children and Youth”** (1/29/99). A new interest in residential schools has resurfaced in the past few years and some states, such as Minnesota, have passed, or are about to pass, legislation to create residential schools, most as charter schools. Residential schools follow different models and receive different sources of funding. Job Corps, with 116 centers nationwide, is the largest federally-funded residential school model. Some schools, such as Indiana’s Sailor’s Home are funded by the state. Others are privately funded, such as Eagle Rock in Colorado (by the Honda Corporation) or the Milton Hershey School (a private endowment). Residential schools may seem expensive, with an average cost of \$25,000 a year to educate and provide room, board, and clothes to each student. However, in the long-run, said **Heidi Goldsmith**, Executive Director of the International Center for Residential Education, these schools prove to be a cost effective way to ensure high quality education and support to children who would otherwise run the risk of dropping out of school, remaining unemployed or getting involved with the court system.

High School Reform

Unresolved issues and concerns affecting high

school age youth have been the focus of many AYPF learning events. In 1997, AYPF began to look at the problems of high schools in a number of field trips and continued a focus on high school reform in 1998 and 1999.

AYPF held a discussion group on **“High Schools of the Millennium”** (3/10/99 and 4/27/99), which continued into 2000. The purpose of this discussion group was to encourage conversation among policy aides, education experts, and practitioners; expand interest in high school reform; and determine if there is agreement on what a newly designed high school experience for teens should look like. Any agreement from this group could be used in a variety of ways, including influencing education policy at the federal, state and local levels.

Among the reasons for focusing on the issue of high school reform:

- the possibility of providing information for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA);
- the upcoming expiration of the School to Work Opportunities Act, which has had an impact on many high school programs;
- the need to improve performance in schools in low-income urban communities;
- the impact that standards-based reform efforts are having on secondary schools; and
- the emerging movement to connect learning with the community.

Based on the conclusions of the discussion group a report will be drafted to explore the vision of a new learning experience at the secondary level; difficulties in the current environment to affect the change; and strategies to help create the new vision of learning for teens.

AYPF study missions have contributed to our exploration of high school reform. These visits have been to urban and rural schools that:

- use whole-school, research-based models of reform, such as *High Schools That Work*³ (and also the Children’s Aid Society community school model used by the Washington Heights Intermediate School 218 in New York City);
- participate in national networks of support and ascribe to particular curricula and school structures (e.g., National Academy Foundation, Coalition of Essential Schools, *High Schools that Work*); and
- have received national recognition based on external criteria (e.g., New American High Schools and New American Urban High Schools⁴).

3 *High Schools That Work* is the nation's first large-scale effort to engage state, district, and school leaders and teachers in partnership with students, parents, and the community to improve the way all high school students are prepared for work and further education. HSTW is based on the belief that, in the right school environment, most students can learn complex academic and technical concepts. The initiative targets high school students who seldom are challenged to meet high academic standards. (HSTW began with 28 sites in 13 states in 1987 and has since grown to more than 800 sites in 22 states.) HSTW has two major goals: (1) to raise the math, science, communication, problem-solving, and technical achievement of more students to the national average and above; and (2) to blend the essential content of traditional college-prep students -- math, science, and language arts -- with quality vocational-technical studies by using applied and integrated curricula.

4 The *New American High School* initiative is part of a strategy developed by the Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, to recognize high schools that are committed to ensuring that all students meet challenging academic standards and are prepared for college and careers. Schools designated as *New Urban High Schools* (NUHS) are committed to preparing all students for success in career, college, and community life and have agreed to work with the NUHS project to support whole-school reform efforts nationwide. These sites demonstrate how to provide high academic standards and career skills for all students through: integration of academic and vocational content; dynamic connections between the school and adult worlds, including internships and other work- and community-based learning; links between high schools and postsecondary educational institutions; and a personalized learning environment.

A number of the schools had been developed to provide necessary options for students or were examples of failing schools that had been turned into successful models.

Among the “new models or options” for students were:

- **Central Park East Secondary School (CPESS)**, a “school of choice” in New York City’s District 4, a member of the Coalition of Essential Schools and a member of the New York Networks for School Renewal of “small schools”⁵
- **Bread and Roses Integrated Arts High School**, an ACORN⁶/New Visions School “small school”
- District of Columbia Charter Schools--

NUHS Project staff coordinates a network of mutual technical assistance to help the sites learn from each other. The sites also receive consultation from NUHS site liaisons and mentors.

The *New American High School* initiative is part of an aggressive strategy developed by the Department of

5 The Center for Collaborative Education (CEE) is the New York City affiliate of the Coalition of Essential Schools, a national school reform movement that began in 1984 with the work of Theodore R.Sizer and his colleagues at Brown University. CCE began 12 years ago with a group of schools seeking to effect policy change. It grew from six to 40 schools and shifted its focus from building small schools to building capacity for performance-based assessment (i.e., presentation of student learning through portfolios and student work).

6 ACORN is a grassroots community-based organization with a membership of over 20,000 low- to moderate- income families. Acorn members organize to influence a wide range of issues, including education, housing, crime, bank investment, employment, and health care. The ACORN Schools Office was established in 1988 in response to intense interest in improving local schools on the part of ACORN members. The Schools Office is governed by the City-Wide Education Committee, made of members from each ACORN neighborhood and school. Members and staff organize campaigns around education issues and develop small, autonomous public schools in ACORN neighborhoods.

- The **Community Academy**, a neighborhood-based, multiple campus charter, operated by The Urban Family Institute, a community-based organization, offering primary through secondary education and an extended day program.
- The **School for Educational Evolution and Development (SEED)**, the nation’s first inner-city public charter boarding school, providing a nurturing environment, strong role models and a rigorous academic program. The school is home to 39 seventh graders and is gearing up to accept 300 students as it adds grades 8 through 12.
- **Options**, operating under the sponsorship of the Capital Children’s Museum, and providing an alternative learning experience for 100 of the District’s most at-risk students, in grades 5 through 8.
- **Cesar Chavez High School for Public Policy**, drawing on the resources in the nation’s capital as a support to the curriculum that promotes citizenship and prepares students to excel in postsecondary education and life. The school opened with a class of 60 ninth graders. At full capacity, the school will serve 240 students in grades nine through twelve.
- The **Math, Science and Technology High Schools**, offering a rigorous, standards-based, college preparatory education for youth interested in math, science and technology.
- The **Henry Ford Academy of Manufacturing Arts and Sciences**, a public charter school sponsored by the Ford Motor Company in partnership with the Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village, offering a broad-based liberal arts curriculum through the lens of manufacturing with an emphasis on

application of academic subjects through a real world context.

- The **Ford Motor Academy of Manufacturing Sciences (FAMS)**, provides a series of courses to students in their junior and senior years and requires an internship with Ford or another local manufacturing firm during the two years.

Among the restructured schools visited were:

- **Sussex Technical High School** in Georgetown, Delaware
- **Bergen County Technical Schools' Career Academies**, Hackensack, New Jersey
- Several *High Schools That Work* in West Virginia
- **Washington Heights Intermediate School (IS) 218** in New York City

Observations from Site Visits

Among the observations made from visits to these schools were:

- Poor school performance has forced many schools and districts to implement extensive changes. But, improving school performance means overcoming extreme challenges and instituting a number of reforms simultaneously.*

Student performance was so low in Summers County, West Virginia that half of the schools in the county were closed and public hearings were held to decide what the community wanted. The community agreed to a focus on stronger academics as well as a hands-on approach to learning. The high school reopened with a strong focus on career preparation and academics. Teachers were willing to change because performance was so bad; they realized they had to do something.

Leaders at the **Randolph County Vocational Technical Center (RCVTC)** in West Virginia faced the task of overcoming the image of a "dumping ground" for low-ability, low-achieving students and convincing the community that these students could and should be taught to higher standards. School leaders were faced with: students who lacked basic reading, mathematics, science and problem-solving skills; high dropout rates, poor attendance, and low achievement; disgruntled employers that complained they were spending time and money to prepare high school graduates who were woefully ill equipped to perform even menial tasks; staff in need of training and direction in bringing about required change; and a school image that was tarnished due to all of these factors.

Strategies for addressing these problems included: eliminating the general track, providing staff development, designing challenging vocational curriculum, instituting block scheduling, and providing extra help and opportunities for dual enrollment in high school and college courses. Seniors must intern, create a product and deliver a presentation. Standards are very high. Active vocational student organizations have provided opportunities for student engagement and development of leadership skills. Faculty members serve as advisors, meeting with students once each month for four years. Finally, RCVTC involved parents from the beginning and kept them involved in all phases of reform.

- Reforms in vocational education have forced massive restructuring of traditional vocational education programs and created academically rigorous, highly popular educational experiences for students.*

The **Bergen County Technical School** has changed from a shared-time vocational school to a full-time program with seven career academies, offering a variety of options for student interests and abilities. The career academies are designed

for students with strong academic skills who plan to pursue a baccalaureate education. All academies have a core curriculum (four years of college preparatory English; four years of a foreign language; biology, chemistry and physics, at a minimum) that is supplemented by coursework in the selected career field.

The school uses the Coalition of Essential Schools model that relies on project-based teaching and learning. Themes for project-based activities are linked to the student's career focus and the academies' involvement with the business and industry community. All seniors are required to participate in a senior experience—an internship that is an interactive learning partnership through which students increase their knowledge and abilities in a selected area of study. The school's location in the suburbs of New York City provides students with a wealth of high quality internship possibilities in the New York City and northern New Jersey region.

Up-to-date technology and offerings pervade the curriculum, including a wide range of electives and co-curricular activities, such as electives in product research and development and an electronic school newsletter that teens nationwide can plug into and even contribute articles.

Like the Bergen County Technical Schools, **Sussex Technical High School**, located in rural Delaware, was once a part-time vocational school serving students from other districts who took their academic courses at their home school. The physical separation of academic and occupational courses ensured that virtually no efforts were made to integrate and reinforce learning at either site. Because the vocational and the feeder districts are each independent districts, no common schedule existed creating endless discontinuity in student learning throughout the year. The school had become a “dumping ground” for poor-performing students and those considered discipline problems in the

feeder districts. In 1990, only two students were enrolled in higher-level math classes and only two in higher level science classes.

The decision to convert from shared-time to a full-time school was made by the school board of the vocational district with buy in from the state board. The superintendent saw this as an opportunity to do something really different—to totally revamp and restructure the school. At that point, **Superintendent George Frunzi** and his staff began exploring options for change and became interested in the *High Schools That Work* model.

Using the HSTW model, Sussex Tech began restructuring in 1991, changing from a shared-time area vocational school to a comprehensive technology magnet high school for students in grades 9 through 12. As a magnet, students from eight public schools and five private schools choose to attend Sussex Tech. Enrollment is now at 1,100, with an attendance rate of 95 percent and a dropout rate of approximately 1.1 percent.

Among the innovations instituted were: block scheduling, allowing for longer class periods and more hands-on activities; counseling support services; “Techademics” or integrated curriculum⁷; and a structured program of studies (in four career areas—automotive technologies; business technologies; health/human services technologies; and industrial/engineering technologies). Seniors are required to complete a senior project, a Senior Exhibition of Mastery,

⁷ All students are expected to complete a minimum of: four English credits in courses with content equivalent to college prep English; three math credits including two in courses with content equivalent to college prep math; three credits in science, with two in courses with content equivalent to college prep science; three credits in social studies; seven credits in a vocational-technical major, with industry standards as the basis for the technical curriculum; two credits in a related vocational or technical field, including one credit in a computer course; and one credit for physical education and one half credit for health.

with three products: a written research report, an item that is built or produced, and an oral presentation. Many employers work closely with the school to provide work-based learning opportunities. Students have access to two-year apprenticeships in the electrical trades and automotive services, access to cooperative education and internship experiences and a job shadowing experience in grades 10, 11, and 12.

- c. *Change requires not only time, but also a cultural shift in the way teachers, administrators, students and parents think about high school. School-based reforms have forced changes in relationships among adults, new responsibilities and lines of authority, and opened opportunities for innovation.*

In Bergen County, **Superintendent Dr. John Grieco** worked to create an environment that embraces change, teamwork and risk-taking. At the Bergen County Technical School, faculty collaboratively determine their own courses and programs, participate in the hiring process (that way, they are certain to select wisely), and the designated leader of a learning or administrative activity is the person deemed most qualified whether a parent, a teacher, a student or a business partner.

The culture has been created for the academies to try new things and not to worry about getting wrong. The culture is supportive of trial and error and replaces the more traditional education culture of fear of trying new things and fear of failure."
Principal Lisa, Bergen County Technical School.

In Sussex Technical High School, many classes were taught in teams. Teachers feel that teaming strengthens the course, provides additional opportunities for preparation and for coaching students, and allows them to learn from a partner and improve their skills.

The Central Park East Secondary School is an organic institution created to meet the needs of students that previously had not been addressed. It operates on the same funding assumptions as other schools; however, the school's leadership has made sacrifices to provide student-centered programming. There are no department heads, no college or guidance counselors, no band, no gym, and there is only one foreign language offering. Staff has taken on a greater range of responsibilities than in traditional high schools—a choice they have made to be able to offer smaller classes.

The Bread and Roses Integrated Arts High School, a NYC “options” school⁸ was founded by teachers from a middle school who felt that there was no appropriate feeder high school in Northern Manhattan that could provide a small, safe, student-centered and intimate environment for students. Teachers have assumed administrative in addition to teaching duties to implement their vision of a caring school environment.

- d. *Professional development is critical to the success of reforming schools.*

Instituting reforms, such as those required by the *High Schools that Work* model, require supporting teachers with staff development to help them understand how to develop integrated curricula; teach applied, contextual material; and provide opportunities for extra help and extra time students need to meet high standards. Staff development has continued to be a major activity of the HSTW implementation as it has in schools in the New York Networks for School Renewal (including CCE and ACORN, among others).

⁸ Half of the students are “placed” (15% above grade level; 15% below grade level and 70% on grade level) through the NYC Board of Education; the school is allowed to select the remainder a portion of students based on their particular focus—in this case, a commitment to diversity and inclusion.

- e. *Education reform must be systemic, requiring sustained leadership, a coordinated vision and support.*

The leadership witnessed through Superintendents Domenech, Frunzi and Grieco, the work of school founders like Deborah Meier, of Central Park East Secondary School and Carol Fresha of Bread and Roses, as well as the networks such as the Center for Collaborative Education, *High Schools that Work*, and the National Academy Foundation illustrate the importance of a coordinated vision and sustained support.

“Reform takes a long time; the consistency of support from public officials including the Governor, the state legislature and state superintendent can make an enormous difference in keeping a focus and momentum; strong leadership is required to help change the culture of schools; a unified county plan for K-12 system is crucial; reform must be systemic and change all aspects of the system simultaneously; there must be a focus on ALL students; and massive technical assistance .”
Henry Marockie, West Virginia State Superintendent of Schools

Preparation for Careers

The health of our economy can be sustained by improving the skills and knowledge of the workforce through enhancements in K-12 education and employer investment in training.

A recent report by the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) looks at the changes to the American economy and lists four major trends: industrial and occupational changes (more shifts to service and information jobs); globalization; dynamism and competition between firms; and the information technology revolution. In the forum “**The New Economy**” (2/19/99), **Robert D. Atkinson**, Director of the New Economy Project at PPI, observed that while wages of college-educated workers have had a significant increase, those of less-skilled workers remained stagnant in this fast-paced and changing economy. Recommendations for sustaining the growth of the new economy include:

- investing in research and innovation,
- speeding the transformation to a digital economy,
- improving skills and knowledge of the workforce by improving student performance in K-12,
- encouraging employers to invest in training, and
- providing federal dollars to help small and medium sized firms engage in worker training.

Employers view high quality school-to-work as a resource for providing future skilled workers and can be key players in creating incentives for students to perform well in school. They also feel that intermediary organizations are important to bridging the cultural gap between schools and employers for the success of school-to-work efforts.

Forum presentations addressed many of the above recommendations for sustaining our economy and improving the quality of the entering workforce. In the forum “**Voices From the Field: Employers Talk about Building a School-to-Work System**” (2/12/99), employers reflected on their experiences with school-to-work initiatives.

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA) of 1994 is designed to improve the transition from school to work for American youth by integrating school-based and work-based learning and exposing students to high quality workplace experiences. The legislation requires the establishment of partnerships involving schools, employers, and other community representatives to design, implement and monitor school-to-work initiatives. The legislation will sunset in October 2001.

According to **Lee Doyle**, Director of Corporate Affairs, BellSouth Corporation, technological advances in the telecommunications field and the expansion of an extremely competitive market have placed new strains on the company. To survive, BellSouth needed to ensure a steady source of highly skilled workers, in addition to building customer loyalty. Their involvement in the school-to-work initiative seemed a logical response to these two forces.

For effective employer participation in school-to-work efforts, employers must be clear about what they can do best and what they cannot do. BellSouth can mobilize a large pool of potential volunteers among their employees and retirees to help in schools, speaking with students about careers and organizing the nationally successful "Groundhog Day." BellSouth, however, cannot require employees to supervise students in the workplace due to existing responsibilities placed on supervisors. Rather than providing internships for students, BellSouth established a summer internship program for teachers. In cooperation with educational publishing

company Scholastic, Inc., BellSouth also produced material to help teachers understand what skills are necessary for employment in the telecommunications field.

Siemens is the sixth largest electrical/electronics manufacturer in the world, with over 300,000 employees in Germany, and about 66,000 in more than 400 sites in the United States. **John Tobin**, Director of Institutional Relations and Vice-President of the Siemens Foundation, observed that public schools are the largest source of potential employees in America. As any other supplier, schools need to provide high quality "products," because, in this international market, work goes where knowledge is. Siemens sees its relationship with the educational system as part of the knowledge supply chain and encourages the public education system to create high quality connections between elementary, secondary, postsecondary and lifelong learning. Similarly, employers must determine the return on investment that makes their participation in STW worthwhile. "The higher the level of work in which students are trained, the higher the return on investment," Tobin emphasized.

He also spoke enthusiastically about the Tech-Prep 2+2+2 model--two years of high school, leading to a two-year Associate's Degree from a community college and two more years in a four-year college to complete a Bachelor's degree. Using this model, the company is graduating its first class of engineers, who started 11th grade in the Siemens Apprenticeship Program. In addition to the apprenticeship program, Siemens' Education Foundation finances numerous K-college activities, focusing mostly on motivating children and youth to study math and science and helping teachers to teach students how to do and enjoy research.

Doyle and Tobin agreed that employers need clarity about what is expected from their participation and a structure of support. Both

can be provided by intermediaries. **William Diehl**, Program Manager of the Center for Youth Development and Education, Corporation for Business, Work and Learning, explained that a cultural gap exists between the world of schools and the world of business. Eighty percent of teachers have never been out of the classroom and are preparing children for a workplace that no longer exists. While employers do not have time to develop activities, schools do not have the knowledge to define which activities must be developed. Intermediaries focus on closing the gaps between systems and getting all partners at the table to identify problems, resources and solutions.

Recently, Siemens opened a factory in Richmond, Virginia. The company needed 12,000 highly skilled employees, but could find only 7,000. To emphasize the advantages of a school-to-work approach, Tobin recounted the story of a young woman who entered the Siemens Apprenticeship Program after dropping out of school, being arrested on drug-related charges and having two children. In the program, she received high quality training, counseling and support. She is now a customer engineer at Siemens, earning a \$45,000 salary. Siemens gained a qualified employee, and the country saved on welfare, jail and other social costs. Indeed, the advantages of a school-to-work approach are not a surprise for a company where the last two CEOs were products of Germany's apprenticeship system.

They can be particularly helpful in gaining the participation of small and medium-size business that can be linked together to develop internships. Other mechanisms are available that intermediaries can facilitate--telementoring, for instance, is a new approach that connects students and teachers with employers through computers, independent of their locations. Diehl stressed that business and other community organizations are enthusiastic about school-to-work and want to get involved. However,

employers do not want to limit their participation to short-term, small impact projects. They want to see meaningful, sustained results. Systemic changes are at the core of school-to-work, but can happen only when the necessary linkages and supports are well established.

In the forum, ***“Making Academics Count: Encouraging Employers to Request School Records of Prospective Employees”*** (11/6/98), the role of employers in supporting student motivation for success in school was discussed. In a 1998 survey by the National Alliance of Business, 69 percent of the employers complained that entry-level employees did not have the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in the workplace. College-bound students work hard because they know that college admissions officers look at their records during the application process, but students who are planning to go directly to work feel that school performance is not important, since employers do not ask for school transcripts.

Making Academics Count is a program of the Business Coalition for Education Reform that aims to convince at least 10,000 companies nationwide to require school records as part of the hiring process. Already 3,000 businesses, such as IBM, Eastman Kodak, BellSouth, and Lockheed Martin, request transcripts of job applicants. A study in five communities looking at significant business education partnerships found when this strategy was used there was: an increase in academic achievement and parental involvement, a decrease in dropout rates, and employers experienced a decrease in hiring and training costs.

Major advances have been made in developing systems of school-to-work preparation and a number of states have begun to successfully integrate STW initiatives with education reform. Still, there is concern about the future of the national school-to-work initiative.

The school-to-career movement grew out of a concern that the public education system was not preparing American youth as well as possible for the transition from school to further learning and the workplace. Proponents of school-to-career agreed that:

- Most youth need help making the transition to adulthood
- Youth need to improve both their academic achievement and their career prospects to attain a successful transition
- This educational strategy requires new relationships between the schools and the community, particularly the business community
- Reforms must be systemic
- States and localities must have flexibility to address specific needs
- Gradual implementation will avoid the customary cycle of an initial outburst of enthusiasm, followed by a lack of interest and energy

These concerns were incorporated into the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (STWOA), the foundation for school-to-career initiatives across the country. The STWOA will sunset in 2001 and there is little congressional support for its renewal.

In the forum ***“What Is Next for School-to-Career?”*** (6/4/99), presenters reflected on what has been accomplished so far in developing a school-to-work system and what remains to be done. **Hilary Pennington** and **Richard Kazis** of Jobs for the Future discussed their publication *“What Is Next for School-to-Career?”* and provided recommendations to the National School-to-Work Office and the states for actions during the time still available.

According to Pennington, among the pitfalls the STW movement fell into early on was the almost exclusive emphasis on K-12 education with little interest in postsecondary linkages and

institutions. This helped create the wrong impression that STW was not related to the transition to further education and alienated many parents. Also, a premature rush to get to scale without a clear understanding of the complexity of the program hurt the quality of the implementation. Finally, the isolation of STW from the standards-driven reform movement in schools allowed the two movements to evolve separately with STW reforms left out of standardized assessments in most states.

Other panelists spoke about how STW will be sustained in their state and city. According to Maryland School to Work Coordinator **Kathy Oliver**, the school-to-career initiative has been an opportunity to link schools with economic development and workforce preparation. Instruction is built around career clusters and employers are given options on how to contribute to the system. The state is committed to continue the initiatives after 2001 and is analyzing the best strategies to address the challenges of finding additional resources to pay for programs and training, expand community support, and improve data collection with follow-up of high school graduates.

In the Philadelphia public schools, school-to-career strategies were integrated into standards and project-based assessments, according to **Cassandra Jones**, Director of Education for Employment. Implementation developed slowly, starting small and rolling out to full scale affecting all students K- 12, with postsecondary linkages. In her assessment, the primary challenge to continuing the success of STW is maintaining the changes in attitude required from teachers, students, parents, employers and postsecondary institutions regarding high expectations and a focus on hands-on, informal and community learning experiences.

Other forum presentations and field visits illustrated successes of the school-to-career movement, including the increasing number of supports that have been developed for students

and institutions, and the progress made in putting together systems of school-to-work transition.

In the forum “**Integrated Career Preparation System: A Model to Teach Academic and SCANS Skills**” (4/30/99), **Arnold Packer and Melissa Siberts**, SCANS 2000 Center, Johns Hopkins Institute, described a “Career Transcript System” that can be used to document student achievement and, coupled with a series of CD-ROMs of integrated curriculum projects, teach SCANS skills to high school and community college students.

In the **field trip to Charlestown and Elkins, West Virginia** (4/8-9/99), participants learned about the state’s school-to-career and education reform system, met with the state superintendent of education and local superintendents and visited three high schools. The state has incorporated both education reform and preparation for careers under the 1996 Jobs Through Education Act focused on ensuring that all students graduate from high school prepared for college, other post-secondary education or gainful employment.

The Act being implemented in stages, to be complete by 2001, established a state policy framework, guidelines and goals for increased academic expectations and career readiness for all students. It also established processes for increased parental involvement and partnerships with business, labor and the community to help students connect success in school with success in adult life, to see how academic subject matter is applied to real world problem solving and to explore career options.

The Department of Education has also been aggressive in promoting an integrated approach to vocational-technical education and education reform. Funds from vocational education, Tech Prep, School to Work, and the state are integrated, so that technical assistance and support are provided for all programs in an integrated fashion. Each program supports the

other, and state leaders have worked hard to avoid any turf battles over program funding. The existence of the Jobs Through Education Act has furthered this integration of efforts, as the legislation applies to all students, not just certain categories of students. Additionally, the state required participating high schools to use the key practices and conditions associated with *High Schools That Work*, organized by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), in their School to Work efforts. As a result of this mandate at the state level, West Virginia currently has 127 participating HSTW sites, representing 75 percent of all secondary schools in the state.

West Virginia has generally been successful in its implementation of School to Work and the Jobs Through Education Act and has avoided problems with parents and community members who claim that school-to-work curriculum is low-level vocational training narrowly focused on jobs. State administrators have made an effort to keep a focus on strong academics and high expectations for all students and to ensure that the career clusters and majors are very flexible. The state superintendent speculated on what gave West Virginia the edge in creating such a comprehensive system--the consistent support from the Governor, state legislature and state superintendent. To work, these efforts needed strong leadership and a unified plan.

These state and local efforts have helped ensure the future of school-to-work by imbedding it deeply in school reform, career preparation and high school restructuring. They give substance to many of the recommendations offered by Kazis and Pennington about the continuing need to:

- support leading innovators
- put greater emphasis on data collection and analysis, particularly on job-related and postsecondary outcomes of youth who experienced school-to-career

- strengthen the infrastructure of partnerships and support intermediary organizations that act as liaisons between schools, employers and the community at large
- reach out to potential allies in other reform movements, including charter schools and after-school programs
- seed the creation of an independent resource and document center.

The West Virginia 1996 Jobs Through Education Act Act:

- Replaces the general curriculum with a system of career clusters and majors
- Increases academic expectations for all students
- Implements a system of career information and guidance that includes work-based learning
- Requires every student in consultation with his/her parents and school advisor to establish a five-year educational plan (Grade 9 – one year beyond high school)
- Requires the involvement of the private sector and other stakeholders as partners at the state, regional and local levels
- Creates a process through which qualified high school graduates can receive a credential that is recognized by employers
- Implements a continuous program of assessment, program improvement, and staff development.

Career and workforce development are responsibilities of community-based organizations, employers, parents and government. Career development must be considered part of a holistic response by the community to preparing young adults for productive lives.

In the AYPF publication and forum ***MORE Things That DO Make a Difference for Youth*** (6/14/99), findings are included from a number of career preparation programs, such as career academies, Tech-Prep, vocational high schools,

and the National Guard Youth Challenge program. These programs shared many common elements with other successful programs in:

- attention to quality implementation
- use of caring and knowledgeable adults
- high standards and expectations
- parent/guardian participation
- importance of community
- use of holistic approaches
- attention to youth as resources, community service and service-learning
- integration of work-based learning
- provision of long-term services, support and follow-up.

Even those programs without a career preparation focus had lessons for career preparation-focused programs, such as increasing parental involvement to bolster parental acceptance and support of the program, and bringing together multiple supports for young people in a holistic fashion. As schools raise standards and expectations of the skills and knowledge young people bring to employment, elements of career preparation must be increasingly comprehensive, building on what we know about academic, skills and social development of young people.

Field trips to both Baltimore (9/25/98), Detroit (3/18-19/99) and New York City (5/6-7/99) showed how agencies of government, community-based organizations, employers and schools contribute to the career preparation of both in-school and out-of-school youth.

In Baltimore, AYPF participants visited the **Fresh Start** program at **The Living Classrooms Foundation**, a nonprofit organization providing hands-on education and job training for children and youth, with a special emphasis on at-risk youth. Using maritime settings, the Foundation provides experience-based educational programs emphasizing the applied learning of math,

science, language arts, history, economics and ecology. **Fresh Start** is a nine-month program that provides employment-training and academic remediation for out-of-school and delinquent youth. Here, they learn broad-based employment skills through applications of carpentry, boat building and construction trades, along with career development and life skills instruction. Youth earn high school credit and GEDs, and prepare for further education and careers. Fresh Start is implemented in partnership with the Maryland Department of Juvenile Justice and received a 1997 PEPNet award.

The **Baltimore City Fire Cadet Program** is designed for high school youth interested in pursuing careers in fire fighting or medical professions. Students enroll in the three-phase program during their junior year in high school. Phase I occurs during the summer after junior year, as “cadets” receive full-time training in fire

Comments from participants on the field trip to Baltimore:

A There is nothing like seeing policies that you believe in and feel are in the best interests of young people come alive before you. There is no substitute for seeing young peoples' lives so affected by being given an opportunity to grow. Care, creativity and trust were in the atmosphere and in the voices and faces of the young people we saw that morning. @

A Reflecting on our visit to the Fire Cadet Program--it was great to actually dialogue with the youth that are enrolled in the program. It was evident that without the dedication of the program staff, these youth may not have recognized their potential to succeed. These visits help me focus on why I am working to influence policy to help youth realize their potential to become contributing members of

fighting, emergency medical services, drivers' education and physical fitness. Phase II continues cadet training in the fall on a part-time basis, with students attending academic classes at their home high school in the morning, then training in the afternoon. Much of this training

is conducted on-site by professional fire fighters and emergency medical technicians. Phase III comes after high school graduation when cadets are employed by one of five city departments: Fire Prevention, Fiscal Services, Personnel, Administration or Public Information. The initiative is jointly run by the Baltimore City Fire Department, Baltimore City Public Schools and the Office of Employment Development.

“Non-Traditional Partnerships for Workforce Development” was the focus of the Detroit field trip and included visits to a workforce development program, a One Stop Center, a high school within a museum, a manufacturing sciences academy and a scientific research lab.

Focus:HOPE is a civil and human rights organization that has had considerable success in preparing disadvantaged youth and adults for careers as machinists and engineers. Also known for food distribution to the needy, Focus:HOPE uses the food pick-up time to introduce mothers and the elderly to training programs. The organization provides a graduated series of program opportunities for program participants to help ensure their success.

- *First Step* assists students in improving their reading, math, writing and speech in order to enter the *Fast Track* program. Students must have math skills at or above sixth grade and reading skills at or above eighth grade. Tuition for this four-week program is \$1,000 and it is supplemented or subsidized by public and private funds.
- *Fast Track* offers intense academic training designed to help high school graduates and GED holders reach the educational level needed to enter the *Machinist Training Institute (MTI)* program. The goal of the seven-week program is to raise math skills two grade levels and reading skills at least one grade level. Student communication skills are developed with an emphasis on resume and interview techniques and

computer skills are honed working at one of 180 computer terminals. Tuition is \$1,700 per student and is supplemented with public and private funds coordinated by Focus:HOPE.

"You want to get people from training into employment as soon as possible. There is usually a nine-month life span after graduation where employers are willing to take students onboard and continue their training. Focus:HOPE manages a placement program for graduates, but some employers reach in early to get qualified employees. What makes a CAT graduate so appealing to employers is their intense theoretical preparation combined with the production experience on competitively bid contracts, providing real-world experience and an integrated engineering experience. Students spend an average of eight hours per day performing machining contracts under the direction of experienced personnel, and three hours per week in formal study guided by engineering mentors from the university and industry partners like Cincinnati Machine, Daimler Chrysler, Detroit Diesel, EDS, Ford Motor Company and General Motors. The program is supported by the Society of Manufacturing Engineers." Ken Kudac, Director of the Center for Advanced Technologies.

- The *Machinist Training Institute* provides state license and accredited training in precision manufacturing and metalworking. *MTI* was created to solve an acute industry skill shortage by training and placing graduates at manufacturing companies throughout metropolitan Detroit. *MTI* relies heavily on equipment donations from manufacturers and federal job training funds.
- Once students complete the *MTI* program, they can enter the *Center for Advanced Technologies (CAT)*, offering hands-on manufacturing training coupled with

academics. Students are paid wages for manufacturing duties while in the program. CAT graduates obtain an Associate or Bachelor's degree conferred through a partnership between Focus: HOPE and Lawrence Technological University, Lehigh University (Pennsylvania), University of Detroit Mercy, University of Michigan or Wayne State University.

In the next part of the trip, participants learned about the *Detroit Workforce Development Board*, created by the Governor to oversee the coordination of existing education, employment and training programs. The board runs a full-service One Stop center housing employment services, including apprenticeship programs, workshops and career resources, business services, job placement services, testing and assessment, unemployment services and job bank registrations. The One Stops works with over 30 organizations including community and faith-based organizations, and with contractors who bid to offer services.

Comments from participants of the Detroit trip:

"I will never forget the people at Focus: HOPE. What an inspiration they were to all of us who labor to improve the lives of the less fortunate. All of the staff from Ford was helpful and knowledgeable."

"The visit to the one-stop was very helpful to me right now as I am working with several states on the realignment of their workforce development practices and policies."

National Academy Foundation, which includes courses such as Financial Commitments, a 9th grade course in which each student plans a new business, learns how to develop a feasibility plan, costs out the product, and develops marketing and production strategies. The curriculum is augmented by the Stanford I. Weill⁹ Institute for Life Long Learning seminars and linkages to higher education. In addition, all

⁹ Sanford I. Weill is a primary benefactor of the school. He formerly headed American Express and now leads the Citigroup.

seniors take a three credit-course at Bernard Baruch College.

The Weill Institute has three components: *Wednesday Seminars* offered by external organizations, *Work Experience and Skills Development*, and *The NASDAQ Incentive Plan*. The Institute conducts approximately 25 different seminars on topics, such as Physics Tutoring (to help students gear up for the Physics Regents), Sports Analogies (provided by the Police Athletic League), Advanced Local Area Wide Network (provided by Extranet employees); Understanding a Wall Street Firm (provided by Salomon Smith Barney employees); and What Happens at the Fed (provided by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York).

Seniors participate in the Investors Portfolio Management Virtual Enterprise—a “virtual” class in which students invest in mutual funds and manage investment accounts. During the AYPF visit, students in the Investors Portfolio Management Virtual Enterprise were actively filing taxes and preparing for a trade show to sign up other virtual business enterprises in the city. According to Kendra, the enterprise CEO selected by her classmates, “We must follow SEC rules and can’t be too aggressive or gamble with the funds.” She confided that she often takes work home in the evenings in order to keep up with her responsibilities as chief officer of the enterprise. The teacher, Mr. Walsh, indicated that he “merely facilitates the process. It’s the students who do all the work.”

All students participate in 120 hours of community service, 120 hours of unpaid and 240 hours of paid internships. Weill Institute staff oversee placement and supervision of student work experiences. These work experiences are used to help students integrate their classroom learning with the demands of the real workplace, to see how businesses work and to learn on-the

job skills. Internships are also used to help motivate students to do better in school since they cannot participate unless they are doing well academically. Students are required to keep an academic/career planning portfolio of their work experience and academic accomplishments (report cards, transcripts, PSAT/SAT scores, etc.).

The NASDAQ Incentive Plan is used to reward students who demonstrate academic excellence and/or improvement. Students earn shares valued at \$10 each for improving their GPA, passing all their classes or other achievements. Students enroll in the program, earn shares throughout their four years at the High School of Economics and Finance and, at graduation, exchange their shares for a check.

Youth and Community Development

There is great consensus among practitioners and researchers about the basic principles of effective youth programs. Increasingly, principles supporting positive youth outcomes are reflected in federal programs and initiatives of national organizations.

The basic principles of effective youth programs¹⁰ detailed in the AYPF publication and at the forum ***More Things that DO Make a Difference for Youth*** (6/14/99) are increasingly reflected in federal program policy and in efforts of national and local agencies to support youth development and the infrastructure required to build quality in the field of youth work.

The forum ***A Youth Development Approach to Services for Young People: The Work of the Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB)*** (6/11/99) focused on the Bureau's services for teenagers and young adults. The FYSB was created to provide youth at risk of becoming involved in risky behavior with positive alternatives, ensuring their safety, and maximizing their potential to take advantage of available opportunities. Its service strategy is based on the premise that, to succeed in life, youth need a sense of competence, usefulness, belonging and power. It requires its program grantees for services to runaway and homeless youth to integrate youth development strategies that:

- Treat youth and their families as partners and involve them in the design, delivery and

10 See box for compilation of lists of "basic principles" from: The Sar Levitan Center for Policy Studies, Institute for Policy Studies at Johns Hopkins University; Gary Walker, President, Public/Private Ventures; the National Youth Employment Coalition's Promising and Effective Practices Network (PEPNet); and the American Youth Policy Forum.

assessment of programs.

- Provide a full continuum of care that meets youth's developmental needs.
- Offer youth opportunities to develop meaningful relationship with caring and supportive adults.

In 1998 the FYSB started the State Youth Development Collaboration Project to promote inter-agency collaboration and strengthen state programs and procedures based on youth development principles. The Project targets youth from age 10 to 24 with no income eligibility criteria and provides five-year grants for training and technical assistance on youth development; implementing strategies to promote youth involvement in the projects; creating new outlets for sharing information on youth development; identifying data that measure positive youth outcomes; and working with state coalitions of youth-serving organizations.

Basic Principles of Effective Youth Programs

- Provide instruction and practice of academic and work-related skills
- Provide long-term, comprehensive services/multiple strategies
- Ensure services are age appropriate and tied to knowledge of youth development
- Provide long-term follow-up after formal program completion
- Ensure implementation quality
- Provide caring adults and small family-like settings
- See youth as assets
- Have high expectations/offer guidance; insist on personal responsibility and accountability
- Offer necessary services such as child care and transportation
- Use innovative instruction with real-world examples: hands-on instruction, project-based learning, service-learning, school-to-careers
- Engage young people in work-based learning and/or service activities
- Ensure employer involvement

In the forum **What Works In Youth Employment and Training: A Discussion With the 1999 PEPNet Awardees** (9/16/99),¹¹ panels of practitioners and program participants, ages 17 to 25, offered insights into the workings of their respective programs and the impact of the programs on the lives of the young people. We learned that in high quality programs:

- Continuous assessment is important for making changes in line with participant needs.

According to one practitioner, "We must provide the best possible services, every day, every time; therefore, it is important that we continuously reevaluate what we are doing." In the words of another practitioner, "The need for continuous improvement means that we must always find new resources to support staff training to address these needs."

- Traditional outcome measures used in many youth employment/development programs (such as employment gauged over a short period of time) do not reflect real, long-term markers to success, such as obtaining a high school diploma, attending college, obtaining a career track job, retaining a job, and career mobility.
- It is important to cultivate youth leadership through participation of young people in the

11 The Promising and Effective Practices Network (PEPNet) is a project of the National Youth Employment Coalition (NYEC) that identifies and promotes effective practices for youth employment and youth development programs. PEPNet was founded in 1995 to spread the message that investment in youth matters and works. Each year, a panel of experts on youth employment and development review applications from initiatives that seek PEPNet recognition. The applications are evaluated on the basis of: purpose and activities, quality management, youth development, workforce development and evidence of success. For more information, see **Lessons Learned from 51 Effective Youth Employment Initiatives**, PEPNet '99. Washington, DC: National Youth Employment Coalition.

design of the programs and in governance activities.

- Investment in the professional development of staff is important to the sustainability, continuity of leadership and quality of programs.
- Youth development and connecting youth to caring adults are central features.

According to one practitioner, "This is especially critical for youth with multiple barriers to employment." In one program, each coordinator is responsible for no more than 12 participants with whom they work extensively in making initial connections to jobs, maintaining retention in jobs and making connections to needed support services.

- Education and training are central to all of the programs since low literacy essentially defines hard-to-serve youth. To address low levels of literacy, programs use small classes, individualized attention, self-paced instruction, English as a Second Language programs, "Reading is Fundamental" and cross-generation activities, such as reading to young children.

The young spokespeople from the PEPNet programs provided insights into why they participate and how these programs have made a difference in their lives. They stressed that these programs differ from regular high school in that here, they are able to get the individual attention they need and are involved with staff who listen, support and care that they succeed. As a result of participation, they have high expectations for themselves, wanting to make a better life for themselves and their children. In the next five years, they see themselves progressing in college, with steady jobs, focused on a career (examples included: in clinical psychology, as a journeyman in a trade, working with troubled youth), being a good citizen, buying a home, having a family and being able to support them. Among the advice offered to other youth:

- "Find people who are positive in your life. Rethink and build relationships. Don't expect to get your way all the time."
- "Don't give up."
- "Listen to your elders and learn from your mistakes."
- "Set goals and determine to do it—no matter what."

There is great need for collaboration of the education, employment and training, and youth-serving communities. Strategies for a more successful youth policy require a common vision across these systems, combined resources and the "un-funded" sources of youth programming inherent in community, faith-based and volunteer efforts. Above all, we must work from the premise that all youth need a quality educational experience and high levels of social supports.

To provide further insight into issues impacting young people, the policies that impact them and the supports and interventions available to them, AYPF held four evening seminars (in a five-part series of discussions on programs serving out-of-school youth). The seminars represented an opportunity for a limited number of AYPF participants to discuss issues of youth development and strategies for addressing the needs of at-risk, out-of-school youth (young people--largely undereducated and unskilled--who are not currently in school or in jobs and are seeking opportunities to further their education and prepare for the workforce).

Topics addressed at these seminars included:

- **A history and overview of federal, state and local programs targeting at-risk and out-of-school youth, including evolving perspectives on youth development and the historical and current response of public and private institutions (1/27/99), with Elton**

Jolly, former president of Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (retired) and **Alan Zuckerman**, executive director, National Youth Employment Coalition.

- **Perspectives of administrators of programs serving at-risk and out-of-school youth (2/24/99), with Taylor Frome**, Executive Director, YouthBuild Philadelphia Charter School; **Diane Cottman**, Assistant Director, Latin American Youth Center, Washington, DC; and **Lorenzo Harrison**, past Deputy Director, STRIVE East Harlem Employment Service and currently Administrator, Office of Youth Programs, Employment and Training Administration, USDOL
- **Perspectives from research and evaluation: Improving the quality and efficacy of programs serving at-risk and out-of-school youth (3/24/99), with JoAnn Jastrzab** of Abt Associates, **Antonio Perez**, Executive Director, Milwaukee Community Service Corps, and **Donna Walker James** of AYPF.
- **Special concerns and issues affecting out-of-school young minority males (including a conversation with young people (4/28/99), with Edward DeJesus**, President of the Youth Development and Research Fund (YDRF), facilitating a discussion with young African American out-of-school youth about jobs, careers and education

Following are some of the observations and insights made by presenters and participants in the seminars on: (a) the federal role in youth development, education and employment policy; (b) needs of youth and necessary program components; and (c) recommendations for policy.

Observations on the Federal Role

1. The federal commitment to youth employment and training entered the national policy agenda almost as an after thought,

beginning initially in the context of training opportunities for dropouts and later as a strategy for keeping communities and youth “pacified” during the long, hot summers and unrest of the civil rights movement era.

2. Federal support helped build the infrastructure of many new community-based organizations needed to provide employment preparation services and to help address the discrimination effects of previous hiring policies. The need to replicate efforts nationwide led to a period of capacity building among these organizations and the development of affiliates.
3. The increase in federal funds and support for employment training led to the need for better coordination of funds and efforts across public agencies at the federal, state and local level. In time, issues of turf and governance superseded concerns of quality and effectiveness of programming. This is a problem that continues today.

Observations on the needs of youth and necessary program components

1. We have learned from the failures of past strategies and the lessons from providers in the field that disadvantaged young people need programming that is comprehensive and focused on the whole individual. The adult model of employment training, involving short-term, occupationally-specific learning and job search experiences is not appropriate. Youth development strategies used traditionally by youth-serving organizations should be integral parts of youth employment and training activities.
2. We tend to think that at-risk, out-of-school youth represent a small segment of the youth population, but in many places their absolute numbers are staggering while our response to them has been negligible. Many survive in unfriendly environments and seek settings

that are safe and nurturing where their voices can be heard and respected.

3. We must work from the premise that *all* youth need a quality educational experience to develop literacy and numeracy, hands-on work experiences to develop work habits, and sustained high levels of social supports.
4. Public schools could be more successful with young people if they assume that all youth can learn, identify learning deficits early before students start to fall behind, focus on how individuals learn, and acknowledge the value of service and experiential learning as important learning modalities for many young people.
5. Young people want and need different types of learning experiences. For some, hands-on learning and vocational education are very critical and so is work-based learning to give them a sense of the opportunities and expectations of the working world.
6. Eliminating discrimination in recruitment and hiring are only the first steps. To be successful in the work setting, many young minority men need access to education, training and support so that they can be successful on the job. Lack of good basic skills (as basic as knowing how to tie a tie, having social skills, knowing how to conduct a job search, being computer literate) and the supports that go with getting and keeping a job (transportation, access to baby sitters, etc.) further contribute to high unemployment rates.

Recommendations for policy

1. The employment and training, education and youth-serving communities have found little common ground in the past, but each can benefit from the knowledge base and successes of the other. Strategies for a more successful youth policy include a common

vision, their combined resources and efforts, and the Aun-funded@ sources of youth programming inherent in community, faith-based and volunteer efforts.

2. We cannot think in terms of quick fixes in moving youth in the Aunderclass@ into economic self-sufficiency. We must think mainstream, giving them the same range of opportunities and time to develop that we provide for more advantaged individuals during their young adult years. Instead of thinking in terms of demonstrations or a few alternative programs, we need to think programmatically on a scale comparable to public school or university systems.
3. True program replication is probably impossible. The basic principles and concepts that “work” should be cultivated, monitored and advanced. A culture should be developed on the part of program funders to promote honesty and frank assessment from program providers.
4. Program implementers must be candid about what their programs are designed to do and not to do.
5. Too often we evaluate programs while they are still being developed. For example, welfare-to-work is already under evaluation even though it is still a funding stream in transition and unevenly implemented. A good policy is to only evaluate a program after it has been in a steady state for at least one year.
6. We often assume that if a program does not have good data documenting its effectiveness, there is nothing to be learned about it and its impact on young people. Nevertheless, many federal policies and funded efforts have been based on anecdotes--in fact, we base much of our decision making on anecdotes. A good journalist can often do a better job of communicating the

kind of services and effects that an intervention has on a young person than does a rigorous evaluation. There is a great need for reports in useable form that provide insights into the richness of interventions, as well as methods to hold practitioners accountable. Most observers believe that we need both--good qualitative and quantitative data--to truly understand what works for young people and the elements of good practice.

7. Much more needs to be done to insure that information about available programs and activities gets to the young people that can benefit most from them.

Chronology of AYPF Activities: July 1, 1998 – June 30, 1999

1998

- 9/10 Forum: **What Works in Youth Employment and Training: A Discussion with the 1998 PEPNet Awardees**, with the 1998 PEPNet Awardees and staff of the National Youth Employment Coalition
- 9/11 Forum: **The Millennium Breach: Richer, Poorer and Racially Apart: A Thirty-year Update of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (The Kerner Commission)**, with Lynn Curtis, President of the Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation and the Corporation for What Works
- 9/18 Video Premiere: **“Lost in Translation: Latinos, Schools and Society,”** with John Merrow and Sonia Slutsky, the Merrow Report
- 9/25 Site Visit to Baltimore, Maryland: **Learning in Action: Two Innovative Employment Training and Youth Development Programs**, site visits to Fire Cadet Academy and Fresh Start-The Living Classrooms Foundation
- 10/16 Forum: **Jefferson’s Children: Education and the Promise of American Culture**, with Leon Botstein, President, Bard College
- 10/23 Forum: **The Educational and Labor Market Performance of GED Recipients**, with David Boesel, Senior Research Associate, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education and Nabeel Alsalam, Congressional Budget Office
- 10/30 Forum: **Urgent Message: Families Crucial to School Reform**, with Ann Henderson, Center for Law and Education, Anne Lewis, Education Writer, and representatives of New York City’s small school reform movement
- 11/6 Forum: **Making Academics Count: Employer Efforts to Use School Records**, Elizabeth Pauly and Aime Rogstad Guidera, National Alliance of Business; Dana Egrescky, New Jersey Chamber of Commerce; Doug Hill, Delaware Business, Industry, Education Alliance; and Kathy Walsh, IBM.
- 11/6-15 Study Mission: **Preparation for Employment: The Partnership of Schools, Employers, and Government**; Munich and Friedrichshafen, Germany; Bregenz and Hochst, Austria; Zurich and Baden, Switzerland (supported by the German Marshall Fund of the United States).
- 11/9-10 Site Visit: **Sussex Technical High School in Georgetown, Delaware/The Transformation of an Area Vocational School into a Comprehensive Full-Time Technical High School** to gain in-depth knowledge of a school that is: (1) implementing **School-to-Work**, (2) recognized by the U.S. Department of Education as a **New American High School** and a **National School**

of Excellence, and (3) a member of the Southern Regional Education Board's **High Schools That Work** initiative.

- 11/20 Forum: **What You Always Wanted to Know About the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards**, with James A. Kelly, President and Chief Executive Officer, NBPTS
- 12/4 Forum: **An Update on Character Education**, with Esther Schaeffer, Executive Director, Character Education Partnership; Karen Bohlin, Center for the Advancement of Ethics and Character; Lynn Lisy-Macan, Principal of Brookside Elementary School, Binghamton, NY; and Timothy Smith, Principal of Mound Fort Middle School of Ogden, UT.
- 12/11 Forum: **A Revolution in School District Governance: The Chicago Experience**, with Dorothy Shipps, Director, Consortium on Chicago School Research, University of Chicago

1999

- 1/8 Forum: **School Reform in El Paso, Texas**, with Susana Navarro, Executive Director of the El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence; Alicia Parra, Deputy Director; Myrna Castrejon, Community Involvement Coordinator; Triana Olivas, Principal, Sageland Elementary School, El Paso.
- 1/21 Dinner Discussion with **Honorable Raymond Bramucci**, Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, on the Workforce Investment Act of 1998.
- 1/27 Dinner Seminar Series: The first of five dinner discussions on programs serving out-of-school youth. **A history and overview of federal, state and local programs targeting at-risk and out-of-school youth, including evolving perspectives on youth development and the historical and current response of public and private institutions**, with Elton Jolly, former president of Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America and Alan Zuckerman, Executive Director, National Youth Employment Coalition.
- 1/29 Forum: **Rethinking Orphanages for the 21st Century: Residential Schools for At-Risk Children and Youth**, with Heidi Goldsmith, Executive Director, International Center for Residential Education; Joseph Devlin, Head of Girard College, PA; Frank Frame, Scotland School for Veterans' Children; Edward Gotgart, Boston University Residential Charter School.
- 1/29 Field Trip: **One-day trip to Bergen County Technical Schools**, Paramus, NJ, to learn about career academies, one-stop information center, and employer partnerships.
- 2/5 Forum: **Community Schools and After-School Programs**, with Martin Blank and Atelia Melaville, Institute for Educational Leadership.
- 2/12 Forum: **Employers Talk About Building a School to Work System: Voices from the Field**, with Joan Wills, Director, Center for Workforce Development

- 2/19 Forum: **The New Economy**, with Robert Atkinson, Progressive Policy Institute.
- 2/24 Dinner Seminar Series: **Perspectives of administrators of programs serving at-risk and out-of-school youth**, with Taylor From, Executive Director, YouthBuild Philadelphia Charter School; Diane Cottman, Assistant Director, Latin American Youth Center, Washington, DC; and Lorenzo Harrison, past Deputy Director, STRIVE East Harlem Employment Service and currently Administrator, Office of Job Training Programs, Employment and Training Administration, US Department of Labor.
- 3/5 Forum: **Paradise Lost: California's Experience, America's Future?**, a conversation with education writer Peter Schrag.
- 3/10 Discussion Group: **High Schools of the Millennium Working Group**.
- 3/12 Forum: **The Reality of School Accountability Reports – What the Public Thinks**, with Andy Plattner, Chairman of A-Plus Communications.
- 3/18
-19 Field Trip, **Dearborn and Detroit, Michigan: Henry Ford Academy and Greenfield Village; Ford Research Laboratories; Focus Hope; Detroit Workforce Investment Board and One-Stop Center**.
- 3/24 Dinner Seminar Series: **Perspectives from research and evaluation: Improving the quality and efficacy of programs serving at-risk and out-of-school youth**, with JoAnn Jastrzab, ABT Associates; Antonio Perez, Executive Director, Milwaukee Community Service Corps; and Donna Walker James, Senior Project Associate, AYPF.
- 3/26 Forum: **Order in the Classroom**, with Paul Barton, Richard J. Coley, and Harold Wenlinsky, Education Testing Service.
- 4/8-9 **Field Trip to West Virginia – Jobs Through Education**, to meet with Chief State School Officer Henry Marockie, and state legislators about the state's new "Jobs through Education" legislation and visit a high school and vocational technical center in Randolph County, part of the *High Schools That Work* network.
- 4/12 Forum: **The Reauthorization of ESEA Title I and the Implications of the Standards Movement for Minority Students**, with James McPartland, Johns Hopkins University and Gary Orfield, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- 4/27 Discussion Group: **High Schools of the Millennium Working Group**.
- 4/28 Dinner Seminar Series: **Special concerns and issues affecting out-of-school young minority males**, with Edward DeJesus, President of the Youth Development and Research Fund (YDRF), facilitating a discussion with young African American out-of-school youth about jobs, careers and higher education.
- 4/30 Forum: **Integrated Career Preparation System**, with Arnold Packer, Johns Hopkins University.

- 5/6-7 Field Trip: **Secondary School Reform in New York City**, with visits to Central Park East Secondary School, High School of Economics and Finance, Bread and Roses Integrated Arts High School, and Washington Heights Intermediate School 218.
- 5/14 Forum: **A Review of Early Intervention Programs to Promote Access to, and Success in, Postsecondary Education**, with Larry Gladieux and Scott Swail, The College Board.
- 5/17 Field Trip: **DC Charter Schools – The Community Academy, Options, SEED, Cesar Chavez and Washington Mathematics, Science and Technology Public Charter Schools**.
- 6/4 Forum: **What Next After the School to Work Opportunities Act Sunsets?** with Hilary Pennington and Richard Kazis, Jobs for the Future.
- 6/11 Forum: **A Youth Development Approach to Services for Young People: The Work of the Family and Youth Services Bureau**, with Pamela A. Johnson, Deputy Associate Commissioner, Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB), Department of Health and Human Services; and Curtis O. Porter, Youth Development Specialist, FYSB.
- 6/14 Forum: **More Things that Do Make a Difference for Youth**, with Donna Walker James, American Youth Policy Forum, and program evaluators featured in the publication.
- 6/15 Dinner Conversation with **Daniel Domenech**, Superintendent of Fairfax, Virginia Public Schools and President of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA).
- 6/25 Forum: **Educating Underschooled Immigrant Youth**, with Donna Christian, President of the Center for Applied Linguistics, Ann Jaramillo, Senior Project Associate, California Tomorrow, Holly Stein, Coordinator for the ESL Language Minority Programs, Prince George’s County Public Schools, and JoAnn Crandall, Professor of Education, University of Maryland, Baltimore County.

American Youth Policy Forum Financial Statement For the Year Ended June 30, 1999

Revenues, Gains and Other Support	Unrestricted & Temporarily Restricted
Grants and Contributions	\$ 2,686,186
Contracts	33,500
Publications (net of costs)	36,901
Interest	86,931
Unrealized Investments	(17,307)
Net Assets Released from Restrictions	<u> -</u>
Total Revenues	<u>\$ 2,826,211</u>
 Expenditures	
Improving Education and Academic Performance	\$ 179,661
Preparation for Careers	107,316
Youth and Community Development	60,351
International Study Mission	30,030
Policy Documents & Service to the National Policymaking Community	230,788
Publications	210,865
Administrative	<u>16,080</u>
Total Expenditures	<u>\$ 835,091</u>
Change in Net Assets	\$ 1,991,120
Net Assets July 1, 1998 (beginning of independent status)	<u> -</u>
Net Assets, June 30, 1999	\$ 1,991,120

American Youth Policy Forum Financial Statement For the Year Ended June 30, 1999

Current Assets:

Cash and Cash Equivalents	\$ 239,773
Investments	958,056
Accounts Receivable	30,279
Prepaid Expenses and Deposits	4,218
Current Portion of Mortgage Note Receivable	<u>29,242</u>
Total Current Assets	<u>\$ 1,261,568</u>

Fixed Assets: (At Cost)

Land	\$ 212,671
Building	264,677
Furniture and Equipment	25,348
Less: Accumulated Depreciation	<u>(10,590)</u>
Total Fixed Assets	<u>\$ 492,106</u>

Other Assets:

Mortgage Note Receivable	\$ 346,250
Less: Current Portion	<u>(29,242)</u>
Total Other Assets	<u>\$ 317,008</u>

TOTAL ASSETS	<u>\$ 2,070,682</u>
--------------	---------------------

LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

Current Liabilities:

Accounts Payable	\$ 38,789
Accrued Expenses	22,077
Refundable Advances	<u>18,696</u>

Total Liabilities	<u>\$ 79,562</u>
-------------------	------------------

Net Assets:

Unrestricted	\$ 1,811,620
Temporarily Restricted	<u>179,500</u>

Total Net Assets	<u>\$ 1,991,120</u>
------------------	---------------------

TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS	<u>\$ 2,070,682</u>
----------------------------------	---------------------

AYPF Board of Directors

Paul Barton

Director
Policy Information Center
Educational Testing Service

Betsy Brand

Co-Director
American Youth Policy Forum

Cynthia G. Brown

Director
Resource Center on Educational Equity
Council of Chief State School Officers

Samuel Halperin (Secretary/Treasurer)

Senior Fellow
American Youth Policy Forum

Glenda L. Partee (President)

Co-Director
American Youth Policy Forum

Anthony R. Sarmiento

Director
Worker Centered Learning
Working for America Institute
American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO)

Thomas Wolanin

Research Professor
Graduate School of Education and Human Development
The George Washington University