

Because of the fragmentary nature of much of the data collected, program-wide findings and conclusions concerning some of the above were not feasible or were of limited import. Only a selection of the more viable were suggested in this report.

B. The Survey Method

Five Manpower Development Specialists from the Division of Program Review and Analysis visited a selected number of projects in each region. The total "sample" consisted of 51 projects with 7,134 enrollees, or about 3.7 percent of the entire summer enrollment. Projects were selected on the basis of the region, population size, urban-rural mix, and time and logistic requirements of the evaluation team.

In all projects visited, the sources of data were NYC files and documents, interviews and conversations with local NYC staff, enrollees, supervisors and other project officials at every level. In addition, contact was established with local community leaders, school officials, CAA staff and State employment service personnel; in certain selected localities, additional contacts were made with local indigenous citizens, civil rights groups, law enforcement officials and youth who did not want to, or were not able to, participate in the program. A list of the projects visited during the evaluations is attached to the report as Appendix I.

PART II. ENROLLEE-CENTERED CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS

This survey was carried out within the framework of a primary conception that the NYC summer program was primarily an instrument to aid youth to remain in school or resume schooling. In addition, the effectiveness of subsidiary objectives was also to be judged in terms of NYC's utility as a factor in the War on Poverty. Did the summer work-training experience have any effect on the participants' ability to overcome the handicaps of poverty? This view of the survey attempted to ascertain whether the total NYC experience helped to overcome economical disadvantage, employability handicaps, verbal deficiencies, attitudinal and motivational shortcomings and personality defects.

Enrollee experiences varied widely in the different areas. Some received significant benefits, while others did not have an opportunity to develop to their maximum potential. Many disadvantaged youth found useful employment during the summer months, while a few realized little or no benefits. The great majority of enrollees continued their full-time enrollment during the summer months—few dropped out. Some of the more important conclusions and findings that appeared to emerge from the total picture are summarized as follows:

1. The summer program was markedly successful in influencing youth to return to school

An overwhelming majority of the enrollees continued their education after the summer work experience. Those few who failed to return to school seemed to have found useful employment in many instances.

2. Enrollees' reactions to their summer experience were generally positive

Interviews revealed that (1) most were satisfied with their pay, supervision and working conditions; (2) some did criticize their work assignments as being too tedious, boring or dull; (3) the average workweek of 20-25 hours pleased many since they could pursue other "vacation-type" recreational activities and still have spending money; and (4) most had plans to continue school in the fall, although a few were undecided because of a desire for a permanent job (more money), marriage, or poor scholastic achievement.

3. Most projects were successful in enrolling the poorest of the poor in local communities

It is clear that sponsors devoted themselves to reaching the hard-core, poverty-handicapped youth. Although there were observable differences in the average levels of poverty among communities in various regions, sponsors seemed to have generally selected the hardest cases relative to the available clientele in their communities.

4. Sponsors were not successful in reaching the unemployed, unaffiliated, school dropout

It appears that only a very small number of school dropouts were enrolled in the summer programs. One problem seemed to be that school-sponsored projects were not structured or inclined to establish contact with the dropout