

who was unaffiliated with any agency, institution or program in the local community. Since most initial recruitment for summer projects took place during the waning days of the regular school term, the dropout was in a poor competitive position for many available job slots. Moreover, the local employment services seemed to have played a minor role in recruiting dropouts for summer programs.

5. Youth employment prospects differed from region to region

The job markets in three regions were excellent, causing some sponsors problems in recruitment. Youths in Regions I, II and VII had access to very attractive jobs, while many in other regions were unable to find temporary summer employment of any type and thus were unemployed throughout the summer.

6. Generally, youth employment prospects in rural areas were better than those in urban centers

In most areas, but especially in Regions IV and VII, rural sponsors found themselves in direct recruitment competition with local farm industry. Farm labor usually offered lower wages, but longer hours, and many eligibles hoped for the chance to make more money by working longer workweeks. Sponsors were not always as vigorous in their recruitment methods as they might have been because of loyalty to an important community industry, sympathetic regard for local needs, and a fear of antagonizing their farmer-neighbors. As a result, NYC did not, in every case, attract the most needy youth in the community, but those who were perhaps affluent enough to afford lower pay and shorter workweeks. NYC sponsors felt working for NYC would have benefited the youth more in the long run, but could not reconcile this with their desire to see the youth earn as much money as possible.

PART III. PROGRAM AND FINDINGS-CENTERED CONCLUSIONS

I. Types of Program Emphasis

The 51 summer projects surveyed fell into two categories, according to their dominant program emphasis. *School-Centered Emphasis*, concerned with work-training related to a school institution, was predominant in 33 projects. *Community-Agency Emphasis*, where the work-training related to the community-at-large, was prevalent in the 18 remaining projects.

The relative merits of the different approaches resist general conclusions because outstanding accomplishments as well as program weaknesses were found among both types. Generally, it can be said that school-centered projects tended to be poor in the quality of job assignments and administration and the community-related projects were usually rated high on job assignments, supportive services and supervision. At the same time, community-related projects tended to have administrative and managerial problems of one kind or another. No general conclusions can be reached regarding other program elements, such as counseling and remedial education, because weaknesses and strengths were observed in both types of projects.

II. Program Content

A. Project Administration

This component was rated high by evaluators in the majority of cases. School sponsors received some negative assessment regarding the quality of their record-keeping function, i.e., the absence of individual folders, incomplete information on Form NYC-16, and poor information on supervisory evaluation.

B. Recruitment and Selection

Urban projects usually did a better job in recruiting than did rural. However, rural projects, while not always operating at full strength, invariably enrolled the hardest cases of deprived youth. As would be expected, rural projects had recruitment problems because of limited recruitment apparatus, problems of mobility and accessibility, and competition from farm labor.

C. Work Assignments

Appendix III is a graphical representation of the distribution of primary work assignments of enrollees in summer projects. Generally, enrollees, during