

APPENDIX II

ENROLLEE CHARACTERISTICS IN THE SAMPLE PROJECTS

1. Annual Family Income

Sixty-four percent of all enrollee's families had incomes of \$3,000 or less. This compares with the 68 percent falling below the poverty criteria in regular in-school programs. Similarly, 72 percent came from homes with five or more members.

Regions III and V showed the highest levels of families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 (79 percent and 81 percent, respectively). These regions also showed the highest levels of adult and youth unemployment and the highest concentration of minority representation in the sample.

2. Race, Ethnic Group and Sex

Negroes represented 36 percent of the enrollment of NYC on-going projects. In the sample, they represented 32 percent. However, Mexican-Americans and American-Indians reflected a higher representation than that found in the national totals. The sample included 17 percent and 7 percent respectively of these minority groups. These differences are accounted for by the fact that Region V had the largest number of enrollees sampled and this region has a heavy concentration of such minority groups.

Based on the sample evidence, racial balance seems to have been difficult to obtain in a number of projects. For example, of the 12 projects surveyed in Region I, one-third were all-white and over half were almost all-white. Out of 5 projects surveyed in Region III, two had over 95 percent Negro representation. Region V had one all Mexican and one an all-Indian project. Region VI had one all-Indian and one all-white project. In Region VII, a third of the projects surveyed were all-white. No doubt community sentiment and sponsor apathy created some barriers to full integration, but by and large, evaluators found lack of racial balance usually was caused by the absence of multi-racial eligibles in many communities.

Male-female ratios were 57 percent and 43 percent respectively. This is in line with the national figures of 54 percent and 46 percent.

3. Age and School Grades

The sample contained an equally divided group of 16 and 17 year-olds. Both groups represented 41 percent of the total sample. The median school grade was the 10th. In this respect, the sample differed approximately 12 percent from national norms.

4. Other Handicaps of Poverty

There is evidence that enrollees came from environments reflecting severe handicaps of poverty. The total of those sampled coming from families on welfare was approximately 22 percent; those residing in public housing were almost 8 percent; about 32 percent were from broken homes; three percent had prior police records; two percent were mentally retarded; and two percent were physically disabled. Some individual projects were extremely successful in enrolling youth with severe social, emotional and economic problems. A few outstanding examples are:

Meriden, Conn.—39 percent on welfare, 36 percent residing in public housing, 69 percent from broken homes, 26 percent mentally retarded and 15 percent with prior police records.

Mayville, N.Y.—45 percent from welfare families and 11 percent high school dropouts.

Reading, Pa.—37 percent on welfare, 17 percent residing in public housing and 58 percent from broken homes.

Seattle, Wash.—50 percent with prior police records and 60 percent from broken homes.

Charleston, S.C.—23 percent physically disabled and 46 percent from broken homes.

Great Falls, Mont.—39 percent former high school dropouts and 48 percent from families on welfare.

These individual examples of project successes in capturing hard-core cases are not in themselves conclusive; however, they do point out that many sponsors