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ABSTRACT

Work-based School-to-Work programs are being asked to help solve faltering labor market prospects for youth, national educational reform needs and decreasing U.S. economic competitiveness. In 1994, the Congress enacted the School-to-Work Opportunities Act to appropriate more than $2 billion over seven years to lay the grounds for a national School-to-Work framework. While many studies have concerned themselves with the School-to-Work outcomes for youth, fewer have addressed sustainable incentives for employers to remain involved. Such incentives are critical if work-based School-to-Work is to survive at a large scale. This case study highlights which factors have kept the healthcare and financial services employers involved in Boston’s ProTech program, and the prospects for expanding a program like ProTech to reach more students.

Primary reasons for involvement include: (1) an altruistic commitment to benefit the community and (2) long-term labor force development (including regional labor pool expansion, hiring networks and industry advertisement). Trainee recruitment to the employers’ permanent staff is not playing a large role. Important factors in maintaining employer commitment are the high personal rewards to those who work with the youth and the responsiveness of the coordinating entity, the Boston Private Industry Council, to employers’ needs. Unfortunately, however, ProTech could not be offered in its current form to all students. Primary constraints to expansion include: (1) the need for supervisors to be interested in and capable of working with youth, (2) employers’ need to select students, and (3) employer budgetary limitations.

The results of this study highlight the improbability that the ProTech program in its current form could be offered to students on a large scale. However, a simpler, modified version of the program may be able to effectively reach large numbers of students.

Thesis Supervisor: Aixa Cintron
Title: Assistant Professor of Urban Studies and Planning
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U.S. Youth in Today’s Labor Market

Earlier in this century, when the U.S. economy was heavily based in manufacturing, it was possible for a teenager to leave high school without a diploma and make a living wage in a factory. However, today’s economy is increasingly based on sectors involving information networking, services provision and high-tech manufacturing, all of which require a higher education level of the average worker.

Complaints abound that high schools have not kept pace with the changes in the economy, leaving youth ill-equipped to fend for themselves after graduation. Employers assert that youth lack the skills they seek while business reports lament our labor force’s decreasing ability to compete against our industrialized counterparts. (National Center on Education and the Economy 1990; Zemsky 1994) A study by Raizen (1989) highlighted that students only acquire academic skills in school, which may not be successfully transferred for use in the workplace or may not serve them well, even if they are. Meanwhile, there are few structures in place to guide a youth’s transition from school to the workplace.

Comparative national studies in the early 1990’s revealed a high-wage model of economic success in Germany. Some authors focused on the role that youth apprenticeship programs played there and argued that the U.S. could adopt similar programs. (Hamilton 1990) Research by Sticht (1989) in the contextual learning movement supports the notion that basic skills are best learned in association with everyday activities. Such research has served to justify arguments that U.S. students need to learn simultaneously in school and the workplace.

What is School-to-Work?

“School-to-work” is an all-encompassing phrase, used to describe programs of varying intensity, from work site tours and job shadowing, to youth apprenticeship; youth apprenticeship is also often called work-based learning. The designs for most work-based School-to-Work (STW) programs call for three elements to the experience:

1. Provision of a real context for learning academic material.
2. Teaching of work-based skills in the workplace.
3. A context for supporting the social development of students. (This includes access to adult role models who help develop social skills such as the ability to monitor one’s own behavior, to be punctual, etc.)

Federal policymakers cast their votes of support for STW with the passage of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act (STWOA) of 1994. As stated therein, they were reacting to the findings that many youth do not possess the skills demanded in our changing workplaces, youth unemployment is “intolerably high”, and earnings of high school graduates are falling relative to those with more education. They also noted that substantial numbers of youth (especially students of color and students with disabilities) drop out of high school and that, as of 1992, approximately 11% of all 16- to 24-year-olds in the U.S. had not completed high school. The Act’s intent is to “establish a national framework within which all States can create statewide School-to-Work opportunities.” Such a framework would foster the development of partnerships amongst schools and employers to provide work-based, experiential training that would enhance youth skills and prepare them for “high-skill, high-wage careers”. These partnerships are also seen as “an investment in future workplace productivity and competitiveness”.

Particular mention is made of wanting to motivate all youths, including “low-achieving” youth, to stay in or return to school. Another stated goal is “to increase opportunities for minorities . . . to prepare for careers that are not traditional for their race . . .”. The Act authorized $300 million in program development “venture capital” for 1995, with 10% reserved specifically for development of STW partnerships in high poverty areas. Disinvested inner cities are often marked by various degrees of poverty and are increasingly inhabited by communities of color. Furthermore, inner city students frequently score lower on standardized tests and have access to fewer job opportunities than their suburban counterparts. The STWOA proposals may appear particularly attractive to those seeking solutions for inner city economic development and job creation.

The Act allows localities a great deal of flexibility to design their programs as they see fit to meet their needs. However, the mandatory aspects of the STWOA work-based learning component include:

- Work experience
- Workplace mentoring

---

Instruction in general workplace competencies (including development of positive work attitudes and "participative" skills)
- Broad instruction, to the extent practicable, in all aspects of the industry

As defined in STWOA, work-based learning "may include such activities as paid work experience, job shadowing, school-sponsored enterprises or on-the-job training". (School-to-Work Opportunities Act, H.R. 2884)

**The Critical Involvement of Employers**

School-to-Work programs are partnerships, which rely heavily on employers to work with teachers and sometimes with intermediary coordinators to forge a cohesive program of instruction and practice. The goals are to improve a student's academic performance and career prospects, while improving the relevance of school curricula and providing certain benefits to employers; they are often marketed as "win-win" programs, with something in it for everybody. However, most reports on STW programs focus primarily on the results for participating youth. Fewer have concerned themselves with sustainable incentives for employers to join or remain involved with the schools. This issue deserves attention because it is widely presumed that one of the most tenuous aspects of School-to-Work programs is the willingness of employers to participate. (Cappelli et al. 1998)

While European models rely heavily on legislative mandates and collective bargaining agreements to ensure employer participation, the U.S. model has been left more to individual choice. (Capelli et al. 1998) Policies can provide financial incentives to encourage employer involvement. The federal government, empowered by the STWOA, granted $643 million to 29 states by 1996 for development of School-to-Work programs. Some states, such as Michigan, Washington and Oregon, offer tax credits or wage subsidies for companies that hire youth apprentices. (Hershey et al. 1997) However, financial incentives are frequently unpopular and/or expensive to enforce. (Osterman 1995) Furthermore, the employer's sincere desire to be involved is critical to the quality of the trainee's experience; self-sustaining incentives must be more thoroughly examined.

**Potentially Sustainable Incentives for Employer Involvement**

Many studies have found that "civic-mindedness" (e.g., a sense of contribution to society and a desire to improve their communities) was one of the leading motivations for employer involvement. (Lynn and Wills 1995; Bailey 1995; Center on Education and Work 1997). A 1998
study from the Westchester Institute for Human Services Research reported that the two most common reasons for surveyed employer involvement were: “because [they] wanted to provide a meaningful service to young people in the community” (86%) and “because school-to-work [is] a good direction for education to take” (88%). (Kelsh) The 1997 NES Survey noted that the best predictor for participation in School-to-Work partnerships is existing involvement in community activities. Bailey contends that this “sense of collective responsibility” is probably the main incentive for larger corporate firms to participate in School-to-Work. (1993) However, such altruism may not be relied upon for a sustained effort. Kelsh notes that self-interested motivations are vital for School-to-Work programs to do well. (1998) Given these considerations, program designers need to assure that there are clear benefits that accrue directly to employers.

Another strong motivator is the need to fill job vacancies. (Cappelli et al. 1998; Lynn and Wills 1995) One widely-touted incentive is that it helps employers meet recruitment goals. Employers themselves reportedly believe this to be true. (Louis Harris and Associates 1991; Hughes 1996; Center on Education and Work 1997) School-to-Work employers in Kelsh’s 1998 survey “saw School-to-Work as a good source for future workers” (35%). Corporations might then see their involvement as an investment in the firm and a reduction of future recruitment expenses.

Most U.S. School-to-Work programs are at a limited pilot-project level now; if they were implemented at a larger scale, perhaps employers would have the incentive to do their part to contribute to a larger regional pool of better-educated employees, which would ultimately serve their self-interest. Bailey labels this as “collective motivation” (1995). 58% of Kelsh’s surveyed employers “wanted to improve the quality of the labor pool and upgrade their workforce”. Some employers already say that their involvement may at least help market their industry’s image to large numbers of young potential workers. (Hughes 1996) Bailey (1993) asserts that successful mass involvement of employers requires that there be an overarching coordinating institution with the power to influence employers’ and schools’ actions. Involvement of industry clusters that are organized and have made a group commitment to School-to-Work programs in their region can also make the job easier for program coordinators. (Osterman 1995)

A related incentive is that it may provide employers with cheap, short-term labor while the youth are in training. This was the most common incentive for employers in a study conducted by the Institute on Education and the Economy. (Hughes 1996) Students often work for lower wages than adults, sometimes even for free, and receive no benefits. However, a 1997
Wisconsin survey reported that both Work Based Learning (WBL) employers and non-WBL employers were equally likely to give “Reduces labor costs” as a reason for hiring high school students (35%). (Center on Education and Work)

There are other “intangible” incentives. Bailey (1995) reports that participating employers may reap the benefits of improved public relations, which promote their businesses; 51% of Kelsh’s surveyed New York employers “hoped to gain some good will and an improved public image” (1998). A 1997 survey of Wisconsin employers reported that 63% of School-to-Work employers reported “Enhances public relations” as a reason for hiring high school students as compared to 32% of non-STW employers who gave that reason for hiring from that population.

Some employers in Hughes’ (1996) and Kelsh’s (1998) studies also noted an improvement in incumbent employee morale and performance. The experience of mentoring the students increased their supervision skills, their own understanding of their work responsibilities and the pride they take in their work.

**Potential Disincentives for Employer Involvement**

As mentioned previously, one potential incentive is to help the employer recruit future workers. However, Goldberger and Kazis (1995) argue that STW programs should train students to acquire widely-applicable job readiness skills, using the arena of a particular workplace for instruction. They would also gain familiarity with one occupation that they might want to pursue in the future but they should not be trained exclusively for one particular career, as youth often discover new interests late in high school and after graduation. Overly-specific training limits their choices and marketability. In a highly mobile job market, transferable skills are critical for job security.

Goldberger and Kazis further maintain that academic and occupational preparation are not mutually exclusive goals; as such, School-to-Work programs often increase youth confidence to apply to two- and four-year colleges after high school. While this is a positive outcome from the point of view of educators and youth, is it common that youth then move on to different careers after postsecondary schooling, thereby eliminating a major perceived benefit of the program to employers? Do they at least stay in the same occupational field, if not with their original employers?

Osterman (1995) says that students rarely stay with the employers who train them. High turnover is particularly common amongst young workers. (Bailey 1993) Meanwhile, the
programs cost employers both in terms of extra training expenditures and/or the loss of productivity by the students’ supervisors. For example, one hospital in Boston’s ProTech program reportedly expended $5,678 per student annually (not including wages) in the early 1990’s. (Osterman 1995) Employers are sometimes reluctant to invest the time and money necessary to develop training plans for the youth. Few U.S. employers offer systematic training, even for their regular employees, and so would probably have to develop that extra capacity for training youth. (Capelli et al. 1998) Additional costs for a STW program include time spent to coordinate with the school curriculum, to mentor youth and to provide an introduction to the industry as a whole. (Stern 1995) Ball and Wolfhagen (1981) found that, in a survey of employers, 82% were not willing to take on youth apprentices, even when they were subsidized for the full wages of the student. Their expected contribution could apparently not justify the perceived extra costs.

The Focus of this Study: Employer Commitment to Work-Based School-to-Work

The STWOA mandates that there be work-based learning components incorporated into the programs it supports. The purpose of this study is to highlight the determinants of employer commitment to Boston’s work-based ProTech program, in an effort to assess the expandability of work-based School-to-Work programs.

Work-based learning jobs are defined in a 1997 Wisconsin study as: “[differing] from part-time, afterschool jobs, in that they require businesses to work closely with schools to provide structured opportunities for students to learn and apply specific skills at the workplace”. The difficulty in recruiting employers to time-intensive work-based programs with hands-on student involvement have led some to speculate about the greater effectiveness of work simulation programs or lighter commitments from employers, like job-shadowing programs. (Bailey 1993; Osterman 1995) A national survey of employers, most of whom were not involved in STW partnerships, highlighted that many harbor high skepticism and even animosity about working with youth. (Zemsky 1994) A 1998 study of New York employers revealed that only 25% of the surveyed School-to-Work employers provided intensive work-based experiences, while 44% were guest speakers in schools, 37% hosted workplace tours and 32% provided job-shadowing opportunities. (Kelsh)

However, 99% of the New York employers who did provide work-based experiences reported feeling “satisfied or “very satisfied” with student performance at the worksite. 95% also said that their other employees felt “positive” about the students coming to the work site, while
the remaining 5% were “indifferent”. Only 19% indicated having any problems with the students; the most frequently mentioned problem was student attendance. (Kelsh 1998) To explain why their opinions of working with youth are significantly higher than those employers in Zemsky’s study, Kelsh proposes that first-hand experience with youth “gives employers a much more constructive perspective about student performance at the worksite”. Furthermore, work-based School-to-Work may not be as difficult to implement as previously presumed; the 1997 National Employer Survey revealed that 26% of all employers were involved in School-to-Work partnerships of some sort: 54% were in various work-based learning opportunities, while 46% were in job-shadowing and mentoring activities.

Large-scale implementation of work-based learning programs is no small feat. Osterman maintains that it is unlikely to occur in the near future. Employer involvement was very low in 1995; only about 1000 students nationwide participated in youth apprenticeship programs. (Osterman 1995) Some criticisms suggest that demonstration programs have been as successful as they have been because they only involved the most committed employers, who would be hard to find for large-scale implementation. Preliminary research on STWOA first year data in the 1997 progress report to Congress revealed that only 2% of all secondary students could be described as “having participated in comprehensive STW activities, i.e., a career major with integrated curricula, and paid or unpaid work experience linked to school.” That same document reports that 41 states and Puerto Rico had STW partnerships, providing a total of 119,000 work-based opportunities. (National School-to-Work Learning and Information Center) While that is a significant increase from 1000, it still does not reach the vast majority of the 13 million postsecondary students in the U.S.

Expandability of STW programs is of particular importance to a city like Boston, which is currently undertaking efforts to move School-to-Work beyond the pilot project level. Every public high school in Boston has been given a mandate from the school superintendent to restructure their curriculum and facilities. Included goals are: to increase students’ time spent in learning activities, to improve their test scores and to equip youth with better skills for the future. Though the schools are free to implement such change as they see fit, STW career pathways appears to be a popular model for breaking schools down into close-knit learning communities. Five of the thirteen district schools implemented career pathways in the 1998-1999 school year; the other eight are currently submitting plans for the coming school year, which may or may not embrace that model.

Chapter One: Why Study School-to-Work Employers?
The career pathways have taken various forms in different schools. However, some common elements include: clustering of students in smaller classes, academic and work-based skill acquisition in the school and on the job, and selection of one career pathway to focus on by the eleventh grade at the latest. The student chooses from among the career pathways available at their school to learn broad job readiness skills and some skills that are specific to that industry. Unfortunately, however, students cannot always be guaranteed placements as the number of employers who are willing to be involved in work-based programs is still limited. Program administrators may be able to place youth to get work experience in another industry if necessary, or their workplace involvement may be limited to job shadowing. Youth are not required to work, however, and some prefer not to so placements are not required for all. As the first year draws to a close, many questions will be raised as to what worked, what did not, and where to go from here.

If we are to design effective programs to help today’s students get tomorrow’s jobs, we need to understand what kinds of School-to-Work experiences can feasibly be implemented at a large scale. If we are to develop a nationwide system for School-to-Work, we need to understand more about what gets employers involved and what determines their ongoing commitment to work-based programs. While many previous studies of employers involved large-scale structured surveys, mine will be a case study based on semi-structured phone interviews with employers in two of Boston’s leading industries, healthcare and financial services.

---

2 Conversation with Mark Cafferty, ProTech Director.
Chapter Two: Boston’s ProTech Program

Part 1: Background & Current Structure

ProTech’s History

Efforts to develop Boston’s School-to-Work programs date back to the 1960’s, when Boston began large-scale efforts to attract new business and turn its economy around. (Murnane and Levy 1996) At the same time that bussing policies were being implemented on the premise of improving educational opportunities for inner city youth, high schools were being partnered with businesses which would provide schools with financial support and students with employment, usually during the summertime.

During the 1980’s and 1990’s, Boston’s Private Industry Council (PIC) has been the engine driving efforts to formalize more structured School-to-Work relationships amongst businesses and schools. The Private Industry Council is Boston’s regional employment board, charged with the mission to connect Boston youth and adults with careers in the mainstream economy.

By 1991, the PIC had helped organize a group of business leaders and school administrators in order to discuss possibilities for linking Boston students with work training opportunities while revising school curricula to promote job-readiness. The team also took a trip to Europe to learn about examples of apprenticeship programs, including those in Germany which have been so lauded for their success. From their investigations emerged the vision for the ProTech program. As described in their mission statement,

“ProTech allows students to understand their educational experiences and activities in the context of the reality and requirements of the working world. Participating employers are directly involved in the preparation students receive so that upon graduation from high school and college, they will meet the employer’s demanding employment standards”. (Boston Private Industry Council 1996)

The PIC’s model of an “Americanized apprenticeship” contains four components, according to Murnane and Levy (1996, p.120):

1. A job that puts the student on a career ladder: “The crucial element is that the job clearly leads somewhere desirable.” The job is part-time during the school year and usually full-time in the summer.
2. A structured relationship between the student's school and the employer, so that they both have a say in the program's implementation and both bear responsibility for its success.

3. A revision of school curriculum to allow students to acquire both job-specific and broad academic skills, as taught through work-related examples.

4. Counseling and encouragement to attend two- or four-year college after high school.

ProTech's first employers were the hospitals. At the time of ProTech's development, Boston's hospitals were reportedly desperate for a greater supply of skilled workers. Since 3 of the 16 seats on the PIC's board, including the chairmanship, were held by hospital chief executive officers, it was relatively easy to promote the idea that healthcare could benefit from a School-to-Work partnership with Boston's high schools. Four out of the six first ProTech hospitals had already been involved with less structured programs to employ youth after school in the summertime. As such, they were accustomed to employing Boston's youth, but they were looking for a stronger program:

"They weren't getting . . . any sort of return on that in any employability way; they were getting . . . the feel-good stuff. What they weren't getting were higher-qualified applicants from the Boston Public Schools for the jobs within the healthcare industry. . . only 1 percent of graduates of the Boston public schools were going into allied health, even though health had 17 or 18 percent of workers in the city." (Murnane and Levy, 1996, p.124)

Current Structure and Operations

Today, the ProTech Program is in its eighth year and involves five of Boston's thirteen district high schools. The largest number of ProTech employers still come from the healthcare industry, though they have now added utilities/communications and financial, business and legal services. Of all the ProTech industries, the healthcare and utilities/communications employers have shown the greatest demand for ProTech youth, reportedly because they have had consistently high shortages of entry-level workers since the inception of the program. Because the hospitals' demand has been so high, the ProTech program continued to expand even during the recession, between 1991 and 1994. The number of participating hospitals has grown to eleven.

The financial services employers were the second industry to get involved and currently employ the second largest number of ProTech students. However, they typically have a lower demand for ProTech youth because they do not usually have shortages of applicants with
bachelor's or 12-18 month clerical degrees for their entry-level positions. There are currently eight participating financial services employers.

It is not always easy to recruit new employers to the program. The employer must be prepared to make a two-year commitment to hiring and training a student during their junior and senior years in high school, and ideally would be able to continue to employ them beyond their graduation. Mark Cafferty, ProTech's director, says that the most successful branches of their program are those where employers need more workers. However, even if the "recruitee" employer does not have a particular labor shortage, the selling point that is stressed most by the PIC is recruitment of ProTech graduates to one's own employee roster. Tom Bryan, who has been ProTech's primary recruiter of new employers to the program since 1991, says that highlighting the employers' altruistic contribution to the community is not a strong recruitment tool. First and foremost, employers still want to know what kind of direct return they will get from their investment in the program. He added that general development of the industry's labor pool is also not a strong selling point, as employers still perceive that as a charitable contribution to the community, from which they have no guarantee of benefitting.

The role of the "employer" is actually played by many people, who fall into one of three categories. There are the executives within the employer organizations, whose sponsorship appears to play a strong role in the success of the program. The executives are not usually involved in the day-to-day operations of the program but do help set program policy, and some serve on ProTech's Executive Committee. There are the direct supervisors of the students, who do the actual training and give most of the ongoing guidance to the youth. They meet with the ProTech coordinators weekly, on average. And at the crossroads are the lead contacts, who negotiate between executives and supervisors how the program will be carried out. The lead contacts are usually employed in the human resources departments of their organizations. They also maintain regular contact with the Private Industry Council through bi-monthly industry-specific lead contact group meetings and daily calls or meetings with ProTech coordinators at the workplace. The lead contacts have the most contact with the ProTech coordinators because they are involved with overseeing all the ProTech youth at their worksite to one degree or another.

ProTech coordinators are a key element of the program. Each of the five participating schools has one coordinator who is employed by the PIC and has offices both at their assigned school and in the PIC headquarters. They serve as the essential bridge between the school and workplace, helping to keep communication flowing smoothly and maintaining regular contact with the student. As such, the students' school and work performance can be monitored.
continuously to assess both the students’ and the employers’ needs and to provide reliable follow-up for problems that may arise. Osterman notes that several demonstration projects believe that an intermediary coordinator is critical to the success of their programs. (1995) Without a coordinator, the schools and employers frequently have trouble seeing eye-to-eye on issues and are unable to keep close enough tabs on the youth to insure success for all.

Youth must also be recruited into the program, late in their sophomore year. There are no tests but there is a seven-page application form, which frequently separates out many students who are not seriously interested in the program. The application requires that the students submit three teacher recommendations, their high school transcript, their most recent report card and essays about why they want to be involved in the program. Furthermore, as they go through the process of learning about the program, it is impressed upon the students that they should apply only if they are truly interested in one of the available industries. This sifting process helps the program meet the needs of the employers by providing them with the most motivated applicants, but also helps the students find out if the program is right for them. Mark Cafferty estimates that out of a class of 300 sophomores who are informed about the program, 100-150 would normally request applications and about 70 would fill out and submit them. These 70 or so are interviewed in order to fill about 30 positions.

According to Mr. Cafferty, the applicants come from a range of academic histories, from straight-A’s to D’s. Once in the program, the youth must maintain a C-average but a D-level student could make it in if they could give a solid explanation for why they had done poorly and would work to do better. The A-level students are actually not always the employers’ first pick, as the straight-A students tend to be the “over-achievers” whose schedules are crowded with extra-curricular activities which compete for their time. The usual ProTech students tend to fall in the B- and C-range.

The basic training guidelines include a one-month training by the ProTech coordinator in September of the junior year. From approximately October to February, the juniors go through rotations at work, observing the various positions available and learning about the details of job responsibilities. Placements then occur, and the youth begin to work after school for wages, for an average of 15 hours a week. These guidelines can be modified by the employer as they deem necessary for their site.

Youth wages vary, based on what the employer can budget for. They typically go up before the student graduates, usually timed with periodic evaluations of their performance. Healthcare employers usually start at $6 an hour and can go up to $7.50. The financial services
employers start around $7.25 an hour and can go up to $10. Most of the student wages are allocated in separate human resources budgets that run out when they graduate from high school.

Once a ProTech youth graduates from high school, they also graduate from the ProTech program but they might continue to work with their employers. If they do so, they usually receive the wage for a typical entry-level employee, from the department that employs them. Such opportunities for continued work vary. For example, most hospitals will only continue to employ the graduate if s/he continues studies in a healthcare field. In many of the financial services firms, a clerical or bachelor’s degree is needed for entry-level positions so there are often few positions available to high school graduates. Whether or not the students continue their studies in the field of training, they can continue to get career counseling from their ProTech employer or from the PIC College and Career coordinators. The PIC maintains a commitment to help them find other jobs, if necessary, and to continue providing them with counseling regarding financial aid, secondary schooling issues and career development.

The program was originally conceived as a “2 +2” program, where graduates would ideally go on to get a two-year technical associate’s degree. This was in response to the needs that the original healthcare employers articulated. Now ProTech is described as a “multi-year” program, in response to the differing needs of new employers. Employers like Bell Atlantic can hire program graduates right out of high school, without further postsecondary education. However, as mentioned above, the financial services employers prefer that their entry-level employees have bachelor’s degrees in order to do non-clerical work. A high percentage of ProTech students go on to postsecondary education: a 1997 study of the graduates from the classes of '93, '94 and '95 revealed that 78% had enrolled in postsecondary educational programs during their first year out of high school. Approximately half were enrolled in associate’s degree programs and half were in bachelor’s degree programs. (Hall)

There are interesting differences between the healthcare and financial services training opportunities. In healthcare, due to the nature of the work, ProTech students can be trained to take on incrementally higher degrees of responsibility. This kind of work lends itself well to allowing a recent high school student to continue to work while they study further in that field. The drawback is that if a healthcare worker wants to change to another field within healthcare, they typically have to start over in another separate certification program.

It is a different picture in financial services. Though it is common for ProTech students to do clerical work while training in financial services, they are not taught to focus on the typing or administrative skills that graduates of clerical degree programs have. Rather, their time there
is meant to expose them to the industry as a whole and to involve them in various projects wherever possible, but entry-level project work usually requires a bachelor’s degree. Hence, without either degree, it has been more difficult to find financial services slots for ProTech graduates immediately after high school. However, once an entry-level employee has a bachelor’s degree, there are many more opportunities to move into different departments within financial services companies, without having to go back for a new credential.
PART 2: STUDY METHODOLOGY
WHERE DID THE DATA COME FROM?

The primary goal of this study is to assess the determinants of employer commitment to the ProTech program. I focused on ProTech's healthcare and financial services employers because they have been involved the longest and, so, would have the best long-term perspective from which to draw more informed opinions about the program. There are also interesting distinctions between the two industries, in addition to those previously mentioned, which highlight how this program may be variably adopted by different industries.

Because the healthcare employers were the first to get involved, most have been in ProTech for at least two years more than the financial services employers. They were also instrumental in the earliest stages of program design. The hospital supervisors seem to have been involved over longer than average periods of time because they are often departmental supervisors, who usually stay in their positions for several years. However, the departments in the financial institutions are significantly larger than in the hospitals; as such, those departmental supervisors do not usually have the time to supervise a student. ProTech's financial supervisors are more often "front line" workers, as Mark Cafferty describes them, who hold less senior positions than hospital supervisors and who tend to move up or over to different departments more frequently.

It is of interest to note here that the 1997 National Employer Survey reported that 44% of health services employers are involved in School-to-Work partnerships, while 35% of finance employers are involved in the same. (Institute for Research on Higher Education) Both are higher than the percentage of employers involved in STW across industries, 26%. As such, it should be kept in mind that for whatever the reasons may be, healthcare and financial services employers may be more likely than the average employer to embrace STW programs.

The primary sources of information for this study were semi-structured phone interviews with employer lead contacts and supervisors of ProTech students and graduates in the healthcare and financial services fields. Twenty-nine interviews were conducted overall: four hospital lead contacts, five financial services lead contacts, twelve hospital supervisors and eight financial services supervisors. The financial services supervisor interviews are fewer in number; one program was rather small and had few supervisors available. At another firm, the lead contact gave me a relatively short list of supervisors to contact, one of whom was too difficult to reach in...
the limited time frame. I only realized towards the end of my research that it might have been helpful to interview the executives at these institutions and, unfortunately, did not have time to do so. This could be a useful area of future investigation, as my research highlights.

I presumed that those institutions that had been involved the longest would have the most balanced feedback about the program, as they would have seen both ups and downs over several years. Again, length of their involvement was the main criteria for selecting which of the participating healthcare and financial services employers to interview. In an effort to get a range of feedback, I interviewed the lead contacts and supervisors at one hospital that has not taken on students this year to learn about why they did not do so. I also interviewed the lead contacts and supervisors at one financial institution that has been enduring some difficulties in order to remain involved.

The templates for guiding the interviews are included in the Appendix. The questions were designed to find out why the employers joined the program, what they perceived as its pros and cons, and whether or not they perceived it to be a cost-effective investment of their resources. I attempted to measure their degree of commitment to the program by inquiring about their confidence in its effectiveness, present and future plans for scholarship funding for students, and their intent to stay in the program. Many of the questions for the lead contacts and the supervisors are the same; those that are different reflect those areas where their insights into the program differ.

As previously noted, there are interesting differences between the healthcare and financial service employers’ involvement in the program, but also amongst the responses of the lead contacts and supervisors. I will report these in different sections and compare them later. I originally perceived that I would not have enough time to interview more than one lead contact and three or four supervisors at each of three hospitals and three financial institutions. I found that I was able to supplement these data with lead contact interviews at one more hospital and one more financial institution, but I do not have interviews for their associated supervisors.

The other branch of inquiry involved a postcard questionnaire mailed out to all ProTech graduates, regardless of their field. I wanted a thorough survey to find out how many ProTech graduates remained with their ProTech employers, why they may have stayed with or left their employers and how many at least stayed in a related field. My original research design included more thorough phone interviews with the graduates, with the intent of matching their responses to those of their supervisors. This would have provided interesting insight into the nature of the
relationships between the students and supervisors, and their similar or differing perceptions of what the program was like for them. Unfortunately, this became too difficult to coordinate and would have proven to be too time-consuming to allow a thorough analysis of the results. The response rate from the mailing and follow-up phone calls was very modest (17%), so those results have been put in the Appendix. However, they are of some interest and I will mention them in the text where relevant.

To complete this work, I had the help of a research assistant, Lita Lee, who was working under the supervision of Professor Aixa Cintron at MIT. Ms. Lee conducted six supervisor interviews, assisted with the mailing and phone calls for the student survey and tabulated the results of the student survey. Many thanks are due to her for her invaluable support and her diligence.
PART 1: THE HOSPITAL LEAD CONTACTS

The following information is based on interviews with the lead contacts (LCs) from four ProTech employer hospitals, representing 36% of participating healthcare employers. All the ProTech hospitals are teaching hospitals. The size of the programs ranged across the hospitals from 4 ProTech students to 105. They involved a variety of departments including Radiology, Nursing, Clinical Laboratories, Operating Rooms, Physical Therapy, Information Systems, Medical Specialties, Non-Invasive Cardiology, Post Partum, Animal Research, Gerontology Laboratories, Corporate Research, Hematology, Oncology, Medical Records, Outpatient Surgery, Nephrology, EKG, Childcare, Pharmacy and Hospitality/Food Services.

I. Getting Involved in the Program

"Why did/does your company get/stay involved?"

Labor Shortage Influences vs. Other Motivators: Then and Now

All four hospitals mentioned labor shortage issues, particularly in the technical fields, as at least one of the reasons their hospitals got involved in the program. Their intent was to get involved in a long-term effort to train a larger work force in the healthcare fields. One hospital noted that the agreement among the hospitals was to train people without competing with each other. Three hospitals said there was a shortage of entry-level workers in the first year they were involved; the fourth said that perhaps there was. Following a span of relative labor surplus between 1993 and 1998, the labor market appears to be tightening up again. According to one LC, there are cyclical shortages every five years or so.

As for current labor shortage influences, their responses ran the gamut. One LC said that these shortages are still definitely an incentive for his/her hospital to stay involved to help
improve the industry’s workforce at large. In particular, this hospital got and stays involved because of their concern that their technically-skilled employee force lacks the racial and cultural diversity of their patient clientele. They felt that it was necessary to do their part to “grow our own”. The second said that labor shortages were initially an incentive to get involved but that, during the labor surplus years, the hospital saw that they were getting exceptional “loyal employees” out of the program so they continued to support it as strongly as before. Recruitment for their hospital is a driving factor, though not dependent on shortages. As this LC put it:

“Some programs are all about giving to the community and not getting anything in return. In this, you really are getting value back too. The students are consistently as good or better than incumbent workers in job performance evaluations. This is a work program, not a social program.”

Another said that the healthcare work force development and recruitment for their hospital are pluses but they are more driven by their mission to educate. The fourth maintained that, though s/he felt that the program was initially sold on the grounds that it would help with worker recruitment needs, s/he did not think that anyone stayed involved for those reasons. S/he remarked that the program is a lot of work, and they only get a few ProTech graduates a year who stay to work beyond high school graduation. S/he also noted that it is difficult to predict what their labor force needs will be two years down the road from a ProTech student’s placement in a department. However, this same LC later said that the reason they stay in is to network with other healthcare employers to find out about good trainees that other hospitals might not have positions for when they graduate.

Two mentioned that it had been described as a “two plus two” program, to get youth to intern during two years of high school, then go on for associates’ degrees and hopefully come back to their training employer. However, over the years, many youth have gone on to four-year colleges. One said that they want the youth to go on for advanced training because there “is little value to the healthcare industry for just high school degrees. We want them to have at least an associate’s degree and healthcare professionals need a four-year degree.” The question of how many eventually come back to the healthcare industry seemed to be unclear for all.

**Other Reasons They Got and Stayed Involved**

Three LC’s said that their hospital’s commitment to the community and/or to improving the quality of Boston’s educational system played a role in their getting involved, and all four said that that is one of the reasons they stay involved. (3&4) “We are beginning to see members...
of the same family involved with our programs, we are developing supportive networks." As for the schools: "They don’t even have the lab supplies and computers to teach what the youth need to know." One said that both community involvement and employee recruitment had been their motives: "We had already been involved with high school students; this seemed like a way to continue that but possibly get a higher return”. However, community involvement is now their primary motive for staying in the program because, in response to severe budget cuts, they often cannot pay to keep their trained ProTech youth beyond high school.(1) “We have gotten much more involved than just being employers. The supervisors are mentors who provide a lot of personal guidance as well.”

Two LC’s cited the need to advertise career opportunities in the industry as reasons they got involved and stay involved.(2) One said that people only think of doctors and nurses when they think of hospitals, but they need to know about lesser-known medical fields, like clinical work and research. As another reason they stay involved, two mentioned the short-term benefits of the work the youth provide while they are there during their two training years.(2)

One LC noted that there are political reasons to stay involved as well, explaining that there is a kind of well-mannered peer-pressure amongst the vice presidents of different hospitals to stick with the program through thick and thin.(1) S/he noted that if one or more hospital executives are involved with the Private Industry Council, it can also provide a degree of assurance that the other executives at that hospital will buy into and support the program.

All four hospitals reported severe budget cuts in recent years.(4) Despite that, only one LC reported that their company ever considered leaving the program, once when severe cuts led to hundreds of layoffs and “everything was on the table”.(1) One reported that for two out of the last nine years, they had had financial difficulty bringing in new students.(1) They had a hospital-wide hiring freeze and could not justify budgeting money for the ProTech program “when we can’t even hire new nurses.” The same person noted that if they ever did have to drop out of the program, it would be purely for financial reasons, not for lack of commitment to the program.

“What were your personal reasons for getting and staying involved?”

The LCs’ reasons for getting involved included: his/her profession is in workforce development(1) and s/he was looking for more rewarding work. (1) Two were asked to do it by their supervisors (2) but one of them "embraced it because [s/he] had a background in community work”. One likes working with youth and feels “we need to reach out and pull kids up”.(1)
They stayed involved for various reasons. Most wanted to provide opportunities for youth: "I know some of these kids would have fallen through the cracks," "I wish I had had an opportunity like this in high school to broaden my horizons". (3) Most also mentioned that it was very rewarding for them: "It provides ENORMOUS personal satisfaction to see youth grow and learn in an adult world." (3) Two said they enjoy working with youth; one of them noted that they liked the "challenge" of working with youth. (2) One stated that s/he felt strongly that companies need to have a social conscience and that after s/he saw how the program worked, s/he was confident that it could really help improve schools, as opposed to other efforts that seem to be throwing money at educational problems, to no avail. (1)

**Early Experiences and Later Adjustments**

All four LCs noted an improvement in the program over the years. (4) Two noted that the first year or two were quite trying, but they had also been two of the pioneer hospitals in ProTech's earliest pilot stages. (2) One of these two noted that there were so many rough spots that s/he was amazed that the supervisors agreed to stay on for a second year. The early problems noted were that there was bad communication through the ProTech coordinator and that there was insufficient time to recruit students who were best suited to the program. Another LC remarked having been overly idealistic at first and that the program expanded too quickly, spreading thin their available resources. (1)

However, following improvements in the program over the years, they all reported feeling a great deal more confidence in the design of the program as adjustments were made to meet their needs. Improvements include:

- highly improved lines of communication with the ProTech coordinator and, therefore, with the school and student. This resulted in swifter resolution of problems that arise with the student, with the coordinator often acting as a mediator of sorts. Implementation of a better reporting system let the employer know how the student is doing in school. (3)

- employer involvement in recruitment of the students, as opposed to leaving it just to the schools. Recruitment in the sophomore year rather than the junior year also helped. (2)

- a more defined curriculum for training the youth. Closer informational ties between the teachers and employers also ensures that the subject matter is being reinforced from both sides. (2)
II. How the Program Works

Where it Works Best

When asked, “Does ProTech seem to work more effectively in certain departments than others?”, three responded that ProTech works best in those departments where the supervisors are personally most committed to the success and quality development of the student. Two of them added that it does not work where the supervisor just wants free help or expects the youth to jump in and function like an adult would. The best supervisors apparently have a “real affinity for working with kids”, but all supervisors need guidelines to help them deal with the issues that arise when working with youth.

The fourth LC said that the program works least effectively in the more “corporate” departments, in things like hospital administration. S/he hypothesized that it may not have been interesting enough for the student if they seem to prefer other positions that involve direct contact with patients.

Availability of Supervisors

The number of supervisors who have dropped out seems to be minimal: “None” “one”, “two” or “a very small percentage”. In one hospital the supervisor’s involvement was cancelled because it seemed that the assigned student would be exposed to too much risk (due to the nature of the work) without enough supervision. In another, the departments fund the program entirely so a couple supervisors have had to reduce their involvement as their budgets fluctuated, but came back later when funding was available. In another, some supervisors lacked the time to provide quality supervision, after the hospital staff underwent downsizing and their individual responsibilities were increased. There were a few reports of supervisors dropping out because of having had a difficult student to work with or getting frustrated with students’ personal problems (e.g. one student was incarcerated, others have had family problems that affected their work performance) but even those were usually willing to take on a new student later.

Three said that it is not hard to find supervisors who are willing to be involved. Two of these mentioned that they have a waiting list or bank of those who want to or have been involved and are willing to take on students again. The fourth LC said that it can be hard to find supervisors who have positions that are challenging enough for the ProTech goals of raising the youth’s skill level. It is never difficult to find supervisors who could use help for “mundane” work, s/he said, but that is not what they want the youth to be doing. In all the hospitals, the
supervisors seem to have a low turnover rate within their hospital jobs, so many have been involved for several consecutive years. For those situations where people have moved on to new positions, the LCs feel that they do a good job of passing the torch to others in the department who were often already involved with students in some capacity.

"Are there benefits to working with youth rather than adults?"

By and large the youth are performing entry-level duties, although some especially highly qualified youth have advanced to positions such as practice assistants in Medical Specialties. However, one LC said that they often create jobs for the youth, which have fewer responsibilities than normal entry-level job vacancies. Two LC’s listed benefits to working with youth, which include:

- Youth have “no bad habits to untrain”. (2)
  
  "Kids learn best. I used to have 27-year-olds, coming back to me after they fell through the cracks and asking for work. They are harder to retrain and they have a higher turnover. The more you get them early, the better a use of your dollars and time it is."

- The ProTech program provides a structure and resources for influencing youth when the worker “goes off”. (i.e., starts neglecting his/her responsibilities) (1)

- “The experience of working with the youth provides real personal satisfaction for the supervisors, and they see their job in a whole new light.”(1)

- The patients like interacting with youth. (1) Another hospital pointed out that they want their workforce to reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of their predominantly African American and Latino patient clientele, in order to better serve them. As there is not much racial or ethnic diversity in their adult workforce and the youth are predominantly African American and Latino, they are filling a gap there. (1)

- Money savings: “Our adult entry-level workers make approximately $3 more per hour.” (1)

While one LC felt that age does not affect the desirability of the worker either way, another felt that there are no benefits to working with youth instead of adults. The reasons include:
having to accommodate the youths’ schedules, “squeezing work in around everything else”.

• the youths’ lack of work ethic. “You don’t get much initially.”

• the youths’ lack of social skills for working with adult co-workers.

The Costs of Training

The LC’s did not have readily available figures as to how much it costs to train a ProTech youth. Estimates covered a wide range, reflecting a diversity of program adaptations and perceptions of “cost”. One recalled that the figures calculated for a community benefit report were in the range of $10-15,000 per student to cover student wages, supervisors’ salaries for the time invested in training, computer training, uniforms and development of training materials. Another figured that training costs would equal just the supervisors’ salaries for time spent training. Another estimated that it takes an average of two months of on-the-job training to prepare a student so, at 15 hours/week and $6.50/hour starting wage, the training cost would just be about $780 per student. The last did not have an estimate but noted that whatever the amount is, it has decreased over the years as training methods and program administration have gotten more efficient. For example, in the first year, their student selection process was not as refined as it is now and they admitted students who needed remedial education classes that the hospital paid for.

Training Time and Previous Experience

As shown in Table 3.1, the time needed to get a return on the costs of training a youth is highly variable; an average of 6.5 months is calculated from the first three LCs (LC4 could not be quantified). The previous experience needed seems quite variable as well, and may reflect that the youth are entrusted with quite different responsibilities at different hospitals. The average previous experience needed is 1.8 years. The verdict seems to be out on whether or not the youth take more or less time than adults to train.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Contact</th>
<th>How long to train student?</th>
<th>How long until benefits &gt; costs?</th>
<th>How does that compare to an adult worker?</th>
<th>How much experience needed for ProTech jobs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>9 – 10 months</td>
<td>Less†</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>4 months + 30 hours</td>
<td>More‡</td>
<td>6 – 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>About the same§</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC4</td>
<td>“variable”</td>
<td>1 month more</td>
<td>Depends¶</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Hospital Lead Contacts: ProTech student training time, comparison with adult training time and previous experience required for ProTech student responsibilities.

Additional Notes on Table 3.1

*Less because “they are more motivated to learn than adults are and their bad habits are not as entrenched as they are in adults. A lot of their advancement is self-motivated, like teaching themselves how to do things like spreadsheet design”.

†Longer because “they do not have models for what it means to be responsible. They need the soft skills of accountability and motivation. The youth can get bored or fidgety, or screw up. They can lose their momentum, like if their grades start to slip.”

‡“Though it is about the same for training an adult, the adult is getting higher wages for the same training. Initially, the youth are more work but they’re worth it. You feel better about their success than that of an adult.”

§The training time depends on the students, as some are faster than adults. However, because they are part-time, it often takes longer for them to acclimate than it does for full-time adults, especially if this is their first job.”

Extra Financial Aid

The hospitals had varying degrees of financial aid support for their ProTech graduates. Two give $500 to each graduate for each of their first two semesters in postsecondary school. (2) Both assert that there is no chance that that amount will increase, as their hospitals’ budgets are extremely tight for the foreseeable future. One of these two has had this money regularly allocated in the budget, but the other has to find the money as it is available, usually if some other expense item in the budget did not get used. Both of these hospitals primarily give the money only to those going on to study in healthcare-related fields. However, one will give money to those who are going into things like liberal arts programs if they are still working at the hospital and the other will give leftover money to students going on to non-healthcare related fields.

A third hospital has a steady fund of $14,000 allocated for ProTech scholarships, which seems to be parcelled out on a case-by-case basis, to “supplement the bits and pieces that [the youth] need.” (1) This is also frequently allocated in two $500 installments, one for each of the
first two semesters of postsecondary school. This LC asserted that the vast majority of the money goes towards further study in the healthcare field, as that is the direction most of their graduates take anyway. However, if a student wanted to go on to an unrelated field, the LC said that they could still get the same money; s/he says that their hospital has a rather "global view" towards education. The last hospital has a standard benefit of $1000 for every year that regular employees are in school, which ProTech youth are eligible for if they stay employed there beyond high school. That money can go for tuition in any field of study.

III. Is the Program Serving a Recruitment Function?

As shown in Table 3.2, the program does not seem to be serving a sufficient recruitment "benefit" function to, in and of itself, justify the costs for two of the hospitals. One did not have specific recruitment concerns and one says that it is meeting their ideal recruitment goals. Two, however, are accessing a new labor source because of the program, and another is accessing a familiar labor source in what s/he considers a more cost-effective manner. (See footnote "a").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Contact</th>
<th>% desired to work at hospital, past graduation</th>
<th>% desired to stay in healthcare field</th>
<th>% still working there, past graduation</th>
<th>% who ever stayed beyond high school graduation</th>
<th>Accessing untapped labor source?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>At least 50</td>
<td>75 in any high-skilled job field</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>No and Yesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yesb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>Doesn't matter</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Hospital Lead Contacts: Percent trainees desired to keep in the hospital or healthcare field on the basis of economic cost-effectiveness vs. the amount who do stay.

Additional Notes on Table 3.2

a ProTech youth come from a labor pool that they currently tap at an older age. "These workers would have come to us eventually, at a lower skill level. It's better to invest earlier because they are harder to train later."

b Before the program began, they had several employees of color in the lower-skilled jobs like food services but were not getting well-educated applicants of color.
"What if they at least stayed in the field?"

All four said that if they knew their trainees were staying in the field though not at their hospitals, it would be an incentive to stay involved and work with other hospitals to expand the labor pool. Networking occurs amongst those hospitals who have qualified graduating students but not the positions available to accommodate their skills and/or interests. All four said that they network with each other now for those purposes to some extent. This networking can occur amongst lead contacts at the bi-monthly employer group meetings in the Private Industry Council offices. However, it is most often carried out by the PIC College and Career Team coordinators, who circulate student resumes, link graduates with employment opportunities through their extensive network of Boston employers and advise students about postsecondary schooling issues. One LC went as far as to say that the networking is the reason why they stay in.

"Do you know why those who left did so?"

The most common reason for students leaving was that they go to college. Others reported that budget constraints within departments make it very difficult to hire ProTech graduates when they finish the program. By then, the employers seem to feel confident that their graduates are qualified to handle the work. "By the time they have made it through two years, if they are still there, you know you want to keep them. It's a matter of where does the money come from." One said that at least they can get preferential hiring status for positions available in other hospital departments and they can get valuable references from the lead contacts. The largest hospital reported that they always had positions available for qualified ProTech graduates, so that was not an issue. Other reasons given for their leaving were the students’ own personal issues or that they found other jobs that pay better. One reported that there was poor screening one year and an entire group of students “flunked out” of the program because they did not take to the program well.

Do the Two Years of Training Pay for Themselves?

Table 3.3 shows, however, that three of the four employers feel that the benefits from the youths’ work outweigh the costs of training them, even if they leave after just two years of high school interning. Those same employers felt that the “easier” students made up for extra efforts spent on the “more difficult” students, such that it was a worthwhile investment of their time, while LC2 was hesitant to say so. Despite this hesitance and his/her statement that the
program does not pay for itself in a pure economic analysis, LC2 was quick to say that there are unquantifiable reasons for their involvement. These include “a sense of responsibility to the City of Boston and a LOT of job satisfaction for the supervisors. It gets down to: why do we do this?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Contact</th>
<th>Do ProTech youth stay longer or shorter?</th>
<th>If they only stay 2 years, are benefits of work &gt; costs?</th>
<th>Is that enough to justify involvement on cost-effectiveness grounds?</th>
<th>Given the easiest and most difficult, worthwhile use of time overall?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>Much longer</td>
<td>Sure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>/ think so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>Some yes, some no</td>
<td>Couldn’t justify on cost-effectiveness grounds alone.</td>
<td>I guess it does. Time on most difficult worth it if they turn around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>SEE BELOWa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, in almost all cases.</td>
<td>Yes, or we wouldn’t be involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC4</td>
<td>Don’t know.</td>
<td>Yeah, definitely.</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Hospital Lead Contacts: Length of stay and cost-benefit perceptions.

Additional Notes on Table 3.3

a “This question isn’t fair. When the youth go on to college, they have to work elsewhere. Their goal is not to work here forever. The hospital knows they will be going on to college.”
b “For some students, if they get placed well, they’re great. They are even greater value than they are paid.”

“Who do you think benefits most from ProTech?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1 Students, #2 Employers, #3 Schools*</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Students, #2 Schools, #3 Employers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Hospital Lead Contacts: Who seems to benefit most?

Additional Notes on Table 3.4

a One LC said: “Hopefully the students would be number one.” Another noted that it would be interesting to see how the schools would rate their answers.
IV. The Good, the Bad and the Future

“What do you think ProTech does well?”

♦ It is well-structured: the coordinators do a good job of easing communication with and developing competency program with the school, “the employer group meetings at the PIC help resolve problems”. (4)

♦ Teaches youth about healthcare, specific skills, how to be responsible; they have developed an excellent curriculum. (3)

♦ Keeps the youth focused, gives them respect. (2)

♦ “It motivates them to do the right thing: get their education and keep their jobs.”

♦ They keep employer commitment high by pulling LC’s into the students’ personal lives (like inviting them to graduations) and “they do a good job of reminding us each year of why we do this, painting the picture for us with success stories about the students. It inspires us to stay involved.” (2)

“What do you think could be improved?”

Recommendations were varied. Several comments were made about how to improve the training and schooling of the youth. One would like to see more communication amongst employers and teachers in order to forge more connections between work activities and the classroom, to make it more meaningful for the students. (1) Another said that more needs to be done to help the students be better academically prepared for college (1); his/her concern is that they can get very discouraged after being urged to go on to college and then not necessarily being prepared to handle the work once they get there. This same person also felt that more work is needed on the soft skills, like attire, professional language and body language. (1) A third wants to see more youth both getting into the program and going on to college. (1) One wants to see a social service support built in to help the youth with their personal problems; (1) another would like to see more minority supervisors, to help serve as role models. (1)

As for things the hospitals could do to strengthen their involvement, two said it would be great if more departments could hire on students in their first year out of high school, after they have proven themselves on the job. (2) One of these two said that there should be a central budget to allow this to happen. One would like to see the program institutionalized more, so that lead contacts and supervisors can easily pull in others to carry it on when they eventually have to.
leave. "We don't want it to be entirely dependent on the good will of whoever happens to inherit it. We need continuity, we need to operationalize it."(1)

Future Employer Commitment

"What determines the number of students you can take at your organization?"

The number of student slots available each year only seemed to have increased significantly in one hospital, while the others have stayed stable from 4-7 students, over several years. All four said that the budget is the one constraint that limits the number of students they can take on.

The Budget

The restructuring of the healthcare industry and consequent massive budget cuts were cited repeatedly as constraining factors for the program. Three of the hospitals fund the program through their human resources departments and one is funded out of the individual departments’ budgets.(3&1) Only one human resources department reported having to negotiate every year for the funds,(1) another felt their budget was secure now after having to argue for it during years of restructuring,(1) and the third said that their funds were so secure that they never had to argue for them.(1) The fourth had had the program funded through human resources but it had to be cut during restructuring in order to save jobs for full-time incumbent workers.(1) At that time, individual departments took on ProTech youth if they could afford it. This means that they no longer have to ask for funds from human resources but it makes the program more susceptible to the fluctuations of individual departmental budgets.

Budget cuts put dual strains on the program because less money is potentially available for ProTech costs, and supervisors are also being asked to take on more responsibilities. As a result, some are unable to give the kind of time needed to do a good job of supervising. "You can't do a half-way job of supervising. The students can feel it and some need hand-holding. We had to drop our numbers so we could make sure the supervisors involved were giving 100%.”

The Role of the Executives

Three out of the four reported that executive-level decision makers want to know about the cost-effectiveness of the program, including the hospital where the budgets come out of individual departmental budgets (3) One of the three said that the executives would never say
that the program was not worthwhile but they still want to know what the bottom line is. The fourth said that the ProTech budget was such a small item that the question of its cost-effectiveness had only come up during their periods of drastic budget cuts. (1)

All four hospitals said that executive level support is “important” or “essential” to securing funding for the program and for maintaining a positive attitude for the program at the organization. (4) One added that “you’ve got to have a teamwork approach”. One hospital reported having a hundred percent support for the program from their executives. (1) Another said s/he had noticed a waning of support over the years, in the face of large budget cuts and the executives having “to make some very tough decisions” as a consequence. (1) However, the fact that it survived a $25 million budget reduction was given as evidence of their continuing commitment. The other two reported “minimal” support from the executives. (2) One of these two said it was because s/he had not cultivated enough interest on their part and would need to do more than s/he had to pull them into it. The other said that their enthusiasm is lower now because they are having to make tough decisions about whether or not to keep workers “who have been there 20 years, versus a high school student ‘off the street’ who may or may not have loyalty to the hospital. If students are here already, they are very important to us. But new recruits are not as pressing in light of our financial situation.”

Recruitment of New Employers

Three of the hospitals reported having done some degree of recruitment of new employers. (3) All three had helped recruit healthcare employers; of these, two mentioned that it was not difficult to attract Boston’s teaching hospitals, as they have existing missions to work for the betterment of their communities. Teaching hospitals frequently already had money going into area schools for outreach programs; this was the first program that asked them to readjust their efforts in order to get something out of it for them too. The “selling points” they used were:

♦ Community commitment: All three talked about getting more involved. (3)
♦ Workforce development: The successes they had seen of youth becoming skilled workers. (3) “If you are going to spend time working with community youth, why not make sure that you are really training them well?” One emphasized the need to “grow their own” to develop their own regional labor pool.
♦ Job enrichment: The supervisors’ satisfaction of seeing youth grow and excel. (1)
♦ Cost-effectiveness: “It’s not very expensive and you get a lot out for what you put in.” (1)
Success stories of youth who had excelled reportedly went a long way to get people excited about the program’s possibilities.

Only one had helped recruit financial services employers. Some financial services companies had already been involved with community outreach and youth for several years. They reportedly have some problems of finding workers, but not as much as the healthcare employers do. Nonetheless, s/he said that in those efforts, one had to be sure to justify the program with work recruitment selling points; “You have to highlight the benefits for stockholders.”

“What would you tell another hospital that is considering getting involved with ProTech?”

“Here’s what you get out of it…” (2)

“The supervisors are for the most part very happy and have had great things to say about it. If you want to branch out and do mentoring, it’s very rewarding. It’s a good thing for healthcare in general, to get students educated and interested in the profession.”

“Start right now! It pays off. It’s a win-win situation and you have a responsibility to your community to get involved.”

“Here’s what you have to put into it…” (2)

“It’s a lot of work. You need a staff person who really takes it on and goes through the process with the kids and is consistently on call to follow through on problems.”

“Make sure there is an intermediary. Keep on track, pay lots of attention to communication and problem-solving. There have to be advocates for the program.”
"Do you want to remain involved in the program? Why?"
(All four lead contacts said yes; the table below is a summary of their responses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason to Be Involved</th>
<th>Ranked this #1 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #2 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #3 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #4 Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide an opportunity for youth and improve education. Employers need to be in</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>touch with their communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working with young people, counseling and/or problem-solving.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase diversity amongst healthcare professionals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment or labor pool expansion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to advertise healthcare professions to future workers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 Hospital Lead Contacts: Ranking of reasons for wanting to stay involved.

V. Discussion

Labor shortages played an important role in getting the hospitals into the ProTech program. Labor shortages seem to continue to play an important but less central role in keeping employers involved. The mission to remain involved with benefiting youth, Boston’s education system, or the community in a more general sense also appears to be a primary incentive for the hospitals, with advertisement of the industry playing an important secondary role. Recruitment does not seem to play a strong role, except at the largest hospital. The program was perceived by all to benefit the youth more than the employers. The hospitals appear to remain quite committed to the youth; for example, they continued allocations of financial aid funds for the graduates each year despite severe budget constraints.

There are barriers to healthcare increasing their involvement, however. The aforementioned budget constraints are a critical concern across the industry because, as one lead contact put it, “Managed care is here to stay. They want the most care, for the least cost, from the least workers”. One might ask why the hospitals have stayed involved past the bumpy first years of developing the program, despite their severe budget constraints, and despite the fact that there is relatively low recruitment of workers to their own employee rosters. Given the seeming inflexibility of the healthcare budgets and the reports that many departments cannot hire qualified youth right when they graduate, it may not be reasonable to expect this program to play a strong
recruitment role. Furthermore, only two of the lead contacts said that they perceive benefits to working with youth as opposed to adults. Despite all this, there is little apparent concern about analyzing the training costs of the program. What, then, sustains their involvement?

The program does not appear to be depleting the employers’ resources, as most perceive that the students’ work more than “pays for itself”, even if they leave just after high school. More importantly, the lead contacts seem to be very interested in the roles ProTech can play to improve the industry’s labor pool, to advertise healthcare career opportunities, to pull in previously untapped labor sources and to assist their networking opportunities with other hospitals. In fact, networking was cited as the reason that one hospital stays in. The lead contacts had their personal altruistic reasons for involvement but also noted a high degree of personal reward from being involved with the youths’ development. In addition to the critical coordinating roles that the lead contacts play, the program’s success appears to be heavily dependent on the supervisors’ commitment to the youth’s success and ability to work with youth. Fortunately, there appears to be no shortage of such adults in the hospitals. ProTech’s responsiveness to needed improvements and decreasing training costs over the years seems to have strengthened and ensured employers’ continued commitment.

The lead contacts did not seem concerned that youth often leave to go to postsecondary schooling; indeed, they asserted that they need them to do so in order to be of real use to the industry. The critical question is: what do ProTech graduates do when they get out of postsecondary education or training? Are they staying in the field? It is unfortunate that I was not able to compile sufficient data of how many youth are at least staying in the healthcare industry but that would be important information to research. Though they are not conclusive, the survey results indicate that a fair number (33%) of those who leave their ProTech healthcare employers are staying in the field, some of whom go to other ProTech healthcare employers (11% of all who left their original ProTech employers). It should also be mentioned here that, of those ProTech graduates who gave reasons for why they left their ProTech employers, 38% left because other jobs pay more. Some have gone to ProTech financial services employers (11%). (See Appendix.)

The survival of the program seems to depend heavily on executive-level financial support and belief in the merits of the program. Funding out of non-departmental budgets also appears to provide a critical degree of consistency for the program. This support is reportedly variable across institutions. Some institutions seem to require more active cultivation of executive-level commitment to and interest in the program to ensure its success. Yet most executives reportedly
have little time to interact with the program. Sharing of success stories seems to have played a
strong role in maintaining or increasing employer commitment. The lead contact who had
“100%” support from the executives and never had to argue for funding told an interesting story
about a graduate of the program who now works as an assistant in the executive administrative
offices. “They’re crazy about her. They always brag about how she’s a ProTech graduate.”
Though she was not strategically placed there, the story makes one wonder if there might be
currently untapped ways to remind unsure executives that the program leads to real life successes.

It is of interest to note the possible role that friendly peer pressure amongst executives
can play, as one lead contact mentioned. Such a dynamic would more likely be seen in an
industry cluster, especially when there are intermediary associations (like the PIC) that increase
interaction amongst industry members. While this alone might not assure employer involvement
over long periods of time, it could play a critical role in sustaining involvement during start-up
years, until they can reap other benefits of the program (e.g.: labor pool expansion, improved
public image, employee morale improvement, etc.).

One issue noted is whether or not employer size affects the degree to which an employer
can embrace or reap the benefits of the program. The largest hospital with the most students
seemed to have the least problems finding slots for graduates, securing funding and expanding the
numbers of youth they can take on. Is it because they were able to take more students early on
and, as such, to increase program visibility which helped convince executives of the program’s
value? Are there scale issues in training that were not addressed here? Do larger hospitals have
relatively fewer budget constraints? I do not have complete information with which to answer
these questions but will revisit this topic in the summary.
PART 2: THE HOSPITAL SUPERVISORS

The following information is based on interviews with twelve supervisors at three of the same hospitals that the lead contacts came from; this represents 27% of the healthcare employers. As previously mentioned, the study was originally intended to assess responses from three hospitals and three financial institutions. I supplemented these interviews with one more lead contact interview in each industry but did not have time to interview the supervisors with whom they work. The supervisors interviewed came from the clinical labs, pathology, pediatrics, radiology, the pharmacy, day care, cardiology, and the operating room.

I. Getting Involved in the Program

Why did you get involved?

All twelve supervisors volunteered to supervise ProTech youth. Two had been involved for only one year, and nine had been involved 4-8 years with an average of 7.5 years. (One did not have this question asked of him/her.)

Their reasons for getting involved were varied. Only three mentioned wanting to train future technicians (1) or to have extra help in the lab because of full-time personnel downsizing. (2) Other reasons given were more personal or altruistic. Many said they wanted to help provide an opportunity to the youth that they would not get otherwise. (6) One of the six mentioned wanting to help “bridge the gap to work and keep them off the streets during this critical time in their lives”, while another said s/he wanted to help youth “make the right choices to prevent them from being Welfare-to-Work program participants down the road”. Several said that they either liked to teach or mentor youth; one noted that s/he had never had children of his/her own, suggesting that this program was an opportunity to interact with youth that s/he might not have had otherwise. (5)

Some said they identified with the youth and/or wished they had had this kind of support and direction when they were growing up. (4) Others said they enjoy working with youth, with one noting that the students bring in new ways of looking at things which makes the full-time employees more excited about their jobs. (4) Two said they felt that it was a good thing to give students hands-on experience, in order to teach them why science is applicable to everyday life, (2) with another noting that s/he had put h—self through school with internships and knew the value of that kind of work and learning experience. (1)
Labor Shortage Influences

As for labor market issues, four said there had been a shortage in their department when they began the program (4) and five said there was some degree of shortage now (5). Specifically, there were remarks that it is hard to find both technicians with the appropriate computer and technical skills, and adults who are willing to do more simple, routine, entry-level work. However, only one said that labor shortage issues influenced their desire to be involved in the program (1). That supervisor noted that the youth are paid their ProTech contractual amount (which is less than that for adults) while providing excellent work, making them an excellent resource to weather times of budget cuts and scarce job applicants. Another noted that, labor market shortages did not influence his/her desire to be involved in the program per se but that “it is nice to have an extra set of hands.” (1) Another said that recruitment would be an incentive to consider if the students did not have other commitments like going on to college (1). S/he also said that the ProTech students cannot currently get sufficient training to join their entry-level force because there are not enough people to train them.

A few of those who said that they were not involved for labor shortage reasons note more altruistic reasons for being involved: “I’m reaching back because I believe in kids”, and “We enjoy being involved in ProTech because it offers youth an opportunity; we don’t necessarily expect them to stay. Our goals for long-term employment are kind of separate from our desire to be involved in ProTech.” “I would be active no matter what the job market was like.” (3)

Expectations and Later Opinions

Early expectations and experiences of the program varied as well. Overall they were positive. Many felt it was going to be good for the students, as it took them from “unstable inner city environments” and provided a chance to get ahead (7). One of the seven noted that it was good to get youth out into the real world to explore while taking on new responsibilities. This person said it was good for the youth to be exposed to a career path but that they did not have to stay on that path in the end. A couple mentioned having initial thoughts that they hoped the youth would be useful as well-trained workers or that they would go on to medical school (2). Only one supervisor reported anxiety before starting the program, as s/he and other supervisors felt that the students would take a lot of time (1). They found that they did not take as much time as feared and their opinion of the program improved. Two supervisors noted that it was rather rough getting adjusted to the program (2). They felt they had been overly optimistic, that the kids were not educated well enough, the program needed more structure, there was a “culture shock of dealing
with youth” when they came into the department. As a result, one felt that it seemed like more work than it was worth but the other said that, despite these issues, the youth were especially motivated to succeed and the program has gotten much better since then.

As they became more involved, most of the supervisors reported that their expectations of the program stayed positive (2 respondents) or improved (8 respondents). Five reported that their opinion of the program improved as it was revised. Important improvements included:

- implementation of a competency program to assess students’ strengths and weaknesses.
- better instruction of the students by ProTech coordinators as to what would be expected of them on the job.
- greater employer involvement in the screening process combined with students having more choice as to where they worked, in order to have a better match for both.
- development and enforcement of guidelines for supervisors to deal with student behavior on the job and closer adherence to hospital policy rather than letting misbehavior slide.
- better communication to the supervisors of the students’ grades and behavior in school.

A few reported feeling more positive about the program because they saw how much it truly impacted the students’ lives for the better. One supervisor also reported relaxing more as s/he grew to trust the students, and another became happily more involved in the students’ lives than expected as s/he attended their school events and graduations.

Some supervisors still had a few reservations, however. Two noted that youth are all different, so some you will have to work harder with than others. They said that it can be a lot of work to “deal with adolescent issues” on the job. Another pointed out that you must recruit youth with a lot of dedication for this program to work. One mentioned being disappointed that it seemed like the youth were being urged to go to college without necessarily having the financial support to stay there; s/he wished that the program had done more to teach youth to save or plan better for their education finances. Another said that their department got overwhelmed through no fault of the ProTech program or the student employee. Rather, it was simply because they already had a significant number of college students interning there, and the supervisors were over-committed trying to train too many students overall. In that scenario, the supervisor said that they could only handle the load if the ProTech student was a “superstar” and would not need as much supervision as others might. (For more details, see “Do you want to remain involved?” at the end of the chapter.)
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II. How the Program Works

"What functions are performed by your department? Which are done by students? How would you describe the program structure in your department?"

The tasks performed by the students included: performing EKGs, data entry, phlebotomy (drawing blood), spinning down blood samples, laying and staining test slides, delivery of samples, slides, medications and reports, restocking medications, record keeping, billing activities, registration verification, filing, answering phones, feeding, changing, supervising and writing evaluations on infants/toddlers, cleaning and preparation of operating rooms and providing x-ray darkroom and film library assistance. The students seemed to be entrusted with significant degrees of responsibilities, performing most or all of the duties of a typical adult entry-level worker by the end of the summer between their junior and senior years of high school.

The nature of the work and training seemed to vary from department to department. While ProTech provides guidelines and basic structures for training, the departments tailor it to what works best for them. For example, in one department, the supervisor had senior ProTech students help train the juniors; in another, each student is assigned to a lab workbench with a lab technician who provides ongoing instruction and supervision; in another, there is “team training” with the youth learning from both clerical and medical staff. Some positions, like the operating room and cardiology, require the student to be independent and to take initiative, while in daycare the students always have an adult supervisor nearby.

When the supervisors were asked to describe one of their typical students, a variety of anecdotes were told of the ups and downs of working with the youth. Five had little to describe for better or for worse but seemed pleased with their students’ work performance. Others had a mixture of stories. By and large, their “average” students were good to excellent workers; one supervisor said that s/he had had some students “close to genius and most were really up there” with regards to their intelligence. Some told stories of their exceptional students who were so good they could come in on weekends as well, or who started out shy or even irresponsible and blossomed into independent, mature workers.

Even the best workers could have their problems though; one supervisor who has been involved for eight years said that s/he has had “some issues with all; it’s a matter of sticking to the rules. Their personal problems arise but you have to develop an environment where they can work out problems and develop coping skills.” Another supervisor said they try to preempt problems by interviewing carefully from the beginning. “They come with their own emotional
baggage. We screen carefully because we don’t want any failures, for the sake of the students and us.”

A few told worst-case scenarios of the greatest difficulties they had had, like giving students several extra chances but the youth just gave up in the end or dropped out for personal reasons. However, all these supervisors seemed willing to work with the students through such rough spots and seemed to have had good success in giving students second chances to get back on track.

“Are There Benefits to Working with Youth Rather Than Adults?”
(One supervisor did not have an opinion on this question because s/he had not been with the program long enough to form an opinion.)

Of the eleven who answered, most of the supervisors asserted that there are benefits to working with youth as opposed to adults. Five reported that the youth bring a different perspective, that they are more motivated than adults are and more willing to take on new challenges. (5) “They aren’t just there for the paycheck.” One of these five went on to say that it is hard to hire people in the current tight labor market to perform the simpler, routine kinds of duties that the students take on. Another noted that students vary in their desire to do a good job but that “a self-motivated high school student is the best you can get.” (i.e., better than an adult worker) Another mentioned that having students ask “why” makes their adult co-workers work better.

Four pointed out that youth can be more trainable, because they do not come with preconceived notions of how a job should be performed. (4) One of these supervisors noted that anybody, regardless of age, can perform these tasks but that the process of helping identify work concepts and their individual skills is more important for youth than adults. S/he also felt that the youth are as qualified as adults for these jobs because they act older than they actually are. Several reported that it was exciting to teach youth or that they gained their own sense of satisfaction for having contributed to a young person’s development. (4) One of these remarked that the youth are harder to work with because they are more time-consuming but that it is rewarding to watch their growth.

Three more noted that the youth are like “free” work capacity because their salaries are paid out of human resources, not through their department. (3) Another mentioned that the youth are relatively cheap labor as they are paid less than adults and, considering how difficult it is to find “quality trained” adult employees for their particular field, the students are contributing
Another said that, considering that the youth were paid about half the wage of an entry-level technician, the “rate of return was excellent for the great students and for those who are bad, you get your money’s worth.”(1) Finally, one supervisor mentioned that involvement in the program “looks good for the boss and for the whole unit, as far as reaching out to the community and doing more than average.”(1)

Only one supervisor felt that there were no real benefits to working with youth as opposed to adults.(1) S/he remarked that the students are usually not mature enough. “Two out of six are good; the others call in sick too often or have lots of other excuses.” It should be noted, however, that this same supervisor also said s/he is not as hard on the youth as s/he would be on other adults in holding them responsible for their duties, so there is a question of whether or not those youth are getting strong enough messages about what is expected of them. One other supervisor reported that, although working with youth provides a sense of satisfaction, the students also have time constraints with their school and extracurricular schedules that are difficult to accommodate.(1) Furthermore, s/he said that the youth are not as reliable or do not prioritize work as well as adults.

The Costs of Training, Training Time and Previous Experience

Only two supervisors had a cost estimate for training youth, one at $200 per year and another at $1000 total sum. All the others said that they did not know of one, and/or remarked that it is hard to estimate.

Training times ranged from 8 hours to 12 months, with an average of 2.7 months. The average time it took for the benefits of the students’ work to outweigh the costs is 5.2 months. Training time as compared to an adult worker appears to be about the same. The previous experience required for ProTech youth responsibilities ranged from 0 to 3 years, with an average of 9.5 months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>How long to train student?</th>
<th>How long until benefits &gt; costs?</th>
<th>How does that compare to time needed for an adult worker?</th>
<th>Experience normally needed for kind of work</th>
<th>ProTech youth do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>6-12 mos.</td>
<td>Almost immediately</td>
<td>Less because they do less.(^b)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>It’s ongoing.(^a)</td>
<td>3-6 mos.</td>
<td>Probably a little less but it depends.(^c)</td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Very similar</td>
<td>HS or GED diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>6-12 mos.</td>
<td>6-12 mos.</td>
<td>A little longer(^d)</td>
<td>Associate or college degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Basic = 6 mos. + ongoing</td>
<td>6-9 mos.</td>
<td>Depends: all learn @ different rates.</td>
<td>Ideally 2-3 years, but some have none.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>8 hrs. + 2 hrs. per mo. after</td>
<td>Immediately or 3 mos. maximum</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
<td>6-8 mos.</td>
<td>A little longer(^e)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>3-4 weeks</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>3 weeks to train adult with experience</td>
<td>1 year(^f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Can’t remember.</td>
<td>6 mos.</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>None is possible, prefers 1-2 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>It’s ongoing.</td>
<td>6-9 mos.</td>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>Familiarity with hospital environment*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>(No answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
<td>Twice as long</td>
<td>HS diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6 Hospital Supervisors: ProTech student training time, comparison with adult training time and previous experience required for ProTech student responsibilities.

Additional Notes on Table 3.6
\(^a\) "The youth get bored without new goals to reach."
\(^b\) "The goal is not to make youth into technicians per se, it’s to give them a real life experience."
\(^c\) "Some kids come in with a clean slate and can be easier to train."
\(^d\) "Simply because they need a little extra introduction to a science background."
\(^e\) "They need some extra time to orient them to the workplace."
\(^f\) "One year is needed for adults who do all the work in the department; a ProTech youth might not be responsible for all the same tasks."
\(^g\) "The basic need is for the employee to have 'hospital awareness', and to be able to speak the language we use. The more advanced work, which only the most advanced ProTech youth do, requires a certification license, 2 years of junior college and 1-2 years of experience."
III. Is the Program Serving a Recruitment Function?

How many stay after they graduate from high school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>How many you worked with?</th>
<th>How many stayed after graduation? Part-time or full-time?</th>
<th>% stayed</th>
<th>If still there, do they meet the standards for other adults?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>1 full-time, 2 summertime</td>
<td>8% f.t. 17% p.t.</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>2 part-time, because they are in school</td>
<td>22% p.t.</td>
<td>They exceed standards because they are more familiar with program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 part-time and in school</td>
<td>36% p.t.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 part-time in school year and full-time in summer</td>
<td>25% p.t. and f.t.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 full-time</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6: mostly part-time because more hours are not available</td>
<td>60%, mostly p.t.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 working vacations and holidays</td>
<td>50% p.t.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Has had four stay, but only two still there, working on vacations</td>
<td>33% p.t.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2 part-time</td>
<td>66% p.t.</td>
<td>They exceed the standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A (Has not had his/her own graduates yet.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Other graduates s/he works with exceed the standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2: 1 full-time, 1 part-time but full-time in summer</td>
<td>8% f.t. 8% p.t. &amp; f.t.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3: all part-time but full-time in the summers</td>
<td>21% p.t. &amp; f.t.</td>
<td>None presently working there, but did want them to stay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7 Hospital Supervisors: ProTech student recruitment and performance measurement by adult standards.

Additional Note on Table 3.7

*Their one continuing worker was recently promoted to the next level above entry-level. "S/he has average to slightly above average abilities, but it takes him/her longer to get a promotion than others, due to a degree of laxity about his/her job."
Do you know why those who left did so?
(Two did not answer because they have not had graduates yet.)

By far the number one reason cited for the ProTech employees leaving was that they went off to college or the armed forces. The next highest reason was that the funding for the program ended at two years and there were no regular departmental positions available to suit the students' skills or interests at the time that they graduated. One of these supervisors said that they tell the graduates to stay in touch to find out when there are job openings, because the Equal Employment Opportunity legislation makes it illegal for the employers to notify them about job openings.

Some graduates had other professional interests so they went into different fields. One of these two supervisors remarked, "After college they really look for something better." Another two supervisors said that some ProTech employees lacked maturity and direction, and that even though they may have gotten along well with them, "some were really lazy." Two supervisors had graduates move away while another had one who got married and stopped working.
Table 3.8 Hospital Supervisors: Length of stay and cost-benefit perceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Do youth stay longer or shorter than adults?</th>
<th>If they only stay 2 years, are benefits of work sig. &gt; costs?</th>
<th>Enough benefit to justify on cost-effectiveness grounds?</th>
<th>Worthwhile use of time overall?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>Oh, yeah.</td>
<td>Yes, more than enough</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Longer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Shorter, because they go to college</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>(No answer)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not applicable, has only had one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>(No answer)</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>Sure.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Would say so.</td>
<td>In my case, yes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>About same</td>
<td>Yes but it depends on the student.</td>
<td>Yeah . . . (some hesitation)</td>
<td>Has not really had “difficult” ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Personally, yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Notes on Table 3.8**

a. "The youth stay longer but they have more guidance and structure than entry-level workers."

b. "The ProTech employees saved us this summer. We had a severe shortage of workers, primarily due to full-time employees going on vacation. The adult workers would have had to do 40-50 hours of overtime each week if it had not been for the ProTech workers, or we would have had to pay high-skilled technicians to do the simpler tasks that the ProTech workers undertook."

c. "Yes, but it helps a lot to have the supervisors get together and share ideas about how to deal with various students."

d. "It’s worth it to try to turn around the ‘bad’ kids; I don’t mind taking a chance on them."
“Who do you think benefits most from ProTech: students, schools or employers?”
(Only 6 answered due to a clerical error on my part.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Employers, #2 Students, #3 Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Employers and Students share equally, not sure about schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All benefit equally</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Students, #2 Employers, not sure about schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9 Hospital Supervisors: Who seems to benefit most?

IV. The Good, the Bad and the Future

“What do you think ProTech does well?”
(One did not answer this as s/he felt that, having only been involved for one year so far, s/he had not had enough time to form a clear opinion yet.)

The overwhelming response was that ProTech does an excellent job of providing youth with opportunities they would not have had otherwise, by: drawing in youth, mentoring them through hands-on work experiences, setting them on career ladders and/or focusing them on their futures. (9) One of these respondents went further, to note that they do it in a “sophisticated way, it’s not just a vo-tech program, these are real opportunities.” Several said that the ProTech coordinators (employed by the PIC) provide good back-up support and communication between the school and the hospital, allowing them to better manage particular problems with individual students. (7) They pointed out that the coordinators help identify issues that arise in the students’ lives and help the supervisors to navigate the “ups and downs” of the supervisory role. Three noted that their hospital lead contacts also played an important role, in that they check in on how the student is doing and are easy to contact about the various problems that can arise. (3)

Preparation was a fairly strong point: some said that they felt ProTech prepared the youth for the work environment well, by doing things like role plays of work scenarios before the youth even get to the hospital. (3) A couple said they did a good job of screening the youth and placing the right ones in those jobs best suited to them. (2) The coordinators were further commended for their follow-up on-site observations and evaluations of the students (2), and for their ability to set program standards and stick to them to assure that everyone meets their goals (students and supervisors alike). (1) ProTech was also noted for focusing the school courses more on what the hospitals needed the students to know for work, (1) and for identifying community institutions that have additional resources to help the youth succeed. (1)
"What do you think could be improved?"

(Two did not answer, as they could not think of anything to improve; one said this was because s/he had only been there one year, so s/he did not have enough time to form a clear opinion yet.)

Recommendations for improvements were rather varied. A number said that there could be stronger job readiness training (4): of these, three wanted the students to have a better understanding of what is expected of them, so that they would take the job more seriously and the fourth wanted more stress on the basics of general work attitude and dress. Others recommended that the program be expanded (3): two would like to see more members of Boston’s business community get involved to provide more opportunities; the third would like to see more supervisors recruited by letting them know how great the payback is, partly because s/he would like to be able to retire eventually and know that the program will be carried on by those who care as much about its success.

Two said that the coordinators could arrange for more frequent check-ins at the site (2); one of them suggested that parents or guardians be invited so that they are more aware of what the student is getting involved in. Another two said that the pay scale needs to be increased, even if it is only by $.50/hour, because if the youth are doing adult work, they should be paid adult wages and the program should be helping them save for college (2) One supervisor wanted to see more standardized trainings and support from within the hospital for the supervisors, including networking meetings where they can periodically sit down and compare notes on how the program is going for them (1). The same person also recommended that youth have similar networking meetings, so they can create a better sense of community and learn from each others’ experiences. One supervisor felt that the final project required of the students was not as academically challenging as it could be (1) One last recommendation was not for an improvement but an urging that they keep up rigorous student selection processes, because “the program is only as good as the students are.” (1)
“Do you want to stay involved?
If so, please rank your reasons why in order of importance.”
(One supervisor felt that it was best for them not to be involved in the program, for reasons elaborated below. Table 3.10 is a summary of the responses from those who said “Yes”.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason to Be Involved</th>
<th>Ranked this #1 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #2 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #3 Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s very personally rewarding to see the impact you can have on a student’s life.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide an opportunity for youth.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The youth provide good work during the two years they are in training.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides a pool of labor they have trained from which to draw the best later, after they graduate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It allows the hospital to be involved in the community, to help alleviate inner city problems, to benefit society at large.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It keeps staff attentive and challenged.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s very cost-effective. Wages are low and do not come out of their departmental budget.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It looks good for us to be involved.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.10 Hospital Supervisors: Ranking of reasons for wanting to stay involved.

Additional Comments from Supervisors
a One supervisor qualified his/her “yes” with: “As long as we are able to provide the resources and patience.”
b “It’s my own selfish need for a pat on the back.”
c “We don’t care if they stay or not, it’s about exposing them to new options and helping them make life choices.”
“This is particularly important for inner city youth, to give them skills they can take anywhere.”
“Helping the youth is the main thing that runs this. I also get a good worker and the feeling that I’ve done something to plant seeds for something better. You can’t ask for more than that.”
d “It makes my life easier.”
“They are a focused and reliable workforce.”
e “We’re taking extra steps to provide education and role models, which is critical in inner cities.”
f “They’re very cost-effective because they’re underpaid; I really wish we could pay them more.”

One supervisor said that they would want to be involved in the program if it were not for their heavy involvement in training college interns. S/he explained that as a teaching hospital, they were already devoting a great deal of time to training college students, who come with 2-4 years of study in the medical field. As such, they can be more productive than ProTech employees and can be given higher responsibilities, so they are prioritized when the department is considering time and money allocations for training. This is especially critical because of the hospital’s extremely tight budget and their consequent demand for multi-skilled workers. S/he
noted that the one possible niche for ProTech workers in that environment is to do the simpler, more repetitive tasks that the college students get bored with and which require less training and supervision. Otherwise, the adult workers get spread too thin trying to train too many and everyone loses out in that situation. Though this supervisor said that they would have liked to be more involved in ProTech, they simply do not have the resources to make it worthwhile for everyone right now.

“What would you tell another supervisor who is considering getting involved in ProTech?” (For complete text of answers to this question, see the Appendix.)

Give and you shall receive (7) . . .
Many said that you need to invest time and/or patience but it’s worth it because:

- you reap personal rewards of seeing them progress. (4)
- you are providing the youth with an opportunity. (2)
- you get a good worker out of it. (2)
- “it’s good to have rapport among the different age groups in the department”. (1)
- it fulfills a mission to teach in the community. (1)

Other advice from these supervisors:
- “You may get kids from different cultural backgrounds. Keep an open mind, treat them fairly.”
- “Make sure you are the right supervisor; you need to be interested in the outcome, and being part of a collaborative process.”
- “Know ahead of time that it’s not easy. It’s like being a mother all over again. You shouldn’t expect maturity.”

Others focused only on the benefits (3):
- ProTech provides support. (2)
- The youth are provided with an opportunity. (2)
- You reap personal rewards. (1)
- You get committed workers. (1)

And some just gave advice (2):
- “Be very straightforward and upfront about what the job entails, what’s expected of them so the student can make a clearer decision. [The students] need to consider the different sites to figure out what kind of work they like.”
- “Don’t think that it is going to take up a lot of your time.”

V. Discussion
There seems to be little evidence that the hospital supervisors are involved in order to recruit future employees. Though some students stay and either meet or exceed their standards, there is a relatively low percentage of ProTech graduates staying on past high school. The supervisors are well aware of this, and yet their commitment to the program
remains high. The supervisors seem to expect that the students will most likely go off to college and will often not be able to continue working there. A couple mentioned not being concerned about whether or not they stay in the healthcare field, so long as they get exposure to the work world and new opportunities. There seems to be little concern about analyzing cost-effectiveness, as so few monetary estimates were given of training costs. Perhaps this would be a different story if more hospitals funded the program out of individual departmental budgets. However, the overriding perception is that the youth are a cost-effective investment, providing more than enough work productivity for their departments to justify the time and money for their training before they graduate from high school.

The ProTech students can be more trying than adult entry-level workers. In their final comments, the supervisors seemed to stress the need for patience and the investment of extra time in the students. Some of this extra time is built into the program; e.g. they allow students to partake in rotations in order to gain exposure to various job possibilities. Some of the extra time seems to be required for particular students who need more reinforcement of the softer skills, like punctuality, dress and professionalism in the work place. Three of the twelve supervisors recommended better preparation of the youth as to what is expected of them on the job, so that they take it more seriously. The youth are also often learning to balance their personal and work lives which can be, for some, a time-consuming process of trial and error.

All this extra effort from the supervisors appears to be made up for, however, in the benefits that the youth provide. The supervisors seem satisfied with the students’ previous academic preparation; indeed, the supervisors’ comments would suggest that some of the youth are exceptionally capable. The time needed to train a student appears to be comparable to the time needed for adults. With regards to training efficiency, many supervisors felt that they are more enthusiastic trainees than adults and more easily trained to the department’s particular way of working. As workers, they can often be more motivated to succeed than adults. Those who do stay beyond the two high school years appear to be among the most committed and valued employees in their departments. Their wages are significantly lower than those of entry-level adults, making them particularly cost-effective.

But the most remarkable results point to the less tangible but seemingly critical role that commitment to youth and personal reward play in the supervisors’ continued involvement in the program. Their reasons for getting and staying involved highlight a high commitment to helping youth get ahead and a high degree of satisfaction in playing a part in helping them do so. It is also interesting to note that, unlike the lead contacts, most of the supervisors think that

---

*Chapter Three: The Healthcare Employers*

*Part 2—The Supervisors*
the employers benefit as much (2/6) or more than (3/6) the youth. Perhaps direct contact with
the youth provides benefits that the supervisors enjoy most. These intangibles should not be
overlooked by STW employers as benefits of the program; it appears to be sustaining
supervisor commitment over several years of involvement. However, only one of the three
healthcare lead contacts said they had brought up supervisor satisfaction in their efforts to
recruit new employers to the program.

Overall, the supervisors seemed pleased with ProTech, particularly with the excellent
maintenance of communication lines to the school and student through the coordinators. One
particular recommendation that could help sustain their involvement was better reinforcement
of the students’ softer skills (punctuality, dress, work professionalism) and more accurate
setting of expectations before they start working. Furthermore, the supervisors seemed to
respond very positively to program adjustments that were made to accommodate their
concerns; this consideration should be continued into the future as ProTech evolves, to assure
that the employers’ issues are addressed.

A matter of concern for teaching hospitals is that they may run a higher risk than other
employers of over-committing, in those departments which already have student trainees. The
one such over-strained department that had to withdraw its further involvement was also
paying its ProTech students with departmental funds, which put pressure on the department to
prioritize higher-educated college trainees, in order to get a quicker return for their limited
dollars. This example and supervisor comments that the youth are like “free workers” further
support the argument that the program’s continuity is best served by non-departmental
funding.
PART 1: THE FINANCIAL SERVICES LEAD CONTACTS

The following information is based on interviews with four current and one former Lead Contacts (LCs) at four ProTech financial services employers, representing 50% of the financial services employers. The size of their programs ranged from 3 to 17 ProTech students. The departments involved include: Commercial Owned Services, Human Resources, Legal, Deposit Research Services, Environmental, Coin and Currency, Lock Box, Tenant Services, Fund Security, Medical Unit, Administrative Systems, Product Assurance, Corporate Deposit Products, Public and Community Affairs, General Services, Deposit Information Assurance and Research.

I. Getting Involved in the Program

“Why did/does your company get/stay involved?”

Labor Shortage Influences vs. Other Motivators: Then and Now

Three financial services employers reported not having had a shortage when they began, nor having one now. (3) Two of these said that labor shortage issues do not affect their decision to be involved. One of the two said that the youth can become a “very important part of the staff, or at least are a little glue to help” with work that full-time clerical assistants usually do, but they are not filling positions that an adult would otherwise. The other of the two said that their institution does not have numerous labor-intensive entry-level positions, like some of the other financial employers do. They usually want their limited entry-level positions to be filled by college graduates. Instead, both say that their real incentive to stay involved is the senior management’s commitment to the community, education, and their partnerships with particular schools, some of which pre-date ProTech. The third LC said that in those departments where they cannot get low-skilled help, labor shortages provide a degree of incentive but even so, it is
hard to place the students because the program has gotten a bad reputation. S/he reports that their especially demanding company is badly partnered with a school that is doing an especially poor job of preparing the youth for their kind of labor needs. S/he asserts that the only reason their institution is involved is for improved public relations.

Another LC said that there was not a shortage in the beginning but they could always use extra help; currently, those departments that take it on tend to have lots of work and little extra resources in their budgets. “We would love to recruit them to come here but if not, at least it contributes to the industry labor pool.” However, s/he says they are primarily concerned with helping the student go on to college.

The fourth said that there most likely was a shortage when they began and that there is definitely one now. S/he felt that labor shortages do influence their decision to be involved, as the youth do good work for the company during their training years and “we are . . . hopefully training them to be either recruited or at least contribute to the labor pool. We are also getting very concerned about the lack of racial diversity in our workforce.” S/he felt, however, that their ongoing motivation to be involved is their commitment to better their community.

“What were your personal reasons for getting and staying involved?”

When getting involved, two were told, not asked, to become the lead contact but one added that s/he enjoys working with youth so s/he was happy to do it. Three said they were liked to teach or work with youth; one said s/he had almost become a teacher at one point in his/her career. Two said they wanted to help provide youth with better opportunities; another two said they wanted to help support their school or the community. One said s/he wanted to help diversify their workforce.

Three stayed in because it is personally rewarding: “to see them develop, balance responsibilities, learn the facts of work life.” One enjoys working with youth. Two wanted to help provide youth with opportunities; one noted that you “can really influence the youth, with the network of all the adults who are involved with them”. One wanted to support their partner school. One mentioned that the youth can be a short term labor resource for their institution.
Early Experiences and Later Adjustments

Three of the LC’s expectations of the program remained the same (positive) or improved. (3) One said: “We are tightening up on screening better. There are disappointments all around when you give a student a second chance and they fizzle out.” (1) Another reported that initially, it felt like they were doing a good thing for the student but in fact the students were not being equipped with a variety of skills for long-run worker readiness. However, the employer has developed a broader training vision now and it feels like it has become mutually beneficial. (1) They have the youth work one year each in two different departments to give them more skills and are educating the supervisors better as to the importance of training youth thoroughly. This increases the possibility that they might be able to hire the youth when they graduate or at least makes them more flexible resources while they are there.

One LC reported that their experience was worse than his/her expectations. S/he had initially been overly idealistic and did not anticipate how hard it is to blend youth into what s/he describes as a “mercenary” work atmosphere at their company. It is especially difficult to find youth with the skills they demand because their school is doing “such a bad job of preparing them”. Though s/he asserts that they are “good kids”, s/he feels “they need a lot of social work”. However, s/he helped tighten up selection criteria, putting more emphasis on grades; s/he says s/he was tough on that because it is the only way s/he could assure that the youth who were admitted would have a chance to succeed in that environment.

II. How the Program Works

Where it Works Best

All five said that it depends on how willing the supervisor is to work together with the student to invest the extra time needed. (5)

“It depends on the supervisors’ commitment to proper training, guidance, structure. They need to have a sensitivity to students of that age, and need to let them know that they are valued. If they just treat them like someone who is there to do the work no one else wants to do, then it doesn’t work.”

Two mentioned previous problems with finding the right supervisors (2): “Not all are comfortable working with youth; instead of talking to them about problems early on, they might let it go too long until the supervisor doesn’t want to bother trying anymore. They need to hold students to the same standards as they keep for adults.” One said that most employees at their company are not
used to supervising anyone, because they tend to hire people who can “hit the ground running and don’t need supervision.” Their human resources department has a higher level of tolerance but even there, there have been enough situations in the past where supervisors felt like they were not getting enough out of the ProTech youth to justify their time investment. Thus, it is not easy to find supervisors, as many employees perceive it as an unproductive time sink.

The other factor regarding where the program works best appears to be the type of work the youth are assigned to do. (2) “More predictable work is easier to get into quickly; project work is more difficult early on but gets easier as they learn to manage time, etc.”

### Availability of Supervisors

Four of the five lead contacts had had supervisors drop out of the program. Three had supervisors step out because they knew they did not have the time to devote to monitor non-clerical work, in order to make it a quality experience for the student. (3) Another pointed out that sometimes, restructuring makes it impossible to remain involved, as one’s job responsibilities shift. (1) One LC says, “It’s because the supervisors don’t know how to relate to youth.” (1) Their program has training to teach supervisors how to work with the youth but s/he feels that, in the end, the supervisors who drop out are just are not cut out for that role. One had had 2 drop out because they were so frustrated with the students’ lack of even simple basic skills (e.g., lack of reading and math skills, or inability to tell time). (1)

Two reported that they try to make it easier for the supervisors by helping handle problem areas. (2) One helps take care of the program paperwork so they do not get bogged down by it. Another says that s/he will intervene to help resolve a problem with a youth but if that does not help, they will sometimes transfer the student to another position before it becomes too much of a problem for the supervisor.

All four who were asked if it was difficult to find new or replacement supervisors said it was not. (One LC was not asked if it was hard to find replacements, due to my own error.) However, one added, “It is hard to find great ones; you have to have supervisory skills already; you can’t learn those from working with a high school student. I knew of a couple supervisors who had been told to do it because their boss thought it would be a good opportunity for them to gain supervision skills.” At the institution that reportedly has few entry-level tasks to do, the LC said that it is usually not hard but many would prefer to employ temps with more skills to get the work done more efficiently. This issue is closely tied to their policy regarding departmental budgeting. Until recently, that company funded the program out of their departmental budgets,
which allow for certain numbers of employees not hours actually worked, so employment of a ProTech youth hindered their hiring of full-time skilled help. The LC said that it helps that all the youth are now funded out of one separate non-departmental budget.

"Are there benefits to working with youth as opposed to entry-level adults for the same job?"

Three said that youth are more fun, or bring life and diversity to their workplace: "They are a breath of fresh air." "It reminds some of their youth."(3) Two said that there are personal rewards to feeling like you are helping young people have access to opportunities. (2) Another two asserted that the students are more content workers, because they are more excited about the challenge and focused on getting their present work done.(2) "Adults get bored or are too concerned about getting promoted." One LC said that youth are easier to train because they have less previous experience (1), and another added more generally that it is easier to train the future workforce to do a job right early on in their lives, as opposed to later (1).

The Costs of Training

All five LCs did not have calculated cost estimates for training a ProTech student.(5) One said that it would be negligible, as the students are not given formal training beyond their participation in computer training classes which are regularly administered company-wide anyways.(1) Another said that, because they also have that kind of in-house training, it "would not be terribly significant: maybe $2-3,000 per student."(1) Another LC at this same place said s/he had "no idea" but offered that the budget for student training and salaries was $50,000 per year for four students.(1)

Training Time and Previous Experience

As shown in Table 4.1, the time needed to get a return on the training of a student is highly variable, with an average of 5.4 months. The previous experience needed ranges from 0 to 2 years, with an average of 9 months. Three LCs felt that training time was about the same as for adults; two felt that youth take longer.
Table 4.1 Financial Services Lead Contacts: ProTech student training time, comparison with adult training time and previous experience required for ProTech student responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Contact</th>
<th>How long to train student?</th>
<th>How long until benefits &gt; costs?</th>
<th>How does that compare to an adult worker?</th>
<th>How much experience needed for ProTech jobs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>About same</td>
<td>None. Need to be responsible, willing to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>One week + ongoing</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>One week more for youth</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>Depends. Some skilled already.</td>
<td>1-3 months</td>
<td>Might be equal.</td>
<td>Not much for clerical, 1 yr. for higher jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC4a</td>
<td>2.5 months + ongoing</td>
<td>4–6 months</td>
<td>Adults have &gt; entry-level skills already.</td>
<td>A year or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC4b</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>Signif. more for youth: have to teach behavior</td>
<td>6 months – 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extra Financial Support

Three of the four financial services employers do not offer scholarships (3); however, one will reimburse tuition for a couple classes a semester for those graduates who are hired as regular departmental employees. The fourth offers a $1000 scholarship to all graduating students regardless of the field of study they pursue. (1) This fund appears to be securely locked into their budget and some years it is not entirely used, as some youth do not go on to college.

III. Is the Program Serving a Recruitment Function?

As shown in Table 4.2, the program does not seem to be serving a sufficient recruitment function to justify, in and of itself, the costs for three of the four institutions (3) (LC3 did not have information with which to answer this question.) Three are accessing a previously untapped labor source (3)
Table 4.2 Financial Services Lead Contacts: Percent trainees desired to keep in the company or financial services field on basis of economic cost-effectiveness vs. the amount who do stay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Contact</th>
<th>% desired to work at your company, past graduation</th>
<th>% desired to stay in financial services field</th>
<th>% still working there, past graduation</th>
<th>% who ever stayed beyond high school graduation</th>
<th>Accessing untapped labor source?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC1</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Doesn’t matter</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC2</td>
<td>At least 50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3</td>
<td>Can’t answer.</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC4a</td>
<td>Ideally 75%</td>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC4b</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Notes for Table 4.2

a “If we kept any more than that, we would not be doing it for the right reasons; we’d be doing it only for the student’s benefit. That’s the percent we sincerely want to keep working here.”

b “That’s difficult to answer. As the program is structured, we have no guarantee of jobs for them.”

c “But we don’t necessarily look at it that way. The youth don’t necessarily indicate that they even want to stay in this field.”

“What if they at least stayed in the field?”

All said that if they knew graduates were staying in their field, it would be an incentive to stay involved. One added that “anything we can do to provide solid skills helps everyone.”

Another, from the “mercenary” program that has been marked by significant attrition said, “It would be but they don’t; most go off to [unskilled jobs] right now.”

However, only one LC reported that s/he networks through the PIC to help youth find positions after graduation if they do not have any available at their company. Of the three who do not, one explained that there is no real need to because so many go on to college instead of work and they always have positions available there for those who do not. Another said that it was a great idea, s/he simply had never thought of it before.

“Do you know why those who left did so?”

The main reason cited for students leaving was that they did not have money available in departmental budgets. One of these three said that, before they started rotating students to work in two different departments and expand their skill base, they did not have enough skills to market them to the various departments that might have been hiring. Another of these three was under the impression that the program ends at two years so it is then time for them to move on.

Two LCs mentioned that students also go off to the military, college or different training
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programs.(2) However, one of these two also pointed out that the majority of the students that
had been at his/her firm were fired for things like "leaving a note that they would be back to work
in two weeks".(1)

Do the Two Years of Training Pay for Themselves?

Table 4.3 shows that LCs at all four companies believe that the benefits of the youth’s
work outweighs the costs of training them, even if they leave after their two high school years.(4)
LCs at all four companies felt that the “easier” students made up for the extra efforts spent on the
“more difficult” students, such that it is a worthwhile investment of their time. The second LC at
one of the companies felt that it probably does not, because of the difficulty they have as an
“especially intolerant” company, partnered with an “especially ineffective” school. Most of the
LCs answered the question of cost-effectiveness with statements about how that is not how they
evaluate the program because they are not involved strictly for labor force/economic reasons.
(See footnotes.)
Table 4.3 Financial Services Lead Contacts: Length of stay and cost-benefit perceptions.

Addional Notes on Table 4.3

a “Everybody knows the youth won’t be staying longer. The youth are temporary, that’s the status.”
b “The program isn’t measured like that. It’s nice to get productivity but the companies that get involved do it for the youth. We want to make sure they get marketable skills.”
c “We could justify it that way; I don’t like to think of it that way. Nobody asks if it’s paying for itself.”
d “That’s not why we do this. We don’t see them as a labor force. We are involved to support the school and reach out to the community. There’s not a lot of cost/benefit analysis done. I would analyze other programs before ProTech.”
e “I want to emphasize that this is an especially bad partnership. Our company is especially intolerant and does not know how to deal with students’ issues. The school is especially ineffective. We lucked out this year and were able to keep three students.”

“Who do you think benefits most from ProTech?”

Table 4.4 Financial Services Lead Contacts: Who seems to benefit most?

IV. The Good, the Bad and the Future

“What do you think ProTech does well?”

All said that ProTech really supports youth, by focusing them on their futures, exposing them to new careers, providing them with new opportunities, and building their self-esteem.(5) One also noted that it does a good job of teaching the youth to apply what they learn in school.
Three said that they have great management and build strong relationships with the employer through the coordinators with meetings, calls and site visits. Specifically, they said that ProTech is flexible and supportive of the employer; e.g. they provide supervisor trainings on how to work with youth.

“What do you think could be improved?”

Recommendations were varied. Two addressed the selection process; one wanted access to results of ProTech skills tests during the selection process, not afterwards. The other thinks they could all be “a little more strict” on screening student admits. “Undeserving youth pull down the standards.” Two wanted smoother operations: one said there needed to be less turnover of ProTech coordinators and the other wanted “a little more organization, like getting things that need to be in writing out more quickly to facilitate money allocations, etc.”

One mentioned wanting more ongoing training for youth to teach more about professionalism, work attitude, career options and handling larger personal issues like teen pregnancy and personal finances. Another wanted more training for the supervisors on how to handle their responsibilities.

Three comments were made about school-related issues. One felt strongly that their students should be getting more hours at school because they cannot keep up in college with only half-days, as their high school partner currently provides. This person also wanted more enforcement of school attendance. The other LC from this same employer said there is a critical need to match the right school with the right employer: i.e.: don’t match the least prepared students with the most demanding employer (as s/he perceives their firm). This LC also said that it is imperative for their own senior management to decide if they are going to be serious and realistic about facing the problems in the program. S/he put forth the possibility that perhaps his/her employer could help the school by putting more money directly into it.

Future Employer Commitment

“What determines the number of students you can take at your organization?”

Three institutions said that the budget determines how many students they can take. The one that is reportedly poorly matched with its school because of its especially high demands on workers said that their limiting factors are the quality of the candidates and the number of supervisors they can get to commit to be involved.
The Budget

Two companies said that their Boston offices had not experienced significant downsizing in the last few years. (2) One has and is heading into a hiring freeze while it merges with another company. (1) (One company was not asked this question, due to my error.) All four funded the program from budgets that are separate from the departments in which the youth work: Public and Community Affairs, Corporate Human Resources, Community Relations and the central budget for Banking Operations. Only one said that the budget must be reauthorized each year (1); the other three said it was secure (3). One noted that having the program funded from a non-departmental budget was a great improvement because previously, it had been difficult to find departments that were willing to include part-time ProTech youth in their head counts. (As previously mentioned, their budgets will only allow a certain number of people to work, regardless of actual hours put in, which put pressure on departments to hire temps instead or to expect ProTech youth to “hit the ground running” if they did take them on.)

The Role of the Executives

All four reported that executive-level decision makers had never asked for the cost effectiveness calculations of the program, to their knowledge. (4) One said that the budget is approved yearly by the senior-level head of the department through which it is funded. That person does not judge the program by the same parameters as their “business” budgets. Instead, s/he wants to know how well ProTech is being managed at their institution, what is happening with the students and whether or not the school is living up to its commitment to educate the students well; his/her agenda is improving the school and the youth’s education. Another mentioned that an executive director funds it through his/her budget so the issue of authorization is at his/her discretion.

When asked how critical executive level financial or moral support is to the success of the program, answers were varied. Two asserted that executive level support is key to the success of the program (2); one of these claimed that such support is critical at any organization. Both of these reported that they have executives involved with the PIC. One of these executives is heavily focused on educational outreach to the community, while the other reportedly stresses that “we are not just doing good by teaching skills – we have young talented high school students producing work for us for two years.”

The other two seemed less sure of what degree of executive level support they have at their companies. Currently, their budgets are being authorized by senior level employees who are
not among the highest executives. One asserts that broad-based executive support is not critical, that ProTech can “stand alone” so long as someone who can approve funding supports it. The other reported that they have been getting along without a clear statement of what the executive level of support is but will need to have that explicitly defined if the program is to move forward, as they are going to need administrative support that has been lacking. They also want to see if it is feasible to “embrace” the program more widely throughout the company, in which case they could use some executive level help in spreading their endorsement to new departments.

**Recruitment of New Employers**

Only one LC reported having assisted with recruitment of new employers. S/he recalled stressing the “bottom line”: that the youth’s short term help (during high school) and long term prospects of a potential future employee are great benefits and are equally important. S/he told them that it creates a good public image for the company and shared success stories about how young people have excelled and become critical employees. S/he “tried to be realistic and let them know that some don’t match up but those who are good pay for themselves.” S/he stressed that the employer is helping the youth but the students help them get work done.

“What would you tell another financial services employer that is considering getting involved with ProTech?”

“**Here’s what everyone gets out of it . . .**”

“It’s a good show for your bank of your commitment to education, young people, the future, and diversity. The youth are making decent money but you’re getting some quality entry-level work at less-than-entry-level wages.”

“**Do it!** It’s an extremely rewarding experience and these students are our future workforce, our future customers. The time we spend with this kind of program will only benefit the community overall.”

“**Here’s what you have to put into it . . .**”

“You definitely need to take the time to be prepared. You need supervisors who are ready to manage teenagers to develop work behaviors.”

“It’s a very good program. It’s most important that they allow the students to try things that we think they can’t handle. Give them more than clerical work; push their boundaries into projects that have a product.”

“It’s a great program but you’ve got to have the right school. You have to have real support and respect from your management.”
"Do you want to remain in the program? Why?"

Three of the companies reported that they never considered leaving the program. The fourth said that they had because there are not enough resources allocated within their company to support it sustainably. Their needs include more steady allocation of training resources and more moral support from executives and fellow workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason to Be Involved</th>
<th>Ranked this #1 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #2 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #3 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #4 Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s personally very rewarding to assist with youth’s development; I enjoy working counseling/mentoring.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide an opportunity for youth and improve education. Employers need to be in touch with their communities.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The youth provide good work during the two years they are in training.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase employee diversity.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Financial Services Lead Contacts: Ranking of reasons for wanting to stay involved. (One LC did not answer, due to my error.)

V. Discussion

Labor shortages do not seem to significantly influence financial services employers to get involved in ProTech. This was also alluded to by the healthcare lead contact who had helped recruit some of the financial employers. In addition, they seem less concerned than the healthcare employers with expanding their regional labor pool, advertising their industry and networking with other financial employers. They do not offer the same financial aid support to their graduates, perhaps indicating that their interest is less tied to the future labor market return of their trainees.

An altruistic commitment to the community seems to play a more central role in getting financial services employers involved. It is of interest that while three hospitals funded their programs through their human resources budgets and one through departmental budgets, suggesting that they all see the program as an investment in their workforce, two of the financial services employers fund ProTech through their community relations budgets. All five lead contacts perceived that the youth are benefiting most from the program and three felt that the employers are benefiting the least. The lead contacts’ personal reasons for wanting to contribute
to youth or education and to reap associated personal gratification also ranked high. Though long
term labor force development was not cited as a reason to stay involved, two mentioned the
benefits of the youth's short-term labor while they are in high school, perhaps indicating that
ProTech is helping them meet current labor needs. ProTech is also helping most of them access a
currently untapped labor source. As with the healthcare employers, the program appears to be
paying for itself with the benefits of the youths' work in the short-term, so it is not a drain on the
companies' resources. They were quick to add that there are other reasons for them to be
involved besides the youth's productivity, like helping the youth and contributing to their
community.

Some information suggests that the financial services employers have fewer budget
constraints than the healthcare industry. None have undergone significant downsizing in the past
few years, though one had gone through a hiring freeze. As with the healthcare employers, there
are no precise cost estimates for training students; however no executives seem to be concerned
about cost-effectiveness either. This may explain why the executive support was not critical for
the maintenance of the programs at two of the financial institutions. However, one LC noted that
such support may be important for the long-term expansion and survival of those programs.

The financial lead contacts seem to have had fewer problems starting up the program than
the early healthcare employers, presumably because the program had already improved by the
time they got involved, at least two years later. Nonetheless, early implementation difficulties
were reported as the lead contacts adapted the program guidelines to their individual sites. Again,
ProTech appears to have done a good job of being responsive to employer needs (e.g.,
maintaining excellent communication channels and developing supervisor trainings) that
currently serve to sustain employer commitment.

One employer, however, continues to struggle with unique problems. According to one
the interviewees, when compared with other financial services employers, they are the most
demanding of their employees, least patient with training and have the least entry-level tasks to
do. They have also been paired with a school that is allegedly doing an especially poor job of
teaching students. Supervisors were reportedly fairly difficult to find at this employer institution,
as ProTech now has a tainted reputation, spread by those who were disappointed early on by the
performance of their students. Of all the financial services employers, these lead contacts
reported the longest training times needed. They were also plagued by a budget policy that only
allows a certain number of people per department, whether they are full-time or part-time. This
seemed to only exacerbate the pressure on the students to "hit the ground running" if a
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department did elect to take them on. This situation may be alleviated somewhat now by their use of non-departmental funding to sustain the program but they will still have to work to reverse ProTech’s reputation there. In this situation, it seems there needs to be a more careful matching of the employers’ needs with a school’s capacity to prepare youth for the workplace. While part of the purpose of the program is to improve schools, it may be too soon for some to meet the skill demands of especially exacting employers.

The success of the program is, again, reportedly heavily dependent on the availability of supervisors who have a sincere interest in working with youth and commitment to their success. There does not seem to be a shortage of such supervisors but there does seem to be some difficulty for supervisors to find sufficient non-clerical work for the youth.

The issue of company size again raises interesting questions. Some of the lead contacts mentioned that the costs of training were low because the youth can join in on regularly offered company-wide training sessions. Presumably, such training would only go on at a large company with a critical mass of entry-level trainees. Such an advantage could not be enjoyed by smaller employers.
PART 2: THE FINANCIAL SERVICES SUPERVISORS

The following information is based on interviews with eight supervisors at three of the financial services organizations that the lead contacts came from, representing 38% of the financial services employers involved. As previously mentioned, the study was originally intended to assess responses from three hospitals and three financial institutions. I supplemented these interviews with one more lead contact interview in each industry but did not have time to interview the supervisors with whom they work. Furthermore, it should be noted that four came from one financial service organization, while Ms. Lee and I were only able to get two each at the other two. One of these programs was rather small and had few supervisors available. At the other, the lead contact gave me a relatively short list of supervisors to contact, one of whom was extremely difficult to reach, so I had to forego that interview.

The supervisors interviewed came from human resources, deposit investments, adjustments, corporate compensation, reconciliation, employee relocation, public and community affairs and product assurance.

I. Getting Involved in the Program

"Why did you get involved?"

The supervisors had been involved for 1-4 years, with an average of 2.5 years. Most supervisors had volunteered to get involved (6), but two were told to (2). Of the two who were told to, one was very anxious at first, not having supervised before, but now “finds it very rewarding”. The other was quite resentful about having been forced to participate but then got used to it and now welcomes it because it provides him/her with extra help, which means s/he does not have to “post jobs” when workloads fluctuate.

As for the six who volunteered, three wanted to help provide opportunities for the youth (3). Two of these mentioned that they wished they had had something like this to guide his/her career choices as a youth. Three saw it as an opportunity to incorporate another career interest (teaching or mentoring youth) into their current job responsibilities (3). Two needed extra help because their workloads had increased but they were not given extra personnel help (2). Two said it was simply because their job responsibility called for their involvement (one is in human resources and one moved into a position that had been vacated by a previous supervisor) but that they were happy to be involved (2).
Labor Shortage Influences

Four said that their department did not have an entry-level labor shortage when the program started (4); two said their departments did (2) and two said they did not know if there had been one (2). Seven supervisors said they do not currently have a labor shortage (7); one noted that they can frequently trade adult incumbent workers across department lines to meet shifting labor demands. Another of the seven said that they do not have a labor shortage because of ProTech; if they were not there, they would have to hire temps who would need to be paid out of their departmental budget.

Six supervisors felt that labor shortage needs did not influence their choice to be involved in ProTech (6). However, one of the six perceives that it does influence some other departments: "It would’ve been great to have more help around tax time." Another said that the youth are a big help to them, especially in the summer when many adult workers take vacation time, but asserts that the youth are not filling positions that would otherwise be open to hire an adult. Two supervisors said that labor shortage issues do influence their involvement (2); their goal seemed to be to meet short term labor needs during the youth’s high school years as opposed to longer term recruitment or industry-wide labor pool expansion.

Expectations and Later Opinions

Four supervisors had positive expectations of the program, as they were eager to help provide an opportunity for the youth to make some money, to learn and to “stay off the streets." (4) Three supervisors were not sure what to expect of the program (3) as they report having known little about it, but one had heard from others who had been involved that the youth were “bright and helpful”. One reported that it was difficult early on, before the implementation of improvements, because the selection process was badly handled, “so we thought ProTech was for problem students.” (1) One was very pessimistic, having been forced to supervise. (1) Another lost a lot of confidence early on, after his/her first two students were dismissed for cheating on their time sheets (1).

Six coordinators reported that their opinions of the program improved (6) and one’s high opinion of it remained high (1). One reported liking that they teach the youth skills in high school rather than waiting until college. Several improvements in the program were noted:

- Better screening of youth.
Better teaching of the students as to what is expected of them and how supervisors can handle problems that arise. One supervisor reported that if this had not improved, s/he would “want nothing to do with this program. I was always running around after the students.” Another said, “We felt like we had to put up with problem students before; now we know how to deal with it.”

Better communication (through detailed manuals and meetings) about what everyone’s responsibilities are, what students’ grades and school behavior are like.

One of these supervisors, who lost confidence in the program after his/her 2 students were caught stealing, reports having had to rebuild faith in the program by talking to ProTech coordinators and other ProTech youth and supervisors. S/he has “had to learn that you can’t just judge the program by one or two students”.

One supervisor has a low opinion of it after his/her first and only year, as his/her youth had a lot of attendance problems, and had to be “hand-held” a lot. S/he describes it as “lots of basic disciplining without much production”. S/he also says that s/he does not want to judge it too quickly because s/he knows of others who have had very positive experiences of it. However, s/he does not think their department is the right place for ProTech because they do not really have “redundant” entry-level work for them to do.

II. How the Program Works

“What functions are performed by your department? Which are done by students? How would you describe the program structure in your department?”

The tasks performed by the students included: filing and auditing files in human resources, database information searches, mailing out letters to resolve abandoned property matters, computer input of invoices, preparation/packaging of conference materials (like informational pamphlets and nametags), mail sorting, provision of information to employees regarding benefits and part-time relocation, development of an orientation package for new employees, computer data entry, coordination (via computer) of mailings when people call in for economic education publications, writing for monthly and annual departmental reports, account maintenance and check scanning.

A couple supervisors described the youth’s responsibilities as essentially equal to those of the full-time employees in their departments: “We assign work that is meaningful to the department so the students feel good about their work.” Most, however, described the youth’s
work as “back-up” assistance with clerical kinds of tasks that assist full-time employees with bigger projects. “We try to share work with them that is beyond the clerical level so they can at least get the bigger picture; they can’t really run with a whole project like a full-time adult could.”

As in the hospitals, the training varies by financial institution according to their needs and style. One institution not only has rotations during training but they make sure that the youth work in different departments during their time there. This allows them to acquire a variety of skills and experience to make them more marketable, either at the bank or out in the labor market. Another institution said that in their program, the supervisors are also evaluated on how much they have worked to help the program meet its ends.

Individual departments vary in their approaches as well. Some have very simple training approaches, like explaining one task at a time and checking the work immediately after it is done, to “prevent problems while they are small”. One uses a team approach, involving several people in the department to explain basic skills and give an orientation to both the company and the industry at large. Others appoint their subordinates to do most of the training.

One supervisor had to take a great deal of time training one, reportedly because s/he had not had any previous experience. S/he writes a checklist of the things s/he needs to do, encourages him/her to ask questions about what s/he does not understand and makes him/her write down answers to those questions that s/he asks repeatedly. Another encourages a great deal of independence: s/he assigns software reading and will follow up with tutorials but s/he also tells the students to self-train with any resources they can find if they run out of things to do and there are no supervisors around. S/he also goes beyond training to teach them about resources like financial aid and credit unions and how to do their resumes, urging them to keep a log of the things they do so they can tell future employers. Another points out that when the youth are initially tested at their skills training center; some are as good or better than adult trainees: “Sometimes they have a competitive edge, because they are still in learning mode. They’re really sharp; some move on easily from entry-level duties.”

The supervisors also gave a variety of anecdotes when asked to describe their typical students. Two only told positive stories. “S/he’s flexible and able to take on multiple tasks; s/he initially did clerical work, but now does independent projects.” “Three of our nine employees are ProTech, so they are a big part of our department. They love it here and want to stay on through college.”
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Four told qualified stories of mixed successes. One is working part-time while in college; s/he reportedly “works fine alone but is socializing too much. We’re going to be undergoing job restructuring in the department anyways so we’ll have to let [him/her] go.”

“I originally thought my ‘typical’ student couldn’t handle the job but [s/he’s] very conscientious, concerned about not making mistakes, has almost full-time responsibilities while going to night school, is taking the initiative to dress more business-like, gets there early and stays late of [his/her] own volition. S/he doesn’t socialize, and I only had to tell [him/her] once not to. These youth are very bright and don’t necessarily need to be doing entry-level work. But I also learned not to get too personally involved. I trusted one who went on maternity leave and was supposed to just be gone long enough for finals, and never came back. That hurt a lot. I decided that I can still assist them but they have to want to have it.”

“I’d already had valuable help from ProTech students; then I was asked to take on an especially shy and reserved youth who had been through a number of supervisors already. [S/he] used to think that [s/he] was always wrong; I taught [him/her] to walk straight and proud and look people in the eye. It worked out well for me; it’s been very satisfying to see the impact I had. But [his/her] heart’s not in it, [s/he] wants to be an artist. [S/he] helps a lot but it would be better for us both if [s/he] was in a field of [his/her] interest, so [s/he] can develop the skills [s/he] wants to use. I have to supervise [him/her] more than I should. Though this is a good fall back experience in case [his/her] dream doesn’t work out.”

“Before they tightened up orientation and made the students really clear on their responsibilities, I had some who took 3-hour lunches and would come back with shopping bags. But I’ve had some great summer workers that were placed through the PIC.”

The last supervisor was the only one who would not be taking on anymore students, due to many factors. His/her first and only experience supervising did not go well:

“I was told by ProTech to give [him/her] challenging tasks, not just menial ones. But [s/he] couldn’t handle challenges; perhaps [s/he] had to start out slower. [S/he] needed a lot of supervision and was not producing much. [S/he] didn’t know how to manage time; I was babysitting. [S/he] had personal problems at home that affected [him/her]; [s/he] felt that [s/he] was not being trusted here. I would not be able to recommend [him/her] to another supervisor but I think it’s fine if the lead contact gives [him/her] another chance elsewhere. [S/he] was a nice person, [s/he] just needs coaching, structure and monitoring. [S/he] had excellent computer skills but lacked initiative. Maybe [s/he] wasn’t ready for the work world yet.”

“Do you know of other supervisors dropping out or wanting to?”

Six said they did not know of supervisors dropping out or wanting to. One remarked that they always seem willing to take youth on, even after they may have had difficulties with...
some. The lead contacts try to pick people who would deal well with students. Many are parents with their own children, said one supervisor.

Two did know of supervisors wanting to drop out (2); one felt that some supervisors underestimate the time commitment and then think they are wasting their time. The other said that some of his/her co-workers have referred to it as “babysitting”. S/he knows of one co-worker who wants “nothing to do” with the ProTech students, for that reason.

“Are there benefits to working with youth rather than adults?”

Seven supervisors identified benefits to working with youth as opposed to adults (7). Four remarked on the personal rewards of seeing the youth develop; “It’s a HUGE morale booster.” (4) Four more said that youth are more willing to do what’s asked of them: “Adults think certain things are below them. An adult would moan about filing.” (4). Two supervisors said that they enjoy either working with teens or teaching. (2) Two said that the youth bring new perspectives to work, which is refreshing for the adult workers. (2) One supervisor said that youth are more eager to learn (1) and one said that they are easier to train (1); “Adults tend to get comfortable and lazy and want to do it their way.” Another said that some youth are more productive than the adults there. (1) One supervisor said they have periodic needs for more help and it is easier to use ProTech youth than to hire another full-time person. (1)

One supervisor could not identify any benefits to working with youth; this was the same supervisor who resented having been told to supervise a youth. (1) Another originally said s/he also could not identify benefits and that it is especially difficult to work with too many youth at once, when it becomes more like “babysitting”. (1). However, s/he later noted that youth do not “give you grief about doing menial tasks”. (included in tally above)

The Costs of Training, Training Time and Previous Experience

None of the supervisors knew of a cost for training a ProTech youth. Two said that it is hard to estimate (2); two said it equals the amount of time spent by the supervisors during training. (2) Another said that the cost is low (1); yet another said that one can do it at no cost, since there are company-wide trainings given regularly where the youth can learn a great deal. (1)

Youth training time ranged from 1 day to 2 months, with an average of 2.5 weeks. The average time before the benefits of their work outweigh the costs (for the seven who felt that they did outweigh the costs) is 1.2 months. When they compared the youth training times to those for
adults, several said that it takes longer to train youth and a couple mentioned that youth and adult responsibilities are not really comparable. Previous experience required for this work ranged from 0-2 years with an average of 7 months. (Note that S8 said that s/he had underestimated the time to train the youth and found that it is a “huge” time commitment.) However, s/he only reported a two week training time. S/he is the supervisor who was very anxious about getting involved because s/he was told to do this but had never supervised before. Fortunately, s/he has since found that it is extremely personally rewarding, so s/he feels that the time is well spent."

Table 4.6 Financial Services Supervisors: ProTech student training time, comparison with adult training time and previous experience required for ProTech student responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>How long to train student?</th>
<th>How long until benefits &gt; costs?</th>
<th>How does that compare to time needed for an adult worker?</th>
<th>Experience normally needed for kind of work ProTech youth do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>1.5 months</td>
<td>1 wk. to train an adult; 90% have prev. exp.</td>
<td>2-3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Hard to say; my one learned quickly.</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Haven’t really had adults in similar positions.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Ongoing; 1 day for some tasks</td>
<td>Benefits never did outweigh. *</td>
<td>Definitely a lot more. *</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Right away</td>
<td>Shorter but jobs not really comparable. *</td>
<td>6 months – 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>More: half the time with student can be on training.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Ongoing, about 1 week to start</td>
<td>2 weeks: Not long.</td>
<td>Hard to judge; most students have fewer skills.</td>
<td>High School diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>1 day – 3 weeks</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>Depends; adults usually learn quicker but some have no computer skills</td>
<td>1 year of basic office work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>1-30 hours (2 weeks)</td>
<td>1-3 months</td>
<td>Adult takes 2/3 that time. They’re more aware of office procedures.</td>
<td>Could have none; 1-2 years would reduce training time by 75%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* S3 had a bad experience with his/her one and only student; s/he spent a lot of time on basic discipline attendance and attire. The student was also “not very productive”. However, S3 said that “doesn’t mean that training youth isn’t a worthwhile effort”.

* The youth are rotated through different departments to give them work experience in different areas; S4 also believes that the longer they stay in one department, the less productive they are. So they stay shorter times and, thus, have fewer responsibilities and less training.
IV. Is the Program Serving a Recruitment Function?
(The N/A’s in Tables 4.7 and 4.8 apply to questions that could not be answered by supervisors who have been involved in the program for two years or less.)

It is difficult to tell from Table 4.7 whether or not the program is serving a recruitment function; several supervisors have not had graduates yet. Those that have would perhaps consider the “percent who stayed” as high enough to play a sizable recruitment role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>How many have you worked with?</th>
<th>How many stayed after graduation?</th>
<th>% stayed</th>
<th>If still there, do they meet the standards for other adults?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>My current high school student does.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 p.t. but f.t. in the summer</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>My current high school student does.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>30 (helps some with all students)</td>
<td>2 p.t., 4 f.t.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Most definitely, sometimes more so.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 p.t.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Financial Services Supervisors: ProTech student recruitment and performance measurement by adult standards.

Additional Notes on Table 4.7
*“ProTech youth sometimes do a better job than new adults because of their existing relationships with supervisors. They’ve created a resume of their own after two years. They catch onto the culture of the bank, they know what they’re getting into. That makes for a good employee.”

“Do you know why those who left did so?”
This question was not applicable to three people, who had not yet had people leave the program because they have been involved for less than two years and their students are still with them.

Of the five who answered this question, three said that students had left for college (3); one said that if a student stopped going to school, they could still come back and see if there were positions available. However, this supervisor added that they do not have as many lower skilled jobs available now; many low skilled jobs have been cut back and they need people with degrees.
One said that they had not had a position available for the youth when s/he graduated, and another of his/her students just did not want to continue working with them past the high school years. One student was pulled out by his/her mother, as his/her grades were dropping; one left after getting pregnant. One supervisor had seen two students fired; another supervisor’s student had gotten interested in healthcare so they advised him/her to pursue that interest.

Two supervisors stated that they were not surprised to see the youth go after their high school years; one asked: “Who knows what they want at 17- or 18-years-old?” The other said s/he felt that there was a mutual understanding with the students that the program was done at the end of their high school years, and that most were fine with that. For those who did want to stay beyond the two years, s/he has done what s/he could to create positions for them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Do youth stay longer or shorter than adults?</th>
<th>If they only stay 2 years, are benefits of work sig. &gt; costs?</th>
<th>Enough benefit to justify on cost-effectiveness grounds?</th>
<th>Worthwhile use of time overall?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>Absolutely*</td>
<td>Absolutely; I never have to supervise one student who is above average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Shorter (See Table 4.6 footnote “b”)</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>Yeah . . .</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yeah. Some are really quick, with others it can be hard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Shorter</td>
<td>Most definitely; that’s a lot of time.</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>I guess it does. Very few are difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Shorter w/S7, but longer in other depts.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Longer</td>
<td>Yeah, even after one year it would.</td>
<td>Yes, but the benefits = my personal reward.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8  Financial Services Supervisors: Length of stay and cost-benefit perceptions.

Additional Notes on Table 4.8
* “I could list many tasks they do which allow me to do more consultation with other managers.”
"Who do you think benefits most from ProTech: students, schools or employers?"
Table 4.9 Financial Services Supervisors: Who seems to benefit most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1 Students, #2 Employers, #3 Schools</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Students, #2 Schools, #3 Employers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Notes on Table 4.9

"Two supervisors said “I would hope that the youth benefit the most.”"

IV. The Good, the Bad and the Future

“What do you think ProTech does well?”

The most frequent response was that the ProTech coordinator and lead contacts maintain good communication amongst students, teachers and employers. Examples given were: visits to the work site, follow-up on the student’s school performance and ready availability to answer supervisor questions. One added that they “handle problems professionally and non-offensively”; another remarked that this communication component has improved greatly over time. One supervisor was especially pleased with the program orientation; the booklet provided them with a reference that they could go over with students and revisit if necessary. The booklet clearly describes what the student should already know from their pre-work ProTech trainings, regarding attire, punctuality, supervisors’ expectations and the code of conduct.

Another two said that they helped screen the students well so that they would have strong applicants; one of these two said that that is the critical component of what ProTech does to make it successful. Another two said more generally that they give the youth an opportunity they would not have gotten elsewhere. One of these two said that the greatest thing they give the students is self-confidence; they also mentioned that they teach youth to look to the future and college, while allowing them to earn money and “put something good on their resumes”. One said that they do a good job of firmly holding the students to adult standards of conduct; another pointed out that they do a good job of publicly recognizing the students’ achievements when they succeed. Finally, one felt like they had a better organized administration, after having improved their paperwork system.
“What do you think could be improved?”

Three supervisors said there was no need for improvements. Two wanted the program to do more to place students in jobs that really match their interests so they are more motivated; one of these remarked: “It seems like most students do it for the money, not because they like it.” Two wanted a more thorough selection process; one said, “I don’t know why some ‘bad apples’ are getting through, but I imagine that’s difficult to assess ahead of time.” The other of these two said they could use more information about the student, like previous employment history and a description of their skills to see if they match those needed by the department; his/her student had said s/he had previous experience but it did not show.

One had recommendations for enhanced communication: s/he wanted the lead contact and ProTech supervisors on site more often, at least once a month. S/he noted that there needs to be less turnover in the ProTech coordinator; it’s hard for everyone to adjust to too much change. S/he also thinks they should plan a structured group activity at least once a month for the students to come together as a group for either a training or community service activity. The supervisors could be involved too but the purpose would be to enhance the student’s sense of belonging to a group and sharing with each other. One felt there needed to be more preparation of students as to how seriously they need to consider their dress, their professional attitude, and how their actions reflect on their department and the institution at large. One is bothered by the fact that their students only have a half day of school (as their high school is designed); s/he says that some of their students have had educational difficulties, so they clearly should be getting more school time (e.g. one has problems with multiplication tables). Another felt that it is a mistake for them to raise everyone’s expectations by asking supervisors to give the youth challenging tasks when they might end up with more responsibility than they can handle. The last wanted more guidance provided to the youth for what to do after high school.
“Do you want to stay involved?
If so, please rank your reasons in order of importance.”
(One said: “No, our department does not have the right entry-level work for ProTech students; there are not enough redundant tasks; this stuff is too complicated.” (1) Table 4.10 is a summary of the responses from the seven who said “Yes.”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason to Be Involved</th>
<th>Ranked this #1 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #2 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #3 Reason</th>
<th>Ranked this #4 Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s very personally rewarding to see the impact you can have on a student’s life.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide an opportunity for youth.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has changed my perspective: given me great respect for young people and their issues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It allows the company to be involved in the community, to help alleviate inner city problems, to benefit society at large.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Nice to have an extra set of hands - for free.”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are less tense, pleasant to work with. “It’s really nice to be around a youth who is starting their life.”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 Financial Services Supervisors: Ranking of reasons for wanting to stay involved.

“What would you tell another supervisor who is considering getting involved with ProTech?”

Focus on the benefits: (3)

“It opens your eyes up to what the students are faced with in today’s society, while you are getting help. I highly recommend it . . .”

“Their salaries come out of a different fund so it’s like a free employee. The students are flexible about wanting to do work that adults don’t want to do. They are more willing to do repetitive tasks. Because of their limited hours, it’s easier to get them to do it now, not later; they can’t really put it off”

Give and you shall receive . . . (4)

“I would DEFINITELY say do it. It’s DEFINITELY worth it, for the personal rewards. But it’s a huge time commitment, be aware of that ahead of time.”

“It’s a good program – I would hope they would be very involved with the kids. They need a lot of guidance. Give them tasks that are meaningful to them and the
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department, not just menial tasks. Try to give them as much training as you can, even if it’s not directly related to the work they are doing... You HAVE to make time for them. They need time."

From the supervisor who resented being forced to do it:  
"I’m not really sure. It’s a great program for the kids, but unless you are dedicated to wanting a student to mentor, it really doesn’t do a whole lot for you. Personally, I like to have them now, since they do provide some help and I don’t have to post any jobs."

Negative but still hopeful (1)

From a supervisor who feels that their department is not well-suited to ProTech because their work is more complicated than entry-level:  
"I would refer them to another supervisor; they’re better off talking to them. My experience was short and negative. But I know of others who have had mixed experiences, good as well as bad."

V. Discussion

As with the hospital supervisors, the financial supervisors do not seem to be involved to recruit future employees. Most of the supervisors confirmed the lead contacts’ comments that there do not appear to be labor shortages in this industry. The two supervisors who said that labor shortage issues do affect their desire to be involved in ProTech addressed its usefulness to meet short-term needs; there seemed to be less concern with recruitment or development of a larger regional pool of labor.

Again, the two highest reasons they want to stay in are for the altruistic motives of helping the youth and for their own personal rewards in seeing them succeed. It was of interest that some supervisors revealed career interests in teaching or mentoring; their involvement in ProTech may be an important way for them to stay with their current employer while answering two personal “callings”. Secondary reasons that seem equally attractive across both industries are the benefits of the work that the youth provide during their two years there.

As in healthcare, no training costs had been calculated but it is perceived that the youth more than pay for their training costs before they graduate. The anecdotes and the final comments are similar in that they describe a mixed bag, mostly of success stories with a share of trying experiences. Many of the supervisors seemed pleased with ProTech’s communication channels. Four recommendations were made to improve either student screening or student placement.
The supervisors identified many benefits to working with youth; several mentioned that they are more willing than adults to do what they are asked to do, and that they bring new perspectives to work. However, they report that the students' training time is frequently longer than that for adult entry-level workers. Perhaps the industry preference for clerical- or bachelor’s-degreed entry-level workers explains this. Considering that the average time reported for training a ProTech youth is 2.5 weeks, there seems to be significantly more pressure in this industry for the youth to get up to speed quickly. It is interesting to note that the financial supervisor who stressed that the program is a “huge time commitment” reported that it takes two weeks to train youth and 1-3 months before the benefits of their work outweigh the training costs. Compared with healthcare supervisor reports of an average training time of 2.7 months and an average of 4.3 months before the benefits outweigh the costs, this would also indicate higher pressure in the financial services industry for ProTech youth to “hit the ground running”. (It should be noted that this supervisor was not from the “mercenary” financial services employer, described previously.)

Another interesting difference between the two industries is that the youth in financial services seem to be charged with significantly fewer responsibilities than the adults in their departments. Without more information about the nature of the work the youth do, it is hard to explain this. They seem to have much shorter training times than the healthcare youth, (2.5 weeks average versus 2.7 months in healthcare) and are reportedly doing work that normally requires less previous experience (average of 7 months versus 9.5 months in healthcare). Similar findings are also borne out by the lead contacts’ comments for these industries. The youth seem to be doing a lot of the clerical financial tasks; perhaps financial services clerical tasks demand the same skill levels as those used by the healthcare students in their predominantly non-clerical work. There was some mention of difficulty finding work that is more than clerical but not overly challenging; maybe the nature of more advanced financial services project work requires that a worker be available on a more full-time basis or that s/he has a bachelor’s degree. Three supervisors used the word “babysitting” to describe frustrating experiences with the financial students; there may be a perception in this industry, if they are being compared to more self-reliant, degreed entry-level workers, that the youth cannot handle more than the simpler tasks. Unfortunately, I cannot tell with certainty from these data.

Another interesting difference is that all the financial supervisors perceived (two “hoped”) that the youth benefit more than the employers from ProTech. This stands in contrast to the healthcare supervisors, most of whom perceive that the employers either benefit more than or
as much as the students from the program. Perhaps this can be explained by the healthcare industry’s stronger incentive to train more entry-level workers.

Three stories deserve extra attention. The supervisor who gave his/her student challenging non-clerical work, as s/he was told to do by ProTech, reported having had to waste a lot of time in constant supervision without much production in return. S/he is now declining further involvement in the program because s/he does not feel that their department has enough “redundant” work for the youth to do. Was the work too much of a leap beyond what most youth in training would consider challenging? Was this particular youth just unfortunately placed with a well-intentioned but misdirected first-time supervisor, and not eased into higher responsibilities that s/he eventually could have handled? Was there miscommunication from the ProTech staff as to what “challenging” entailed?

In this scenario, there seems to have been a need for clearer communication on such matters, and a closer look at the kind of work that different departments can offer youth, in order to assure that both the supervisor and student do not get discouraged. Perhaps more specific examples of “appropriate work” for ProTech students could be disseminated. It seems that it is especially critical that a supervisor’s first year be closely monitored. Not only can first-time supervisors get more easily discouraged than experienced supervisors, who probably have had successes to temper any disappointments, but they may then drop out, which can hurt ProTech’s reputation and future recruitment of supervisors. Along these same lines, because there is a higher turnover of supervisors in financial services, ProTech may need to make an effort to train first-time financial supervisors more thoroughly. The healthcare program is likely to be reaping the benefits of continuity from long term supervisors passing the torch after new supervisors have watched the program and seen how it works.

Another two supervisors were told by their bosses to take on a student. One was extremely anxious about the prospect; the other was resentful. Fortunately, these both worked out relatively successfully, as they are both still involved. One appears to be reaping tremendous personal rewards, the other seems to be co-existing with it but glad for the extra help. I was not able to interview supervisors who have left the program, to ascertain their reasons for doing so. However, I am reminded that most of the lead contacts said that the best departments for ProTech are those where the supervisors are committed and interested in working with youth. It seems critical that involvement in the program be a voluntary matter, since their primary reasons for
staying involved are personal reward and altruistic desire to help the youth, there needs to be a predisposition to seeking those rewards and giving that help gladly.
CHAPTER FIVE:
SUMMARY AND
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The greatest potential value of this study goes beyond the ProTech program, to help inform the effort to restructure Boston’s public school system. Many schools are embracing School-to-Work models to guide their initiatives. This study also adds to the body of School-to-Work program analyses that is growing as our nation evaluates the possibilities for a U.S. School-to-Work framework, as described in the STWOA Act of 1994.

Incentives for Involvement

♦ An altruistic commitment to betterment of the community appears to be the most common reason for company involvement. This reportedly has been the longstanding primary reason to stay involved for most of the financial employers and, to a large degree, for the healthcare employers. The scarcity of training cost estimates suggests that employers are not closely analyzing the program on an economic basis. Unfortunately, altruistic reasons for involvement are not highly sustainable. There may be other non-economic reasons for involvement, such as a kind of “public relations competitiveness” that two lead contacts alluded to; such matters are not usually discussed openly so this may be playing more of a role than I was told.

♦ Recruitment of trainees to the employers’ own payrolls is not occurring in high numbers. ProTech graduates who do stay with their employers appear to be better-than-average, highly-valued employees. However, the employers seem to be well aware that relatively low percentages stay with or come back to their ProTech employers. Fortunately, the benefits of the youths’ work seems to more than “pay for” the training costs, even if they leave after high school. The students are reportedly helping some employers meet short-term labor demands.

♦ Labor shortages and concerns with long term labor force development provided strong incentives for healthcare employers to get involved and continue to play a strong role in sustaining their involvement. It does not seem to be necessary for an
employer to be enduring labor shortages in order to get involved. Those who are enduring labor shortages, however, may be the best candidates for starting up a new program; the healthcare employers had to get through two difficult start-up years before the program settled in. Undoubtedly, their long-term demand for labor helped sustain them through this period.

♦ **Targeting clusters of industries seems to help sustain involvement.** Industry clusters can reap the benefits of contributing to and drawing from a larger regional labor pool, or hiring through networks of participating employers. Industry member participants presumably can also help each other to advertise their industry to young labor market entrants. These incentives seem to be particularly strong in the healthcare industry, as they face cyclical labor shortages; they are less enticing to Boston’s financial employers who seem to have little need for new applicants.

♦ **Personal rewards from their involvement emerged as major incentives for lead contacts and supervisors to remain involved in the program.** Past studies have mentioned but not made much of supervisors’ personal rewards from their involvement in the program. (Capelli et al. 1998) However, efforts to recruit new employers should emphasize incumbent employee morale enhancement as a major benefit to the employer for the program, not just a welcome side benefit. For a few supervisors and lead contacts, ProTech seems to have provided them with an opportunity to pursue a career interest in teaching or mentoring that they would not be able to pursue without leaving their employer; as a result, there may even be a higher level of incumbent employee retention because of their involvement.

♦ **ProTech staff responsiveness to employers’ needs has played a strong role in maintaining employer commitment.** The ProTech staff appear to have successfully molded this program to reflect the needs of the employers, as well as the youth. Their improved preparation of the youth, efforts to develop training and disciplinary guidelines, and maintenance of clear communication channels between the school and employer were frequently cited as positive developments. These appear to assure the employers that they are truly part of a partnership, where their concerns are given due consideration.

---
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Diversification of workforce emerged as a possible incentive. While it was not brought up frequently, there was some mention in both industries that a desire to diversify their workforce was also an incentive for their involvement. This is of note, because that issue has not been highlighted in earlier empirical studies. This incentive may be of particular relevance to urban regions of higher racial and ethnic diversity.

Higher degrees of interaction with the youth seem to enhance perceptions of employers' benefits. Overall, both sets of supervisors perceived higher benefits to employers than their lead contacts did. Most of the lead contacts and supervisors also reported that their opinions of the program improved as they became more involved with it, confirming Kelsh's assertion that employers with first-hand experience of a STW program have more constructive opinions of students' performance. (1998) Along that reasoning, since executives have the least interaction with the program, they may have the least-informed opinions about the benefits that the youth bring to the workplace. As executive-level support appears to be critical to program viability, continued efforts to cultivate executive interaction with and understanding of the program benefits are critical.
Where ProTech Seems to Do Best

- Funded through non-departmental budgets
- In industries with labor shortages
- In large companies/institutions
- With continuity of lead contacts & supervisors
- With supervisors who volunteer to be involved and who are given supervision training
- With high executive level support
- With employer involvement in program development, such as student selection and discipline procedures

More Successful

Less Successful

- Funded through departmental budgets
- In industries with labor surpluses
- In small companies/institutions
- With high turnover of lead contacts & supervisors
- With inexperienced supervisors who are told to get involved
- With little executive level support
- With little employer involvement in program development

Diagram 1
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Constraints to Expansion

- **The need for supervisors to have a genuine interest and ability to work with youth.** While ProTech seems to be contributing to productivity goals for the employers, it is not just a work program where one teaches work skills. The youth seem to need reinforcement of their soft skills more than their academic skills, and need to learn how to balance their personal lives with a whole new challenge: their professional lives. They need mentors, as this new experience can be daunting. One hospital lead contact noted that, ironically, some of the youth can get depressed once they have become successful in the program. For most, it is their first experience taking on new responsibilities in an unfamiliar arena; for some, it feels like a departure from their friends and family, even their old identity, s/he said. Handling such concerns requires a supervisor who is sensitive to the particular struggles that the youth face, and patient enough to stay through both the ups and downs that a youth may experience.

Real or perceived behavioral barriers to hiring youth are significant: in a 1997 Wisconsin study of employers, 40% of the Work Based Learning employers said that youth behavior and discipline was a barrier to hiring them and 52% said that their lack of life skills was a problem. (Center on Education and Work) These are issues that a supervisor/mentor can work on with a youth. Unfortunately, not everyone has an inherent ability or desire to mentor youth and not all executives are willing to have their employees expending time working on such issues.

- **Employer demand for student selection.** Even with their dedication and interest in helping the youth, a number of lead contacts and supervisors mentioned the need to select the youth carefully for involvement in this program. Furthermore, despite their selection of those they think will be able to handle the program, the supervisors still stressed that one has to take time and be patient with the youth. How much time, then, would one have to take with a youth who cannot reasonably handle the requirements of a program like ProTech? This would suggest that this particular program cannot be offered to all students, at least in those industries where demands of the employees are similar to those in healthcare and financial services.

- **Budgetary limitations.** Across the board, except for one, the lead contacts said their numbers of students are set by institutional budgetary constraints. This has kept
ProTech's numbers relatively low for all but a few employers, even over several years of involvement and commitment to the program. As Kelsh (1998) and others have pointed out, the more in-depth the activity (i.e., work-based learning as opposed to job shadowing or site tours), the more likely it is that fewer youth can be involved. This is a very real concern, which seems to be confirmed by the ProTech employers' reports.

- **The need for continuity.** The program seems to benefit from continuity of supervisors and lead contacts. It would be ideal to have these positions filled by employees who can work with the program for several years. However, the personnel structure, promotion policies and employee retention practices of some companies do not always allow that to happen, which further limits the sites where ProTech could flourish.

- **Some employers will not commonly hire program graduates until they are fully credentialed elsewhere.** Ideally, ProTech graduates would be able to stay with their employers following their high school years, for two years or more. However, those in financial services prefer that their entry-level employees have degrees first, before they apply for positions. This preference for degreeed applicants may apply to other industries as well.

- **Healthcare and financial services employers are more likely than other employers to get involved, according to the 1997 NES-II Employer Survey.** Though the report does not explain why some industries are more involved than others, one needs to consider that, for whatever reasons, other industries may be less likely to embrace ProTech.

**Implications for Further Research**

ProTech in its current configuration could not be offered to all Boston students. In fact, ProTech's director Mark Cafferty says that it is not appropriate for all students, as some do not want to have so much structure and monitoring. Lower impact programs, such as summer internships or job shadowing, combined with supportive learning communities within schools that would ideally play a mentoring role could also have positive results while demanding less of employers. Fortunately, Boston's many career pathway schools provide additional settings to research the effectiveness of differing approaches. Attentive evaluation of career pathway youth
outcomes and employer satisfaction could provide essential information for nascent STW programs across the country.

According to the PIC staff, many employers are currently recruited to ProTech with the "sales pitch" that they can eventually recruit well-trained ProTech graduates to their companies. In practice, however, recruitment is relatively low. Employers need to have realistic expectations of what the program will deliver, so they do not become disillusioned. More needs to be done to find out if graduates are at least staying in the industry of training, to provide some additional positive labor force outcome. Though they are not conclusive, the results from the graduate survey (see Appendix) suggest that some healthcare graduates who left their original employers are staying in their training fields and some of them are going to other ProTech healthcare employers. Some former ProTech healthcare trainees are now with ProTech financial employers; perhaps there are benefits across industries to developing a generally higher skilled applicant pool.

Longterm surveys of graduates' employment outcomes could help assure employers that the program is meeting their labor force development interests, if ProTech graduates are eventually coming back to them after attending school or training programs. While the financial services employers do not appear to be involved for labor force development reasons, their perceptions may change with time and research. This is the first year that their graduates could be getting out of four-year colleges, with the bachelor’s degrees that they demand. Follow-up studies would be useful to find out if the financial employers will eventually get degreed applicants who were in ProTech and are, therefore, well-acquainted with and especially qualified for jobs with those financial services companies.

Accurate estimates of program cost would help employers understand what is entailed when they get involved. In this study, the off-the-cuff estimates ranged from "little to no cost" to thousands of dollars. In the Wisconsin study of employers, those who were not involved in STW programs perceived the costs of such programs to be much higher than they actually are. (Center on Education and Work 1997) Such information could be used to allay employer anxieties about their involvement.

As previously mentioned, there was a high degree of lead contact and supervisors' personal reward reported in this survey; some reported that ProTech allows them to pursue work interests in teaching and mentoring while staying with their original employer. It would be of interest to research what role ProTech might play in incumbent employee retention.
There may be a comparative advantage enjoyed by larger employers who get involved. The NES-II study (1997) highlighted that STW participants are more often the larger employers (250 to 1000+ employees). Some explanations offered by this study that are relevant to ProTech are that larger employers may have lower costs of training, as youth can be included in on-going training programs at little or no cost. Larger employers may also have a better chance of reaping recruitment benefits, as they stand a higher chance of having a variety of positions open for graduates when they are needed. One might hypothesize as well that larger employers who take on a higher number of trainees can have higher absolute numbers of success stories, which would help inspire and educate potential supervisors and lead contacts about how the program is run. They may also learn the most from mistakes they might make, since they too would presumably occur at higher absolute numbers. Lessons learned could then be shared easily with lead contacts and supervisors within the same organization. These questions were not explicitly addressed here but their answers would be highly useful.
**APPENDIX**

**RESULTS FROM THE PROTECH GRADUATE SURVEY**

(For the text of the postcard survey, refer to the end of the Appendix.)

A postcard survey was sent out to 373 ProTech graduates. 66 were “returned to sender”, as the graduates were no longer living at those addresses. 24 of these were also not reachable by phone, as their lines were not in service or they had moved. 62 postcards were answered by graduates by mail or over the phone. If one considers the original 373 as the universe of potential respondents, the response rate is 62/373 = 17%. If one subtracts those who had both outdated addresses and phone numbers, the universe is 349 and the response rate is 62/349 = 18%.

Another 19 cards were partially filled out by a PIC employee who has been in regular contact with some of the graduates and knew where they were working now and whether or not they would be working with their original ProTech employer this summer.

Of the 81 postcards, 41 were from graduates of the healthcare field, 25 were from financial services, and 15 were from “other”, such as business services and utilities. One should note that, according to Paul Osterman, those who respond to trainee follow-up surveys tend to be those who have had more positive experiences with a program and/or are now “doing well”. As a result, there may be a positive bias to these responses.

**Of financial services graduates,**

48% are currently or in the summer will be working with their ProTech employers.

Top reasons given (out of the 9 who gave reasons):

- I have a good relationship with my employer. (6/9)
- I enjoy working for this employer. (5/9)
- I like what I do. (5/9)
- Relates to my career interests. (4/9)

52% are not and will not be working with their ProTech employers.

Top reasons given (out of 11 who gave reasons):

“Other” (8, but two were unintelligible):

- “There were no jobs available.” (2)
- “My life took different turns.”
"The program ended when I graduated from high school."

"Was downsized out of my job while I went on maternity leave."

"They could not afford to keep me."

Of the 13 who are no longer with their ProTech employers,

- 1 is with the Cambridgeport Bank as a system administrator. (8%)
  1 is a security guard (with a ProTech healthcare employer) who listed "business" as his/her career interest. (8%)
- 4 are with healthcare-related employers (31%), but none are ProTech employers. Their titles are: administrative assistant/supervisor, patient processor, youth health educator and pharmacy intern.

Of healthcare services graduates,

34% are currently or in the summer will be working with their ProTech employers.

Top reasons given (out of 6 who gave reasons):

- I have a good relationship with my supervisor (6/6)
- I enjoy working for this employer (5/6)
- I like what I do (4/6)
- Relates to my career interests (3/6)

66% are not and will not be working with their ProTech employers.

Top reasons given (out of 24 who gave reasons):

- Other (11/24):
  - "I wanted to try something new." (3)
  - "No positions were available." (3)
  - "The budget ran out/the program ended." (2)
  - "Went into the army." (2)
  - "Work study." (2)
  - "I went off to school and found a better job."
  - "I was laid off."
  - "It was too far and hard to get to."
  - "I didn’t have time while going to school full-time."
  - Another job pays more. (9/24)
Doesn’t relate to my career interests. (7/24)
(Other career interests given: graphic desktop publishing, education, psychology, communications, physical therapy.)

Of the 27 who are no longer with their original ProTech employers,

- 9 are still with healthcare-related employers (33%):
  - 3 are with other ProTech healthcare employers. Their titles are: transporter, surgical technician and receptionist.
  - 6 are with non-ProTech employers. Their titles are: medical lab technician, combat medic, medical assistant, registered nurse, technical support consultant, and healthcare account service representative.

- 4 are with financial services employers (15%):
  - 3 are ProTech financial services employers. Titles are service associate (2) and proofing clerk.
  - 1 is with a non-ProTech employer, working as an electronic desktop designer.

Discussion

Of those for whom we have information, a significant number are still with their original ProTech employers, though this population may have been more likely to respond to the survey.

Those financial services trainees who are still with their ProTech employers seem to have very positive working relationships with them. Of those who are no longer with their original ProTech employer, only 1 (8%) is still in financial services and 1 (8%) has an interest in “business”. 4 (31%) are in healthcare-related fields, but not with ProTech employers.

Those healthcare services trainees who are still with their ProTech employers also seem to be enjoying very positive working relationships with them. There is a higher percentage who left their employers than the financial services, however. Of those who left, a high number said they left because other jobs pay more, or because they were interested in other fields. Of those who are no longer with their original ProTech employer, 9 (33%) are still in healthcare, 3 (11%) of which are now with different ProTech healthcare employers. 4 (15%) are in financial services, 3 (11%) of which are with ProTech financial services employers.

Healthcare seems to be losing employees to better wages elsewhere. There is evidence that some are still in the field, however, and some ProTech healthcare employers are even hiring employees that were trained by other ProTech healthcare employers in their cluster. ProTech financial services may also be benefiting from higher skilled workers that were trained by ProTech healthcare employers, as some have gone to work with them.

Appendix

-98-
Healthcare Services Supervisor Quotes

"It takes some time. You need to show interest in the students and to nurture them, but the rewards are great. I feel that if one is in a teaching hospital, as we are, it's part of their mission."

"It's a way to reach out and help people. Take a strong look and it's well worth the training aspects. They stay and you can count on them more than other summer or full time workers who leave quickly. These kids and the program maintain their commitment."

"It's one of the best things you could do. You need to be able to reach out and spend some time with them. The first three months are hard. Give them responsibility and they'll be great. If you just want someone to work, work, work, this isn't for you."

"It's worth their time and effort to do it. Be patient."

"Be very straightforward and up front about what the job entails, what's expected of them so the student can make a clearer decision. [The students] need to consider the different sites to figure out what kind of work they like."

"Go for it. Depending on the school, you may get kids with very different cultural backgrounds but keep an open mind and treat them fairly. Be patient."

"Make sure you are the right supervisor. You need to be interested in the outcome, which is part of a collaborative process. This is an opportunity to mold a young person, to develop communication with them. It's great to see their confidence build. It's good to have their work and good to have rapport among the different age groups in the department."

"Embark on the project with the attitude that it is not easy, that it is like being a mother all over again. The youth are still children and you shouldn't expect maturity. It is very rewarding, though."

"You need patience but it is rewarding and you will reap benefits."

"There are lots of merits to the program, even just seeing the individual thrive. [ProTech is] very supportive. Not everyone is going to college so any training is a plus."

"It's a good program."

"Don't think that it is going to take up a lot of your time."
Financial Services Supervisor Quotes

"It's a great program – you can really benefit from it. It opens your eyes up to what the students are faced with in today's society, while you are getting help. I highly recommend it, it's a win-win."

"I would highly recommend it."

"I would refer them to another supervisor; they're better off talking to them. My experience was short and negative. But I know of others who have had mixed experiences, good as well as bad."

From the one who resented being forced to do it:
"I'm not really sure. It's a great program for the kids, but unless you are dedicated to wanting a student to mentor, it really doesn't do a whole lot for you. Personally, I like to have them now, since they do provide some help and I don't have to post any jobs."

"It's a good program – I would hope they would be very involved with the kids. They need a lot of guidance. Give them tasks that are meaningful to them and the department, not just menial tasks. Try to give them as much training as you can, even if it's not directly related to the work they are doing, to expose them to many things. You HAVE to make time for them. They need time."

"I think it's a good program: the bank benefits, and so does the student. Everyone gains and it's well worth it for the employers."

Their salaries come out of a different fund so it's like a free employee. The students are flexible about wanting to do work that adults don't want to do. They are more willing to do repetitive tasks. Because of their limited hours, it's easier to get them to do it now, not later; they can't really put it off."

"I would DEFINITELY say do it. It's DEFINITELY worth it. But it's a huge time commitment, be aware of that ahead of time."
ProTech Supervisor Phone Survey

Intro:
My name is ___ and I am working on thesis research at MIT in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning.
I am helping evaluate ProTech employers’ experience of the program.
These interviews are confidential; your most candid responses will be the most helpful.

General Questions
1. Which medical field/subspecialty are you in?
   (Get examples of functions performed and which are done by students.)

2. How many years were you involved in ProTech? 
   How many students have you had total?

3. Please think of a student you worked with who was typical of the students you had, given all the ups and downs?

   Name of student __________________________________________________________________________
   (What was this student like?)

4. On a scale of 1-10, rate their:

   N:
   | Abil. to learn skills quickly |          |
   | abil. to work independently   |          |
   | work attitude                |          |
   | Overall contrib. to w.place   |          |
   | Other                        |          |

5. Why did you get involved? 
   Did you volunteer to supervise a youth or were you told to?

6. What were your initial thoughts about the program? (Pro or Con)

7. Did your thoughts about the program change as you became more involved? How? 
   (Did it get better or worse overall? GIVE ANECDOTES)

Experience of the Program/Students
8. How would you describe the program structure at your site?
   (Who trains who, how are they trained? 
   Did that change much in the first years? If so, why?)

9. Are there benefits to working with youth as opposed to hiring adult workers for the same job?
• Is there an estimated cost to training a ProTech student?
• How long does it typically take to train ProTech youth?
• How long until the benefits they provide outweigh the costs of training (give the time it takes from the start of training)?
• How does that amount of time and/or money compare to the training needs of another typical, adult entry-level worker?
• How many years experience is typically needed for an adult to fill that position?
• Do ProTech youth stay working there a longer or shorter time than other adult entry-level workers? (How many have stayed? Part-time v. full-time work? Summer v. year round?)
• If the students only stayed for two years and then left, do the benefits of their work significantly outweigh the costs before they go? (Is that enough benefit to justify staying in the program just on "productivity/contribution to the department’s work" arguments?)
• Does your time spent on the easiest students make up for the time spent on the most difficult students in order to make it a worthwhile investment of your time overall?
• Have you known of other supervisors dropping out or wanting to? Why did they?

10. Are any of the youth still working with you?
   • If not, do you know why they left?
     (Were there any barriers to keeping them?)
   • If still there, do they meet the standards you have for other adult employees in similar positions?

11. What do you think ProTech did/does well?
    (What support did ProTech coordinators provide you with?)

12. Who benefits most from ProTech: students, schools or employers? (In order)

13. What do you think could have been/could be improved?
    (What else could coordinators provide you with?)

14. What would you tell another supervisor who is considering getting involved in ProTech?

Labor Market Issues
15. Was there a shortage of entry-level workers in your department in the first years of the program?
   • Is there a shortage now?
   • Would you say that that influences your desire to be involved with ProTech?

Future Involvement
16. Do you want to remain involved in the program? (Why/Why not?)
    (Please list in descending order of importance the reasons you should stay involved)
**ProTech Lead Contact Phone Survey**

**Intro**
I am a Masters student at MIT, working on my thesis.
I am helping evaluate ProTech employers’ experience of the program.
I want to assure you that these interviews are confidential and that your most candid responses will be the most helpful.

**General Questions**
1. How many students/supervisors involved the first year(First Year=____?) How many involved now? How many students do supervisors usually have at a time?

2. Which departments were/are involved in the program?

**Motivations**
3. Why did you get involved with ProTech?

4. If you were one of the original participants, how was it pitched to you? 
   If not one of the original participants, how was it explained to you when you got involved?

5. Why have you stayed involved with ProTech? 
   (How have your thoughts changed for better or worse re: the program?)

6. Was there a shortage of entry-level workers in the ProTech-related departments in the first years of the program? How is it now? 
   (PR: Would you say that that influences your desire to be involved with ProTech?)

**Experience of the program**
7. Does the ProTech program seem to work more effectively in certain departments than in others? 
   • If so, why?

8. Are the youth performing entry-level duties? 
   Are there benefits to working with youth as opposed to hiring entry-level adults for the same job? 
   • Is there an estimated cost to training a ProTech student? 
   • How long does it typically take to train ProTech youth? 
   • How long until the benefits they provide outweigh the costs of training? 
     (i.e., when does it feel like you got a return on your investment of training?) 
   • How does that amount of time and money compare to the training needs of another typical, adult entry-level worker? 
   • How many years experience is typically needed for these positions? 
   • Do ProTech youth stay working there a longer or shorter time than other entry-level workers?
• How many have stayed?
  (Part-time/full-time? Summer/year-round?)
  (Do they meet the standards you have for other adult employees in similar
  positions?)
• How many have gone?
  (Do you know why they left?)
  (If they wanted to stay were there obstacles to keeping them?)
• If they only stay two years, do the benefits of their work outweigh the costs of
  training them before they go?
  (If labor needs are part of your reason for participating, is that a sufficient return?)
• Does the effort and time spent on the easiest students make up for the time spent
  on the most difficult students in order to make it a worthwhile investment of your
  time overall?
• If you knew that your ProTech youth were staying in the field, even though not at
  your organization, would it be an incentive to stay in the program and work with
  other hospitals to expand the labor pool?
• In order to justify involvement just on cost-effectiveness grounds, what percent of
  students would you want to stay with your org?
  What percent would you want to know stayed in the field?

9. In working with ProTech students, are you accessing a previously untapped source of
   labor?

10. Of schools, students and employers, who do you think benefits most from ProTech,
    in order:

11. Did you ever consider leaving the program? If so, why?

12. Did you ever have supervisors drop out of the program? Why?

13. What do you think ProTech does well?

14. What do you think could be improved?

15. What would you tell another hospital that is considering getting involved with
    ProTech?

Future Involvement

16. What extra financial support/scholarships are presently available for ProTech
    graduates? What are future plans for those funds?

17. Do you want to remain involved in the program? Why/Why not?
    Please list your reasons, with most important reasons first.
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Thesis Survey Supplementary Questions
FOR LEAD CONTACTS

1. Are you a teaching hospital? OR:
   For financial services: Has your company undergone significant downsizing in the last three years?

2. What is your department/job title there? (HR?)

3. How many students total have come through the program?
   How many ever stayed past the first two years out of high school? (Part-time, full-time, summer, year-round?)
   How many are still there?

4. Do you network with other hospitals to let them know about ProTech graduates who need jobs that your hospital/company may not have positions for right then?

5. Is scholarship $ only for those students who go into ProTech related fields in school? (Give examples of fields that are sufficiently related)

6. Have you had supervisors drop out?
   How many? Why?
   Is it hard to find enough who are interested/replacements?
   Since you started, what percent of supervisors move into new positions, and so have to stop being involved?
   What determines the number of students you can take at your organization?

7. Why did your company get involved/why does it stay involved?
   Do they feel that it is a donation to the students and community,
   Do they feel that it pays for itself in the short-term,
   Do they see it as a long-term investment in recruitment and/or a larger labor pool to choose from?
   Were they looking for short-term or long-term labor shortage alleviation?
   OR Why did you get involved, personally? Why do you stay involved? (whichever they did not already answer)

8. Did you ever help recruit other employers?
   If so, how did you recruit others to the program?
   Do they seem to have different reasons for wanting to get involved?)

9. How is ProTech funded at your organization? (Out of which dept?)
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• Is funding secure for the program or is it a yearly battle to argue for it?
• Do executives ever question the cost-effectiveness/usefulness of the program?
  (What do they say?)
• Has anyone ever wanted that calculated?

10. What degree of sponsorship/support do you have from your organization’s executives?

• How involved are they in the program?
  (Do they ever meet the students/coordinators?)
  (Are any of them involved with the PIC/on the PIC board?)

• How important is their support to securing funding?

  How important is their support in maintaining good will for the program at your organization?
PROTech Graduate Postcard Survey

1. What is your current or most recent job? Job Title: ____________________________
   Name of Employer: ____________________________

2. Are you currently working at this job? ___Yes ___No

3. Are you currently or will you in the summer work with your original ProTech employer?
   ___Yes ___No

   If “yes”, why? (check all that apply)
   ___ Relates to my career interests
   ___ Enjoy working for this supervisor
   ___ It’s hard to find another job
    ___ The pay is better than other jobs
    ___ I have a good relationship with my supervisor
    ___ I like what I do
    ___ Other ______________________________________

   If “no”, why not? (check all that apply)
   ___ Doesn’t relate to my career interests (My career interests are: ____________________________)
   ___ Did not enjoy working for this employer
   ___ I did not get along with my supervisor
   ___ No jobs available interested me
   ___ My schedule did not match employer hours
    ___ Another job pays me more
    ___ Not interested in any job at this time
    ___ Other ______________________________________

Please return as soon as possible and THANKS!!!!


Hughes, Katherine. 1996. *Employer Motivations for Providing Work-Based Learning Placements to Students: Preliminary Results from Research in Progress*, Transcript of lecture at a symposium of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.


Conversations with Boston Private Industry Council staff:
Mark Cafferty, ProTech Director
Georgia Hall, Student Career Services Manager
Tom Bryan, Marketing Team Representative

---
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