



Cornell University
ILR School

Cornell University ILR School
DigitalCommons@ILR

Federal Publications

Key Workplace Documents

8-29-2012

Vulnerable Youth: Background and Policies

Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara
Congressional Research Service

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace

Thank you for downloading an article from DigitalCommons@ILR.

Support this valuable resource today!

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Key Workplace Documents at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in Federal Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact catherwood-dig@cornell.edu.

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact web-accessibility@cornell.edu for assistance.

Vulnerable Youth: Background and Policies

Abstract

[Excerpt] This report first provides an overview of the youth population and the increasing complexity of transitioning to adulthood for all adolescents. It also provides a separate discussion of the concept of “disconnectedness,” as well as the protective factors youth can develop during childhood and adolescence that can mitigate poor outcomes. Further, the report describes the evolution of federal youth policy, focusing on three time periods, and provides a brief overview of current federal programs targeted at vulnerable youth. The report then discusses the challenges of coordinating federal programs for youth, as well as federal legislation and initiatives that promote coordination among federal agencies and support programs with a positive youth development focus.

Keywords

youth, development, vulnerable youth, federal policy, legislation

Comments

Suggested Citation

Fernandes-Alcantara, A. L. (2012). *Vulnerable youth: Background and policies*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.

A more recent version of this report can be found here: http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/key_workplace/1226



Vulnerable Youth: Background and Policies

Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara
Specialist in Social Policy

August 29, 2012

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RL33975

Summary

The majority of young people in the United States grow up healthy and safe in their communities. Most of those of school age live with parents who provide for their well-being, and they attend schools that prepare them for advanced education or vocational training and, ultimately, self-sufficiency. Many youth also receive assistance from their families during the transition to adulthood. During this period, young adults cycle between attending school, living independently, and staying with their families. Approximately 60% of parents today provide financial support to their adult children who are no longer in school. This support comes in the form of housing (50% of parents provide this support to their adult children), living expenses (48%), cost of transportation (41%), health insurance (35%), spending money (29%), and medical bills (28%). Even with this assistance, the current move from adolescence to adulthood has become longer and increasingly complex.

For vulnerable (or “at-risk”) youth populations, the transition to adulthood is further complicated by a number of challenges, including family conflict or abandonment and obstacles to securing employment that provides adequate wages and health insurance. These youth may be prone to outcomes that have negative consequences for their future development as responsible, self-sufficient adults. Risk outcomes include teenage parenthood; homelessness; drug abuse; delinquency; physical and sexual abuse; and school dropout. Detachment from the labor market and school—or disconnectedness—may be the single strongest indicator that the transition to adulthood has not been made successfully.

The federal government has not adopted a single overarching federal policy or legislative vehicle that addresses the challenges vulnerable youth experience in adolescence or while making the transition to adulthood. Rather, federal youth policy today has evolved from multiple programs established in the early 20th century and expanded in the years following the 1964 announcement of the War on Poverty. These programs are concentrated in six areas: workforce development, education, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, social services, public health, and national and community service. They are intended to provide vulnerable youth with opportunities to develop skills to assist them in adulthood.

Despite the range of federal services and activities to assist disadvantaged youth, many of these programs have not developed into a coherent system of support. This is due in part to the administration of programs within several agencies and the lack of mechanisms to coordinate their activities. In response to concerns about the complex federal structure developed to assist vulnerable youth, Congress passed the Tom Osborne Federal Youth Coordination Act (P.L. 109-365) in 2006. Though activities under the act were never funded, the Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs was formed in 2008 under Executive Order 13459 to carry out coordinating activities across multiple agencies that oversee youth programs. Separately, Congress has considered other legislation (the Younger Americans Act of 2000 and the Youth Community Development Block Grant of 1995) to improve the delivery of services to vulnerable youth and provide opportunities to these youth through policies with a “positive youth development” focus.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Overview.....	2
Age of Youth and the Transition to Adulthood.....	2
Defining the Vulnerable Youth Population.....	4
Groups of Vulnerable Youth.....	5
Framework for Risk.....	6
Disconnectedness.....	8
Positive Youth Development: The Importance of Resiliency and Opportunity.....	9
What is Youth Development?.....	9
The Youth Development Movement.....	10
Evolution of the Federal Role in Assisting Vulnerable Youth.....	12
1912-1950s: Children’s Bureau Programs and Workforce Programs.....	12
1960s-1970s: War on Poverty Initiatives and Expansion of Programs.....	14
White House Conferences on Children and Youth: 1960s and 1970s.....	15
Family and Youth Services Bureau.....	16
1980s-Present: Current Youth Programs.....	16
Job Training and Workforce Development.....	17
Education.....	18
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.....	21
Social Services.....	22
Public Health.....	23
National and Community Service.....	25
Federal Efforts to Improve Coordination Among Programs for Vulnerable Youth.....	27
Overview.....	27
Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-501).....	28
Federal Council on Children, Youth, and Families.....	28
Grants for States and Community Programs.....	29
More Recent Concerns about Coordination of Youth Programs.....	29
Youth Build Transfer Act (P.L. 109-281).....	30
Tom Osborne Federal Youth Coordination Act (P.L. 109-365).....	31
Executive Order 13459.....	32
Comparison of the Federal Youth Development Council and the Interagency Working Group.....	33
Federal Initiatives to Improve Coordination.....	35
Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.....	35
Shared Youth Vision Initiative.....	35
Federal Mentoring Council.....	36
Child Welfare Partnerships.....	36
Partnerships for Youth Transition.....	37
Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SS/HS) Initiative.....	37
Drug-Free Communities Support Program.....	38
Policies to Promote Positive Youth Development.....	38
Overview.....	38
Youth Development Community Block Grant of 1995 (H.R. 2807/S. 673).....	38
Younger Americans Act of 2001 (H.R. 17/S. 1005).....	39

Conclusion 40

Figures

Figure 1. Risk Framework for Vulnerable Youth..... 7

Tables

Table 1. Duties of the Federal Youth Development Council, by Goal..... 32
Table A-1. Federal Programs for Vulnerable Youth..... 42
Table A-2. Relevant CRS Reports and Analyst Contact Information 63

Appendixes

Appendix. Federal Youth Programs and Relevant CRS Reports and Experts 42

Contacts

Author Contact Information..... 65
Acknowledgments 65

Introduction

Congress has long been concerned about the well-being of youth. The nation's future depends on young people today to leave school prepared for college or the workplace and to begin to make positive contributions to society. Some youth, however, face barriers to becoming contributing taxpayers, workers, and participants in civic life. These youth have characteristics or experiences that put them at risk of developing problem behaviors and outcomes that have the potential to harm their community, themselves, or both. Poor outcomes often develop in home and neighborhood environments that do not provide youth with adequate economic and emotional supports. Groups of vulnerable (or "at-risk") youth include emancipating foster youth, runaway and homeless youth, and youth involved in the juvenile justice system, among others. Like all youth, vulnerable youth face a difficult transition to adulthood; however, their transition is further complicated by a number of challenges, including family conflict and obstacles to securing employment that provides adequate wages, health insurance, and potential for upward mobility.

The federal government has not adopted a single overarching federal policy or legislative vehicle that addresses the challenges at-risk youth experience in adolescence or while making the transition to adulthood. Rather, federal youth policy today has evolved from multiple programs established in the early 20th century and expanded through Great Society initiatives. These programs, concentrated in six areas—workforce development, education, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, social services, public health, and national and community service—provide vulnerable youth with opportunities to develop skills that will assist them in adulthood.

Despite the range of federal services and activities for vulnerable youth, many of the programs have not been developed into a coordinated system of support. In response, federal policymakers have periodically undertaken efforts to develop a comprehensive federal policy around youth. Congress has passed legislation (the Tom Osborne Federal Youth Coordination Act, P.L. 109-365) that authorizes the federal government to establish a youth council to improve coordination of federal programs serving youth. The youth council has not been established, but in 2009, a federal working group on youth issues was convened. In the past three decades, Congress has also considered other legislation (the Youth Community Development Block Grant of 1995 and the Younger Americans Act of 2000) to improve the delivery of services to vulnerable youth and provide opportunities to these youth through policies with a "positive youth development" focus.

This report first provides an overview of the youth population and the increasing complexity of transitioning to adulthood for all adolescents. It also provides a separate discussion of the concept of "disconnectedness," as well as the protective factors youth can develop during childhood and adolescence that can mitigate poor outcomes. Further, the report describes the evolution of federal youth policy, focusing on three time periods, and provides a brief overview of current federal programs targeted at vulnerable youth. (**Table A-1**, at the end of the report, enumerates the objectives and funding levels of such programs. Note that the table does not enumerate all programs that target, even in small part, vulnerable or disconnected youth.) The report then discusses the challenges of coordinating federal programs for youth, as well as federal legislation and initiatives that promote coordination among federal agencies and support programs with a positive youth development focus.

Overview

Age of Youth and the Transition to Adulthood

For the purposes of this report, “youth” refers to adolescents and young adults between the ages of 10 and 24. Under this definition, there are approximately 64 million youth (or 21% of the population) in the United States.¹ Although traditional definitions of youth include adolescents ages 12 to 18, cultural and economic shifts have protracted the period of adolescence. Children as young as 10 are included in this range because puberty begins at this age for some youth, and experiences in early adolescence often shape enduring patterns of behavior.² Older youth, up to age 24, are in the process of transitioning to adulthood. Many young people in their mid-20s attend school or begin to work, and some live with their parents or other relatives.

The current move from adolescence to adulthood has become longer and more complex, particularly since the postwar period.³ Youth of the 1950s were more likely to follow an orderly path to adulthood. They generally completed their education and/or secured employment (for males), including military service, which was followed by marriage and parenthood in their early 20s. (This was not true for every young person; for example, African Americans and immigrants in certain parts of the country faced barriers to employment.) Unlike their postwar counterparts who had access to plentiful jobs in the industrial sector, youth today must compete in a global, information-driven economy that favors highly skilled, educated workers.⁴ The ability for young people to secure well-paid employment is contingent on higher levels of education. From the 1970s to the 2000s, real wages and hours worked rose most significantly for those with some college or who had a college degree.⁵ Many more youth now receive vocational training or enroll in colleges and universities after leaving high school compared to earlier generations.⁶

During the period of transition, young adults cycle between attending school, living independently, and staying with their parents. They also use this time to explore career options and relationships with potential long-term partners.⁷ The median age of first marriage has risen

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, *Age and Sex: 2010*, 2010 Census Summary File 1, available at http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_SF1_QTP1&prodType=table.

² Carnegie Corporation of New York, Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, *Great Transitions: Preparing Adolescents for a New Century* (October 1995), pp. 20-21.

³ Wayne G. Osgood et al., eds., *On Your Own Without a Net: The Transition to Adulthood for Vulnerable Populations*. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), pp. 4-6. (Hereinafter, Wayne G. Osgood et al., eds., *On Your Own Without a Net*.)

⁴ Sheldon Danziger and David Ratner, “Labor Market Outcomes and the Transition to Adulthood,” *The Future of Children, Transition to Adulthood*, vol. 20, no. 1 (Spring 2010), p. 24, http://futureofchildren.org/futureofchildren/publications/journals/journal_details/index.xml?journalid=72.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 136-138.

⁶ Maria D. Fitzpatrick and Sarah E. Turner, “Blurring the Boundary: Changes in Collegiate Participation and the Transition to Adulthood,” in *The Price of Independence: The Economics of Early Adulthood*, Sheldon Danziger and Cecilia Elena Rouse, eds., (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2007), pp. 110-11.

⁷ Sheldon Danziger and Cecilia Elena Rouse, eds., *The Price of Independence: The Economics of Early Adulthood* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2007), pp. 3, 11. (Hereinafter, Danziger and Rouse, eds., *The Price of Independence: The Economics of Early Adulthood*.)

each decade since the 1950s, with 25.8 years for women and 28.3 years for men in recent years.⁸ The extended transition to adulthood for some youth may delay becoming financially independent, which can create burden their families. Nearly 60% of parents today provide financial support to their adult children who are no longer in school. This support comes in the form of housing (50% of the parents who provided support), living expenses (48%), cost of transportation (41%), health insurance (35%), spending money (29%), and medical bills (28%).⁹ Approximately 1.1 million young adults who were not in school lived with one or both of their parents in 2010.¹⁰

Programs that assist youth making the transition to adulthood also recognize that adolescence is no longer a finite period ending at age 18. For example, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111-148), the health reform law, requires health insurance companies to provide coverage to the children of parents who are enrolled in their health care plans up to their 26th birthday. It also provides a new Medicaid pathway, effective January 2014, for children who age out of foster care up to their 26th birthday. Since FY2003, the Chafee Foster Care Education and Training Vouchers program has provided vouchers worth up to \$5,000 annually per youth who is “aging out” of foster care or was adopted from foster care after 16 years of age.¹¹ The vouchers are available for the cost of attendance at an institution of higher education, as defined by the Higher Education Act of 1965. Youth receiving a voucher at age 21 may continue to participate in the voucher program until age 23.

Further, the changing concept of the age of adulthood is gaining currency among organizations and foundations that support and study youth development projects. The Youth Transition Funders Group is a network of grant makers whose mission is to help all adolescents make the successful transition to adulthood by age 25. Similarly, the Network on Transitions to Adulthood, a consortium of approximately 20 researchers from around the country, was created in 2000 to study the changing nature of early adulthood.¹²

⁸ U.S. Census Bureau, *Historical Time Series, Marital Status (MS-2), Estimated Median Age at First Marriage, by Sex: 1890 to the Present*, available at <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/hh-fam.html>; and Casey E. Copen et al., Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *First Marriages in the United States: Data From the 2006-2010 National Survey of Family Growth*, No. 49, March 22, 2012, pp. 5-6, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr049.pdf>.

⁹ This is based on a survey of parents and their adult children ages 18 to 39 who are not in school. Jenna Goudreau, “Nearly 60% of Parents Provide Financial Support to Adult Children,” *Forbes*, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jennagoudreau/2011/05/20/parents-provide-financial-support-money-adult-children/>.

¹⁰ This is based on adult children ages 18 to 34 who are not in school. Laryssa Mykyta and Suzane Macartney, *Sharing a Household: Household Composition and Well-Being 2007-2010*, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Report, June 2012, <http://www.census.gov/prod/2012pubs/p60-242.pdf>.

¹¹ See CRS Report RL34499, *Youth Transitioning from Foster Care: Background and Federal Programs*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

¹² The Network has published three books on this topic. See Richard A. Settersten, Jr., Frank F. Furstenburg, Jr., and Rubén Rumbaut, eds., *On the Frontier of Adulthood: Theory, Research, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Osgood et al., eds., *On Your Own Without a Net*; and Danziger and Rouse, eds., *The Price of Independence: The Economics of Early Adulthood*.

Defining the Vulnerable Youth Population

The majority of young people in the United States grow up healthy and safe in their communities. Those of primary and secondary school age live with parents who provide for their emotional and economic well-being and they attend schools that prepare them for continuing education or the workforce, and ultimately, self-sufficiency. One-third of young adults today will graduate from a four-year college or university.¹³ Nonetheless, some young people do not grow up in a secure environment or with parents that provide a comprehensive system of support.¹⁴ These youth often live in impoverished neighborhoods, where they may be exposed to violence, and come to school unprepared to learn. Their communities and schools often lack resources. Even youth who have adequate academic and emotional support may experience greater challenges as they transition to adulthood.

There is no universal definition of the terms “vulnerable” or “at-risk” youth,¹⁵ and some believe that these labels should not be used because of their potentially stigmatizing effects.¹⁶ The terms have been used to denote individuals who experience emotional and adjustment problems, are at risk of dropping out, or lack the skills to succeed after graduation.¹⁷ They have also been used to suggest that youth grow up in unstable family or community environments.¹⁸ Researchers, policymakers, and youth advocates, however, might agree to this definition: vulnerable youth have characteristics and experiences that put them at risk of developing problem behaviors and outcomes that have the potential to hurt their community, themselves, or both.¹⁹ “At risk” does not necessarily mean a youth has already experienced negative outcomes but it suggests that negative outcomes are more likely. Youth may also experience different levels of risk. On a risk continuum, they might have remote risk (less positive family, school, and social interaction and some stressors) to imminent risk (high-risk behaviors and many stressors).²⁰ Youth may also experience multiple risk factors. Vulnerable youth may also display resiliency that mitigates negative outcomes.

¹³ This is based on percentage of adults ages 25 to 34 who have received a bachelor’s degree or higher in 2011. Sarah R. Crissey, “Educational Attainment of the Population 18 Years and Over by Age, Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin: 2011,” Census Bureau, <http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/2011/tables.html>.

¹⁴ Heather Koball et al., *Synthesis of Research and Resources to Support at-Risk Youth*, Mathematica Policy Research, inc., ACF Youth Demonstration Development Project, June 21, 2011, http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/fys/youth.../synthesis_youth.pdf. (Hereinafter Heather Koball et al., *Synthesis of Research and Resources to Support at-Risk Youth*.)

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Kristin Anderson Moore, “Defining the Term ‘At Risk,’” Child Trends Research-to-Results Brief, Publication #2006-12, October 2006. (Hereinafter, Kristin Moore, “Defining the Term ‘At-Risk.’”)

¹⁷ J. Jeffries McWhirter et al., *At-Risk Youth: A Comprehensive Response*. California: Thomson Brooks/Cole, 2004, p. 6. (Hereinafter, J. Jeffries McWhirter, *At-Risk Youth*.)

¹⁸ Kristin Moore, “Defining the Term ‘At-Risk.’”

¹⁹ Martha R. Burt, Gary Resnick, and Nancy Matheson, *Comprehensive Service Integration Programs for At-Risk Youth*, The Urban Institute, 1992, pp. 13-22.

²⁰ J. Jeffries McWhirter, *At-Risk Youth*, pp. 7-9.

Groups of Vulnerable Youth

Researchers on vulnerable youth have identified multiple groups at risk of experiencing poor outcomes as they enter adulthood.²¹ These groups include, but are not limited to the following:

- youth emancipating from foster care;
- runaway and homeless youth;
- youth involved in the juvenile justice system;
- immigrant youth and youth with limited English proficiency (LEP);
- youth with physical and mental disabilities;
- youth with mental disorders; and
- youth receiving special education.

Some researchers have also classified other groups of vulnerable youth on the basis of risk outcomes: young unmarried mothers, high school dropouts, and disconnected (e.g., not in school nor working) youth.

Among the seven groups listed above, some lack financial assistance and emotional support from their families. Former foster youth, for example, often do not have parents who can provide financial assistance while they attend college or vocational schools. Other vulnerable youth have difficulty securing employment because of their disabilities, mental illness, juvenile justice history, or other challenges. Vulnerable youth who have depended on public systems of support often lose needed assistance at the age of majority.²² Many will lose health insurance coverage, vocational services, and supplementary income.²³ They will also face challenges in accessing adult public systems, where professionals are not always trained to address the special needs of young adults. Regardless of their specific risk factor(s), groups of vulnerable youth share many of the same barriers to successfully transitioning into their 20s.

Even within these groups, the population is highly diverse. For example, among youth with disabilities, individuals experience asthma, visual or hearing impairments, emotional disturbances, congenital heart disease, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, diabetes, cancer, and spina bifida. Youth in these seven groups also represent diverse socioeconomic and racial backgrounds. However, youth of color and the poor tend to be overrepresented in vulnerable populations. This

²¹ See, for example, Heather Koball et al., *Synthesis of Research and Resources to Support at-Risk Youth*; Wayne Osgood et al., eds., *On Your Own Without a Net*; and Michael Wald and Tia Martinez, *Connected by 25: Improving the Life Chances of the Country's Most Vulnerable 14-24 Year Olds*, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation Working Paper, November 2003. *Synthesis of Research and Resources to Support at-Risk Youth* includes youth who are the focus of programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families, including youth aging out of foster care, runaway and homeless youth, youth receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), teenage parents, and juvenile offenders. *On Your Own Without a Net* focuses on the seven groups listed above, in addition to youth reentering the community from the juvenile justice system. "Connected by 25" focuses on four groups: high school dropouts, young unmarried mothers, juvenile justice-involved youth, and foster youth.

²² Wayne G. Osgood et al., eds., *On Your Own Without a Net*, p. 10.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 10-12.

is due, in part, to their exposure to poverty, and crime, racism, and lack of access to systems of care, such as health care and vocational assistance.²⁴

Youth may also be members of multiple vulnerable populations. For instance, former foster youth are particularly at risk of becoming homeless. Each year about 26,000 youth “age out” of foster care, and of these youth, about two-fifths receive independent living services.²⁵ Emancipated youth may have inadequate housing supports.²⁶ Recently emancipated foster youth also tend to be less economically secure than their counterparts in the general youth population because they earn lower wages and are more likely to forego college and vocational training.²⁷ Their economic vulnerability can place them at risk of losing their housing.

Framework for Risk

Not all vulnerable youth experience negative outcomes. However, the social science literature identifies three broad categories of factors that influence whether youth face challenges in adolescence and as they transition to adulthood.²⁸ These categories include antecedents of risk, markers of risk, and problem behaviors. **Figure 1** summarizes the three categories and the risk outcomes vulnerable youth may experience.

²⁴ J. Jeffries McWhirter, *At-Risk Youth*, pp. 9, 13, and 14.


²⁵ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, *AFCARS Report #19, Preliminary Estimates for FY2011*, July 2012, http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/stats_research/index.htm#afcars.

²⁶ Mark E. Courtney and Darcy Hughes Heuring. “The Transition to Adulthood for Youth “Aging Out” of the Foster Care System” in Osgood et al., eds., *On Your Own Without a Net*, pp. 27-32.

²⁷ Peter J. Pecora et al., *Improving Foster Family Care: Findings from the Northwest Foster Care Alumni Study*, Casey Family Programs, 2005, pp. 1-2, available at <http://www.casey.org/Resources/Publications/NorthwestAlumniStudy.htm>. (Hereinafter, Peter J. Pecora et al., *Improving Foster Family Care*.)

²⁸ This discussion is based on Martha R. Burt, Gary Resnick, and Nancy Matheson, *Comprehensive Service Integration Programs for At-Risk Youth*, The Urban Institute, 1992, pp. 13-22.

Figure 1. Risk Framework for Vulnerable Youth



Source: Figure created by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) on the basis of Martha Burt, Gary Resnick, and Nancy Matheson, “Comprehensive Service Integration Programs for At-Risk Youth: Final Report,” The Urban Institute, 1992, Exhibit 2.2.

Antecedents of risk are the social environmental conditions that influence outcomes; these factors significantly predict the overall well-being of youth. Poverty, community conditions, and family structure are three primary antecedents of risk. Poverty is linked to a number of potential future problems among youth, including low professional attainment and meager future earnings. An analysis that utilized data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth and U.S. census tract information for 1980 to 1990 estimated that adolescents ages 14 to 22 who grew up in relatively high poverty metropolitan neighborhoods were less likely to be employed as adults than their peers.²⁹ Other macro-level forces—the location of employers and the erosion of the manufacturing sector—can also limit the jobs available to poor youth who live in urban areas.³⁰

²⁹ Steven R. Holloway and Stephen Mullherin, “The Effects of Adolescent Neighborhood Poverty on Adult Employment,” *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 26, no. 4, 2004.

³⁰ Peter Edelman, Harry J. Holzer, and Paul Offner, *Reconnecting Disadvantaged Young Men*. Washington, DC: Urban (continued...)

Some analyses have found that youths' place of residence in proximity to jobs affects their labor market involvement independent of other factors.³¹ Jobs in the manufacturing sector have been replaced by the growth of the service and high-technology sectors, jobs requiring technical and managerial skills.³² Youth who drop out of school or do not pursue postsecondary education cannot easily compete for available jobs.

Markers of risk also suggest that youth will experience negative outcomes in adolescence and beyond. Markers of risk are tangible indicators that can be measured or documented in public records; low school performance and involvement in the child welfare system are two such markers. Low academic performance, according to scores from a basic cognitive skills test as part of the 1994 National Longitudinal Education Survey, is associated with low employment rates. Among 16-to-24 year olds who scored below the 20th percentile on the test, 74% of white youth, 47.7% of black youth, and 57.4% of Hispanic youth were employed.³³ Youth involved in the child welfare system, including out-of-home placement in the foster care system, are at-risk because of their history of abuse or neglect. Studies show that youth who have "aged out" of foster care fare poorly relative to their counterparts in the general population on several outcome measures.³⁴

Problem behaviors further define a youth's level of risk for incurring serious consequences during the transition to adulthood. Problem behaviors are activities that have the potential to hurt youth, the community, or both. Youth with these behaviors likely live under risk antecedent conditions and have displayed risk markers. Behaviors include early sexual experimentation; truancy; use of tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs; running away from home or foster care; and association with delinquent peers. Problem behaviors, coupled with poor socioeconomic and social environmental factors, can precipitate more long-term negative outcomes, described in **Figure 1**, as risk outcomes. *Risk outcomes* include school dropout, low employment prospects, teen pregnancy, and alcohol and substance abuse.

Disconnectedness

Youth advocates and researchers have recently focused on vulnerable youth who experience negative outcomes in both employment and educational attainment.³⁵ Generally characterized as *disconnected*, these youth are not working or attending school. However, there is no uniform definition of this term. On the basis of a CRS review of studies on the population, the definition of *disconnected* varies, with differences in ages of the youth and the length that youth are not in school or working. The studies count youth as young as age 16 and as old as age 24, with ages in

(...continued)

Institute Press, 2006, pp. 19-21. (Hereinafter, Edelman, Holzer, and Offner, *Reconnecting Disadvantaged Young Men*.)

³¹ See for example, Weinberg, Reagan, and Yankow, *Do Neighborhoods Matter?*; Katherine M. O'Regan and John M. Quiley, "Where Youth Live: Economic Effects of Urban Space on Employment Prospects," *Urban Studies*, vol. 35, no. 7, 1998 and Stephen Raphael, "Inter-and Intra-Ethnic Comparisons of the Central City-Suburban Youth Employment Differential," *Industrial & Labor Relationship Review*, vol. 51, no. 3, April 1998.

³² William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Vintage Books, 1996, pp. 25-29.

³³ Edelman, Holzer, and Offner, *Reconnecting Disadvantaged Young Men*, p. 21.

³⁴ Peter J. Pecora et al., *Improving Foster Family Care*.

³⁵ CRS Report R40535, *Disconnected Youth: A Look at 16- to 24-Year Olds Who Are Not Working or In School*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara and Thomas Gabe.

between (i.e., 16 to 19, 18 to 24).³⁶ Youth are generally considered disconnected if they were not working or in school at the time they were surveyed, or over a period of time prior to the survey. Some of the definitions, however, incorporate other characteristics, such as marital status and educational attainment. Further, several studies used definitions that included only non-institutionalized youth. This means that these studies do not count youth in prisons, college dorms, mental health facilities, and other institutions.

Positive Youth Development: The Importance of Resiliency and Opportunity

Although vulnerable youth experience more negative outcomes than their counterparts who are not considered to be at risk, some of these youth go on to attend college and/or secure employment. Youth advocates argue that vulnerable youth can reach their goals if given adequate opportunities to develop positive behaviors during adolescence. Emphasizing that youth are in control of their future and can make contributions to their communities and society, these advocates view vulnerable youth as resources rather than victims or perpetrators.³⁷

What is Youth Development?

Youth development refers to the processes—physical, cognitive, and emotional—that youth undergo during adolescence. The competencies that youth begin to gain during adolescence can assist them as they transition to adulthood. Youth who master competencies across several domains will likely achieve desirable outcomes, including educational and professional success, self-confidence, connections to family and the community, and contributions to society. These areas of competency include the following:

- *Cognitive*: Knowledge of essential life skills, problem solving skills, academic adeptness;
- *Social*: Connectedness with others, perceived good relationships with peers, parents, and other adults;
- *Physical*: Good health habits, good health risk management skills;
- *Emotional*: Good mental health, including positive self-regard; good coping skills;
- *Personal*: Sense of personal autonomy and identity, sense of safety, spirituality, planning for the future and future life events, strong moral character;
- *Civic*: Commitment to community engagement, volunteering, knowledge of how to interface with government systems; and
- *Vocational*: Knowledge of essential vocational skills, perception of future in terms of jobs or careers.³⁸

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ National Youth Development Information Center, *What is Youth Development?*, available at <http://www.nydic.org/nydic/programming/definition.htm>.

³⁸ National Research Council, *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2002, pp. 6-7.

A primary factor that influences how well youth develop these competencies is the interaction among *individual characteristics*, or traits influenced by genetic inheritance and prenatal environment; the *social environment*—societal conditions, communities, and schools can serve to reinforce positive behaviors and promote positive outcomes for vulnerable youth; and the *home environment*, including discord among parents and monitoring of children by their parents.³⁹

Individual conditions refer to the characteristics of individuals that can influence resilience. Individual-level characteristics that can promote resilience include social skills, coping strategies, a positive sense of self, and high expectations. *Societal conditions*—economic conditions, the prevalence of discrimination, and educational institutions—affect the development of youth competencies and connectedness to others. Adolescents who perceive their future in terms of jobs or careers often achieve desirable outcomes. For vulnerable youth, poor economic conditions and fewer opportunities to work can affect how they perceive their future. Youth’s interaction with the community is another variable that shapes their development. Community culture, or the values and beliefs of a particular community, may support the positive development of youth by reinforcing cultural norms that favor academic achievement and professional success. Communities can play a role in fostering youth development by providing multiple pathways to help youth strengthen their competencies through schools and other institutions. Youth advocates argue that these pathways should involve services and long-term programs that provide opportunities for youth during the school day and in non-school hours when youth may be more susceptible to risky behaviors.⁴⁰ Within schools, the availability of resources for youth and their parents, such as programs that monitor and supervise youth, and quality youth-serving institutions and organizations can buffer youth from negative community cultures. Outside of schools, youth development programs—such as mentoring and leadership programs—emphasize the positive elements of growing up and engage young people in alternatives to counteract negative pressures.

Finally, the family context plays a pivotal role in youth development. Parental oversight of their children and family structure affect how well youth transition to adulthood. Positive adolescent development is facilitated when youth express independence from their parents, yet rely on their parents for emotional support, empathy, and advice. Parenting styles and family structure play important roles in the lives of youth. Parents who discipline in a moderate and caring manner, and provide positive sanctions for prosocial behaviors can assist youth to develop a sense of control over their future. Family structures that promote positive parent-child relationships, even after divorce or times of stress (such as separation or loss of a parent), can provide youth with emotional and other support during adolescence and beyond.

The Youth Development Movement

The belief that all youth have assets has formed the basis of the youth development movement that began in the 1980s in response to youth policies and programs that attempted to curb the specific problems facing youth (i.e., pregnancy, drug use) without focusing on how to holistically improve outcomes for youth and ease their transition to adulthood. A range of institutions have

³⁹ This discussion is based on U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Family and Youth Services Bureau, *Understanding Youth Development: Promoting Positive Pathways of Growth*, 1997; and Heather Koball et al., *Synthesis of Research and Resources to Support at-Risk Youth*.

⁴⁰ Karen Pittman, Merita Irby, and Thaddeus Ferber, *Unfinished Business: Further Reflections on a Decade of Promoting Youth Development*, The Forum for Youth Investment, 2000, p. 9, available at http://www.ppv.org/ppv/publications/assets/74_sup/ydv_1.pdf. (Hereinafter Pittman, Irby, and Ferber, *Unfinished Business*.)

promoted this approach through their literature and programming: policy organizations (Forum for Youth Investment and National Network for Youth); national direct service organizations for youth (4-H and the Boys and Girls Clubs of America); public and private research entities (National Research Council, Carnegie Corporation of New York, and MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Transitions to Adulthood), and government sub-agencies with a youth focus (the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Family and Youth Services Bureau and the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention).⁴¹ The youth development movement has attempted to shift from an approach to youth that emphasizes problem prevention to one that addressed the types of attitudes, skills, knowledge, and behaviors young people need to develop for adulthood.⁴²

Despite the endorsement of the positive youth development approach by prominent organizations, the movement has faced challenges.⁴³ Youth advocates within the movement point to insufficient guidance for program planners and policymakers about prioritizing which youth to serve, given the limited resources available to communities for youth programs. They have also criticized the lack of sufficient evaluation of programs and organizations using a positive development approach. According to these advocates, some youth development efforts have been built on insufficient data about demand for or supply of programs and were started without baseline data on reasonable youth indicators. Further, they argue that youth development messages have, at times, failed to generate excitement among policymakers because they did not convey how positive youth development policy and programs could respond to the challenges young people face and lead to better outcomes for youth and society at large. In turn, the movement has failed to adequately link to local and regional infrastructures that assist with funding, training, and network development.

To address these challenges, youth advocates (the same groups that have raised criticisms about the movement) have proposed a number of recommendations. For example, the Forum for Youth has urged advocates to clarify a youth development message that specifies concrete deliverables and to connect the movement to sustainable public and private resources and other youth advocacy efforts.⁴⁴ The recommendations have also called for evaluations of youth programs with a positive youth approach and improved monitoring and assessment of programs.

⁴¹ See for example, Karen Pittman, "Some Things Do Make a Difference and We Can Prove It: Key Take-Aways" from *Finding Out What Matters for Youth: Testing Key Links in a Community Action Framework for Youth Development*, The Forum for Youth Investment, April 2003, available at <http://www.ydsi.org/ydsi/pdf/WhatMatters.pdf>; 4-H, *The National Conversation on Youth Development in the 21st Century: Final Report*, 2002; National Research Council, *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development*, 2002; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Publications on Positive Youth Development, available at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb/content/positiveyouth/publications.htm>.

⁴² Pittman, Irby, and Ferber, *Unfinished Business*, pp. 20-22.

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 30-31.

⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 14-27.

Evolution of the Federal Role in Assisting Vulnerable Youth

The remainder of this report describes the evolution of federal youth policy and provides an overview of current programs and initiatives that focus on vulnerable youth. Many of these initiatives promote coordination of federal youth programs and positive youth development.

The federal government has not adopted a single overarching federal policy or legislative vehicle that addresses the challenges that young people experience in adolescence or while making the transition to adulthood. Rather, federal youth policy today evolved from multiple programs and initiatives that began in the early 1900s to assist children and youth. From the turn of the twentieth century through the 1950s, youth policy was generally subsumed under a broad framework of child welfare issues. The Children's Bureau, established in 1912, focused attention on child labor and the protection of children with special needs. The age boundaries of "youth" were not clearly delineated, but on the basis of proposed child labor reform legislation at that time, "child" referred to those individuals age 16 and under. Also during this period, work and education support programs were created to ease the financial pressures of the Great Depression for older youth (ages 16 to 23), and increasingly, federal attention focused on addressing the growing number of youth classified as delinquent.

The subsequent period, spanning the 1960s and 1970s, was marked by the creation of programs that targeted youth in six policy areas: workforce development and job training, education, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, social services, public health, and national and community service. Finally, from the 1980s until the present, many of these programs have been expanded; others have been eliminated. The federal government has also recently adopted strategies to better serve the youth population through targeted legislation and initiatives.

1912-1950s: Children's Bureau Programs and Workforce Programs

At the turn of the twentieth century, psychologists first formally defined the concept of adolescence. American psychologist G. Stanley Hall characterized the period between childhood and adulthood as a time of "storm and stress," with youth vulnerable to risky behavior, conflict with parents, and perversion.⁴⁵ The well-being of adolescents was emerging as an area of concern during this time, albeit as part of a greater focus on child welfare by states and localities. States began to recognize the distinct legal rights of children, generally defined as age 16 and younger, and to establish laws for protecting children against physical abuse, cruelty, and neglect. Children who were abused or neglected were increasingly removed from their homes and placed in almshouses and foster homes by the state. Juvenile courts and reform schools, first created in the late 1800s, were also expanding during this period. By 1912, 22 states had passed legislation to establish juvenile courts.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ G. Stanley Hall, "Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion, and Education," (1904) in John H. Bremner, Tamara K. Hareven, and Robert M. Mennel, eds., *Children & Youth in America, Vol. II: 1866-1932, Parts 1-6*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971, pp. 81-85.

⁴⁶ John H. Bremner, Tamara K. Hareven, and Robert M. Mennel, eds., *Children & Youth in America, Vol. II: 1866-1932, Parts 1-6*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971, p. 440.

The year 1912 also marked the federal government's initial involvement in matters relating to child welfare with the creation of the Children's Bureau in the U.S. Department of Labor. The Bureau emerged out of the Progressive Movement, which emphasized that the stresses on family life due to industrial and urban society were having a disproportionately negative effect on children.⁴⁷ Though not a cabinet-level agency, the purpose of the Bureau was to investigate and report upon all "matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life" for the federal government. The Bureau adopted a "whole child" philosophy, meaning that the agency was devoted to researching every aspect of the child's life throughout all stages of his or her development. In particular, the Bureau focused on infant and maternal health, child labor, and the protection of children with special needs (e.g., those who were poor, homeless, without proper guardianship, and mentally handicapped).

The concept of a "youth policy" in those early years was virtually nonexistent. However, the Bureau's efforts in combating child labor and investigating juvenile delinquency from 1912 through the early 1950s targeted youth ages 10 to 16. Bureau Chief Julia Lathrop and Progressive Era advocates pushed for laws that would prohibit the employment of children under age 16.⁴⁸ The Bureau also tracked the rising number of juvenile delinquents in the 1930s and evaluated the causes of delinquency, citing unhappy home conditions and gang membership as a predictor of gang activity.⁴⁹ In 1954, the Bureau established a division on juvenile delinquency prevention.

Perhaps the most well known policies the Children's Bureau implemented that affected youth were through the child health and welfare programs established by the Social Security Act (P.L. 74-231) of 1935. As originally enacted, the law authorized indefinite annual funding of \$1.5 million for states to establish, extend, and strengthen public child welfare services in "predominately rural" or "special needs" areas. For purposes of this program (now at Title IV-B, Subpart 1 of the Social Security Act), these were described as services "for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children, and children in danger of becoming delinquent."⁵⁰ The Aid to Dependent Children Program (now Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant) was also created under the act to provide financial assistance to impoverished children. "Dependent" children were defined as children under age 16 who had been deprived of parental support or care due to a parent's death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity, and was living with a relative. Amendments to the program extended the age of children to 18.⁵¹

Separately in the 1930s, the federal government addressed youth poverty triggered by the Great Depression. The Federal Transient Relief Act of 1933 established a Transient Division within the Federal Transient Relief Administration to provide relief services through state grants. Also in 1933, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) opened camps and shelters for more than one

⁴⁷ Kriste Lindenmeyer, *"A Right to Childhood:" The U.S. Children's Bureau and Child Welfare, 1912-46* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997). (Hereinafter Lindenmeyer, *A Right to Childhood*.)

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 127, 137-138.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 148-153.

⁵⁰ In 1962 (P.L. 87-543), child welfare services were formally defined under Title IV-B as "public social services which supplement, or substitute for parental care and supervision for the purpose of (1) remedying or assisting in the solution of problems which may result in, the neglect, abuse, exploitation, or delinquency of children, (2) protecting and caring for homeless, dependent, or neglected children, (3) protecting and promoting the welfare of children, including the strengthening of their own homes where possible or, where needed, the provision of adequate care of children away from their homes in foster family homes or day-care or other child-care facilities."

⁵¹ Lindenmeyer, *A Right to Childhood*, p. 193.

million low-income older youth. Two years later, in 1935, President Franklin Roosevelt created the National Youth Administration (NYA) by executive order to open employment bureaus and provide cash assistance to poor college and high school students. The Transient Division was disbanded shortly thereafter.

From 1936 to 1940, legislation was proposed to provide for comprehensive educational and vocational support for older youth. As introduced in 1938, the American Youth Act (S. 1463), if passed, would have established a federal National Youth Administration to administer a system of public-works projects that would employ young persons who were not employed or full-time students. The act would have also provided unemployed youth with vocational advisors to assist them in securing apprentice training. Further, young people enrolled in school and unable to continue their studies without financial support would have been eligible to receive financial assistance to pay school fees and school materials, and personal expenses.⁵² The act, however, was never brought to a full vote by the House or Senate. The Roosevelt Administration raised concerns in hearings on the bill that it was too expensive and would have provided some of the same services already administered through the CCC and NYA.⁵³ (The two programs were eliminated in the early 1940s.)

By the late 1940s, the Children's Bureau no longer had jurisdiction to address "all matters" concerning children and youth because of federal government reorganizations that prioritized agency function over a particular constituency (i.e., children, poor families, etc.). The bureau was moved in 1949 from the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) to the Federal Security Agency (FSA), and child health policy issues were transferred to the Public Health Service. The Bureau's philosophy of the "whole child" diminished further when the FSA was moved to the newly organized Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) in 1953.⁵⁴

1960s-1970s: War on Poverty Initiatives and Expansion of Programs

The 1960s and 1970s marked a period of federal efforts to assist poor and disadvantaged children and their families. President Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty initiatives and subsequent social legislation established youth-targeted programs in the areas of workforce development and job training, education, delinquency prevention, social services, and health. The major legislation during this period included the following.

- Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 (P.L. 88-452): As the centerpiece of the War on Poverty, the EOA established the Office of Economic Opportunity. The office administered programs to promote the well-being of poor youth and other low-income individuals, including Job Corps, Upward Bound, Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), Head Start, and Neighborhood Youth Corps, among others. The mission of the Job Corps was (and still is) to promote the vocational and educational opportunities of older, low-income youth. Similarly, Upward Bound was created to assist disadvantaged high school students who went on to attend college.

⁵² John H. Bremner, Tamara K. Hareven, and Robert M. Mennel, eds., *Children & Youth in America, Vol. III: 1933-1973, Parts 1-4*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971, pp. 91-96.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 99-104.

⁵⁴ For additional information about the creation of HEW, see CRS Report RL31497, *Creation of Executive Departments: Highlights from the Legislative History of Modern Precedents*, by Thomas P. Carr.

- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 (P.L. 89-10): The purpose of the ESEA was to provide federal funding to low-income schools. Amendments to the act in 1966 (P.L. 89-750) created the Migrant Education Program and Migrant High School Equivalency Program to assist states in providing education to children of migrant workers.
- Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 (P.L. 89-329): The HEA increased federal funding to universities and created scholarships and low interest loans for students. The act also created the Talent Search Program to identify older, low-income youth with potential for postsecondary education. The act was amended in 1968 (P.L. 90-575) to include two programs: Student Support Services and Upward Bound (which was transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education, and later to the U.S. Department of Education). Student Support Services was created to improve disadvantaged (defined as disabled, low-income, or first in their family to attend college) college students' retention and graduation rates.
- Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-378): The legislation permanently established the Youth Conservation Pilot Program to employ youth of all backgrounds to perform work on federal lands.
- Comprehensive Employment and Training Activities Act (CETA) of 1973 (P.L. 93-203): The program established federal funding for the Youth Employment and Training Program and the Summer Youth Employment Program. The programs financed employment training activities and on-the-job training.
- Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) of 1974 (P.L. 93-415): The act extended federal support to states and local governments for rehabilitative and preventative juvenile justice delinquency projects, as established under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act (P.L. 90-445). The major provisions of the JJDPA funded preventative programs in local communities outside of the juvenile justice system. The act's Title III established the Runaway Youth Program to provide temporary shelter, counseling, and after-care services to runaway youth and their families. Congress later amended (P.L. 95-115) Title III to include homeless youth.
- Education for All Handicapped Children of 1975 (P.L. 94-142): The act required all public schools accepting federal funds to provide equal access to education for children with physical and mental disabilities. Public schools were also required to create an educational plan for these students, with parental input, that would emulate as closely as possible the educational experiences of able-bodied children. (This legislation is now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.)

White House Conferences on Children and Youth: 1960s and 1970s

Since 1909, the executive branch has organized a White House Conference on Children (and youth, in later decades). The White House conferences of 1960 and 1971 focused on efforts to promote opportunities for youth. The recommendations from the 1960 conference's forum on adolescents discussed the need for community agencies to assist parents in addressing the

concerns of youth, as well as improved social services to adolescents and young adults.⁵⁵ The recommendations called for the federal government to establish a unit devoted to youth and to support public and private research regarding the issues facing this population, including their employment, education, military service, marriage, mobility, and community involvement. The 1971 conference had a broader focus on issues that were important to youth at the time. Recommendations from the conference included a suspension of the draft, less punitive measures for drug possession, and income guarantees for poor families.⁵⁶

Family and Youth Services Bureau

The Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB) was created in 1970 to provide leadership on youth issues in the federal government.⁵⁷ At that time, it was held that young people were placed inappropriately in the juvenile justice system, while others were not receiving needed social services. Known then as the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, the sub-agency proposed a new service delivery strategy (similar to the contemporary positive youth development approach) that emphasized youth's competence, usefulness, and belonging.⁵⁸ The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) of 1974 emphasized that youth committing status offenses (behaviors considered offenses only if carried out by a juvenile, such as truancy or running away) were more in need of care and guidance than they were of punishment. Passage of the JJDP laid the foundation for much of FYSB's work today with runaway and homeless youth and other vulnerable youth groups.

1980s-Present: Current Youth Programs

Current federal youth policy has resulted from the piecemeal creation of programs across several areas of social policy. Many of the youth-focused programs that trace their history to the War on Poverty continue today, and several new programs, spread across several agencies, have been created. (While the Family and Youth Services Bureau was created to provide leadership on youth issues, it administers a small number of youth programs, including the Runaway and Homeless Youth program and the Teen Pregnancy Prevention program, among others.) Federal youth policy today also includes recent initiatives to promote positive youth development and increase coordination between federal agencies that administer youth-focused programs.

Table A-1 in the **Appendix** provides an overview of over 50 major federal programs for youth in six policy areas discussed above—job training and workforce development, education, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, social services, public health, and national and community service. The table includes the programs' authorizing legislation and US code section; objectives; FY2006 through FY2012 funding levels and the requested FY2013 funding levels; agency with jurisdiction; and targeted at-risk youth population.⁵⁹ The programs were selected based upon their

⁵⁵ Executive Office of the President, *Conference Proceedings from the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth*, March 27-April 2, 1960 (Washington: GPO, 1960), p. 212.

⁵⁶ Executive Office of the President, *Conference Proceedings from the White House Conference on Youth*, 1971. Washington: GPO, 1971.

⁵⁷ This discussion is based on correspondence with U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, April 2007.

⁵⁸ American Youth Policy Forum, *A Youth Development Approach to Services for Young People: The Work of the Family and Youth Services Bureau*, Forum Brief, June 11, 1999.

⁵⁹ The FY2009 funding levels will be updated when the final figures become available.

objectives to serve vulnerable youth primarily between the ages of 10 to 24, or to research this population. The CRS contributors to **Table A-1**, their contact information, and CRS reports on some of the programs are listed in **Table A-2**.

As enacted, the programs are intended to provide vulnerable youth with the opportunities to develop skills and abilities that will assist them in adolescence and during the transition to adulthood. Congress has allocated funding to these programs for a number of services and activities, including conflict resolution; counseling; crime/violence prevention; gang intervention; job training assistance; mentoring; parental/family intervention; planning and program development; and research and evaluation. The programs differ in size, scope, and funding authorization levels and type (mandatory vs. discretionary).

The list is not exhaustive and may omit programs that serve the targeted youth population. Two major block grant programs—the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program (TANF) and the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)—are not included because they do not provide dedicated funding for youth activities. However, states can choose to use TANF and SSBG funds for such purposes. TANF law permits states to use block grant funds to provide services to recipient families and other “needy” families (defined by the state) so long as the services are expected to help lead to independence from government services or enable needy families to care for children at home. States may also provide services to non-needy families if they are directed at the goals of preventing and reducing out-of-wedlock pregnancies or encouraging the formation of two-parent families. SSBG provides funding to assist states to provide a range of social services to adults and children, and each state determines what services are provided and who is eligible. Youth-focused categories of services that can be funded through the SSBG include education and training services to improve knowledge or daily living skills and to enhance cultural opportunities; foster care services for children and older youth; independent and transitional living services; pregnancy and parenting services for young parents; and special services for youth involved in or at risk of involvement with criminal activity.⁶⁰

Job Training and Workforce Development⁶¹

The federal government funds four major job training and workforce development programs for youth: Job Corps, Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Youth Activities, YouthBuild, and Youth Conservation Corps. These programs (except for the Youth Conservation Corps) are administered by the Department of Labor and target low-income youth ages 16 to 24 who require additional assistance in meeting their vocational goals. Job Corps is the largest of these programs, with centers in all 50 states and Puerto Rico. Program training consists of career preparation, development, and transition; academic initiatives; and character building. The Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998 (P.L. 105-220) reauthorized the program through FY2003, although annual appropriations have continued funding.

The Workforce Investment Act also established WIA Youth Activities to fund employment training and academic support services for both youth in school and school dropouts ages 14 to 21. Eligible youth must be low-income and either deficient in basic literacy skills, a school

⁶⁰ A state-by-state expenditure data report for these and other categories of services is available at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/ssbg/annrpt/2005/index.html>.

⁶¹ For additional information, see CRS Report R40929, *Vulnerable Youth: Employment and Job Training Programs*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

dropout, homeless, a runaway, foster child, a parent, an offender, or an individual who needs additional assistance to complete an educational program or secure employment. Youth councils of local Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) advise the boards about youth activities. WIBs are certified by the state to coordinate the workforce development activities of a particular area through a local workforce investment system.⁶²

Created by the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1992 (P.L. 101-625), YouthBuild has many of the same educational and vocational objectives as those established under Job Corps and WIA Youth Activities. YouthBuild participants ages 16 to 24 work toward their GED or high school diploma while learning job skills by building affordable housing. The program, formerly in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, was made part of WIA, administered by DOL, under the YouthBuild Transfer Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-281). Finally, the Youth Conservation Corps, established in 1970 by the Youth Conservation Corps Act (P.L. 91-378) and administered by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, targets youth ages 15 to 18 of all backgrounds to work on projects that conserve natural resources.

Education

Most federal education programs for vulnerable youth are authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 and the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, administered by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). The ESEA provides the primary source of federal funds to K-12 education programs. The legislation's purpose, from its original enactment in 1965 to the present, is, in part, to provide supplementary educational and related services to educationally disadvantaged children who attend schools serving relatively low-income areas. The Higher Education Act is the source of grant, loan, and work-study assistance to help meet the costs of postsecondary education. The act also supports programs by providing incentives and services to disadvantaged youth to help increase their secondary or postsecondary educational attainment. Separate legislation authorizes additional education programs serving youth with disabilities and homeless youth.

Programs Authorized by Title I of the ESEA

Title I of ESEA provides most of the funding for programs that serve disadvantaged youth, and was most recently reauthorized and amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA) of 2001 (P.L. 107-110).

Title I-A (Education for the Disadvantaged Program) is the largest federal elementary and secondary education program.⁶³ Title I-A grants fund supplementary educational and related services to low-achieving and other pupils attending schools with relatively high concentrations of pupils from low-income families. The NCLBA expanded Title I-A provisions requiring participating states to adopt content and pupil performance standards, and assessments linked to these; and to take specified actions with respect to low-performing schools and local education agencies (LEAs). Title I-C (Migrant Education Program) provides formula grants to state

⁶² The 109th Congress considered legislation (H.R. 27) to make the Youth Councils optional. For additional information, see CRS Report RL32778, *The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA): Reauthorization of Job Training Programs in the 109th Congress*, by Blake Alan Naughton and Ann Lordeman.

⁶³ For additional information, see CRS Report RL33960, *The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as Amended by the No Child Left Behind Act: A Primer*, by Rebecca R. Skinner.

education agencies (SEAs) for the development of programs targeted to migrant students and Title I-D (Neglected, Delinquent, or at Risk of Dropping Out Program) gives funding to LEAs and SEAs to meet the special educational needs of youth in institutions and correctional facilities for neglected and delinquent youth, as well as youth at risk of dropping out. Finally, Title I-H (High School Dropout Program) targets grants to schools that serve grades 6 to 12 and have annual dropout rates that are above the state average as well as middle schools that feed students into such schools.

Other ESEA Programs

Titles III and IV of the ESEA also target disadvantaged youth. Title III (English Language Acquisition Program) provides grant funding to states to ensure that limited English proficient (LEP) children and youth, including immigrant children and youth, attain English proficiency. The NCLBA has given SEAs and LEAs great flexibility in designing and administering instructional programs, while at the same time focusing greater attention on the achievement of English proficiency. Title IV-B (21st Century Community Learning Centers program) provides competitive grants to LEAs for academic and other after-school programs. The purpose of the program is to provide opportunities for academic enrichment to help students, particularly those from low-income backgrounds, meet local and state academic achievement standards and reinforce their regular academic instruction.

Programs Authorized Under HEA

Funding provided under the Higher Education Act (P.L. 89-329), as amended, is authorized through FY2014. Foremost among HEA programs targeted to low-income, college-bound youth are Trio and GEAR UP.⁶⁴ The Migrant High School Equivalency program is another key component of the HEA.

Trio Programs. Trio programs are designed to assist students from disadvantaged backgrounds to pursue higher education and to complete their post-secondary studies.⁶⁵ Five Trio programs provide direct services to students and two provide indirect services.⁶⁶ The five primary programs are: Talent Search, Upward Bound, Educational Opportunity Centers, Student Support Services, Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement, and. Each of these programs is designed to intervene at various points along the education continuum.

Talent Search, authorized under the original HEA legislation, encourages youth who have completed at least five years of elementary education with college potential to complete high school and enter postsecondary education; to encourage dropouts to reenter school; and to disseminate information about available postsecondary educational assistance. *Upward Bound*

⁶⁴ For additional information, see CRS Report RL31622, *Trio and GEAR UP Programs: Status and Issues*, by Jeffrey J. Kuenzi.

⁶⁵ The precise definition of disadvantaged varies between the programs. It generally refers to individuals who are low-income, first-generation college students, or disabled.

⁶⁶ These two programs are the Staff Development program and Dissemination Partnership Grants program. The Staff Development program supports training of current and prospective Trio staff. The Dissemination Partnership Grants funds partnerships with institutions of higher education or community organizations not receiving Trio funds but that serve first-generation and low-income college students.

projects seek to motivate middle school and high school students to succeed in postsecondary education through instruction and counseling, among other activities.

Educational Opportunity Centers provide information to prospective postsecondary students regarding available financial aid and academic assistance, and help them apply to college. *Student Support Services* projects are intended to improve college students' retention and graduation rates, and improve transfer rates from two-year to four-year colleges through instruction; exposure to career options; mentoring; and assistance in graduate admissions and financial aid processes. In selecting grantees, the Secretary of Education considers an institution's efforts to provide participants with aid sufficient to meet full financial needs and to constrain student debt. Finally, the *Robert E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement* program prepares disadvantaged students for post-doctoral study through seminars, research opportunities, summer internships, tutoring, mentoring, and exposure to cultural events and academic programs.

GEAR UP. Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Program (GEAR UP), a program not part of the TRIO array of programs, was added to the HEA by the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998 (P.L. 105-244). GEAR UP seeks to increase disadvantaged students' secondary school completion and postsecondary enrollment by providing support services. GEAR UP differs from Trio in two key aspects: the program (1) serves a cohort of students from seventh grade to their first year of college and (2) assures students of the availability of financial aid to meet college costs. States or partnerships (schools and at least two other entities, such as community organizations and state agencies) are eligible for funding. Any funded state or partnership must provide comprehensive mentoring, tutoring, counseling, outreach, and support services to participating students. Participating states are also required to establish or maintain a postsecondary college scholarship for participants; partnerships are permitted to include a scholarship component.

Migrant High School Equivalency Program. The Migrant High School Equivalency Program, authorized under HEA, funds institutions of higher education (or private nonprofits in cooperation with institutions of higher education) to recruit and provide academic and support services to students who lack a high school diploma and whose parents are engaged in migrant and other seasonal farmwork. The purpose of the program is to assist students to obtain a high school equivalency diploma and gain employment, or to attend college or another postsecondary education or training program.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, is the major statute that provides federal funding for the education of children and youth with disabilities.⁶⁷ Part B of the act includes provisions for the education of school-aged children. As a condition for the receipt of funds states must provide "free appropriate public education" to youth as old as 21 (age may vary depending on state law). This term refers to the right of all children with disabilities to receive an education and related services that meet state curriculum requirements, at no costs to parents. Appropriateness is defined according to the child's individualized education plan (IEP) which delineates the special instruction the child should receive and his or her educational goals.

⁶⁷ For additional information, see CRS Report R41833, *The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B: Key Statutory and Regulatory Provisions*, by Ann Lordeman.

Education of Homeless Children

The McKinney-Vento Act (P.L. 100-77), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, authorizes the Department of Education to fund LEAs to provide homeless children and youth comparable educational services. With certain exceptions for health and safety emergencies (and for schools permitted under a “grandfather” clause), states are prohibited from using funds for either a separate school or separate program within the school.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in the Department of Justice (DOJ) coordinates federal activities and administers programs relating to the treatment of juvenile offenders and the prevention of juvenile delinquency. These programs include those enacted under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act⁶⁸

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) was first enacted in 1974 (P.L. 90-415) and was most recently reauthorized in 2002 by the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (P.L. 107-273). Its provisions were authorized through FY2007. The JJDP as originally enacted had three main components: it created a set of institutions within the federal government that were dedicated to coordinating and administering federal juvenile justice efforts; it established grant programs to assist the states with setting up and running their juvenile justice systems; and it promulgated core mandates that states had to adhere to in order to be eligible to receive grant funding. While the JJDP has been amended several times over the past thirty years, it continues to feature the same three components. The major components of the JJDP are discussed below.

State Formula Grants. The JJDP authorizes OJJDP to make formula grants to states which can be used to fund the planning, establishment, operation, coordination, and evaluation of projects for the development of more effective juvenile delinquency programs and improved juvenile justice systems. Funds are allocated annually among the states on the basis of relative population of people under the age of eighteen, and states must adhere to certain core mandates in order to be eligible for funding.

Juvenile Mentoring Program. This grant program was repealed in 2002 by the 21st Century Department of Justice Reauthorization Act (P.L. 107-273); however, it has continued to receive appropriations each subsequent fiscal year.⁶⁹ These grants could be awarded to local educational agencies (in partnership with public or private agencies) to establish and support mentoring programs.

Part E: Developing, Testing, and Demonstrating Promising New Initiatives and Programs (Challenge Grants). The Challenge Grants program authorizes OJJDP to make grants to state,

⁶⁸ For additional information, see CRS Report RL33947, *Juvenile Justice: Legislative History and Current Legislative Issues*, by Kristin M. Finklea.

⁶⁹ For additional information, see CRS Report RL34306, *Vulnerable Youth: Federal Mentoring Programs and Issues*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

local, and Indian governments and private entities in order to carry out programs that will develop, test, or demonstrate promising new initiatives that may prevent, control, or reduce juvenile delinquency.

Title V Community Prevention Block Grants. The Community Prevention Block Grant program authorizes OJJDP to make grants to states, that are then transmitted to units of local government, in order to carry out delinquency prevention programs for juveniles who have come into contact with, or are likely to come into contact with, the juvenile justice system.

Social Services

The major social service programs to assist at-risk youth are authorized under the Social Security Act, as amended, and are administered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).⁷⁰

Foster Care Program and Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP)

Title IV-E of the Social Security Act authorizes the federal foster care program.⁷¹ Under this program, a state may seek federal funds for partial reimbursement of the room and board costs needed to support eligible children who are neglected, abused, or who, for some other reason, cannot remain in their own homes. To be eligible for Title IV-E, a child must be in the care and responsibility of the state and 1) the child must meet income/assets tests and family structure rules in the home he/she was removed from;⁷² 2) have specific judicial determinations made related to reasons for the removal and other aspects of his/her removal and placement; and 3) be placed in an eligible licensed setting with an eligible provider(s).

The federal government has established certain requirements related to state provision of foster care that are applicable to all children and youth in foster care. These include that a state has a written case plan detailing, among other things, where the child is placed and what services are to be provided to ensure that a permanent home is re-established for the child. Further, for each child in foster care, this plan must be reviewed on a regular basis, including a review by a judge no less often than every 12 months. For many youth who enter foster care, returning to their parents is the way permanence is re-established. For some youth, however, it is not safe or possible to reunite with their parents. In those cases states must work to find adoptive parents or legal guardians who can provide a permanent home for these youth.

⁷⁰ Two additional child welfare programs, Court Appointed Special Advocates and Children's Advocacy Centers, are discussed in the chart below. The programs are administered by the U.S. Department of Justice.

⁷¹ For additional information, see CRS Report RL31242, *Child Welfare: Federal Program Requirements for States*, by Emilie Stoltzfus.

⁷² With an exception, discussed below, the income and asset tests, as well as family structure/living arrangement rules are identical to the federal /state rules that applied to the now-defunct cash aid program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), as they existed on July 16, 1996. Under the prior law AFDC program, states established specific AFDC income rules (within some federal parameters). The federal AFDC asset limit was \$1,000, however, P.L. 106-169 raised the allowable counted asset limit to \$10,000 for purposes of determining Title IV-E eligibility. In addition to meeting the income/asset criteria in the home from which he/she was removed, a child must meet the AFDC family structure/living arrangement rules. Those rules granted eligibility primarily to children in single-parent families (parents are divorced, separated, or never-married and one spouse is not living with the child; or the parent is dead). In some cases a child in a two-parent family may be eligible (if one parent meets certain unemployment criteria).

Foster youth who reach the “age of majority” (18 years in most states) and who have not been reunited with their parents or placed with adoptive parents or guardians are said to “emancipate” or “age out” of foster care. The Chafee Foster Care Independence Program, created in 1999 (P.L. 106-169), required states to provide independent living services for youth until their 21st birthday and those of any age in foster care who are expected to leave care without placement in a permanent family.⁷³ Services may consist of educational assistance, vocational training, mentoring, preventive health activities, and counseling. States may dedicate as much as 30% of their program funding toward room and board for youth ages 18 through 20. A separate component of the CFCIP—the Education and Training Vouchers program—was established in 2002 (P.L. 107-133) to provide vouchers to youth eligible for the CFCIP and youth adopted from foster care after 16 years of age. The vouchers are available for the cost of attendance at an institution of higher education, as defined by the Higher Education Act of 1965.⁷⁴ Only youth receiving a voucher at age 21 may continue to participate in the voucher program until age 23.

Runaway and Homeless Youth Program

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Program, established in 1974 under Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, contains three components: the Basic Center Program (BCP), Transitional Living Program (TLP), and Street Outreach Program (SOP).⁷⁵ These programs are designed to provide services to runaway and homeless youth outside of the law enforcement, juvenile justice, child welfare, and mental health systems. Services include temporary and long-term shelter, counseling services, and referrals to social service agencies, among other supports. The funding streams for the Basic Center Program and Transitional Living Program were separate until Congress consolidated them in 1999 (P.L. 106-71). Together, the two programs, along with other program activities, are known as the Consolidated Runaway and Homeless Youth Program.⁷⁶ Although the Street Outreach Program is a separately funded component, SOP services are coordinated with those provided by the BCP and TLP.

Public Health

Public health programs for vulnerable youth are concentrated in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (ACF) and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA).⁷⁷ These programs address youth mental health, substance abuse, teen pregnancy prevention, and support for pregnant and parenting teens.

⁷³ For additional information, see CRS Report RL34499, *Youth Transitioning from Foster Care: Background and Federal Programs*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

⁷⁴ See Sections 102 and 472 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

⁷⁵ For additional information, see CRS Report RL33785, *Runaway and Homeless Youth: Demographics and Programs*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

⁷⁶ Other program activities include a national communications system for runaway youth and their families, logistical support for grantee organizations, HHS’s National Clearinghouse on Families and Youth, demonstrations, and the administration of the management information system that tracks data on runaway and homeless youth, known as NEO-RHYMIS.

⁷⁷ For additional information, see CRS Report R41477, *Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA): Agency Overview and Reauthorization Issues*, by C. Stephen Redhead.

Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services

SAMSHA is organized into three units: the Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS), the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT), and the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP). Collectively, the centers administer approximately 13 programs (not all discussed here or in **Table A-1**) for youth ages 10 to 21 (and up to 25 for some programs). The programs primarily target youth with serious emotional disturbances (SED) and youth at-risk of abusing drugs and alcohol.

CMHS. Suicide prevention activities are funded by SAMHSA's Campus Suicide Prevention Grant Program and State-Sponsored Youth Suicide Prevention and Early Intervention Program (collectively known as the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act Suicide Prevention Program). The campus grant program funds services for all students (including those with mental health problems and substance abuse that makes them vulnerable to suicide), while the state-sponsored program supports statewide and tribal activities to develop and implement youth suicide prevention and intervention strategies.⁷⁸

The Comprehensive Mental Health Services for Children with SED program provides community-based systems of care for children and adolescents with serious emotional disturbances and their families. The program aims to ensure that services are provided collaboratively across youth-serving systems (such as schools and foster care placements) and that each youth receives an individual service plan developed with the participation of the family (and, where appropriate, the youth) to meet the mental health needs of that youth. A second program, the National Child Traumatic Stress Network, was created to establish a national network that provides services and referrals for children and adolescents who have experienced traumatic events.

CSAT. The Assertive Adolescent and Family Treatment Program provides grants to states to address gaps in substance abuse services for youth. The purpose of the program is to use proven family-centered practices to treat drug addicted youth. This treatment model focuses on making families and primary caregivers part of the treatment process on the basis of the belief that their inclusion increases the likelihood of successful treatment and reintegration of adolescents into their communities. Another program that provides treatment for youth who are drug dependent is the Juvenile Treatment Drug Courts. This program targets juvenile offenders (pre-adjudicated or adjudicated status, or post-detention), and provides substance abuse treatment, wrap-around services supporting substance abuse treatment, and case management. A judge oversees the drug treatment program and may allow the youth to avoid (further) penalties for their delinquent behavior.

CSAP. The Strategic Prevention Framework State Infrastructure Grant provides funding to states to implement strategies for preventing substance and alcohol abuse among adolescents and adults. The grant implements a five-step process: 1) conduct a community needs assessment; 2) mobilize and/or build capacity; 3) develop a comprehensive strategic plan; 4) implement evidence-based prevention programs and infrastructure development activities; and 5) monitor process and evaluate effectiveness. CSAP also administers, in cooperation with the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, the "Drug-Free Communities Support Program" (see below).

⁷⁸ Other SAMSHA funds are made available for the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline and training to organizations and individuals developing suicide prevention programs.

Teen Pregnancy Prevention and Support Programs⁷⁹

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services administers research and education programs to reduce teen pregnancy or to provide care services for pregnant and parenting adolescents. An education program, Abstinence Education Grants, provides formula and competitive grants for abstinence education. States may request funding for the Abstinence Education Grants program when they solicit Maternal and Child Health block grant funds (used for a variety of health services for women and children, including adolescent pregnancy prevention activities); this funding must be used exclusively for the teaching of abstinence. From FY2000 through FY2009, abstinence-only education for youth ages 12 to 18 was also funded through HHS's Community-Based Abstinence Education program (formerly known as Special Programs of Regional and National Significance, SPRANS).

P.L. 111-148 (the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, PPACA) established a state formula grant program to enable states to operate a new Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP), which is a comprehensive approach to teen pregnancy prevention that educates adolescents on both abstinence and contraception to prevent pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. It also provides youth with information on several adulthood preparation subjects (e.g., healthy relationships, adolescent development, financial literacy, parent-child communication, educational and career success, and healthy life skills). The new program is mandated to provide programs that are evidence-based, medically accurate, and age-appropriate.

In addition to the education programs, HHS sponsored projects to increase awareness about teen pregnancy and abstinence through FY2011 under the Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Projects and Research Grants. These programs were designed to promote family involvement in the delivery of services, adolescent premarital sexual abstinence, adoption as an alternative to early parenting, parenting and child development education, and comprehensive health, education, and social services geared toward the healthy development for mother and child. The project program provided services to youth and the research and evaluation program evaluates the delivery of those services.

National and Community Service⁸⁰

The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) is an independent federal agency that administers programs authorized by two statutes: the National and Community Service Act (NCSA, P.L. 101-610) of 1990, as amended, and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act (DVSA, P.L. 93-113) of 1973, as amended.⁸¹ The focus of these programs is to provide public service to communities in need through multiple service activities. Although CNCS works to involve a diverse range of individuals in their programs, the agency makes particular efforts to engage disadvantaged youth, either because they enroll these youth to help to carry out the programs (i.e.,

⁷⁹ For additional information, see CRS Report RS20301, *Teenage Pregnancy Prevention: Statistics and Programs*, by Carmen Solomon-Fears.

⁸⁰ This information was provided by the Corporation for National and Community Service in correspondence in March and April 2008.

⁸¹ For additional information, see CRS Report RL33931, *The Corporation for National and Community Service: Overview of Programs and FY2012 Funding*, by Abigail B. Rudman and Ann Lordeman, and CRS Report R40432, *Reauthorization of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (P.L. 111-13)*, by Ann Lordeman.

members or volunteers) or provide services to them through the programs (i.e., beneficiaries). CNCS's strategic plan for 2011 through 2015 emphasizes the agency's focus on improving the lives of disadvantaged and other youth by leveraging national service programs to meet their most pressing academic, health related, environmental, and social needs.⁸²

The NCSA and DVSA were most recently reauthorized by the Serve America Act (P.L. 111-13), which includes a definition of "disadvantaged youth." A "disadvantaged youth" is an individual who is economically disadvantaged and one or more of the following: out-of-school, including out-of-school youth who are unemployed; in or aging out of foster care; has limited English proficiency; homeless or who have run away from home; at-risk of leaving secondary school without a diploma; former juvenile offenders or at risk of delinquency; or individuals with disabilities. One of the programs discussed below requires a certain share of volunteers to be disadvantaged youth.

The major CNCS programs are organized into two service streams, AmeriCorps and Senior Corps.

AmeriCorps

AmeriCorps identifies and addresses critical community needs by tutoring and mentoring disadvantaged youth, managing or operating after-school programs, helping communities respond to disasters, improving health services, building affordable housing, and cleaning parks and streams, among other services. There are three AmeriCorps programs: AmeriCorps State and National, Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), and National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC). For providing services full-time for a term of service (up to one year), AmeriCorps members earn an education award equal to the maximum amount of a Pell Grant in the year in which service is rendered (and proportionally less if they provide services for half-time, reduced half-time, etc.).

AmeriCorps State and National program⁸³ provides state formula and competitive grant funding to governor-appointed state service commissions, which award grants to non-profit groups that recruit AmeriCorps members to respond to local needs (AmeriCorps State). The balance of grant funding is distributed competitively by CNCS to multi-state and national organizations (AmeriCorps National), such as Teach for America, and to Indian tribes and territories. Some grantees enroll members who are disadvantaged, such as YouthBuild USA, which recruits at-risk youth ages 17 to 24 as members, to meet the housing and technology needs of their communities. Other grantees place members in organizations and schools to serve disadvantaged youth in grades K through 12 in after-school, before school, and enrichment programs.

The focus of VISTA⁸⁴ is to strengthen efforts to eliminate poverty through volunteer service. VISTA provides full-time members to non-profit community organizations and public agencies through a non-competitive application process managed locally by CNCS State Offices. VISTA supports projects that focus on serving disadvantaged youth beneficiaries, some of whom are

⁸² Corporation for National and Community Service, Strategic Plan 2011-2015, http://www.nationalservice.gov/pdf/11_0203_cncs_strategic_plan.pdf.

⁸³ The programs are also called AmeriCorps*State and National Direct by CNCS, and is titled National Service Trust Programs in Title I-C of the NCSA.

⁸⁴ This program is called AmeriCorps*VISTA by CNCS, and VISTA in Title I-A of DVSA.

younger than age 12. These projects include mentoring, as well as after school, tutoring, and job skills development programs. Although VISTA does not target any one population of youth, the program has recently placed an emphasis on serving children of prisoners and youth aging out of foster care.

Finally, NCCC⁸⁵ is a residential program for youth 18 through 24. Members live and train at five campuses and are deployed to serve communities in every state. Like the other two AmeriCorps programs, members work closely with non-profit organizations and public agencies to meet community needs. P.L. 111-13 requires that the percentage of participants in the program who are disadvantaged youth increase over time.

Senior Corps

Senior Corps is composed of volunteers age 55 or older who help to meet a wide range of community challenges through three programs: Foster Grandparents Program (FGP), Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), and Senior Companion program. The first two provide assistance in the community by working with children and youth with a variety of needs, among other populations and activities. The FGP provides aid to children and youth with exceptional needs, including children who have been abused or neglected or are otherwise at risk; mentors troubled teenagers and young mothers; cares for premature infants and children with physical disabilities; and teaches reading instruction to children who are falling behind their grade level. RSVP provides a variety of services to communities. These services include tutoring children and teenagers, renovating homes, and serving as museum docents. Grants for the Senior Corps programs are awarded to non-profit organizations and public agencies. Upon successful completion of a three-year grant cycle, the organization or agency is eligible to renew the grant for another cycle without competition from other entities.

Federal Efforts to Improve Coordination Among Programs for Vulnerable Youth

Overview

Despite the range of services and activities programs for vulnerable youth, many of these programs appear to have developed with little attempt to coordinate them in a policy area or across policy areas. Policymakers and youth advocates argue that federal agencies must develop mechanisms to improve coordination—defined, at minimum, as communication and consultation. They argue that coordination is necessary because of the expansion of programs that serve youth, the increasing complexity and interrelated nature of public policies that affect youth, the fragmentation of policy-making among agencies, and the establishment of new policy priorities that cross older institutional boundaries.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ This program is called AmeriCorps*NCCC by CNCS, and the Civilian Community Corps in Title I-E of NCSA.

⁸⁶ For additional information about rationales for coordination, see CRS Report RL31357, *Federal Interagency Coordinative Mechanisms: Varied Types and Numerous Devices*, by Frederick M. Kaiser. For a discussion of federal efforts to coordinate and integrate various social service programs, see CRS Report RL32859, *The “Superwaiver” Proposal and Service Integration: A History of Federal Initiatives*, by Cheryl Vincent.

The following section discusses federal efforts to improve coordination of youth programs. The section first addresses laws and an executive order that have sought to spur coordination across multiple government agencies. These laws include the Claude Pepper Young Americans Act (P.L. 101-501), YouthBuild Transfer Act (P.L. 109-281), and Tom Osborne Federal Youth Coordination Act (P.L. 109-365); however, of the three, only the YouthBuild Transfer Act has been funded. In 2008, President George W. Bush signed Executive Order 13459 to establish an Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs. Following this discussion is a description of efforts to coordinate programs around specific youth topic areas and youth populations, such as through coordinating councils and grant programs carried out by two or more agencies.

Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-501)

The Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 (Title IX of the August F. Hawkins Human Services Reauthorization Act, P.L. 101-501) was the first in recent history to address youth coordination issues; however, the law was never funded. P.L. 101-501 sought to increase federal coordination among agencies that administer programs for children and youth, while also enhancing the delivery of social services to children, youth, and their families through improved coordination at the state and local levels.⁸⁷ In its report supporting the act's coordinating provisions, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee noted:⁸⁸

The Committee is concerned that the current system of service is fragmented and disjointed, making it difficult, if not impossible for children and families who are being served in one system to access needed services from another. This creates a situation in which problems of children and families not only go unmet but undetected and unresolved. Through the inclusion of these proposals, the Committee hopes to articulate a national commitment to our nation's children, youth, and families and to encourage greater cooperation at federal, state, and local levels.

Federal Council on Children, Youth, and Families

The Federal Council on Children, Youth, and Families was authorized by the Young Americans Act to address concerns about the fragmentation and duplication of services for youth at the federal and local levels. The act provided that the council comprise representatives from federal agencies and state or local agencies that serve youth, rural and urban populations; and national organizations with an interest in young individuals, families, and early childhood. The duties of the council were to include 1) advising and assisting the president on matters relating to the special needs of young individuals (and submitting a report to the president in FY1992 through FY1998); 2) reviewing and evaluating federal policies, programs, or other activities affecting youth and identifying duplication of services for these youth; and 3) making recommendations to the President and Congress to streamline services, reduce duplication of services, and encourage coordination of services for youth and their families at the state and local levels. The act was amended in 1994 (P.L. 103-252) to require that the council also identify program regulations, practices, and eligibility requirements that impede coordination and collaboration and make

⁸⁷ For further discussion of concerns with coordination at the state and local levels and local initiatives to improve coordination in the early 1990s, see CRS Report 96-369, *Linking Human Services: An Overview of Coordination and Integration Efforts*, by Ruth Ellen Wasem (out of print). The report is available upon request at x7-5700.

⁸⁸ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, *Human Services Reauthorization Act*, report to accompany P.L. 101-501, 101st Cong., 2nd sess., S.Rept. 101-421 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1990), p. 1963.

recommendations for their modifications or elimination. Though the council was to be funded through FY1998, funding was never appropriated.

Grants for States and Community Programs

The Young Americans Act also established grant funding for coordinating resources and providing comprehensive services to children, youth, and families at the state and local levels. For states to receive funding, the act required each state to submit a plan discussing how state and local entities would coordinate developmental, preventative, and remedial services, among other provisions. This grant program was never funded.

More Recent Concerns about Coordination of Youth Programs

In addition to the programs described in **Table A-1**, dozens of other programs in multiple federal agencies target, even in small part, vulnerable youth. The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) cataloged 131 programs for at-risk or delinquent youth across 16 agencies in FY1996. GAO defined these youth as individuals age five to 24 who, due to certain characteristics or experiences, were statistically more likely than other youth to encounter certain problems—legal, social, financial, educational, emotional, and health—in the future.⁸⁹ The White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, convened in 2002 under President George W. Bush, compiled a similar list of over 300 programs for disadvantaged youth (using nearly the same definition as GAO) in 12 agencies for FY2003 targeting vulnerable youth and youth generally.⁹⁰ In its October 2003 final report, the task force identified concerns with coordinating these programs:

- *Mission Fragmentation:* The federal response to disadvantaged youth is an example of “mission fragmentation” because dozens of youth programs appear to provide many of the same services and share similar goals. For example, academic support was identified as a service provided by 92 programs and mentoring was identified as a service provided by 123 such programs, in FY2003.
- *Poor Coordination for Sub-Groups of Youth:* According to the task force, the federal government does not coordinate services for specific groups of youth (i.e., abused/neglected youth, current or former foster youth, immigrant youth, minority youth, obese youth, urban youth, and youth with disabilities, among others). The task force report listed 30 sub-groups of vulnerable youth, with each sub-group receiving services through at least 50 programs administered by 12 agencies. The report cited that each agency operates their programs autonomously and is not required to coordinate services with other agencies.

⁸⁹ U.S. General Accounting Office, *At-Risk and Delinquent Youth: Multiple Federal Programs Raise Efficiency Questions*, GAO/HEHS-96-34, March 1996, at <http://www.gao.gov/archive/1996/he96034.pdf>. (GAO is now known as the U.S. Government Accountability Office.)

⁹⁰ The programs provide services such as: academic support; support for adults who work with youth; after-school programs; AIDS prevention activities; counseling; mental health services; mentoring; self-sufficiency skills; tutoring; and violence and crime prevention. See Executive Office of the President, *White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth Final Report*, October 2003, pp. 165-179, at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb/content/docs/white_house_task_force.pdf. (Hereinafter *White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth Final Report*.)

- *Mission Creep*: Known as “mission creep,” multiple agencies are authorized by broadly-written statute to provide similar services to the same groups of youth despite having distinct agency goals and missions. Though youth programs are concentrated in the U.S. Departments of Education, Health and Human Service, and Justice, nine other agencies administer at least two youth-focused programs: Agriculture, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Labor, Transportation, Corporation for National and Community Service, Defense, Office of Drug Control Policy, and Environmental Protection Agency.
- *Limited Program Accountability*: The extent of overlap among youth programs and the efficacy of these programs are difficult to determine because some of them have not been recently assessed through the Office of Management and Budget’s Program Assessment and Rating Tool (PART) or by an independent program evaluation. As of FY2003, more than half of the 339 youth-related programs identified by the task force had not been evaluated within the last five years. Of those programs that were evaluated, 75% were evaluated independently and the remaining programs were self-evaluated by the grantees. According to the task force, the quality of the evaluations was low because most did not randomly assign some youth to the programs and track their progress against similarly-situated youth not in the program.
- *Funding Streams that Reduce Accountability*: The funding streams for youth programs affect their oversight. More than 300 youth projects received earmarked appropriations (not necessarily from an account in a federal youth program) in FY2003, totaling \$206.2 million. According to the report, earmarked projects do not have the same level of accountability as discretionary and mandatory programs. The report also raised concerns that programs in needy communities may be overlooked through the earmark process.

Congress has also examined challenges to coordinating programs targeted to certain groups of youth. In a May 2004 hearing, the Government Reform Committee examined redundancy and duplication in federal child welfare programs.⁹¹

Youth Build Transfer Act (P.L. 109-281)

The Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth identified several programs, including YouthBuild, that were located in a federal department whose mission does not provide a clear and compelling reason for locating them within that agency. As such, the task force recommended that YouthBuild be transferred from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to the U.S. Department of Labor because of DOL’s mission of administering workforce and training programs.⁹² As discussed above, the YouthBuild program provides educational services and job training in construction for low-income youth ages 16 to 24 who are not enrolled in school. On September 22, 2006 the YouthBuild Transfer Act (P.L. 109-281), authorizing the transfer of the program from HUD to DOL, was signed into law. The program is now funded under the Workforce Investment Act.

⁹¹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Government Reform, *Redundancy and Duplication in Federal Child Welfare Programs: A Case Study on the Need for Executive Reorganization Authority*, hearing, 108th Cong., 2nd sess., May 20, 2004 (Washington: GPO, 2004), available at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/chearings/108heat1.html>.

⁹² *White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth Final Report*, pp. 33-34.

Tom Osborne Federal Youth Coordination Act (P.L. 109-365)

In response to the concerns generally raised by the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, Congress passed the Tom Osborne Federal Youth Coordination Act (Title VIII of the Older Americans Act, P.L. 109-365), which created the Federal Youth Development Council and specified that it would be chaired by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The Council was authorized for FY2007 and FY2008, but was not ultimately established. Funds were not appropriated for these years. However, on February 7, 2008, President Bush signed Executive Order 13459 to establish an Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs, discussed below, to improve coordination of youth policy.⁹³

Although not explicitly stated in P.L. 109-365, the purpose of the legislation appeared to be twofold: to improve coordination across federal agencies that administer programs for vulnerable youth and to assist federal agencies with evaluating these programs. **Table 1** describes the duties of the Council that were discussed in the law to meet these two goals. Prior to the passage of the law, policymakers and advocates asserted that the council could help to improve policy effectiveness by reducing the duplication of effort and working at cross-purposes, while integrating distinct but reinforcing responsibilities among relatively autonomous agencies.⁹⁴ They argued that the council could improve accountability of various federal components by consolidating review and reporting requirements. Other duties of the council that are not listed in the table, include providing technical assistance to states to support a state-funded council for coordinating state youth efforts, at a state's request, and coordinating with other federal, state, and local coordinating efforts to carry out its duties.

The law specified that the council coordinate with three existing interagency bodies: the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, the Interagency Council on Homelessness, and the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (The legislation did not describe how the council should coordinate with these other bodies. For further information on the Coordinating Council, see below.) Further, the law required that the council provide Congress with an interim report within one year after the council's first meeting, as well as a final report not later than two years after the council's first meeting. The final report was to include (1) a comprehensive list of recent research and statistical reporting by various federal agencies on the overall well-being of youth; (2) the assessment of the needs of youth and those who serve youth; (3) a summary of the plan in coordinating to achieve the goals and objectives for federal youth programs; (4) recommendations to coordinate and improve federal training and technical assistance, information sharing, and communication among federal programs and agencies; (5) recommendations to better integrate and coordinate policies across federal, state, and local levels of government, including any recommendations the chair determines appropriate for legislation and administrative actions; (6) a summary of the actions taken by the council at the request of federal agencies to facilitate collaboration and coordination on youth serving programs and the results of those collaborations, if available; (7) a summary of the action the council has taken at

⁹³ Executive Order 13459. "Improving the Coordination and Effectiveness of Youth Programs." *Federal Register*, vol. 73 (February 7, 2008), pp. 8003-8005.

⁹⁴ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Select Education, *Coordination Among Federal Youth Development Programs*, hearing 109th Cong., 1st sess., July 12, 2005, statements of Rep. Tom Osborne and Marguerite W. Sallee, Alliance for Youth (Washington: GPO, 2005), available at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/chearings/109heat1.html>.

the request of states to provide technical assistance; and (8) a summary of the input and recommendations by disadvantaged youth, community-based organizations, among others.

Table I. Duties of the Federal Youth Development Council, by Goal

Goal: To Improve Coordination	Goal: To Assess Youth Programs
<p>—Ensure communication among agencies administering programs for disadvantaged youth;</p> <p>—Identify possible areas of overlap or duplication in the purpose and operation of programs serving youth and recommending ways to better facilitate the coordination and consultation among such programs;</p> <p>—Identify target populations of youth who are disproportionately at risk and assist agencies in focusing additional resources on such youth;</p> <p>—Assist federal agencies, at the request of one or more agencies, in collaborating on (1) model programs and demonstration projects focusing on special populations, including youth in foster care and migrant youth; (2) projects to promote parental involvement; and (3) projects that work to involve young people in service programs;</p> <p>—Solicit and document ongoing input and recommendations from (1) youth, especially youth in disadvantaged situations; (2) national youth development experts, researchers, parents, community-based organizations, foundations, business leaders, youth service providers, and teachers; and (3) state and local government agencies.</p>	<p>—In coordination with the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, assess (1) the needs of youth, especially those in disadvantaged situations, and those who work with youth; and (2) the quality and quantity of federal programs offering services, supports, and opportunities to help youth in their development;</p> <p>—Recommend quantifiable goals and objectives for federal programs to assist disadvantaged youth;</p> <p>—Make recommendations for the allocation of resources in support of such goals and objectives;</p> <p>—Develop a plan (that is consistent with the common indicators of youth well-being tracked by the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics) to assist federal agencies (at the request of one or more such agencies) coordinate to achieve quantifiable goals and objectives;</p> <p>—Work with federal agencies (1) to promote high-quality research and evaluation, identify and replicate model programs and promising practices, and provide technical assistance relating to the needs of youth; and (2) to coordinate the collection and dissemination of youth services-related data and research.</p>

Source: Created by the Congressional Research Service (CRS), on the basis of language in P.L. 109-365.

Executive Order 13459

On February 7, 2008, President Bush signed Executive Order 13459 to establish an Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs (hereinafter, Working Group). In the order, President Bush cited the success of the interagency collaboration that resulted from the Helping America’s Youth (HAY) initiative as the impetus for creating an Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs. HAY was a national initiative, led by Laura Bush, to promote positive youth development by raising awareness about the challenges facing youth and motivating caring adults to connect with youth through forums and an online resource.⁹⁵ This online resource, known as the Community Action Guide, sought to help communities assess their needs and resources and link them to effective programs to help youth. This tool was created in partnership with nine federal agencies.

The Working Group was convened in 2008. Pursuant to the executive order, the working group consists of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Labor; the Office of National Drug Control Policy; and the Corporation for National and Community Service. Many of the federal

⁹⁵ For additional information, see <http://www.helpingamericasyouth.gov/>.

career staff members involved in HAY participate in the Working Group. The primary functions of the working group, as specified in the executive order, include (1) identifying and engaging key government and private or nonprofit organizations that can play a role in improving the coordination and effectiveness of programs serving and engaging youth, such as faith-based and other community organizations; (2) developing a new federal website on youth, built upon HAY's Community Guide,⁹⁶ (3) encouraging all youth-serving federal and state agencies, communities, grantees, and organizations to adopt high standards for assessing program results, including through the use of rigorous impact evaluations, as appropriate; and (4) reporting to the President on its work and on the implementation of any recommendations arising from its work.

Congress has appropriated funds for the Working Group in one year since the group was established. The Working Group received \$1 million in FY2009 through the HHS appropriation to be used for soliciting input from young people, state children's cabinet directors, and nonprofit organizations on youth programs; developing an "overarching strategic plan for federal youth policy," and "recommendation to improve the coordination, effectiveness, and efficiency of programs affecting youth."⁹⁷ From May to December 2010, the Working Group convened listening sessions in 10 communities throughout the United States to solicit input from stakeholders, including youth, about the plan.⁹⁸ In August and October 2010, the Working Group held meetings, at HHS, to solicit information from the public on the strategic plan.⁹⁹ In December 2010, the Working Group published a draft of the strategic plan in the *Federal Register* and asked for public comments.¹⁰⁰ The Working Group has since developed a framework to guide development of the plan, which focuses on three overarching outcomes for youth up to the age of 24: health, safety, and wellness; school, family, and community engagement and connections; and education, training, employment, transitions, and readiness for careers and adulthood.¹⁰¹

Comparison of the Federal Youth Development Council and the Interagency Working Group

Major differences between the Federal Youth Development Council and the Interagency Working Group, as expressed in the law and executive order, appear to be their leadership structures, membership, and some of their duties. Under both the Federal Youth Development Council and Interagency Working Group, the HHS Secretary is to serve as chair. As part of the Working Group, the Secretary has the discretion to designate other agency heads as the chair and vice chair after two years, and biennially thereafter. Although the Federal Youth Development Council was

⁹⁶ The website has been established at <http://www.findyouthinfo.org>.

⁹⁷ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Division F of committee print to accompany the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (H.R. 1105), 111th Cong., 2nd sess. (Washington: GPO, 2009).

⁹⁸ For further information, see Working Group on Youth Programs, "Strategic Plan," http://www.findyouthinfo.gov/spotlight_strategicPlan.shtml.

⁹⁹ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, "Public Meeting To Solicit Input for a Strategic Plan for Federal Youth Policy," *75 Federal Register* 154, August 11, 2010; and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, "Public Meeting To Solicit Input for a Strategic Plan for Federal Youth Policy," *75 Federal Register* 190, October 1, 2010.

¹⁰⁰ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, "Input for a Strategic Plan for Federal Youth Policy," *75 Federal Register* 244, December 21, 2010.

¹⁰¹ For further information, see Working Group on Youth Programs, "Strategic Plan," http://www.findyouthinfo.gov/spotlight_strategicPlan.shtml.

authorized for a two-year period (FY2007 and FY2008), the executive order does not specify a date that the Working Group should be terminated.

The Development Council would have likely been funded through an appropriation to HHS, whereas the Working Group is funded by several agencies. Further, the authorization for the two entities identified distinct, but overlapping memberships. The Council was authorized to include representatives from outside organizations and groups, and the President would have been required to consult with Congress about these appointments. In contrast, the Working Group consists exclusively of federal staff. Finally, the two bodies have some distinct duties, as specified in the law and executive order. Unlike the Working Group, the Council was charged with assessing the needs of youth and those who work with youth to promote positive youth development; recommending quantifiable goals and objectives for youth-serving programs; and advising on the allocation of resources in support of these goals and objectives. And unlike the Council, the Working Group is directed to create a new federal website on youth that provides training to youth-serving entities and to develop and disseminate strategies to reduce the factors that put youth at risk.

Despite these differences, the functions of the Council and Working Group, as described in law and E.O. 13459, respectively, are similar. Both bodies were directed to improve coordination and collaboration among federal agencies. For example, the law specifies that one of the duties of the Council was to ensure communication among the agencies; to assist federal agencies in collaborating on model programs, such as those involving special populations and projects to promote parental involvement; and to coordinate with federal interagency entities, including the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Likewise, the Working Group is charged with identifying and promoting initiatives and activities that merit strong interagency collaboration because of their potential to offer cost-effective solutions, including mentoring, in concert with the Federal Mentoring Council. The Working Group is actively working with other partnerships as well.

The law and executive order also direct the two bodies to identify and disseminate information about promising youth programs. The law specifies that the Council should work with federal agencies to “promote high-quality research and evaluation, identify and replicate model programs and promising practices, and provide technical assistance relating to the needs of youth.” Similarly, the executive order directs the Working Group to encourage various levels of government and organizations to adopt “high standards for assessing program results ... so that effective practices can be identified and replicated.” The role of the Working Group’s website is to disseminate promising practices and to provide technical assistance to youth-serving organizations and partnerships.

Finally, the executive order appears broad enough to permit the Working Group to take on some of the functions that were specified for the Council, such as identifying target populations of youth who are disproportionately at risk for negative outcomes; supporting initiatives that target certain populations of youth, such as migrant youth or youth in foster care; and soliciting and documenting ongoing input and recommendations from youth, national youth development experts, researchers, community-based organizations, state and local governments, and other stakeholders.

Federal Initiatives to Improve Coordination

Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Coordinating Council (Council) on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention was established by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-415) and is administered by the Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The Council's primary functions are to coordinate federal programs and policies concerning juvenile delinquency prevention, unaccompanied juveniles, and missing and exploited children. The Council is led by the Attorney General and the Administrator of OJJDP and includes the heads of all the federal agencies that touch on these broad areas, including the Secretary of Health and Human Services; the Secretary of Labor; the Secretary of Education; the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy; the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service; and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization (now the Commissioner of Immigration and Customs Enforcement).

In recent years, the Council has broadened its focus to other at-risk youth. The Council is seeking to implement some of the recommendations made by the Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, including (1) improve coordination of mentoring programs; (2) develop a unified protocol for federal best practices clearinghouses; (3) build a rigorous and unified disadvantaged youth research agenda; (4) improve data collection on the well-being of families; (5) increase parents' involvement in federal youth programs; (6) target youth in public care; (7) target youth with many risk factors; and (8) expand mentoring programs to special target groups, among other recommendations.¹⁰²

Shared Youth Vision Initiative

In response to the recommendations made by the Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, the U.S. Departments of Education Health and Human Services, Justice, and Labor, and the Social Security Administration partnered to improve communication and collaboration across programs that target at-risk youth groups under an initiative called the "Shared Youth Vision." The agencies convened an Interagency Work Group and conducted regional forums in 16 states to develop and coordinate policies and research on the vulnerable youth population. Representatives from federal and state agencies in workforce development, education, social services, and juvenile justice have participated in the forums. The purpose of these forums was to create and implement plans to improve communication and collaboration between local organizations that serve at-risk youth. The department competitively awarded grants totaling \$1.6 million to these states to assist them in developing strategic plans to link their systems that serve youth. For example, Arizona is using this initiative to bring together state and county agencies that can assist youth exiting foster care or the juvenile justice system in two counties connect to education and employment services and supports.¹⁰³ The Department of Health and Human Services has funded a solutions desk,

¹⁰² U.S. Department of Justice, Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Report of Activities and Recommendations to Congress, 2001-2008*, September 2008, http://www.juvenilecouncil.gov/reports/1_13_2009/Final%20Council%20Report%202008—12%2030%2008%20.pdf.

¹⁰³ For additional information about the programs in each state, see <http://www.doleta.gov/ryf/Resources/TechnicalAssistanceForum.cfm>.

administered by the National Child Welfare Resource Center for Youth Development, to provide the 16 states a single point of access to information on federal resources available to assist them in implementing Shared Youth Vision activities.

Federal Mentoring Council¹⁰⁴

The chief executive officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service and the Commissioner of HHS's Family and Youth Services Bureau chair the Federal Mentoring Council ("Council"), which consists of the leadership teams of eight federal agencies with multiple youth-focused programs. The Council was created in 2006 to address the ways these agencies can combine resources and training and technical assistance to federally administered mentoring programs and to serve as a clearinghouse on federal mentoring. A national working group composed of leading mentoring experts and practitioners (including the chief executive officers of MENTOR, Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, the Boys and Girls Club, and America's Promise, among others) advises and shares effective mentoring practices with the Council. Since the Council was convened, it has met quarterly.

The Council's website, <http://www.federalmentoringcouncil.gov>, includes research from practitioners in the mentoring field and lists grant opportunities for mentoring. The Council does not have a designated funding source, although staff at HHS, CNCS, and the other agencies commit time to serving on the Council and carrying out its activities. When funding has been required to implement their initiatives, such as the website, member agencies contribute funding as they are able.

Child Welfare Partnerships

HHS's Administration for Children and Families (ACF), the agency that carries out most federal child welfare programs, has partnered with other agencies to focus on the mental health and educational needs of children in foster care. ACF is coordinating with the Centers on Medicare and Medicaid (CMS) and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), both agencies at HHS, to "support effective management" of prescription medication for children in foster care, and they have called on their state counterparts to do the same. Further, CMS, ACF, and SAMHSA convened state directors of child welfare, Medicaid, and mental health agencies in August 2012 to address use of psychotropic medications for children in foster care as well as the mental health needs of children who have experienced maltreatment. In a letter to states about their joint work, the three federal agencies said that "State Medicaid/CHIP agencies and mental health authorities play a significant role in providing continuous access to and receipt of quality mental health services for children in out-of-home care. Therefore it is essential that State child welfare, Medicaid, and mental health authorities collaborate in any efforts to improve health, including medication use and prescription monitoring structures in particular."¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ For additional information, see CRS Report RL34306, *Vulnerable Youth: Federal Mentoring Programs and Issues*, by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara.

¹⁰⁵ George Sheldon, Acting Assistant Secretary, ACF; Donald Berwick, Administrator, CMS; and Pamela Hyde, Administrator, SAMHSA, to "State Director," November 23, 2011, <http://www.childwelfare.gov/systemwide/mentalhealth/effectiveness/jointlettermeds.pdf>.

Separately, ACF has partnered with the Department of Education (ED) in an effort to improve the educational outcomes of youth in foster care. ACF and ED convened a meeting in 2011 with state child welfare, education, and juvenile court officials for every state, Washington, DC, and Puerto Rico. The purpose of the meeting was to encourage collaboration across these different systems as a way to ensure that youth are continuously enrolled in school and that schools are meeting the needs of these youth. The jurisdictions worked on action plans to implement strategies for collaboration, and they continue to implement these plans.¹⁰⁶

Partnerships for Youth Transition

HHS's Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) and ED's Office of Special Education are cosponsoring a program, that began in FY2003, to offer long-term support to young people between the ages of 14 and 25 with serious emotional disorders and emerging serious mental illnesses. The program is intended to assist youth transitioning to the adult system of medical care, while continuing to receive educational services. One of the program's goals is to develop models of comprehensive youth transition services that can be evaluated for their effectiveness.¹⁰⁷ An evaluation of the program suggests that it has contributed to positive outcomes for youth, particularly in the areas of education and employment.¹⁰⁸

Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SS/HS) Initiative¹⁰⁹

From FY1999 through the present, HHS, ED, and DOJ have provided joint grant funding for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative to reduce violence and drug abuse at schools (K-12) and in communities. Local education agencies—in partnership with local law enforcement, public mental health, and juvenile justice entities—apply for SS/HS funding. The initiative sponsors projects in schools and communities that 1) provide a safe school environment; 2) offer alcohol-, other drug -, and violence-prevention activities and early intervention for troubled students; 3) offer school and community mental health preventative and treatment intervention programs; 4) offer early childhood psychosocial and emotional development programs; 5) support and connect schools and communities; and 6) support safe-school policies.

Examples of programs for youth K through 12th grade include after-school and summer tutoring programs; recreational activities such as chess club; volunteering; and coordinated social service and academic activities for youth at risk of engaging in delinquent behavior, including mental health care services, peer mentoring, and parent workshops.

¹⁰⁶ For further information, see Hunter College, Silberman School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Permanency and Family Connections, "Child Welfare, Education, and the Courts: A Collaboration to Strengthen Educational Success of Children and Youth in Foster Care," http://www.nrcpfc.org/education_summit/index.html.

¹⁰⁷ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, SAMHSA, *Transition to Adulthood: SAMHSA Helps Vulnerable Youth*, SAMHSA News, vol. XI, no. 1 (2003).

¹⁰⁸ Mason G. Haber, Arun Karpur, Nicole Deschenes, and Hewitt B. Clark, *Predicting Improvement of Transitioning Youth People in the Partnerships for Youth Transition Initiative: Findings From a Multisite Demonstration*, *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, vol. 35, no. 4 (October 2008).

¹⁰⁹ For additional information, see U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration, "Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SSHS) Initiative," <http://www.sshs.samhsa.gov/>.

Drug-Free Communities Support Program¹¹⁰

The Drug-Free Communities Support Program is administered by SAMSHA and the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (which has entered into an agreement with OJJDP to manage the program on behalf of the agency). The program awards grants to community coalitions through a competitive grant award process. The program is intended to strengthen the capacity of the coalitions to reduce substance abuse among youth (and adults) and to disseminate timely information on best practices for reducing substance abuse.

Policies to Promote Positive Youth Development

Overview

Some youth advocates argue that expanding programs for youth and providing mechanisms to coordinate these programs should be part of a larger effort to improve youth outcomes. This effort builds on the positive youth development approach (discussed above) that views youth as assets, in contrast to deficit-based models which focus primarily on specific youth problems.

Federal legislation and initiatives have been framed through the youth development philosophy with the goal of providing resources and guidance to communities and youth-focused programs that engage young people in roles as full participants in the work place, community, and society at large. Major legislation with a positive youth approach has included the Youth Development Community Block Grant of 1995 (H.R. 2807/S. 673) and the Younger Americans Act of 2001 (H.R. 17/S. 1005), both of which did not pass out of committee.

Youth Development Community Block Grant of 1995 (H.R. 2807/S. 673)

The Youth Development Community Block Grant (YDCBG) of 1995 (H.R. 2807/S. 673) proposed to consolidate nearly two dozen federal youth programs administered by the U.S. Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice. The purpose of the legislation was to shift from a system of categorical programs that targeted the problems of certain sub-populations of youth (i.e., pregnant youth, youth abusing drugs) to one that promoted all aspects of youth development. At hearings on the legislation in the House and Senate, Members of Congress, community leaders, and youth advocates discussed the need to support comprehensive community services for youth. J.C. Watts, a co-sponsor of the legislation, testified:

Because high risk behaviors are often interrelated, programs must consider the overall development of individual youngsters rather than focusing on one problem in isolation. Our current system of narrowly defined, categorical programs is rather like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle scattered over a card table. The YDCBG puts these pieces together.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ For additional information, see Executive Office of the President, Office of National Drug Control Policy, <http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/dfc/>.

¹¹¹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, (continued...)

The YDCBG Act did not prescribe specific activities or program types for which the funds were to be used. Rather, the legislation would have required states to submit a plan to HHS that outlined their youth development priorities. Funding would have flowed to local community boards, which would have tailored local YDCBG programs to community needs, consistent with the goals of these plans. Funding from the block grant could only supplement, and not supplant, existing funds for youth development programs and activities.

The block grant was to be based on three equally weighted formula factors: the proportion of the nation's total youth (defined as ages 6 to 17) that reside in each state; proportion of the nation's poor youth (defined as youth from low-income families) that reside in each state; and the average incidence of juvenile crime during the most recent four-year period. This \$900 million proposed grant would have been funded through the programs that were to be eliminated, with a 10% overall reduction.

The legislation was referred out of committee in both the House and Senate, but was not taken up again.

Younger Americans Act of 2001 (H.R. 17/S. 1005)

The goal of the Younger Americans Act of 2001 (H.R. 17/S. 1005) was to create a national youth policy that would have funded a network of youth programs through a central funding source, based loosely on the framework of the Older Americans Act.¹¹² Similar to its predecessor, the YDCBGA, the Younger Americans Act sought to provide resources to youth consisting of (1) ongoing relationships with caring adults; (2) safe places with structured activities; (3) access to services that promote healthy lifestyles, including those designed to improve physical and mental health; (4) opportunities to acquire marketable skills and competencies; and (5) opportunities for community service and civic participation.

If passed, HHS would have distributed block grant funds to states according to a formula that accounted for their proportion of the nation's youth ages 10 to 19 and the proportion of youth receiving a free or reduced-price school lunch. States would have then distributed funds to local area agencies on youth, which were to be supervised by community boards comprised of youth, representatives of youth-serving organizations, representatives of local elected officials, parents, and leaders of social and educational institutions in the community. Local youth organizations could apply to the community service board for funding to carry out program activities such as character development and ethical enrichment activities; mentoring activities; provision and support of community youth centers; and nonschool hours, weekend, and summer programs and camps, among other activities. HHS would have also set aside funding for evaluations of these programs.

The Younger Americans Act proposed to fund the program at \$500 million the first year, increasing to \$2 billion in its fifth year. The legislation did not pass committee in the House or Senate.

(...continued)

Youth, and Families, *Youth Development*, hearing, 104th Cong., 1st sess., September 19, 1996.

¹¹² The Older Americans Act is the major vehicle for the delivery of social and nutritional services for older persons.

Conclusion

This report provided an overview of the vulnerable youth population and examined the federal role in supporting these youth. Although a precise number of vulnerable youth cannot be aggregated (and should not be, due to data constraints), these youth are generally concentrated among seven groups: youth “aging out” of foster care, runaways and homeless youth, juvenile justice-involved youth, immigrant youth and youth with limited English proficiency (LEP), youth with physical and mental disabilities, youth with mental disorders, and youth receiving special education. Each of these categories is comprised of youth with distinct challenges and backgrounds; however, many of these youth share common experiences, such as unstable home and neighborhood environments, coupled with challenges in school. Without protective factors in place, vulnerable youth may have difficulty transitioning to adulthood. Detachment from the labor market and school—or disconnectedness—is perhaps the single strongest indicator that the transition has not been made adequately. Despite the negative forecast for the employment and education prospects of vulnerable youth, some youth experience positive outcomes in adulthood. Youth who develop strong cognitive, emotional, and vocational skills, among other types of competencies, have greater opportunities to reach their goals. Advocates for youth promote the belief that all youth have assets and can make valuable contributions to their communities despite their challenges.

The federal government has not developed a single overarching policy or program to assist vulnerable youth, like the Older Americans Act program for the elderly. Since the 1960s, a number of programs, many operating in isolation from others, have worked to address the specific needs (i.e., vocational, educational, social services, juvenile justice and delinquency prevention, and health) of these youth. More recently, policymakers have taken steps toward a more comprehensive federal response to the population. The YouthBuild Transfer Act of 2006 moved the YouthBuild program from HUD to DOL because the program is more aligned with DOL’s mission of administering workforce and training programs. Also in 2006, the Tom Osborne Youth Coordination Act was passed to improve coordination across federal agencies that administer programs for vulnerable youth and to assist federal agencies with evaluating these programs. In February 2008, President Bush signed an executive order establishing a federal Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs. Other coordinating efforts, such as the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and Shared Youth Vision initiative, may have the resources and leadership to create a more unified federal youth policy, albeit the Council has a primary focus on juvenile justice-involved youth.

In addition to the Federal Youth Coordination Act, the few youth-targeted acts over the past ten years have not passed or have passed without full implementation. The unfunded Claude Pepper Young Americans Act of 1990 sought to increase coordination among federal children and youth agencies by creating a Federal Council on Children, Youth, and Families that would have streamlined federal youth programs and advised the president on youth issues. Similarly, federal legislation reflecting a youth development philosophy, with the goal of providing resources to youth and engaging young people in their communities, has not been reported out of committee. The 1995 Youth Development Community Block Grant and 2001 Younger Americans Act would have provided grant funding to the states with the greatest concentrations of low-income youth to provide resources, such as mentors and opportunities for community service and civic participation.

Though federal legislation targeted at vulnerable young people has not been passed or implemented in recent years, Executive Order 13459 and current collaborations (Share Youth Vision and the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention) appear to have begun addressing, even in small measure, the needs of this population.

Appendix. Federal Youth Programs and Relevant CRS Reports and Experts

Table A-1. Federal Programs for Vulnerable Youth

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Job Training and Workforce Development					
Job Corps	Workforce Investment Act of 1998, as amended 29 U.S.C. §2881 et seq.	To assist eligible youth who need and can benefit from an intensive workforce development program, operated in a group setting in residential and nonresidential centers, to become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens.	FY2006: \$1.6 billion FY2007: \$1.6 billion FY2008: \$1.6 billion FY2009: \$1.7 billion (plus \$250,000 under P.L. 111-5) FY2010: \$1.7 billion FY2011: \$1.7 billion FY2012: \$1.7 billion	U.S. Department of Labor	Youth ages 16 to 21 (with exceptions) who are either low-income, basic skills deficient, a school dropout, homeless, a runaway, or a foster child, a parent or an individual who requires additional education, vocational training, or intensive counseling and related assistance to participate successfully in regular schoolwork or to secure and hold employment.
WIA Youth Activities	Workforce Investment Act of 1998, as amended 29 U.S.C. §2851 et seq.	To provide services to eligible youth seeking assistance in achieving academic and employment success, including the provision of mentoring, support services, training, and incentives.	FY2006: \$941 million FY2007: \$941 million FY2008: \$924 million FY2009: \$924 million (plus \$1.2 billion under P.L. 111-5) FY2010: \$924 million FY2011: \$824 million FY2012: \$824 million	U.S. Department of Labor	Youth ages 14 to 21 who are low-income and either deficient in basic literacy skills, a school dropout, homeless, a runaway, a foster child, pregnant, a parent, an offender, or an individual who requires additional assistance to complete an educational program, or to secure and hold employment.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
YouthBuild	Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, as amended 29 U.S.C. §2918a	To enable disadvantaged youth to obtain the education and employment skills while expanding the supply of permanent affordable housing for homeless individuals and low-income families.	FY2006: \$62 million FY2007: \$62 million FY2008: \$59 million FY2009: \$70 million (plus \$50 million under P.L. 111-5) FY2010: \$102.5 million FY2011: \$79.7 million FY2012: \$79.7 million	U.S. Department of Labor	Youth ages 16 to 24 who are a member of a low-income family, in foster care, a youth offender, have a disability, are a child of incarcerated parents, or a migrant youth or a school dropout (with exceptions).
Youth Conservation Corps	Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970, as amended 16 U.S.C. §1701 et seq.	To further the development and maintenance of the natural resources by America's youth, and in so doing to prepare them for the ultimate responsibility of maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.	No specific amount appropriated or requested. The Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies generally directs the four agencies to allocate no less than a particular amount to Youth Conservation Corps activities (funding generally ranges from \$1.5 million to \$2 million per agency).	U.S. Department of the Interior (Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Agency, and the National Park Service) and U.S. Department of Agriculture (Forest Service)	All youth 15 to 18 years of age (targets economically disadvantaged, at-risk).

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Education					
Title I-A: Education for the Disadvantaged	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §6301 et. seq.	To improve the educational achievement of educationally disadvantaged children and youth, and to reduce achievement gaps between such pupils and their more advantaged peers.	FY2006: \$12.7 billion FY2007: \$12.8 billion FY2008: \$13.9 billion FY2009: \$14.5 billion (Plus \$10.0 billion under P.L. 111-5) FY2010: \$14.5 billion FY2011: \$14.5 billion FY2012: \$14.5 billion FY2013 Request: \$14.5 billion	U.S. Department of Education	Educationally disadvantaged children and youth, in areas with concentrations of children and youth in low-income families.
Title I-C: Migrant Education	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §6391	To support high quality and comprehensive educational programs for migrant children and youth.	FY2006: \$387 million FY2007: \$387 million FY2008: \$380 million FY2009: \$395 million FY2010: \$395 million FY2011: \$394 million FY2012: \$393 million FY2013 Request: \$393 million	U.S. Department of Education	Migrant children and youth.
Title I-D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youths Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At Risk	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §6421-6472 et seq.	To meet the special educational needs of children in institutions and community day school programs for neglected and delinquent children and children in adult correctional institutions.	FY2006: \$50 million FY2007: \$50 million FY2008: \$49 million FY2009: \$50 million FY2010: \$50 million FY2011: \$50 million FY2012: \$50 million FY2013 Request: \$50 million	U.S. Department of Education	Abused/neglected youth, delinquent youth, and juvenile offenders.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Title I-H: School Dropout Prevention	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §6551 et seq.	To provide for school dropout prevention and reentry and to raise academic achievement levels.	FY2006: \$5 million FY2007: \$0 FY2008: \$0 FY2009: \$0 FY2010: \$50 million FY2011: \$49 million FY2012: \$49 million FY2013 Request: \$0 (Similar activities would be supported under a new program, College Pathways and Accelerated Learning, that would consolidate funds for School Dropout Prevention and other programs. The Administration proposes funding the new program at \$81 million.)	U.S. Department of Education	Youth at risk of dropping out of school districts with dropout rates higher than their state's average.
Title III: English Language Acquisition	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §6801 et seq.	To ensure that limited English proficient children (LEP) and youth, including immigrant children and youth, attain English proficiency.	FY2006: \$669 million FY2007: \$669 million FY2008: \$700 million FY2009: \$730 million FY2010: \$750 million FY2011: \$734 million FY2012: \$732 million FY2013 Request: \$732 million	U.S. Department of Education	Children and youth with limited English proficiency.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Title IV-A: Safe and Drug Free Schools, Part A, Subpart 1, State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §§7111-7118	To prevent violence in and around schools and to strengthen programs that prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs, involve parents, and are coordinated with related federal, state, and community efforts and resources.	FY2006: \$347 million FY2007: \$347 million FY2008: \$295 million FY2009: \$295 million FY2010: \$0 FY2011: \$0 FY2012: \$0 FY2013 Request: \$0	U.S. Department of Education	All youth; at-risk youth; school dropouts.
Title IV-B: 21 st Century Learning Centers	Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §8241 et seq.	To create community learning centers that help students meet state and local educational standards, to provide supplementary educational assistance, and to offer literacy and other services to the families of participating youth.	FY2006: \$981 million FY2007: \$981 million FY2008: \$1.1 billion FY2009: \$1.1 billion FY2010: \$1.2 billion FY2011: \$1.2 billion FY2012: \$1.2 billion FY2013 Request: \$1.2 billion	U.S. Department of Education	Students who attend high-poverty and low-performing schools.
Title VII: Education of Homeless Children	McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987, as amended 42 U.S.C. §§11431-11435	To provide activities for and services to ensure that homeless children enroll in, attend, and achieve success in school.	FY2006: \$62 million (plus \$5 million for hurricane supplemental) FY2007: \$62 million FY2008: \$64 million (plus \$15 million for disaster supplemental) FY2009: \$65 million (plus \$70 million under P.L. 111-5) FY2010: \$65 million FY2012: \$65 million FY2013 Request: \$65 million	U.S. Department of Education	Homeless children and youth in elementary and secondary schools, homeless preschool children, and the parents of homeless children.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B Grant to States	Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, as amended (currently known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) 20 U.S.C. §1400 et seq.	To provide a free appropriate education to all children with disabilities.	FY2006: \$10.6 billion FY2007: \$10.8 billion FY2008: \$11.0 billion FY2009: \$11.5 billion (plus \$11.3 billion under P.L. 111-5) FY2010: \$11.5 billion FY2011: \$11.5 billion FY2012: \$11.6 billion FY2013 Request: \$11.6 billion	U.S. Department of Education	School-aged children and youth with disabilities, up to age 21 (pursuant to state law).
Migrant High School Equivalency Program and College Assistance Migrant Programs	Higher Education Act, as amended 20 U.S.C. §1070d-2	To provide academic and support services to help eligible migrant youth obtain their high school equivalency certificate and move on to employment or enrollment in higher education.	FY2006: \$34 million FY2007: \$34 million FY2008: \$33 million FY2009: \$34 million FY2010: \$37 million FY2011: \$37 million FY2012: \$37 million FY2013 Request: \$37 million	U.S. Department of Education	Migrant youth ages 16 to 21.
Upward Bound (includes Regular Upward Bound and Upward Bound Math and Science and excludes Veterans Upward Bound, which serves veterans)	Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §1070a-13	To increase the academic performance of eligible enrollees so that such persons may complete secondary school and pursue postsecondary educational programs.	FY2006: \$299 million FY2007: \$301 million FY2008: \$347 million FY2009: \$350 million FY2010: \$349 million FY2011: \$340 million FY2012: \$310 million FY2013 Request: \$840 million (part of larger funding for TRIO programs)	U.S. Department of Education	Low-income individuals and potential first generation college students between ages 13 and 19, and have completed the 8 th grade but have not entered the 12 th grade (with exceptions).

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Educational Opportunity Centers	Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §1070a-16	To provide information to prospective postsecondary students regarding available financial aid and academic assistance, and help them apply for admission and financial aid.	FY2006: \$48 million FY2007: \$47 million FY2008: \$47 million FY2009: \$47 million FY2010: \$47 million FY2011: \$48 million FY2012: \$47 million FY2013 Request: \$840 million (part of larger funding for TRIO programs)	U.S. Department of Education	At least two-thirds of participants in any project must be low-income students who would be first-generation college goers. They must also be at least 19 years old.
Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement	Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §1070a-15	To provide grants to institutions of higher education to prepare participants for doctoral studies through involvement in research and other scholarly activities.	FY2006: \$42 million FY2007: \$45 million FY2008: \$45 million FY2009: \$47 million FY2010: \$48 million FY2011: \$46 million FY2012: \$36 million FY2013 Request: \$840 million (part of larger funding for TRIO programs)	U.S. Department of Education	Low-income college students or underrepresented students enrolled in an institution of higher education.
Student Support Services	Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §1070a-14	To improve college students' retention and graduation rates, and improve the transfer rates of students from two-year to four-year colleges.	FY2006: \$271 million FY2007: \$272 million FY2008: \$284 million FY2009: \$302 million FY2010: \$301 million FY2011: \$291 million FY2012: \$291 million FY2013 Request: \$840 million (part of larger funding for TRIO programs)	U.S. Department of Education	At least two-thirds of participants in any project must be either disabled individuals or low-income, first-generation college goers. The remaining participants must be low-income, or first-generation college goers, or disabled. Not less than one-third of the disabled participants must be low-income as well.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Talent Search	Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §1070a-12	To identify disadvantaged youth with potential for postsecondary education; to encourage them in continuing in and graduating from secondary school and in enrolling in programs of postsecondary education; to publicize the availability of student financial aid; and to increase the number of secondary and postsecondary school dropouts who reenter an educational program.	FY2006: \$150 million FY2007: \$143 million FY2008: \$143 million FY2009: \$142 million FY2010: \$142 million FY2011: \$139 million FY2012: \$136 million FY2013 Request: \$840 million (part of larger funding for TRIO programs)	U.S. Department of Education	Project participants must be between 11 and 27 years old (exceptions allowed), and two-thirds must be low-income individuals who are also potential first-generation college students.
Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR-UP)	Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended 20 U.S.C. §1070a-21-1070a-28	To provide financial assistance to low-income individuals to attend an institution of higher education and support eligible entities in providing counseling, mentoring, academic support, outreach, and supportive services to students at risk of dropping out of school.	FY2006: \$303 million FY2007: \$303 million FY2008: \$303 million FY2009: \$313 million FY2010: \$323 million FY2011: \$303 million FY2012: \$302 million FY2013 Request: \$840 million (part of larger funding for TRIO programs)	U.S. Department of Education	Low-income students and students in high-poverty schools.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Juvenile Justice					
State Formula Grants	Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. §5631-33	To increase the capacity of state and local governments to support the development of more effective education, training, research, and other programs in the area of juvenile delinquency and programs to improve the juvenile justice system (e.g., community-based services for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency, group homes, and halfway houses).	FY2006: \$80 million FY2007: \$79 million FY2008: \$74 million FY2009: \$75 million FY2010: \$75 million FY2011: \$62 million FY2012: \$40 million FY2013 Request: \$70 million	U.S. Department of Justice	Delinquent youth, juvenile offenders, and at-risk youth.
Juvenile Accountability Block Grant	21 st Century Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2002 42 U.S.C. 3796ee	To strengthen the juvenile justice system, including, but not limited to, developing, implementing, and administering graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders; building, expanding, renovating, or operating temporary or permanent juvenile correction, detention, or community corrections facilities; and hiring juvenile court judges and other court personnel.	FY2006: \$50 million FY2007: \$49 million FY2008: \$52 million FY2009: \$55 million FY2010: \$55 million FY2011: \$46 million FY2012: \$30 million FY2013 Request: \$30 million	U.S. Department of Justice	Delinquent youth, juvenile offenders, gang members, and at-risk youth.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Gang Free Schools and Communities—Community Based Gang Intervention	<i>Currently Unauthorized.</i> This program was repealed by P.L. 107-273 but funding continues to be appropriated.	To prevent and reduce the participation of juveniles in the activities of gangs that commit crimes (e.g., programs to prevent youth from entering gangs and to prevent high school students from dropping out of school and joining gangs).	FY2006: \$25 million FY2007: \$25 million FY2008: \$19 million FY2009: \$10 million FY2010: \$10 million FY2011: \$8 million FY2012: \$5 million FY2013 Request: \$0	U.S. Department of Justice	At-risk youth, delinquent youth, juvenile offenders, gang members, and youth under age 22.
Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP)	<i>Currently Unauthorized.</i> This program was repealed by P.L. 107-273 but funding continues to be appropriated.	To develop, implement, and pilot test mentoring strategies and/or programs targeted for youth in the juvenile justice system and in foster care, and youth who have reentered the juvenile justice system (e.g., Big Brothers/Big Sisters program).	FY2006: \$10 million FY2007: \$10 million FY2008: \$70 million FY2009: \$70 million FY2010: \$100 million FY2011: \$83 million FY2012: \$78 million FY2013 Request: \$58 million	U.S. Department of Justice	Delinquent youth, juvenile offenders, and foster youth.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
State Challenge Activities, Part E	Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. §5665	To provide states with funding to carry out programs that will develop, test, or demonstrate promising new initiatives that may prevent, control, or reduce juvenile delinquency.	FY2006: \$106 million FY2007: \$105 million FY2008: \$89 million FY2009: \$82 million FY2010: \$91 million FY2011: \$0 FY2012: \$0 FY2013 Request: \$0	U.S. Department of Justice	At-risk youth, delinquent youth, juvenile offenders, gang members, and at-risk youth.
Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Program	Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. §4781-85	To fund delinquency prevention programs and activities for at-risk youth and juvenile delinquents, including, among other things, substance abuse prevention services; child and adolescent health and mental health services; leadership and youth development services; and job skills training.	FY2006: \$65 million FY2007: \$64 million FY2008: \$38 million FY2009: \$63 million FY2010: \$65 million FY2011: \$4 million FY2012: \$20 million FY2012 Request: \$40 million	U.S. Department of Justice	Delinquent youth, juvenile offenders, at-risk youth.
Social Services					
Foster Care	Social Security Act of 1935 (Sections 471 and 472), as amended 42 USC §§671, 672	To assist states in providing foster care for eligible children, including maintenance payments (i.e. room and board) and case planning and management for children and youth in out-of-home placements.	FY2006: \$4.7 billion FY2007: \$4.8 billion FY2008: \$4.6 billion FY2009: \$4.7 billion FY2010: \$4.7 billion FY2011: \$4.5 billion FY2012: \$4.3 billion FY2012 Request: \$4.4 billion	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Federal support available for children and youth who are removed from low-income families (meeting specific criteria) for their own protection. (However, federal protections related to case planning and management are available to all children/youth who are in foster care.)

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Chafee Foster Care Independence Program	Social Security Act of 1935 (Section 477), as amended 42 U.S.C. §677	To assist states and localities in establishing and carrying out programs designed to assist foster youth likely to remain in foster care until age 18 and youth ages 18-21 who have left the foster care system in making the transition to self-sufficiency.	FY2006: \$140 million FY2007: \$140 million FY2008: \$140 million FY2009: \$140 million FY2010: \$140 million FY2011: \$140 million FY2012: \$140 million FY2013 Request: \$140 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Current or former foster care youth under age 21.
Chafee Foster Care Independence Program Education and Training Vouchers	Social Security Act of 1935, (Section 477), as amended 42 U.S.C. §677	To make education and training vouchers available for youth who have aged out of foster care or who have been adopted from the public foster care system after age 16.	FY2006: \$46 million FY2007: \$46 million FY2008: \$45 million FY2009: \$45 million FY2010: \$45 million FY2011: \$45 million FY2012: \$45 million FY2013 Request: \$45 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Older foster care youth and youth adopted from foster care at age 16 or older.
Basic Center Program	Runaway and Homeless Youth Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. §5701 et seq.	To establish or strengthen locally controlled community-based programs outside of the law enforcement, child welfare, mental health, and juvenile justice systems that address the immediate needs of runaway and homeless youth and their families.	FY2006: \$48 million FY2007: \$48 million FY2008: \$53 million FY2009: \$53 million FY2010: \$54 million FY2011: \$54 million FY2012: \$54 million FY2013 Request: \$54 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Runaway and homeless youth and their families.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Transitional Living Program for Older Homeless Youth	Runaway and Homeless Youth Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. §5701 et seq.	To establish and operate transitional living projects for homeless youth, including pregnant and parenting youth.	FY2006: \$40 million FY2007: \$40 million FY2008: \$43 million FY2009: \$44 million FY2010: \$44 million FY2011: \$44 million FY2012: \$44 million FY2013 Request: \$44 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Runaway and homeless youth ages 16-21.
Street Outreach Program	Runaway and Homeless Youth Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. §5701 et seq.	To provide grants to nonprofit agencies to provide street-based services to runaway, homeless, and street youth, who have been subjected to, or are at risk of being subjected to sexual abuse, prostitution, or sexual exploitation.	FY2006: \$15 million FY2007: \$15 million FY2008: \$17 million FY2009: \$17 million FY2010: \$18 million FY2011: \$18 million FY2012: \$18 million FY2013 Request: \$18 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Runaway and homeless youth who live on or frequent the streets.
Court Appointed Special Advocates	Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended 42 U.S.C. §13011-13014	To ensure every victim of child abuse and neglect receives the services of a court appointed advocate.	FY2006: \$12 million FY2007: \$12 million FY2008: \$13 million FY2009: \$15 million FY2010: \$15 million FY2011: \$12 million FY2012: \$4.5 million FY2013 Request: \$0	U.S. Department of Justice	Abused and neglected children and youth.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Children's Advocacy Centers	Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended 42 U.S.C. §13001-13004	To establish advocacy centers to coordinate multi-disciplinary responses to child abuse and to provide training and technical assistance to professionals involved in investigating and prosecuting child abuse, and to support the development of Children's Advocacy Centers on multi-disciplinary teams.	FY2006: \$15 million FY2007: \$15 million FY2008: \$16 million FY2009: \$20 million FY2010: \$23 million FY2011: \$19 million FY2012: \$18 million FY2013 Request: \$0	U.S. Department of Justice	Abused and neglected youth.
Public Health					
Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act Youth Suicide Prevention Program	Public Health Service Act of 1974, as amended 42 USC § 290aa et seq., 290bb et seq.	To provide grants to states and college campuses for youth suicide prevention activities.	FY2006: \$23 million FY2007: \$23 million FY2008: \$34 million FY2009: \$35 million FY2010: \$35 million FY2011: \$42 million FY2012: \$42 million FY2013 Request: \$34 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth under age 25.
Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances	Public Health Service Act of 1974, as amended 42 USC §290ff	To provide community-based systems of care for children and adolescents with a serious emotional disturbance and their family.	FY2006: \$104 million FY2007: \$104 million FY2008: \$102 million FY2009: \$108 million FY2010: \$121 million FY2011: \$118 million FY2012: \$117 million FY2013 Request: \$89 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth under age 22 with a serious emotional disorders.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
National Child Traumatic Stress Network	Children's Health Act of 2000 (Section 582(d)) 42 USC §290aa	To create a national network that develops, promotes, and disseminates information related to a wide variety of traumatic events.	FY2006: \$29 million FY2007: \$29 million FY2008: \$33 million FY2009: \$38 million FY2010: \$41 million FY2011: \$41 million FY2012: \$46 million FY2013 Request: \$46 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Children and youth who have experienced traumatic events.
Strategic Prevention Framework State Infrastructure Grant	Public Health Service Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. 290bb	To provide funding to states for infrastructure and services that implement a five-step strategy for preventing substance and alcohol abuse among youth.	FY2006: \$106 million FY2007: \$105 million FY2008: \$103 million FY2009: \$110 million FY2010: \$112 million FY2011: \$110 million FY2012: \$110 million FY2013 Request: \$60 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth at risk of using and abusing drugs.
Assertive Adolescent and Family Treatment Program (Family Centered Substance Abuse Treatment Grants for Adolescents and their Families)	Public Health Service Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. 290bb-2	To provide substance abuse treatment practices to adolescents and their families using previously proven effective family-centered methods.	FY2006: \$5 million FY2007: \$10 million FY2008: \$10 million FY2009: \$10 million FY2010: \$14 million FY2011: \$14 million FY2012: \$10 million FY2013 Request: \$10 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth using drugs.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking Act (STOP Act)	Public Health Service Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. 290bb-25b	To provide effective substance treatment and reduce delinquent activity.	FY2007: \$840,000 FY2008: \$5 million FY2009: \$7 million FY2010: \$8 million FY2011: \$7 million FY2012: \$7 million FY2013 Request: \$7 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth using alcohol.
Community-Based Abstinence Education (replaced in FY2010 with the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program, discussed below)	Social Security Act of 1935 (Section 1110 using the definitions contained in Section 510(b)(2)), as amended 42 U.S.C. §710	To provide project grants to public and private institutions for community-based abstinence education project grants.	FY2006: \$109 million FY2007: \$109 million FY2008: \$109 million FY2009: \$95 million FY2010: \$0 FY2011: \$0 FY2012: \$0 FY2013 Request: \$0	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth ages 12 to 18.
Abstinence Education Program	Social Security Act of 1935 (Section 510), as amended 42 U.S.C. §710	To provide formula grant funding for states to provide abstinence education and, at the option of the state, where appropriate, mentoring, counseling, and adult supervision to promote abstinence from sexual activity.	FY2006: \$50 million FY2007: \$50 million FY2008: \$50 million FY2009: \$38 million FY2010: \$50 million FY2011: \$50 million FY2012: \$50 million FY2013 Request: \$0	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth likely to bear children outside of marriage.
Abstinence Education Program	Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2012 (P.L. 112-74)	To provide competitive grants to public or private entities for abstinence education as defined by 42 U.S.C. §710.	FY2006: \$0 FY2007: \$0 FY2008: \$0 FY2009: \$0 FY2010: \$0 FY2011: \$0 FY2012: \$5 million FY2013 Request: \$0	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth likely to bear children outside of marriage.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program	Omnibus Appropriations Act, FY2010 (P.L. 111-117)	To provide competitive project grants and contracts to public and private entities for medically accurate and age appropriate programs that reduce teen pregnancy.	FY2010: \$110 million FY2011: \$105 million FY2012: \$105 million FY2013 Request: \$105 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth ages 12 to 18.
Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Projects	Public Health Services Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. §3002	To provide project grants to establish innovative, comprehensive, and integrated approaches to the delivery of care services for pregnant and parenting adolescents with primary emphasis on adolescents who are under age 17.	FY2006: \$30 million FY2007: \$30 million FY2008: \$30 million FY2009: \$30 million FY2010: \$17 million FY2011: \$12 million FY2012: \$0 FY2013 Request: \$0 (Funding for the Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Projects and Research Grants is combined.)	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Pregnant and parenting youth, non-pregnant youth and their families.
Adolescent Family Life Research Grants	Public Health Services Act of 1974, as amended 42 U.S.C. §3002	To provide project grants to encourage and support research projects and dissemination activities concerning the societal causes and consequence of adolescent sexual activity, contraceptive use, pregnancy, and child rearing.	FY2006: \$30 million FY2007: \$30 million FY2008: \$30 million FY2009: \$30 million FY2010: \$17 million FY2011: \$12 million FY2012: \$0 FY2012 Request: \$0 (Funding for the Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Projects and Research Grants is combined.)	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Pregnant and parenting youth, non-pregnant youth and their families.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP)	The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (P.L. 111-148) 42 U.S.C. §713	To provide formula grant funding for states to educate youth on both abstinence and contraception for the prevention of pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections, including HIV/AIDS.	FY2010: \$75 million FY2011: \$75 million FY2012: \$75 million FY2013 Request: \$75 million	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	Youth under the age of 21.
National and Community Service					
AmeriCorps State and National	National Community Service Act, as amended 42 U.S.C. §12571 et seq., 42 U.S.C. §12061 et seq.	To address the educational, public safety, human, or environmental needs through services that provide a direct benefit to the community.	FY2006: \$265 million FY2007: \$265 million FY2008: \$257 million FY2009: \$271 million (plus \$89 million under P.L. 111-5) FY2010: \$373 million FY2011: \$349 million FY2012: \$344 million FY2013 Request: \$345 million	Corporation for National and Community Service	Youth up to age 25 with exceptional or special needs, or who are economically disadvantaged and for whom one or more of the following apply: 1) out-of-school, including out-of-school youth who are unemployed; 2) in or aging out of foster care; 3) limited English proficiency; 4) homeless or have run away from home; 5) at-risk of leaving school without a diploma; and 6) former juvenile offenders or at risk of delinquency.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
AmeriCorps VISTA	Domestic Volunteer Service Act, as amended 42 U.S.C. § 4951, 42 U.S.C. § 12061 et seq.	To bring low-income individuals and communities out of poverty through programs in community organizations and public agencies.	FY2006: \$95 million FY2007: \$95 million FY2008: \$94 million FY2009: \$96 million (plus \$65 million under P.L. 111-5) FY2010: \$99 million FY2011: \$99 million FY2012: \$95 million FY2013 Request: \$95 million	Corporation for National and Community Service	Youth up to age 25 with exceptional or special needs, or who are economically disadvantaged and for whom one or more of the following apply: 1) out-of-school, including out-of-school youth who are unemployed; 2) in or aging out of foster care; 3) limited English proficiency; 4) homeless or have run away from home; 5) at-risk to leave school without a diploma; and 6) former juvenile offenders or at risk of delinquency.
AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps	National Community Service Act, as amended 42 U.S.C. § 12611 et seq., 42 U.S.C. § 12061 et seq.	To address the educational, public safety, environmental, human needs, and disaster relief through services that provide a direct benefit to the community.	FY2006: \$37 million FY2007: \$27 million FY2008: \$24 million FY2009: \$28 million FY2010: \$29 million FY2011: \$29 million FY2012: \$32 million FY2013 Request: \$30 million	Corporation for National and Community Service	Youth up to age 25 with exceptional or special needs, or who are economically disadvantaged and for whom one or more of the following apply: 1) out-of-school, including out-of-school youth who are unemployed; 2) in or aging out of foster care; 3) limited English proficiency; 4) homeless or have run away from home; 5) at risk of leaving school without a diploma; and 6) former juvenile offenders or at risk of delinquency.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Learn and Serve America	National Community Service Act, as amended 42 U.S.C. §12521-12547, 42 §U.S.C. 121561 et seq.	To involve students in community service projects that address the educational, public safety, human, or environmental needs in ways that benefit both the student and community.	FY2006: \$37 million FY2007: \$37 million FY2008: \$37 million FY2009: \$37 million FY2010: \$40 million FY2011: \$0 FY2012: \$0 FY2013 Request: \$0	Corporation for National and Community Service	Youth up to age 25 with exceptional or special needs, or who are economically disadvantaged and for whom one or more of the following apply: 1) out-of-school, including out-of-school youth who are unemployed; 2) in or aging out of foster care; 3) limited English proficiency; 4) homeless or have run away from home; 5) at risk of leaving school without a diploma; and 6) former juvenile offenders or at risk of delinquency.
Senior Corps Foster Grandparents	Domestic Volunteer Service Act, as amended 42 U.S.C. §5011 et seq.	To provide service to children with special or exceptional needs.	FY2006: \$111 million FY2007: \$111 million FY2008: \$109 million FY2009: \$109 million FY2010: \$111 million FY2011: \$111 million FY2013: \$111 million FY2013 Request: \$111 million	Corporation for National and Community Service	Youth up to age 25 with exceptional or special needs, or who are economically disadvantaged and for whom one or more of the following apply: 1) out-of-school, including out-of-school youth who are unemployed; 2) in or aging out of foster care; 3) limited English proficiency; 4) homeless or have run away from home; 5) at risk of leaving school without a diploma; and 6) former juvenile offenders or at risk of delinquency.

Program	Authorizing Legislation and U.S. Code Citation	Objective(s) of Program	FY2006 -FY2012 Appropriations (including funding under the Recovery Act, P.L. 111-5) and President's FY2013 Request (all numbers rounded)	Agency with Jurisdiction	Target At-Risk Youth Population
Senior Corps RSVP	Domestic Volunteer Service Act, as amended 42 U.S.C. 5001	To involve seniors in community service projects that address the educational, public safety, human, or environmental needs in ways that benefit both the senior and community.	FY2006: \$60 million FY2007: \$60 million FY2008: \$59 million FY2009: \$59 million FY2010: \$63 million FY2011: \$50 million FY2012: \$50 million FY2013 Request: \$50 million	Corporation for National and Community Service	Youth up to age 25 with exceptional or special needs, or who are economically disadvantaged and for whom one or more of the following apply: 1) out-of-school, including out-of-school youth who are unemployed; 2) in or aging out of foster care; 3) limited English proficiency; 4) homeless or have run away from home; 5) at risk of leaving school without a diploma; and 6) former juvenile offenders or at risk of delinquency.

Source: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service.

Table A-2. Relevant CRS Reports and Analyst Contact Information

Issue Area(s)	Corresponding CRS Report(s)	Analyst	Contact Information
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B Grants to States National and Community Service Programs	CRS Report R41833, <i>The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B: Key Statutory and Regulatory Provisions</i> , by Ann Lordeman CRS Report RL33931, <i>The Corporation for National and Community Service: Overview of Programs and FY2012 Funding</i> , by Abigail B. Rudman and Ann Lordeman	Ann Lordeman	alordeman@crs.loc.gov x7-2323
Vulnerable Youth and Youth Programs Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and Education and Training Voucher Program Runaway and Homeless Youth Program (Basic Center, Transitional Living, and Street Outreach Programs) Missing and Exploited Children's Program Mentoring Children of Prisoners Workforce Investment Act youth programs	CRS Report RL34499, <i>Youth Transitioning from Foster Care: Background and Federal Programs</i> , by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara CRS Report RL33785, <i>Runaway and Homeless Youth: Demographics and Programs</i> , by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara CRS Report RL34050, <i>Missing and Exploited Children: Background, Policies, and Issues</i> , by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara CRS Report RL34306, <i>Vulnerable Youth: Federal Mentoring Programs and Issues</i> , by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara CRS Report R40929, <i>Vulnerable Youth: Employment and Job Training Programs</i> , by Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara	Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara	afernandes@crs.loc.gov x7-9005
Title VII: Education of Homeless Children	CRS Report RL30442, <i>Homelessness: Targeted Federal Programs and Recent Legislation</i> , coordinated by Libby Perl	Gail McCallion	gmccallion@crs.loc.gov x7-7758
Upward Bound Education Opportunity Centers Student Support Services Talent Search Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs	CRS Report RL31622, <i>Trio and GEAR UP Programs: Status and Issues</i> , by Jeffrey J. Kuenzi (archived)	Cassandra Dortch	cdortch@crs.loc.gov x7-0376
Workforce Development	CRS Report RL33687, <i>The Workforce Investment Act (WIA): Program-by-Program Overview and Funding of Title I Training Programs</i> , by David H. Bradley	David H. Bradley	dbradley@crs.loc.gov x7-7352

Issue Area(s)	Corresponding CRS Report(s)	Analyst	Contact Information
Juvenile Justice	CRS Report RS22655, <i>Juvenile Justice Funding Trends</i> , by Kristin M. Finklea CRS Report RL33947, <i>Juvenile Justice: Legislative History and Current Legislative Issues</i> , by Kristin M. Finklea	Kristin M. Finklea	kfinklea@crs.loc.gov x7-6259
Title I: Education for the Disadvantaged Title I-D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youths Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At Risk Migrant Education Migrant High School Equivalency Program Title III: English Language Acquisition	CRS Report RL33960, <i>The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as Amended by the No Child Left Behind Act: A Primer</i> , by Rebecca R. Skinner	Rebecca R. Skinner	rskinner@crs.loc.gov x7-6600
Community-Based Abstinence Education Abstinence Education Program Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Projects Personal Responsibility Education Program Adolescent Family Life Research Grants	CRS Report RS20873, <i>Reducing Teen Pregnancy: Adolescent Family Life and Abstinence Education Programs</i> , by Carmen Solomon-Fears CRS Report RS20301, <i>Teenage Pregnancy Prevention: Statistics and Programs</i> , by Carmen Solomon-Fears	Carmen Solomon-Fears	csolomonfears@crs.loc.gov x7-7306
Foster Care and Child Welfare Court Appointed Special Advocates Program Children's Advocacy Centers	CRS Report RL31242, <i>Child Welfare: Federal Program Requirements for States</i> , by Emilie Stoltzfus CRS Report RL31242, <i>Child Welfare: Federal Program Requirements for States</i> , by Emilie Stoltzfus	Emilie Stoltzfus	estoltzfus@crs.loc.gov x7-2324

Source: Table prepared by the Congressional Research Service.

Author Contact Information

Adrienne L. Fernandes-Alcantara
Specialist in Social Policy
afernandes@crs.loc.gov, 7-9005

Acknowledgments

Carmen Solomon-Fears, Rebecca Skinner, and Erin Bagalman contributed to the tables in this report.