

PROPOSED LIVELIHOOD PROGRAM FOR PAROLE AND PROBATION CLIENTS OF DAGUPAN CITY

BRIGETTE JESSICA B. FLORES

Master in Education
Major in Technology and Livelihood Education

Abstract

Livelihood stability is a critical factor in reintegration for individuals under community-based corrections. Yet, parole and probation clients often face persistent employment insecurity, limited market-aligned skills, and stigma-related barriers that undermine their capacity to sustain lawful income. This study assessed the livelihood conditions of parole and probation clients in Dagupan City. It developed a locally grounded livelihood program framework based on identified needs, barriers, and feasible livelihood tracks. Using a descriptive-developmental mixed-methods design, quantitative data were gathered through a structured survey administered to 30 parole and probation clients (n = 30).

In contrast, qualitative inputs from purposively selected stakeholders were used to validate and contextualize the results. Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, and weighted mean) were applied to summarize respondent profiles, determine priority livelihood supports, and identify the most experienced livelihood barriers. Thematic analysis was used to integrate stakeholder insights and strengthen program relevance. Results showed that respondents were within productive age groups, predominantly male, and generally characterized by limited educational attainment and dependence on informal or unstable income sources. The most highly needed livelihood supports were job placement and employment referral, market-aligned skills training, and access to start-up capital. Major barriers included a lack of capital, limited availability of stable jobs, and stigma or discrimination associated with criminal justice involvement. Feasibility assessment indicated that construction/trades upgrading, retail and service work, and driving/delivery services were the most viable livelihood tracks for the target population. Based on these findings, the study proposes a structured livelihood program framework that integrates employability services, skills upgrading, enterprise support, and enabling mechanisms to strengthen reintegration outcomes and improve livelihood security among parole and probation clients.

Keywords: Parole; Probation; Livelihood Program; Reintegration; Employment Referral; Skills Training; Dagupan City

1. Introduction

Community-based corrections—including probation and parole—are widely recognized as essential components of modern criminal justice systems because they enable the supervision of justice-involved individuals in the community while supporting rehabilitation, reintegration, and public safety. In contrast to purely custodial approaches, community supervision is designed not only to monitor compliance with legal conditions but also to facilitate gradual reentry into society through structured support and behavior change interventions. International guidance frames community-based measures as part of a balanced, rights-respecting correctional strategy that reduces unnecessary incarceration while strengthening individuals' capacity to reintegrate as productive members of society (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights [OHCHR], 1990). This approach is consistent with contemporary perspectives on desistance and reintegration, which emphasize that long-term crime reduction is most likely when

supervision and supportive services operate together in a coordinated manner (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime [UNODC], 2018).

The importance of reintegration support is especially evident given the socioeconomic realities faced by parolees and probationers. Many individuals placed under community supervision return to environments characterized by poverty, unstable employment, limited access to services, and exposure to criminogenic pressures. These conditions can undermine both reintegration and compliance because clients may struggle to meet basic needs while also fulfilling supervision requirements such as reporting, attending mandated sessions, and maintaining consistent behavior change routines. UNODC (2018) emphasizes that reintegration is strengthened when community supervision is paired with practical services that address real-life barriers—including employment, livelihood, housing, and access to basic social support. This framing suggests that supervision alone is rarely sufficient to facilitate stable reentry, particularly when structural disadvantages remain unaddressed.

Among the most decisive reintegration factors is access to lawful and stable income. Employment or viable self-employment supports reintegration not only because it provides financial resources, but because it stabilizes daily routines, strengthens prosocial identity formation, increases legitimate social ties, and reduces reliance on informal survival strategies that may increase risk. Employment also helps individuals maintain compliance by covering the practical costs of community supervision, such as transportation to reporting offices, obtaining documentation, and participating in required programs. The evidence base on reentry repeatedly identifies employment as a central lever for improving post-release stability, while also acknowledging that justice-involved populations face layered barriers to labor market participation (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration [DOLE-ETA], 2019).

However, employment instability among parole and probation clients is often rooted in a combination of limited human capital, disrupted education, weak attachment to the formal labor market, and constrained opportunity networks. Many justice-involved individuals enter supervision without marketable credentials, with minimal work history, or with skills that do not align with current labor market demand. As a result, they are more likely to depend on informal work, intermittent jobs, or precarious self-employment, which can lead to recurring instability even when individuals are motivated to work (DOLE-ETA, 2019). Workforce development guidance similarly stresses that skills training is most effective when it is demand-driven and linked to real opportunities, rather than delivered as generic training detached from employer needs and market realities (World Bank, 2025).

A particularly persistent employment barrier is stigma and discrimination linked to criminal justice involvement. Even when individuals possess the skills and motivation to work, employers may still hesitate to hire them because of perceived risk, reputational concerns, or biased assumptions about reliability. Evidence syntheses on reentry employment highlight that this stigma creates a structural barrier that often prevents job-ready candidates from accessing stable work (DOLE-ETA, 2019). International human rights reporting reinforces this point by stressing that discrimination and exclusion can significantly obstruct reintegration outcomes for persons released from detention or placed under non-custodial measures (OHCHR, 1990). These conditions imply that reintegration-oriented livelihood interventions must incorporate strategies that strengthen employer engagement, build supported pathways to work, and reduce stigma-based exclusion.

Beyond stigma, clients may face practical barriers that affect both access to livelihood opportunities and the ability to sustain participation in training or employment. These barriers often include a lack of start-up capital, limited access to tools or equipment, transportation constraints, documentation issues, and competing family responsibilities. Such constraints are widely recognized in livelihood program implementation literature, which shows that training programs frequently underperform when enabling supports—such as capital inputs, toolkits, post-training

coaching, or market linkages—are missing. As a result, effective livelihood interventions typically require more than skills development; they require a pathway model that helps participants convert training into real income generation (World Bank, 2025). For justice-involved clients, this is even more critical, as unstable livelihood conditions can impede both reintegration progress and compliance capacity.

Livelihood interventions are therefore increasingly viewed as legitimate reintegration mechanisms because they address structural barriers that disproportionately affect marginalized groups. In development and social policy contexts, livelihood programs are used to improve access to productive assets, expand employable skills, strengthen enterprise readiness, and connect beneficiaries to opportunities for decent work. These approaches align with reintegration guidance that emphasizes the need for coordinated post-release services and community-based measures that respond to the practical needs of justice-involved individuals (UNODC, 2018). Likewise, evidence on employment-centered reentry programming suggests that job readiness, job matching, placement supports, and coordinated service pathways are crucial elements of successful reintegration strategies (DOLE-ETA, 2019).

Within this broader context, developing a livelihood program proposal for parole and probation clients in Dagupan City is warranted, as it operationalizes global reintegration principles into a localized, implementation-ready framework. While international and national frameworks articulate the value of non-custodial measures, effective community reintegration depends heavily on local conditions: the structure of the local economy, the availability of training providers, the accessibility of employment referral mechanisms, the strength of institutional partnerships, and the lived realities of clients under supervision. International standards, such as the Tokyo Rules, emphasize not only the legitimacy of non-custodial measures but also the importance of community involvement and safeguards that support rehabilitation and reintegration (OHCHR, 1990). UNODC (2018) similarly notes that reintegration outcomes are shaped by the availability of practical services that reduce barriers and enable stable reintegration. These insights suggest that localities must design reintegration supports grounded in their economic and institutional contexts rather than relying solely on general policy principles.

Dagupan City provides a relevant context for livelihood program development, as it is an economically active urban center with commercial, service-oriented, and trade-related opportunities that may support employment or microenterprise pathways. At the same time, parole and probation clients in Dagupan may experience distinct reintegration barriers compared to the general population, such as supervision-linked time constraints, stigma-related exclusion, and limited access to formal job opportunities. Without localized evidence, livelihood programs risk becoming misaligned with client readiness and local market realities, resulting in low participation, weak completion, or limited conversion of training into income. Workforce development guidance underscores that training effectiveness depends on relevance and labor-market linkage, suggesting that programs should be designed through local opportunity mapping and stakeholder coordination (World Bank, 2025).

The need for localized diagnostics is especially significant for parole and probation clients because their livelihoods are closely tied to reintegration outcomes that matter both to individual rehabilitation and to public safety. Economic instability may increase stress, undermine compliance, and reduce clients' ability to sustain prosocial routines. Reintegration frameworks emphasize that preventing recidivism and supporting successful reentry require coordinated interventions that address both individual needs and structural barriers, rather than relying solely on supervision (UNODC, 2018). Employment-focused evidence reviews similarly highlight that justice-involved individuals benefit from structured pathways that connect them to real job opportunities, supported by barrier reduction and service integration (DOLE-ETA, 2019).

Accordingly, the present study addresses a practical, evidence-based gap by proposing a livelihood program for parole and probation clients in Dagupan City, grounded in local needs and

feasibility conditions. The study is anchored on the premise that livelihood stability is not merely an economic outcome. Still, a reintegration mechanism that supports compliance, reduces vulnerability, and strengthens the prospects of long-term desistance. By assessing client profiles, identifying livelihood-related needs and barriers, and mapping feasible livelihood tracks based on readiness and local opportunity, the study aims to develop a program framework that integrates market-aligned skills development with employability services, enterprise support, and enabling mechanisms such as capital assistance, tool provision, documentation support, and partnership coordination. Such a program model aligns with international guidance emphasizing community-based reintegration supports (UNODC, 2018) and with workforce development evidence highlighting the importance of connecting training to real opportunities through structured pathways (World Bank, 2025).

Ultimately, a livelihood program tailored to parole and probation clients in Dagupan City can contribute to broader social and governance objectives. For clients, the program can strengthen income stability and improve their capacity to comply with supervision obligations. For supervising offices and local stakeholders, it can provide a structured reintegration tool that complements monitoring with practical support. For the community, livelihood stability can reduce marginalization and strengthen public safety by supporting lawful participation and reducing exposure to criminogenic risks. In this sense, livelihood programming becomes a strategic reintegration investment—one that must be locally grounded, evidence-informed, and designed not as a single training event, but as a coordinated pathway toward sustained economic participation.

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-developmental research design anchored in a mixed-methods approach. The descriptive component was used to systematically document and quantify the socio-demographic profile, livelihood conditions, and livelihood-related needs and barriers of parole and probation clients in Dagupan City. Quantitative data were gathered primarily through structured survey responses and were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, and weighted means to provide an evidence-based picture of participants' characteristics and livelihood circumstances.

The developmental component of the design focused on translating empirical findings into an output-oriented intervention, specifically the formulation of a proposed livelihood program framework for parole and probation clients. In this phase, the results of the needs assessment served as the foundation for identifying feasible livelihood tracks and developing a structured program proposal aligned with participants' readiness and local opportunity contexts.

To strengthen interpretation and program relevance, qualitative inputs (e.g., stakeholder insights and contextual understanding of reintegration constraints) were incorporated to validate and contextualize the quantitative findings. This mixed-methods integration enhanced the study's ability to produce a program proposal that is both data-driven and responsive to real-world reintegration conditions.

2.2 Participants

The study consisted primarily of parole and probation clients in Dagupan City who were under active community supervision during the data-gathering period. These clients served as the main respondents of the research and provided the core quantitative data through the administration of a structured survey questionnaire. A total of 30 parole and probation clients ($n = 30$) participated as survey respondents, allowing the study to generate descriptive information about their socio-demographic characteristics, livelihood conditions, and livelihood-related needs

and barriers. Participants were selected based on their availability and relevance to the study objectives, and only those residing within Dagupan City and currently under supervision were included. Individuals outside the locale, those no longer under probation or parole supervision, and persons in custodial settings were not part of the study population.

In addition to the primary respondents, the study also included selected stakeholders to support the qualitative component of the research and strengthen the contextual grounding of the findings. These secondary participants, selected through purposive sampling, included supervising personnel and other relevant individuals or representatives from institutions who could provide insights into livelihood implementation and reintegration support. Their participation helped validate and enrich the interpretation of the survey results, ensuring that the resulting livelihood program proposal was both evidence-based and responsive to practical, local reintegration conditions.

2.3 Instrumentation

The study employed researcher-developed instruments to capture both quantitative and qualitative evidence for a livelihood program proposal for parole and probation clients in Dagupan City. For the quantitative component, the primary instrument was a structured survey administered to parole and probation clients. The questionnaire was used to gather data on respondents' socio-demographic profiles, livelihood status, and perceived livelihood needs and barriers, which were later summarized using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, and weighted means.

For the qualitative component, the study also utilized stakeholder input instruments, such as a guide for key informant interviews and/or focused discussions, to obtain contextual insights from selected supervising personnel and other relevant stakeholders. These qualitative inputs helped interpret the survey findings. They strengthened the feasibility of the proposed livelihood program by incorporating practical considerations for implementation, partnership building, and client support mechanisms.

2.4 Data Analysis

The study used a combination of quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures consistent with its descriptive-developmental mixed-methods design. For the quantitative data, responses from the structured survey questionnaire were organized, tabulated, and analyzed using descriptive statistics. Specifically, the study employed frequency counts and percentages to summarize respondents' socio-demographic characteristics and livelihood conditions. At the same time, weighted means were used to determine the extent of identified livelihood needs and perceived barriers. These statistical procedures allowed the researcher to present an evidence-based profile of parole and probation clients and to rank or prioritize livelihood concerns based on the respondents' reported experiences.

For the qualitative data, inputs gathered from selected stakeholders through key informant interviews and/or focused discussions were examined using thematic analysis. This involved reviewing responses, identifying recurring patterns, and clustering related statements into themes relevant to reintegration challenges, livelihood feasibility, and program implementation considerations. The qualitative themes were then used to validate and enrich the interpretation of the quantitative findings, ensuring that the proposed livelihood program was not only statistically grounded but also aligned with practical, real-world conditions and stakeholder perspectives within the local setting.

3. Results

The results of the study showed that the parole and probation clients in Dagupan City (n = 30) were largely within the economically productive age groups, with the highest proportion

belonging to the 26–35 age bracket (33.3%), followed by those aged 36–45 (26.7%) and 46–55 (20.0%). The respondents were predominantly male (73.3%), and many were married (43.3%) or single (36.7%), indicating that a substantial portion of the clients likely carried family responsibilities that could influence training participation and livelihood priorities. In terms of educational attainment, the largest share were high school graduates (33.3%), followed by those at the high school level (23.3%) and the college level (23.3%), with smaller proportions at the elementary level and college graduate status. Skills backgrounds were concentrated in construction-related skills (26.7%) and retail/service work (20.0%), with additional skills in food preparation (16.7%), driving/delivery (16.7%), and smaller groups reporting sewing/tailoring and basic computer skills. Importantly, the income profile reflected livelihood vulnerability, as most respondents relied on informal wage employment (30.0%), self-employment (23.3%), and occasional/seasonal work (16.7%), while only a smaller portion reported formal wage employment (16.7%) and a few had no income at all, reflecting broad income instability.

Regarding livelihood needs, the study found that the most strongly prioritized support was job placement and employment referral assistance (WM = 3.47, *Highly Needed*), indicating that respondents considered direct access to employment opportunities as a primary requirement for livelihood improvement. This was followed closely by skills training aligned with local jobs/markets (WM = 3.40, *Highly Needed*) and access to start-up capital or livelihood assistance (WM = 3.33, *Highly Needed*), showing that respondents viewed both employability improvement and financial capability as necessary to sustain lawful income. Other supports such as tools or starter kits (WM = 3.20), financial literacy (WM = 3.13), entrepreneurship coaching (WM = 3.07), market linkage (WM = 3.03), and documentation support (WM = 2.97) were also rated within the *Needed* range, reinforcing that respondents did not only need training but also enabling supports that would allow them to sustain income generation after interventions.

In terms of barriers, the results indicated that the most highly experienced constraints were lack of capital or start-up funds (WM = 3.50, *Highly Experienced*), limited availability of stable jobs (WM = 3.37, *Highly Experienced*), and stigma or discrimination due to criminal justice involvement (WM = 3.30, *Highly Experienced*). These findings suggest that even when clients are motivated to work, structural and social barriers may limit their ability to access stable employment or initiate livelihood activities. Other experienced obstacles included lack of tools/equipment (WM = 3.17), transportation constraints (WM = 3.07), inadequate educational attainment/skills mismatch (WM = 3.03), and lack of required documents (WM = 2.97), with family responsibilities also affecting attendance and participation (WM = 2.70). Overall, the barrier profile emphasized that livelihood interventions must address both resource constraints and access barriers to produce sustainable outcomes.

Finally, the feasibility assessment of livelihood tracks—based on client readiness and local economic opportunities—showed that the most feasible and priority tracks for Dagupan City were Construction/Trades Upgrading (Overall Feasibility = 4.15, Rank 1), Retail and Service Work (Overall = 4.00, Rank 2), and Driving/Delivery Services (Overall = 3.95, Rank 3). These tracks were followed by Food Preparation and Baking (Overall = 3.80, Rank 4) and microenterprise options such as Vending (Overall = 3.70, Rank 5) and Fish/Food Value-Chain Microenterprise (Overall = 3.60, Rank 6). Lower-ranked but still feasible tracks included Basic Digital Work (Overall = 3.40, Rank 7) and Sewing/Tailoring Services (Overall = 3.15, Rank 8), which were considered more appropriate for selected participants and would require stronger resource support. These results collectively supported the need for a locally grounded livelihood program that prioritizes high-feasibility employment tracks while providing enterprise and specialized options supported by enabling services.

4. Discussion

The findings of the study underscore that livelihood insecurity remains a central reintegration challenge among parole and probation clients in Dagupan City. The participant profile indicates that most respondents were in their prime working years and predominantly male, with many reporting limited educational attainment and focusing on trades, retail/service work, and food-related tasks. This pattern is consistent with reentry and workforce evidence showing that justice-involved populations often enter community supervision with disrupted schooling, limited formal work history, and uneven access to market-aligned credentials—factors that constrain formal employment entry and push individuals into informal or unstable work arrangements (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration [DOL-ETA], 2019). In the present study, this vulnerability was reflected in the respondents' reliance on informal wage work, self-employment, and occasional/seasonal work, with only a minority holding formal employment. These conditions suggest that parole and probation clients may be attempting to sustain reintegration through income streams that are inherently unstable and thus insufficient for long-term compliance and desistance.

A key contribution of the study lies in the clear prioritization of livelihood supports. Respondents identified job placement and employment referrals as the most needed forms of assistance, followed by skills training aligned with local market opportunities and access to start-up capital. This ranking is notable because it suggests that participants do not primarily view training as an isolated solution; instead, they view livelihood improvement as a pathway that must connect them directly to opportunities and resources. This aligns with international reintegration guidance that emphasizes the importance of coordinated post-release support systems—particularly those that facilitate access to employment, services, and social supports to reduce the risk of relapse into offending (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime [UNODC], 2018). It also reflects broader development evidence that skills initiatives are most effective when they are demand-driven, connected to employers, and designed around employment outcomes rather than training completion alone (World Bank, 2020).

The barrier results reinforce why referral and capital support emerged as major priorities. The most highly experienced constraints were lack of start-up funds, limited availability of stable jobs, and stigma or discrimination linked to criminal justice involvement. These findings are consistent with international and U.S.-based reentry evidence showing that justice-involved individuals face structural and social barriers to employment, including employer hesitation, legal restrictions in some contexts, and persistent stigma that can exclude otherwise employable candidates (DOL-ETA, 2019). In practical terms, stigma underscores the importance of intermediary mechanisms such as job matching, employer partnerships willing to hire justice-involved individuals, and structured referral arrangements that make hiring less risky and more predictable for employers. Likewise, the prominence of capital barriers underscores that enterprise-oriented livelihood tracks—such as vending, value-chain microenterprise, or service-based self-employment—cannot be implemented effectively without access to start-up inputs, toolkits, and post-training coaching. This observation aligns with workforce and skills development guidance, which emphasizes that training must be paired with enabling supports to translate into sustainable income generation (World Bank, 2020).

Taken together, the needs and barriers indicate that the proposed livelihood program should be conceptualized as a reintegration pathway rather than a single intervention. The Tokyo Rules, which provide international standards for non-custodial measures, emphasize that community-based measures should promote rehabilitation and involve the community in the treatment and reintegration of offenders (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights [OHCHR], 1990). The study's findings support this direction by demonstrating that parole and probation clients require community-linked support systems that connect them to job opportunities, reduce exclusion, and provide practical assistance. In this sense, livelihood

programming can serve as a reinforcement mechanism for supervision: stable livelihoods improve clients' capacity to meet supervision obligations and strengthen their ability to build prosocial routines, which are central to longer-term reintegration success (UNODC, 2018).

The feasibility analysis further strengthens the programmatic implications by identifying livelihood tracks that align with both participants' skill clusters and local economic realities. Construction/trades upgrading ranked as the most feasible track, followed by retail/service work and driving/delivery services. These tracks are consistent with respondents' reported skill backgrounds and with the labor-market logic that, in many urban Philippine settings, the construction and service sectors provide accessible entry points for semi-skilled workers. Importantly, the high feasibility of construction/trades upgrading suggests that a well-designed program could focus on certification, safety training, and skills upgrading linked with actual contractors or construction firms. Likewise, retail/service work feasibility implies the potential for job placement partnerships with malls, supermarkets, logistics operations, and other service-sector employers—especially when supported by pre-employment orientation, employer engagement, and stigma-reduction mechanisms. Such interventions align with employment reentry evidence, which emphasizes the importance of structured partnerships and integrated support services to improve job access (DOL-ETA, 2019).

At the same time, the feasibility of food preparation, vending, and value-chain microenterprise pathways highlights the importance of enterprise support models—particularly for clients who may be unable to secure formal employment due to discrimination or limited openings. The study's barrier findings, however, suggest that enterprise tracks must incorporate start-up capital, access to tools, market linkages, and coaching; otherwise, they risk becoming aspirational but non-operational. This is consistent with global skills and livelihood policy evidence, which notes that training outcomes improve when programs link beneficiaries to real markets and provide post-training support that enables sustained engagement and income generation (World Bank, 2020).

Overall, the study supports a livelihood program model that integrates: (a) job placement and referral mechanisms, (b) market-aligned skills upgrading, (c) start-up assistance for enterprise pathways, and (d) enabling supports such as tools, documentation support, financial literacy, and coaching. These components collectively respond to both the needs and barriers articulated by the participants. Moreover, grounding the program in locally feasible tracks increases the likelihood that training and support services will translate into measurable livelihood outcomes rather than remain stand-alone capacity-building activities. Such an approach aligns with UNODC's reintegration guidance, which emphasizes that reintegration is strengthened when community supervision is linked to services that address real-life risks and needs, especially employment and livelihood stability (UNODC, 2018).

In conclusion, the results of the study suggest that a single factor does not drive livelihood insecurity among parole and probation clients in Dagupan City, but rather an interaction of human capital limitations, capital constraints, limited stable job opportunities, and stigma-related exclusion. Addressing these constraints requires a reintegration-oriented livelihood program that is both evidence-based and locally grounded. The study's proposed livelihood tracks provide a strong foundation for such a program by identifying realistic employment and enterprise pathways that can be strengthened through partnerships, enabling supports, and sustained coaching. In line with the Tokyo Rules and UNODC guidance, livelihood programming can be positioned as a strategic reintegration investment—one that strengthens not only economic participation, but also community safety and long-term desistance through stability, inclusion, and structured support systems (OHCHR, 1990; UNODC, 2018).

References

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (1990). *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (The Tokyo Rules)*. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/united-nations-standard-minimum-rules-non-custodial-measures>

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2018). *Introductory handbook on the prevention of recidivism and the social reintegration of offenders*. https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/18-02303_ebook.pdf

U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. (2019). *Supporting reentry employment and success: A summary of the evidence for adults and young adults (ETAOP 2019–11)*. <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ETA/publications/ETAOP2019-11%20REO%20Supporting%20Reentry%20Employment%20RB090319.pdf> (DOL)

World Bank. (2025). *Skills development*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/skillsdevelopment>

World Bank. (2020). *Demand-driven skills training and results-based contracting: Lessons for youth employment programs*. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/245201585887181276/pdf/Demand-Driven-Skills-Training-and-Results-Based-Contracting-Lessons-for-Youth-Employment-Programs.pdf>