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Executive Summary

The Santa Clara County Opportunity Youth Partnership (OYP) was launched in 2013 to create stronger educational and career pathways for “Opportunity Youth”—youth and young adults ages 16-24 who are disengaged from work and education. With the goal of improving results for all Opportunity Youth in Santa Clara County, the OYP is prioritizing those young people who face particular barriers to success because they have been engaged in the foster care or juvenile justice system, have experienced homelessness, or are pregnant or parenting. Many of these young people have also been disconnected from school at some point in their lives.

In December 2014, OYP began collecting detailed data on young people served by OYP partner organizations to better understand the needs of these young people, how OYP partner organizations can improve coordination to help youth achieve self-sufficiency, and to measure progress toward educational and employment goals. It has continued to collect updated data on these youth for three subsequent rounds, the most recent of which took place in April 2016.

This report is a follow-up assessment of the Opportunity Youth cohort from the first two years of the OYP initiative’s data collection period. It describes the status of education and employment attainment of young people that were served by Design, Implementation and Services Committee (DISC) member organizations from December 2014 to April 2016; attempts to quantify the degree of connectivity of those young people across different DISC member organizations; and examines the extent to which progress toward short and long term goals occurred over a seventeen-month period (December 2014 to April 2016).

Since December 2014, OYP partners have collectively reported on over 1,500 foster, justice-engaged, pregnant or parenting, and homeless youth and young adults across Santa Clara County (1,281 unduplicated youth). By Round 4, 40 percent of the people reported in Rounds 1 and 2 could be matched to Round 4 records. Results from the matched cohort between the first two rounds and the fourth round show an 11 percentage point increase in high school completion, an 8 percentage point increase in postsecondary enrollment, and an 11-point increase in youth employment (including internships).

Overall, 92 percent of the matched cohort made progress in some way along their educational and employment pathways by either maintaining their educational enrollment or work experiences, attaining higher levels of education, re-enrolling in school, or starting new work experiences.

Percentage of Matched Cohort that Showed Progress Between Rounds 1/2 and Round 4

![Percentage of Matched Cohort that Showed Progress Between Rounds 1/2 and Round 4](image)

Note: All percentages are based on a denominator of 378, the entire matched cohort sample.
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A Note of Thanks From Kids in Common

What gets measured gets done. The success of this collective impact initiative is directly tied to our ability, as a community, to identify the outcomes that matter most for Opportunity Youth, hold ourselves accountable to tracking them over time, and make use of that data to learn and move the needle. Over the past two years, through hard work, collaboration, and compromise the partners that are the Opportunity Youth Partnership have begun to measure the outcomes that matter most for Opportunity Youth in Santa Clara County. Kids in Common has been privileged to support our CBO community in moving this work forward. We are inspired by the bold leap our partners have taken to build a better system of supports for our most disconnected youth and young adults.

Addressing complex social problems requires more than good intentions. Shared measurement is one of the five conditions required for successful collective impact. In community after community, over and over again, by both anecdote and emerging research from the field, we learn that shared measurement forms the bedrock of collective impact. The rigorous accountability and the fearless transparency shared measurement fosters are the lifeblood of this work. Collective impact begins by arriving at a common understanding and definition of the problem. It moves forward with stakeholders tackling all parts of a problem together, synchronizing individual efforts, and coming together as a system. And it culminates in a shared dedication to finding new ways to work together in pursuit of a common agenda. Collective impact asks us and allows us to re-imagine the definitions of success and renew our commitment to moving young people toward durable self-sufficiency. Beneath all of this, undergirding the move towards game-changing results, is a system of shared measurement aligned to the outcomes that matter most.

Collective impact, and shared measurement in particular, requires tremendous investments of time, energy, and effort. It requires time to meet, to develop trusting relationships, and to complete the tedious tasks of data collection and entry. Not every organization starts in the same place, and this work requires the courage to examine individual practices, the will to steadily nurture a commitment to continual improvement, and the patience to stay invested as fellow collaborators work through individual challenges.

These organizations are working together not because of financial rewards (because there are none in the near term), but because they are not satisfied with the status quo. Our partners know it is our systems that are disconnected, not the youth. In this work, they see an opportunity to make things right. Our partners know the potential each youth holds—a potential that is too often subjugated to our policies and procedures—and commit to nurturing that potential into maturity. And while their work is with individual youth, our partners understand that we need to work together to design a better system that makes certain every young person can achieve success in education and career, and achieve true self-sufficiency. This work, together, is how we change the odds and change the game for opportunity youth.

Kids in Common knows that success will not be achieved without the commitment of time and resources by our partners. We appreciate these organizations for daring to believe that we can and must do better for our youth and young adults. For this, we thank them and look forward to our continued work together.
Introduction

The Santa Clara County Opportunity Youth Partnership (OYP) was launched in 2013 to create stronger educational and career pathways for “Opportunity Youth”—youth and young adults ages 16–24 who are disconnected from work and education. These youth have economic and social value to our community, and by bolstering their chances to succeed in education and obtain gainful employment, we provide a skilled workforce to local business and industry and strengthen our economy and community.

With the goal of improving results for all Opportunity Youth in Santa Clara County, the OYP is prioritizing young people who face particular barriers to success because they have been engaged in the foster care or juvenile justice system, have experienced homelessness, or are pregnant or parenting. Many of these youth have also been disconnected from school at some point in their lives.

Kids In Common, a program of Planned Parenthood Mar Monte, serves as the backbone organization for OYP’s collective impact model. Through this collective impact framework, OYP expects to build a movement across Santa Clara County that will increase awareness about OY, improve practice and build the capacity of service providers, align and integrate programs, and engage employers to offer career options to OY.

More than 35 governmental agencies, education institutions, community-based organizations and workforce development agencies are part of the Santa Clara County Opportunity Youth Partnership. Within OYP there are two administrative bodies that guide and implement the partnership’s work. The first of these is the OYP Executive Committee, a group comprised of administrators from five OYP partner organizations. The Executive Committee meets monthly to monitor the progress of OYP and to provide guidance to OYP leadership and its broader membership.

The second group is the OYP Design, Implementation and Services Committee (DISC), which consists of representatives from fifteen community-based organizations that work directly with Opportunity Youth. The DISC meets monthly to focus on issues specific to the collective impact model and to build a robust data collection and measurement system.

The DISC’s work is focused heavily on OYP’s commitment to ensure that the 16-24 year old Opportunity Youth they serve will complete high school, obtain the postsecondary education they need, and develop pathways to career employment and self-sufficiency. Through the efforts described above, OYP intends to create a robust network of youth-serving organizations, educational institutions, and employers that, collectively, will serve to expand pathways to success for young people.

GOALS OF OYP

The long-term objective of OYP is to help young people become self-sufficient adults. Specifically, this means they will have the education and job skills they need to obtain steady, career employment, and that their income is sufficient to provide for adequate, stable housing,
food, and health insurance. In pursuit of this objective, OYP’s six goals for youth along the path to self-sufficiency include the following:

1) If not graduated from high school, re-enroll in high school.
2) Complete HS graduation or equivalency.
3) Gain early work experience—either a first job of any kind, or an internship in a career field.
4) Obtain postsecondary degree or professional certification in a career field.
5) Obtain full-time employment or job experience in a career field.
6) Earn wages that are at least $3 above minimum wage.

DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND SERVICES COMMITTEE MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

Kids In Common serves as the backbone organization of OYP. In the first two years of OYP, fifteen organizations joined the partnership and became members of the DISC. Fourteen organizations were able to contribute data on youth they serve who meet the OYP eligibility criteria:

- Bill Wilson Center (BWC)
- Boys & Girls Clubs of Silicon Valley
- Child Advocates of Silicon Valley (CASV)
- ConXion to Community (CTC)
- Family & Children Services (Independent Living Program of Santa Clara Co.)
- First Place for Youth
- Fresh Lifelines for Youth (FLY)
- Good Karma Bikes
- Planned Parenthood Mar Monte (PPMM)
- San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School (SJCC)
- Silicon Valley Children’s Fund (SVCF)
- Teen Success, Inc.
- TeenForce
- Work2Future
- Unity Care

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This report is a follow-up assessment of the Opportunity Youth cohort from the first two years of the OYP initiative. It describes the status of youth that were served by DISC member organizations from December 2014 to April 2016; attempts to quantify the degree of connectivity of those youth across different DISC member organizations; and examines the extent to which progress toward short and long term goals occurred over a seventeen-month period (December 2014 to April 2016).

1 Did not contribute data.
This report encompasses a longer time period and more youth than the previous report from August 2015. Like the previous report, this one offers a window into the nature of connectivity between DISC member organizations, identifies where the largest needs are for certain segments of the OY population, and can help identify sub-cohorts of youth that organizations can begin to monitor and support in specific ways. Finally, the report provides some lessons learned during the first year regarding data collection and measurement that may be applied in subsequent years.
**Methodology and Design**

The report is designed as a way to both report on the indicators required by the Aspen Institute, and to offer insights regarding the status and progress of the current OY population and the organizations they working with. Each of these priorities is detailed below.

**COMMON INDICATORS (ASPEN INSTITUTE)**

OYP is required by the Aspen Institute to measure five common indicators. They are the number and percent of youth who achieve the following outcomes:

- **Indicator 1:** Earn a secondary credential (HS diploma, equivalency)
- **Indicator 2:** Complete an internship or related work experience
- **Indicator 3:** Enroll in a postsecondary institution
- **Indicator 4:** Earn a postsecondary credential
- **Indicator 5:** Gain employment in a career field

Each of the above is referenced in the report within each topic area.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In addition to reporting on the common indicators, the report seeks to answer the following research questions.

1) What are the demographics of the Opportunity Youth population in 2016?

2) How many youth improved their educational attainment from late 2014 or early 2015 through April 2016?

3) How many youth gained or maintained employment from the late 2014 or early 2015, through April 2016?


5) What are the conditions and circumstances associated with progress or lack of progress on key education, employment and other self-sufficiency outcomes? (e.g., age, OYP eligibility, connectivity)

6) How many youth made positive steps of any kind, and how many did not make progress, from early 2015 to 2016?

**DATA COLLECTION PROCESS & SOURCES**

Youth data from DISC member organizations were collected through an OYP intake/survey form created by ASR and OYP leadership staff, which was then disseminated to DISC organization staff. Those organizations entered the data into an Excel-based data entry system created by ASR.
Data collection occurred over four periods. Round 1 occurred during November and December of 2014 (9 organizations participated), Round 2 occurred during May and June 2015 (11 organizations), Round 3 occurred during November 2015 (13 organizations), and Round 4 occurred during April 2016 (14 organizations). OYP partners were instructed to report on the status of youth they were serving between the ages of 16 and 24, who had been in the foster or justice system, were pregnant or parenting, or homeless.

It is important to understand that the youth whose data were submitted across each of the rounds did not represent all OYP-eligible youth served by OYP partners. Some organizations did not have the capacity to report every eligible youth they served. Certain organizations that work with many common youth coordinated to reduce duplicate reporting among their eligible populations.

To maintain data confidentiality, the data files automatically generated an encrypted ID for each youth based on the youth’s initials and date of birth. When the files were exported and submitted to ASR, the names of each youth were automatically withheld by the organizations, and not transmitted to ASR. OYP and ASR received a court order approving the sharing of data for foster youth served by the Santa Clara County government.

When the data files were merged into a single file for analysis, the ID numbers created for each youth were used to identify youth whose data were submitted simultaneously by multiple organizations, and to match records of youth who participated across different rounds of data collection.
Description of the Current OYP Cohort (Round 4)

The total number of youth who were reported by OYP member organizations in April 2016 (Round 4) was 856. However, 153 of these youth were found to have been reported by multiple organizations, yielding a final count of 703 unduplicated youth reported in Round 4.

This total population is described below. Unless otherwise noted, figures represent unduplicated counts, meaning that a youth reported by multiple organizations is only represented once.

ROUND 4 OPPORTUNITY YOUTH BY ELIGIBILITY AND ORGANIZATION

Figure 1 (below) shows the number of youth reported in Round 4 by OYP member organizations within each of the four primary eligibility criteria. The categories are not exclusive; 17 percent of youth belonged to more than one category. In addition to the 5 percent of the cohort that was homeless, an additional 6 percent had previously experienced homelessness. Thus, a total of 11 percent of the cohort been homeless at some point in their lives.

Figure 1. Number and Percentage of Opp. Youth Reported, by Eligibility Criteria (April 2016)

Note: N=703 Opportunity Youth in Round 4. Percentages sum to over 100 percent because youth may fit in more than one category. Each of the four eligibility categories above includes all youth who have ever belonged to that category, except for Homeless. Youth reported as homeless are limited to those who were experiencing chronic or episodic homelessness during Round 4.

On the following page, Figure 2 details the specific combinations of eligibility that exist across the cohort. The largest single group consists of the 31 percent whose eligibility is based solely on being pregnant or parenting youth, but aren’t eligible within other categories. There are an additional 12 percent who are pregnant or parenting as well as either justice-engaged, foster youth or homeless youth.
Figure 2. **OYP Eligibility Combinations (Disaggregated)**

Note: Combinations of more than two eligibility categories exist but are not represented above. Each combination of three or four represent less than 1 percent of the cohort.

Figure 3 shows the number of total youth reported by each OYP member organization for Round 4. These totals represent all youth with valid data through Round 4 from each organization; youth reported by multiple organizations are included within each organization’s total.

Figure 3. **Total Youth Reported by Each OYP Member Organization (April 2016)**

Note: These are duplicated counts; every youth reported by each organization is represented. N=856.

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Overall, the Round 4 OYP cohort is 63 percent female and 74 percent Latino/Hispanic. Sixteen percent of youth were reported as having a special need or disability, and 61 percent have no special need or disability. Special needs status or known disabilities were not reported for the remaining 23 percent of youth. The average age across all youth is 19 years; 24 percent are 16-17 years old, and 76 percent are 18-24 years old (as of May 1, 2016).
Figure 4. Demographics of Overall OYP Cohort (Round 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pct (N=703)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African Amer.</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Amer.</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs/Disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot report</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (as of May 1, 2016)</td>
<td>Avg = 19.4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Up</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age distribution of the cohort is presented below. Nearly two-thirds of youth (65 percent) are between 17 and 19 years old.

Figure 5. Age Distribution Across Rounds 4 Opportunity Youth

EDUCATION LEVELS

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION STATUS

Out of all OYP youth through April 2015, 32 percent had graduated from high school or received a GED. Among youth under age 18, 1 percent had graduated or received a GED, while 42 percent of those 18 and older had graduated or received a GED.
Figure 6. **Pct of Opp. Youth With HS Diploma or GED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Opp. Youth</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Up</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=681.

**Levels of Education Attained by Opportunity Youth**

Figure 7 displays the highest levels of education obtained by all Opportunity Youth, by age and overall, as of Round 4 (April 2016).

Figure 7. **Levels of Education Achieved Across OYP Round 4 Cohort, by Age**

Figure 8 details the percentage of youth that were enrolled and not enrolled in school, and those for whom no report was provided, by age and high school completion status. Over three quarters of the cohort were enrolled in school (or other educational program) as of April 2016.
Figure 8. **Opportunity Youth Current Enrollment Status (April 2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In School (HS or Postsec.)</th>
<th>Not In School</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Opp. Youth (n=696)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 (n=165)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Up (n=516)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduates (or GED) (n=220)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Graduated HS (n=452)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9 shows more specifically where youth were enrolled as of April 2016, according to age and high school completion status. Most high school graduates (56 percent) were enrolled in a two-year college or vocational program, and most youth under age 18 were in high school (87 percent enrolled, 9 percent not enrolled). Fifteen percent of youth that had not graduated from high school (or received a GED) were not enrolled anywhere in school as of April 2016.

Figure 9. **Where Opportunity Youth Are Enrolled (April 2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Enrolled</th>
<th>High School (9-12th)</th>
<th>GED Pgm</th>
<th>2-Year College, Voc./Prof. Certif.</th>
<th>Four-Year College</th>
<th>No Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Opp. Youth (n=696)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 (n=165)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Up (n=516)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduates (or GED) (n=220)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Graduated HS (n=452)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**How Many Opportunity Youth Have Been Disconnected From School?**

Across all youth, 46 percent of youth had been disconnected from school for more than two weeks at some point in their lives. This percentage fluctuated across different segments of the cohort. Seventy percent of homeless youth, 66 percent of justice-engaged youth, and 52 percent of pregnant and parenting youth had been disconnected from school at some point in their lives.

![Bar Chart: Percentage of OY That Have Ever Been Disconnected From School]

**Figure 10. Percentage of OY That Have Ever Been Disconnected From School**

Note: N=589. Percentages reflect the percentage of youth who have been disconnected, among those for whom answer of either Yes, No or Don’t Know was provided. Youth with no response are not included in the percentage calculation. Overall, 26 percent of youth had never been disconnected, and 28 percent of youths’ history of disconnection was not known.

**Employment and Current Work Experience**

Figure 11 (below) indicates that 40 percent of OY were employed or engaged in some kind of work experience as of April 2016. This includes both paid and unpaid positions such as internships. Among high school graduates, at least 58 percent were working. Among youth that had not completed high school, 29 percent were working. Out of this total population of 270 working youth, 23 youth (9 percent) were engaged in internships or apprenticeships.

The 60 percent who were not reported as working includes a 4 percent segment whose job status was not known by the agency who reported them (meaning that they may have been working but the agency was not aware of it). The other 57 percent were known not to be working.


**Figure 11.  Current Work Experience, By HS Graduation Status**

Note: High school graduates are not separated into age groups because over 80 percent were 19-24 years old.

**How Many Jobs Were Career Related?**

Eleven percent of jobs held by youth were related to the youth’s career interests. The other 88 percent was comprised of 55 percent whose positions were not career-related, and 33 percent whose connection to a career was not known.

**Wages**

The average wage among OY as of April 2016 was **$11.25**, roughly one dollar above minimum wage. This average does not include unpaid internships. Figure 12 (below) displays wages for each of the 170 youth whose wages were reported, rounded down to the nearest dollar.

Nevertheless, five percent of youth (9 of 270) whose incomes were reported were earning less than minimum wage. Seventeen percent of working youth (30 out of 170) were earning at least **$3 over** minimum wage.

**Figure 12.  Wage Distribution Among Opportunity Youth**

Note: N=170 youth with wage data reported. This represents 63 percent of youth with jobs.
EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT, CROSS-TABULATED

On the following page, Figure 13 displays disaggregation of HS graduation status, education, and employment status of all OY included in Round 4. The axis at bottom presents three levels of disaggregation. First it separates all youth according to HS graduation status; then, within those two groups it separates by most recent school enrollment status; and then it provides the number of within those segments who were working in jobs the two months before round 4 data were collected.

As highlighted below, 62 youth were reported as not in school and not working—9 percent of the total OYP cohort included in Round 4. A little over two-thirds (69 percent) of these youth had also not completed HS.

Figure 13. **Opp. Youth By HS Graduation, Educational Enrollment and Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Unknown</th>
<th>No Job In School</th>
<th>Has Job In School</th>
<th>Job Unknown</th>
<th>No Job</th>
<th>Has Job</th>
<th>Job Unknown</th>
<th>Has Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Diploma or GED</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduates</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=680
*There were 19 youth who had not completed HS, and whose current enrollment status was unknown. Of these, seven were employed, five were not employed, and seven had unknown job status.*
SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Five self-sufficiency indicators have been collected and updated for youth for Rounds 2-4:

- Healthcare
- Food
- Housing
- Education
- Income

Within each area, youth were marked along a 1-5 scale. A “1” in any area indicated the lowest level of self-sufficiency within each area (e.g., no income, chronic food insecurity, homeless, no HS diploma and not enrolled in school, and no healthcare coverage). A “5” indicated the highest level (e.g., earning discretionary income, ability to purchase food beyond basic needs, safe and unsubsidized housing, completed postsecondary education, and has comprehensive health insurance). A rating of “3” is considered the minimum needed to be considered self-sufficient. These ratings are most applicable to youth who are at least 18.

Figure 14 (below) displays the self-sufficiency scores for Opportunity Youth ages 18 and older who were reported in Round 4. The line down the center of the chart serves as a marker of minimum self-sufficiency: the percentages to the left of the line represent youth that fall below the minimum desired level, and the percentages to the right represent all who were at or above the minimum desired level. A detailed description of the individual self-sufficiency scores lies below Figure 14, and the Self-Sufficiency Index definitions appears in the appendix.

---

2The response rates for self-sufficiency items among 18-24 year olds were: Income – 91%; Education – 94%; Housing – 90%; Food – 90%; Health Care – 83%.
Figure 14. **Self-Sufficiency Ratings of Opportunity Youth, Age 18 and Older**

HEALTH CARE

The 87 percent segment consists of youth 18 and older with health care coverage through Medi-Cal, and the 8 percent segment represent youth with other comprehensive health care coverage. Five percent of those reported are not signed up for any coverage.

In addition, the health care portion of the self-sufficiency index contained an item regarding **medical homes**. This information was not known for 32 percent of youth ages 18 and up in Round 4. But among those who provided an answer, 36 percent reported having a medical home.

FOOD

Eighteen percent of the 18 and older cohort lack secure access to food. Five percent have chronic and severe food insecurity and do not receive CalFresh benefits. Thirteen percent have moderate food insecurity, and receive an inadequate level of CalFresh benefits. The majority, however, have secure access to food at one of three levels: 63 percent can meet basic food needs with public assistance, 15 percent can meet their own needs without assistance, and 5 percent can even purchase food beyond their most basic needs.

HOUSING

Nearly one-fifth of 18 and older youth do not have safe and stable housing. This includes 5 percent who are homeless or threatened with eviction, and 12 percent who are either in transitional or substandard housing, their current housing costs are unaffordable, or their housing is not safe. The remaining 83 percent have a minimum level of adequate and stable
housing: 20 percent have stable but only marginally adequate housing, 33 percent have safe, subsidized housing, and 30 percent have safe and adequate unsubsidized housing.

**EDUCATION**

Forty-two percent of youth 18 and older have not completed high school. Specifically, 13 percent of 18 and older youth have neither finished HS or are enrolled in secondary education³, and thirty-nine percent have not completed HS but are enrolled in HS, a re-engagement center or a GED program. Of the remaining 58 percent, 21 percent have completed HS only, 26 percent have enrolled in a postsecondary or other training/certification, and one percent have completed a postsecondary program, training or certification.

**INCOME**

Sixteen percent of 18 and older youth have no income or other financial assistance. An additional 17 percent have income that is not adequate to meet basic needs. Of the 66 percent who can meet basic needs, 55 percent rely on subsidies or assistance from others, 10 percent are able to meet their needs without relying on assistance or subsidy, and one percent can easily meet their needs and have some discretionary income as well.

**Self-Sufficiency by OYP Eligibility**

The chart in Figure 15 disaggregates self-sufficiency by OYP eligibility, which allows us to observe the extent to which different kinds of 18-24 year old Opportunity Youth face different challenges. The bars represent the percentage of each group that has reached the minimum level of sufficiency (rating of 3, 4, or 5) within each of the five areas.

Two findings that emerge from the table are that homeless OY appear to be least self-sufficient across most areas, and foster youth appear to be closest to achieving self-sufficiency. This pattern matches that from the previous report after Round 2 of data collection.

---

³ There is a slight apparent discrepancy between the data reported in the self-sufficiency and the education enrollment sections. A small number of youth who were reported as enrolled in school the education section were marked as not enrolled in secondary education within the self-sufficiency section.
Figure 15. **Percent of 18-24 Year Olds at Minimum Self-Sufficiency Level, by OYP Eligibility**

Note: Foster N=239-253; Justice N=125-136 Parenting/Pregnant N=273-295; Homeless N=31-33. Minimum self-sufficiency is a rating of 3 or higher on the self-sufficiency index. See appendix for complete definition of each level within each area of the self-sufficiency index.

With regard to education, most foster youth in the cohort are HS graduates pursuing postsecondary education, while the majority of justice-engaged, pregnant or parenting, and homeless youth have not yet completed HS. Although foster youth are doing slightly better than other groups with respect to income, there is less of a difference across groups for this category, with approximately two-thirds foster youth, justice engaged, and parenting/pregnant youth achieving self-sufficiency for income. Compared to the other three groups, a much smaller percentage of homeless youth achieved self-sufficiency in each of the five categories.

**YOUTH CONNECTIONS AMONG OYP PARTNERS**

One of the fundamental goals of the OYP initiative is to develop greater connectivity among partners and youth, in terms of both referrals of youth by staff, and through more frequent communication and coordination among partners. The OYP intake/survey form was designed to capture evidence of connectivity by asking what types of programs and services youth had been engaged in across the OYP DISC network, in addition to the services of the organization reporting that youth. The form did not ask respondents to specify the nature of those connections or their duration, but rather simply whether or not a connection had ever existed.

With this information, we may begin to understand the degree to which Opportunity Youth are connected to different types of organizations, and what other circumstances or outcomes may result from greater connectivity. The connections reported for youth with data through Round 4 are presented below.
Figure 16 indicates that most youth—64 percent—were connected to a single organization (i.e., the one that reported him/her). The other 36 percent of the cohort had worked with two or more different OYP DISC partner organizations at some point. Notably, there has been a 10 percentage point decrease from Round 2 to Round 4 in the percentage of youth reported by only one organization—that is, there are more youth connected to multiple organizations in Round 4 than there were in Round 2.

**Figure 16. Number of Different OYP Partners Connected to Youth**

![Bar Chart]

Note: Average number of connections per youth was 1.75.

**Connectivity Within OYP DISC Network, by OYP Eligibility**

Figure 17 displays on the number of organizations reported per youth, disaggregated by OYP eligibility status. From this perspective we can see that foster youth tended to have the most connections cited with other organizations (2.37, on average), as compared with homeless youth (1.67), justice-engaged youth (1.62), and parenting and pregnant youth (1.40).

This section examines the progress that occurred among Opportunity Youth toward achieving the medium and long-term outcomes of OYP youth between 2015 (Round 1 or Round 2) and June 2016 (Round 4). Those outcomes are:

- Enrolling in HS or GED program (if not already graduated)
- HS graduation
- Postsecondary enrollment
- Gaining employment in a career field
- Self-sufficiency

First, we shall look at which youths’ data were collected in Round 1 or 2 and updated in Round 4.

MATCHED COHORT ACROSS ROUNDS 1, 2 & 4

In Round 1 (Nov/Dec 2014) and Round 2 (May 2015), 13 different OYP partners reported on 936 different Opportunity Youth that they were serving during at least one of those time points. By Round 4, 378 youth from the combined Round 1-2 cohort remained (40 percent retention), while an additional 325 youth had been added (Fig. 19).

Rounds 1 and 2 were combined into one group for two reasons. First, combining them maximized the number of youth from 2015 who could be matched to Round 4 in 2016. Secondly, self-sufficiency data was first collected in Round 2. By combining data from both rounds, the early self-sufficiency data could be matched to follow-up data in Round 4. Round 3 data was disregarded for this analysis because nearly all youth in that round were included in Round 4.
Opportunity Youth Data Collected in Rounds 1, 2 and 4

Figure 18. Opportunity Youth Data Collected in Rounds 1, 2 and 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Opp. Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matched Cohort: 378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmatched to Rd 4: 558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New in Rd 3 or 4: 325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched Cohort: 378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For the “Rounds 1 & 2” total, youth from both rounds were combined into a single unduplicated set.

Youth Not Updated After Rounds 1/2

This section describes the 558 youth who were in Round 1 and/or 2, but were not in Round 4. In Figure 18 (above), this group of youth are represented by the blue portion of the bar.

The table below presents the different reasons why the data could not be updated for 60 percent of youth reported from rounds 1-2. More than one reason could be cited per person, thus the percentages total more than 100 percent.

Figure 19. Reasons Youth Records Were Not Updated After Round 1 or 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent of Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program ended OR youth were no longer eligible (left program)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff unable to locate youth</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth graduated</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth withdrew from program</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth moved out of the area</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth aged out of program</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Youth who exited the cohort, and could not be updated in later rounds, were not all of the same type. As the following graph indicates, each eligibility category experienced close to a 50 percent exit rate. Justice-engaged youth were the most likely type of youth to exit the cohort after at least one data submission in Round 1-3.
Figure 20. Percentage of Youth Who Have Exited the OYP Cohort, by Eligibility Type

Note: Percentages are based on the following numbers of unduplicated youth ever reported within each category: Foster=490, Justice=337, Pregnant/Parenting=501, Homeless=70.

Nearly one third of the youth who exited the cohort before Round 4 had not yet graduated from high school or earned a GED (63 percent). Twenty percent were not enrolled in school at all as of their last update. Thirty percent were employed, including half (49 percent) of all high school graduates. Fifteen percent of the exited cohort were employed in career-related jobs.

Youth In Matched Cohort (Rounds 1/2 and Round 4)

This section describes youth who were in Round 1 and/or 2, and also in Round 4 (the matched cohort). (These are the youth from Figure 18 that are represented by the two red portions of the bars.)

Below, Figure 21 presents the number of youth from each OYP organization that are represented within the matched cohort.

Figure 21. OYP Organizational Representation, Rounds 1-2 Matched to Round 4

Note: Figures represent the total number of youth reported by each organization that are represented in the matched cohort.

As Figure 22 indicates, the youth from Rounds 1-2 who remained in the cohort in Round 4 mostly foster youth or pregnant/parenting youth (52 percent foster, 36 percent
In comparison to the cohort at the end of Round 2, the cohort that remained through Round 3 contained a larger percentage of foster youth, a smaller percentage of justice-engaged youth, and roughly the same proportions of pregnant/parenting and homeless youth.

Figure 22. **OYP Eligibility of Full Round 1/2 Sample and Matched Cohort**

Below is a brief illustration of the demographic makeup of the matched cohort spanning Rounds 1-2 and 4. The cohort is heavily represented by Latino women (46 percent).

Figure 23. **OYP Eligibility, Gender and Age Differences in Matched Cohort**

Note: N=378. Includes all youth present in either Round 1 or 2, and Round 4.
CHANGES IN EDUCATION ATTAINMENT & ENROLLMENT, AND EMPLOYMENT

The figure below shows youths’ educational status, by age cohort, in early rounds and Round 4. As expected there was a larger increase for the younger cohort in the percentage of youth who had graduated from high school (increase of 17 percentage points compared to 6 percentage points for older cohort). The decrease in school enrollment may be due to the relatively large number of students in the younger cohort who graduated from high school between the early rounds and round 4 (and had not enrolled in postsecondary education.

There was a net increase in youth employment of eleven percentage points (33 to 44 percent) from Round 1/2 to Round 4, with similar increases in both the younger and older cohorts. As expected, a greater percentage of youth in the older cohort were employed. There was no change in the percentages of employed youth doing work related to their career interests.

Figure 24. Net Changes in Educational Attainment and Enrollment, and Employment, Between Early Rounds (1 and 2) and Round 4—By Age in Early Rounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 16-18 (N=257)</th>
<th>Ages 19-24 (N=115)</th>
<th>All Youth (N=372)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rd 1/2</td>
<td>Rd 4</td>
<td>Rd 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from HS/GED</td>
<td>17% 34%</td>
<td>66% 72%</td>
<td>33% 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Enrolled in School / Educational Program (any kind)</td>
<td>85% 77%</td>
<td>88% 83%</td>
<td>86% 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in Postsecondary Institution</td>
<td>15% 26%</td>
<td>70% 70%</td>
<td>29% 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (or Internship)</td>
<td>22% 33%</td>
<td>59% 69%</td>
<td>33% 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Related to Career Interests (pct. of those employed)</td>
<td>8% 9%</td>
<td>18% 17%</td>
<td>13% 13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Age range is based on youths’ ages in the first/second round. Percentages represent the percentage of students that were known to be graduated or in enrolled. The remaining percentage not shown is a combination of youth that were known to be not enrolled or graduated plus those for whom a status could not be established. The non-reportable percentage is generally less than 10 percent. Note: Jobs include paid and unpaid work experiences (e.g., internships).

How Many Youth Re-Enrolled in School?

Of the 47 youth who were reported as not in school or other educational program in the early rounds, 9 youth (19 percent) re-enrolled by Round 4.

How Many Youth Left School?

Out of 336 youth enrolled in school in Round 1/2, 42 youth (12.5 percent) had left school as of Round 4. Of those 42 youth that appeared to have disengaged from school by Round 4, 11 of these youth were already HS/GED graduates in Round 1/2. Of the other 31 youth that had not completed HS in Round 1, 19 had since graduated from HS (or equivalent) since Round 1/2, and 12 appeared to have disengaged in school before completing high school.
**HOW MANY UNEMPLOYED YOUTH FROM ROUND 1/2 GAINED JOBS BY ROUND 4?**

Out of 253 unemployed youth in Round 1/2, 60 (24 percent) had gained employment by Round 4. Of these 53 youth that started new jobs, 54 (90 percent) were 18 or older in Round 4.

**HOW MANY EMPLOYED YOUTH FROM ROUND 1/2 WERE NO LONGER EMPLOYED BY ROUND 4?**

Out of 120 youth employed in Round 1/2, 19 (16 percent) were no longer employed by Round 4. Of these 19 youth, 18 (95 percent) were 18 or older in Round 4.

**CHANGE IN NUMBER OF DISCONNECTED YOUTH**

The percentage of disconnected youth (without jobs and not enrolled in school) increased slightly from 9 percent to 11 percent. Of the 18 youth who were not disconnected in the early rounds but were disconnected in round 4, two-thirds (12 youth) had graduated from high school (seven of these between Round ½ and Round 4).

**Figure 25. Changes in Disconnected Youth—By Age in Early Rounds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 16-18 (N=258)</th>
<th>Ages 19-24 (N=118)</th>
<th>All Youth (N=378)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rd 1/2</td>
<td>Rd 4</td>
<td>Rd 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnected:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Employment/Internship and Not in School</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHANGES IN SELF-SUFFICIENCY FROM ROUND 2 TO ROUND 4**

Organizations began collecting self-sufficiency data in Round 2. Figure 26 displays a comparison of self-sufficiency levels among 189 18-24 year-olds reported between Rounds 2 and 4. There was little overall movement in self-sufficiency other than a slight increase in the percentage of youth that had completed high school.
**Figure 26. Self-Sufficiency from Round 2 to Round 4 (18-24 year olds)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Levels 1-2</th>
<th>Levels 3-4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME - Rd 2</strong></td>
<td>9% 14%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd 4</td>
<td>10% 16%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION - Rd 2</strong></td>
<td>13% 31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd 4</td>
<td>12% 27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING - Rd 2</strong></td>
<td>5% 10% 16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd 4</td>
<td>4% 13% 17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOOD - Rd 2</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd 4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH CARE - Rd 2</strong></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd 4</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=189 18-24 year olds.

**OVERALL YOUTH PROGRESS**

This section examines the number of Opportunity Youth who made progress along their educational or employment pathway from Round 1/2 to Round 4. All percentages in Figure 27 (below) are based on the entire matched cohort sample of 402 youth.

Overall, 92 percent of the matched cohort showed progress in at least one of five different ways. The largest segment of this group was the 72 percent who showed progress by continuing their education into Round 4. An additional two percent of the cohort re-enrolled in school. Thirty-eight percent showed progress by completing a new level of education, such as graduating from high school or advancing to the next grade level.

With regard to employment and work experience, 25 percent of the cohort maintained employment or other work experiences into Round 4, while an additional 15 percent started new positions after not reporting any work experiences during Round 1/2.

**NOTE:** When examining Figure 27, it is important to note that some youth showed progress in more than one area. The 92 percent column on the right includes all youth who met at least one of the five criteria for progress.
YOUTH PROGRESS BY CONNECTIVITY

This section examines how different forms of youth progress from Rounds 1-2 to Round 4 were associated with degrees of connectivity to OYP partner organizations. The figure below indicates the percentage of youth who made or maintained progress in education and employment between Rounds 1-2 and Round 4, based on the number of connections to any of the 16 OYP partner organizations.

The chart provides some evidence that youth connected with more than one OYP partner organization were more likely to maintain or enhance their educational attainment, retain previous employment or gain new employment by Round 4 (April 2016).

Note: Number of youth represented within each bar are as follows: 1 Org = 188; More than 1 = 160. Overall, 76 percent of youth remained in school from round 1 or 2 to round 4, and 3 percent returned to school after having been enrolled in round 1 or 2. These outcomes were merged into one measure.
Youths’ average self-sufficiency scores did not shift from Round 2 to Round 4—overall or by the number of connections they had with OYP organizations. Youth with more connections showed higher self-sufficiency on average, but there was no meaningful change from May 2015 to April 2016.

Figure 29. **Average Self-Sufficiency from Round 2 to Round 4, by Degree of Connectivity**
Conclusion

Over four rounds of data collection (from December 2014 to April 2016), fourteen member organizations of the OYP Design, Implementation and Services Committee (DISC) collectively reported on over 1,500 foster, justice-engaged, pregnant or parenting, and homeless youth across Santa Clara County (1,281 unduplicated youth). The data served three purposes: To identify and describe the OYP population, to report on five common indicators to the Aspen Institute, and to provide formative assessment results as the OYP collective impact model takes shape. The data collected on these youth included demographics, educational attainment and enrollment, employment, self-sufficiency and connections to other OYP organizations.

By Round 4, 40 percent of youth reported in Rounds 1 and 2 could be matched to Round 4 records. Results from the matched cohort between the first two rounds and the fourth round show an 11 percentage point increase in high school completion, an 8 percentage point increase in postsecondary enrollment, and an 11-point increase in youth employment (including internships).

Overall, 92 percent of the matched cohort made progress in some way along their educational and employment pathways by either maintaining their educational enrollment or work experiences, attaining higher levels of education, re-enrolling in school, or starting new work experiences.

COMMON INDICATORS

The common indicators OYP is required to report to the Aspen Institute are provided below. Results reflect the most recently updated information for the 1,281 individual youth that have been reported by OYP partners since December 2014.

Indicator 1: Earn a secondary credential (HS diploma, equivalency)

✓ 32 percent have completed HS or equivalency.
  ○ 42 percent of 18-24 year olds
  ○ 1 percent of 16-17 year olds

Indicator 2: Complete an internship or related work experience

✓ 40 percent were employed or participating in an internship
  ○ 58 percent of HS graduates
  ○ 29 percent of non-HS graduates

Indicator 3: Enroll in a postsecondary institution

✓ 25 percent were enrolled in a postsecondary institution
  ○ 66 percent of HS graduates
  ○ 33 percent of 18-24 year olds

Indicator 4: Earn a postsecondary credential
7 percent have earned a postsecondary credential (e.g., associate’s degree or vocational certification)
- 10 percent of HS graduates
- 8 percent of 18-24 year olds

Indicator 5: Gain employment in a career field

15 percent of positions held by youth were career-related.
- 17 percent of HS graduates
- 15 percent of 18-24 year olds

CHANGES OBSERVED FROM ROUND 1/2 TO ROUND 4

Of the 936 Opportunity Youth that were reported in either Round 1 or 2, 378 youth could be matched across both rounds to measure change. The matched cohort had higher proportions of foster youth and females than the entire OY population, and relatively lower proportions of justice-engaged youth, pregnant/parenting youth, and males. Below are the key findings observed among the 378 youth monitored from Round 1 or 2 (i.e., December 2014 or May 2015) to Round 4 (April 2016).

- 92 percent of the matched cohort made progress in some way along their educational and employment pathways by either maintaining their educational enrollment or work experiences, attaining higher levels of education, or re-enrolling in school or starting new work experiences.
- The high school completion rate within the matched cohort rose 12 percentage points, from 33 to 45 percent, from Round 1/2 to Round 4.
- Although the percentage of youth enrolled in postsecondary education increased eight percentage points (from 29 to 37 percent), there was a slight decline in the percentage of youth enrolled in school overall (from 86 to 79 percent). This was mainly due to many youth completing high school, but not continuing on to postsecondary education.
- There was an eleven percentage point gain in the percentage of youth employed or participating in internships, from 33 percent to 44 percent.
- Due to the number of students who completed high school and were no longer in school or employed by the Round 4 data collection period, the percentage of disconnected youth rose slightly, from 9 to 11 percent overall.
- Other than an uptick in high school completion, there was very little shift across the five self-sufficiency measures. (See recommendations for a discussion of what may be behind this.)

OTHER KEY FINDINGS

In addition to the common indicators and changes reported above, the data collected in the first two years of OYP provided valuable insights around cohort attrition, self-sufficiency and organizational connectivity.

- Sixty percent of youth from the first two rounds could not be updated and reported on during Round 4. The primary cause of this attrition was youth discontinuing their participation in the programs and services offered by OYP partners, which precluded those organizations from being able to update the status of those youth.
• **The vast majority of youth were at or above the minimum self-sufficiency levels** regarding income, food, housing and health care. Eighteen to 24 year olds were least self-sufficient in education, though this area showed improvement by Round 4. It is not clear to what extent the lack of changes in self-sufficiency measures were a result of (a) the fact that most youth were already at Level 3 or higher during Round 2, (b) the loss of youth from the cohort who actually did increase their self-sufficiency but could not be reported, or (c) under-reported improvements among youth that remained in the cohort.

• As was found in the previous report in 2015, **foster youth shared the most connections to different OYP-affiliated organizations**. Youth that were connected to the highest number of organizations were more likely to remain employed, to find new employment, enter or remain in school, and attain higher levels of education.

**RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

Based on the findings provided above and other lessons learned over the second year of OYP, the following recommendations are offered to improve the quality of data going forward and the overall development of the OYP initiative.

1) **Consider whether streamlining data collection procedures to reduce attrition within the cohort and reducing missing data may be possible.**

   If possible, this would make possible a more robust Round 3 analysis of youth one year out from the baseline data collection period.

2) **Utilize the developing Aspen 100 cohort to refine data collection and networking support for youth.**

   The nascent Aspen 100 initiative offers OYP opportunities to better understand ways of coordinating services and maintaining strong links to youth across OYP partners. As of this report, OYP has recruited 100 youth from the existing OYP cohort, between ages 18 and 22, to be members of this cohort. These youth have agreed to provide regular, detailed updates about their education, career and self-sufficiency progress for 1-2 years. In exchange, OYP partner organizations have committed to addressing the individual needs and of these young people through coordinated action, such as identifying opportunities and connections that can help youth solve problems and attain their individual goals. Through this initiative, OYP seeks to build a stronger, more integrated network of partners working on behalf of Opportunity Youth, and to use the data to gain deeper insights about how to improve the overall system of support among youth serving organizations.
Appendix

SELF-SUFFICIENCY INDEX DEFINITIONS

In the Round 2 intake/survey form, OYP member organizations reported on youths’ self-sufficiency using the following set of questions and definitions. These ratings were adapted from a list of indicators used by the Step Up Silicon Valley anti-poverty program.

HEALTH CARE

1. No medical insurance.
2. Medi-Cal coverage.
3. Other comprehensive health insurance.
4. Don’t know.

Does the youth have a “medical home”?
“Medical home” refers to a patient-centered model of care in which the patient has an ongoing relationship with a physician who can provide comprehensive care; and in which medical care is coordinated with the primary provider in cooperation with specialists and support from the community.

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

FOOD

1. Chronic and severe food insecurity; not receiving CalFresh (food stamps).
2. Moderate food insecurity; may have CalFresh benefits but they are inadequate.
3. Can meet basic food needs with reliance on public assistance (e.g., CalFresh) or caregiver.
4. Can meet basic food needs without public assistance.
5. Can regularly purchase food beyond what is necessary for basic needs.
6. Don’t know.

HOUSING

1. Homeless (including couch-surfing) or threatened with eviction.
2. Not homeless, but at least one of three conditions is present:
   a. In transitional, temporary or substandard housing,
   b. Current rent or mortgage payment is unaffordable (over 33% of pre-tax income),
   c. Housing is not safe.
3. In stable housing that is safe but only marginally adequate.
4. In safe and adequate subsidized housing.
5. In safe and adequate unsubsidized housing.
6. Don’t know.

EDUCATION

1. No HS diploma/GED, and not enrolled in secondary education.
2. No HS diploma/GED, but is enrolled in high school, re-engagement center or GED program.
3. Has HS diploma/GED.
(4) Is enrolled in postsecondary education, training or certificate program.
(5) Has completed postsecondary education, training or certificate.
(6) Don’t know.

**Income**

(1) No income or other financial assistance (including high school students who do not need income yet).
(2) Inadequate income; cannot meet basic needs (with or without subsidy).
(3) Can meet basic needs with assistance or subsidy.
(4) Can meet basic needs without assistance or subsidy.
(5) Can meet basic needs and has discretionary income.
(6) Don’t know.