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Introduction

The Santa Clara County Opportunity Youth Partnership (OYP) was launched in 2013 to create stronger educational and career pathways for “Opportunity Youth”—youth ages 16–24 who are disengaged 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 will be focusing on youth 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 model 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 and Implementation Committee (DISC), which consists of representatives from 13 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) Develop a career plan.
4) Obtain postsecondary degree or professional certification in a career field.
5) Obtain employment or job experience in a career field.
6) Earn wages that are at least $3 above minimum wage.

OYP-DISC MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

Kids In Common serves as the backbone organization of OYP. In the first year of OYP, 13 organizations joined the partnership and became members of the DISC. Eleven of these were able to contribute data on youth they serve who meet the OYP eligibility criteria:

- Boys & Girls Clubs of Silicon Valley
- Fresh Lifelines for Youth (FLY)
- ConXion to Community (CTC)
- Child Advocates of Silicon Valley (CASV)
- Planned Parenthood Mar Monte (PPMM)
- Family & Children Services (FCS, which operates the Independent Living Program of Santa Clara Co.)
- Bill Wilson Center (BWC)
- Silicon Valley Children’s Fund (SVCF)
- San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School (SJCC)
- TeenForce
- Work2Future
- UnityCare*
- Year Up*

*These organizations had not participated in OYP youth data collection as of June 2015, but are expected to join in later rounds.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This report is an initial formative assessment of the Opportunity Youth cohort from the first year of the OYP initiative. It describes the status of youth that were served by DISC member organizations from late 2014 to the middle of 2015; 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 six-month period (December 2014 to June 2015).

As the report represents a six-month period during the first year of a three-year initiative, it is not a conclusive or summative evaluation of whether OYP has achieved its goals. Rather, the results are expected to inform the OYP’s planning for years 2 and 3 of the initiative. For example, the report offers a window into the nature of connectivity between DISC member organizations, identifies where the largest needs are for certain segments of the OYP population, and can help identify sub-cohorts of youth that organizations can begin to monitor and support in specific ways going forward. 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 types of youth were in the OYP cohort in the first year?
2) At what stage along their pathway to employment and self-sufficiency was each of the OY cohort members at the beginning of OYP?
3) How many OY achieved each of the short, medium and long term outcomes (including the five common indicators) after joining OYP, as described in the logic model?
4) How many OY made positive steps in the direction of the long term outcomes over a given period?

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 two periods. Round 1 occurred during November and December of 2014 (9 organizations), and Round 2 occurred during May and June 2015 (11 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 as of the two collection periods.

It is important to understand that the youth whose data were submitted across rounds 1 and 2 do 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 in both Round 1 and Round 2 of data collection.
Description of the Entire OYP Cohort (Rounds 1 & 2)

The total number youth reported by OYP member organizations across rounds 1 and 2 was 1,074. However, 138 of these youth were found to have been reported by multiple organizations, yielding a final count of 936 *unduplicated* youth reported across both rounds.

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.

OYP BY ELIGIBILITY AND ORGANIZATION

Figure 1 (below) shows the number of youth reported by OYP member organizations within each of the four primary eligibility criteria, across rounds 1 and 2. The categories are not exclusive; 13 percent of youth belonged to more than one category.

Figure 1. Number and Percentage of Opportunity Youth Reported, by Eligibility Criteria

Note: Percentages sum to over 100% 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 1 or 2 data collection periods.

On the following page, Figure 2 details the specific combinations of eligibility that exist across the cohort. The largest single group consists of the 34 percent whose eligibility is based solely on being foster youth, but aren’t eligible within other categories. There are an additional nine percent who are foster youth as well as justice-engaged, pregnant or parenting, or homeless youth.
OYP Eligibility Combinations (Disaggregated)

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

Figure 3 shows the number of total youth reported by each OYP member organization overall (across both rounds).

Total Youth Reported by Each OYP Member Organization

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

DEMOGRAPHICS

Overall, the OYP cohort across both rounds 1 and 2 was 57 percent female and 71 percent Latino/Hispanic. Sixteen percent of youth were reported as having a special need or disability, and 49 percent had no special need or disability. Special needs status or known disabilities were not reported for the remaining 35 percent of youth. The average age across all youth was 19 years; 31 percent were 16-17 years old, and 69 percent were 18-24 years old.
### Figure 4. Demographics of Overall OYP Cohort (Rounds 1 & 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pct (N=936)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hisp</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Afr. Amer.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Amer.</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Needs/Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot report</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg = 19.1 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Up</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age distribution of the cohort is presented below. Over three quarters of the cohort (78%) were between 17 and 20 years old.

### Figure 5. Age Distribution Across Rounds 1 & 2

![Bar chart showing age distribution across rounds 1 & 2]

Note: Ages as of June 1, 2015. N=930.

### EDUCATION LEVELS

#### High School Graduation Status

Out of all OYP youth through June 2015, **35 percent** had graduated from high school or received a GED. Among youth under age 18, **9 percent** had graduated or received a GED. Among youth 18 and older, **46 percent** had graduated or received a GED.
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 2 (June 2015) or Round 1 if not reported in Round 2.

Current Enrollment

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.
### Opportunity Youth Current Enrollment Status

<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=936)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 (n=291)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Up (n=643)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduates (or GED) (n=326)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Graduated HS (n=604)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Current” enrollment reflects the youths’ status as of June 2015, or Dec 2014 if not reported in Round 2.

Figure 9 shows more specifically where youth are enrolled, according to age and high school completion status.

### Figure 9. Where Opportunity Youth Are Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Enrolled</th>
<th>On Summer Break*</th>
<th>High School (9-12th)</th>
<th>GED Pgm</th>
<th>Comm. College or Voc./Prof. Certif.</th>
<th>Four-Year College</th>
<th>No Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Opp. Youth (n=936)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 (n=291)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Up (n=643)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Grads/GED (n=326)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Grad. HS (n=604)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The second round of data collection occurred in June 2015. This option was provided for students who were on summer break between school years, and the organization who reported them did not consider them disconnected from school.

Note: Data reflect Round 2. If youth was not reported in Round 2, then the data reflects youth’s enrollment as of Dec. 2014.

### How Many Opportunity Youth Have Been Disconnected From School?

In Round 2, a question was added to the intake/survey form to learn how many youth had ever been disconnected from or dropped out of school. The question specifically asked about current or prior lapses in attendance that lasted more than two weeks during middle or high school.

Of the 603 youth for whom an answer was provided, at least 50% had been disconnected from school at some point in their lives. This percentage fluctuated across different segments of the cohort. Eighty-one percent of homeless youth, 82 percent of justice-engaged youth, and 58 percent of pregnant and parenting youth had been disconnected from school at some point in their lives.
EMPLOYMENT AND CURRENT WORK EXPERIENCE

Figure 11 (below) indicates that at least one-third of OY were employed or engaged in some kind of work experience as of the most recent round that their data were collected (either December 2014 or June 2015). This includes both paid and unpaid positions such as internships. Among high school graduates, at least 53 percent were working. Among youth that had not completed high school, 22 percent were working.

Out of this total population of 305 working youth, 28 youth (9 percent) were engaged in internships or apprenticeships.

The 67 percent who were not reported as working includes a 17 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 50 percent were known not to be working.
**HOW MANY JOBS WERE CAREER RELATED?**

Sixteen percent of jobs held by youth were related to the youth’s career interests. The other 84 percent was comprised of 66 percent whose positions were not career-related, and 18 percent whose positions were not known whether they were career-related.

**WAGES**

The average and most commonly reported wage among OY between December 2014 and June 2015 was $10.15, which was the official minimum wage in San Jose before it increased to $10.30 on January 1, 2015. Figure 12 (below) displays wages for each of the 218 youth whose wages were reported, rounded down to the nearest dollar.

The youth who were reported as earning $0 per hour were primarily engaged in unpaid internships. Nevertheless, 16.5 percent of youth (36 out of 218) whose incomes were reported were earning less than minimum wage. Thirteen percent of working youth (29 out of 218) were earning at least $3 over minimum wage.

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

Note: Includes 218 youth for whom wage data were reported. This represents 70 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 through June 2015. 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 as of either Dec. 2014 or June 2015 (whichever period was the last one tracked).

As highlighted below, 104 youth were reported as not in school and not working—11 percent of the total OYP cohort. Three quarters (76%) of these youth had also not completed HS.
**SELF-SUFFICIENCY**

In the second round of the first year of data collection across OYP member organizations, the partnership began collecting self-sufficiency data across the cohort of eligible youth. Five self-sufficiency indicators were added for the May/June 2015 period:\(^1\)

- 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

---

\(^1\) Self-sufficiency ratings were adapted from a list of indicators used by the Step Up Silicon Valley anti-poverty program: [http://stepupsv.org/](http://stepupsv.org/)
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 2. 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.

Figure 14. Self-Sufficiency Ratings of Opportunity Youth, Age 18 and Older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (N)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care (317)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (324)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (379)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (427)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (391)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data include youth 18 and older from Round 2 of the first year of OYP data collection. 1 = Lowest Level of Self-Sufficiency; 3 = Minimum Desired Level; 5 = Highest Level. See appendix for complete definition of each level within each area of the self-sufficiency index.

2The response rates for self-sufficiency items among 18-24 year olds were: Income – 88%; Education – 96%; Housing – 85%; Food – 73%; Health Care – 71.
HEALTH CARE

The 93 percent segment consists of youth 18 and older with health care coverage through Medi-Cal, and the 6 percent segment represent youth with other comprehensive health care coverage. Two 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 60 percent of youth ages 18 and up in Round 2. But among those who provided an answer, 25 percent reported having a medical home.

FOOD

Nine percent of the 18 and older cohort lack secure access to food. Two percent have chronic and severe food insecurity and do not receive CalFresh benefits. Seven 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: 71 percent can meet basic food needs with public assistance, 16 percent can meet their own needs without assistance, and 3 percent can even purchase food beyond their most basic needs.

HOUSING

Almost one third of 18 and older youth do not have adequate housing. Of this group, 17 percent are homeless or threatened with eviction, and 14 percent are either in transitional or substandard housing, their current housing costs are unaffordable, or their housing is not safe. The remaining 69 percent have a minimum level of adequate and stable housing: 16 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-three percent of 18 and older youth have not completed HS. Of that group, 14 percent of 18 and older youth have neither finished HS or are enrolled in secondary education. Twenty-nine percent have not completed HS but are enrolled in HS, a re-engagement center or a GED program. Of the remaining 57 percent, 26 percent have completed HS only, 29 percent have enrolled in a postsecondary or other training/certification, and two percent have completed a postsecondary program, training or certification.

INCOME

Nearly one quarter (24 percent) of 18 and older youth have no income or other financial assistance. An additional 12 percent have income that is not adequate to meet basic needs. Of the 64 percent who can meet basic needs, 49 percent rely on subsidies or assistance from others, 11 percent are able to meet their needs without relying on assistance or subsidy, and four percent can easily meet their needs and have some discretionary income as well.

---

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.
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.

**Figure 15.** Percent of 18-24 Year Olds at Minimum Self-Sufficiency Level, by OYP Eligibility

Note: Foster N=184-215; Justice N=24-89’ Parenting/Pregnant N=110-177; Homeless N=19-34. 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. Similarly, over 80 percent of foster youth reported have enough income and other support to meet basic financial needs, while just 64 percent of parenting and pregnant youth, 46 percent of justice-engaged youth, and 35 percent of homeless youth have enough income to meet their basic needs.

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, how those connections grow over time, and what
other circumstances or outcomes may stimulate or result from greater connectivity. The
connections reported over the first two rounds of OYP data collection are presented below.

In Figure 16 (below) all OYP youth across both rounds are represented. The chart indicates that
the overwhelming majority of youth—74 percent—were connected to a single organization (i.e.,
the one that reported him/her). The other 26 percent had worked with at least two different
DISC partner organizations at some point.

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

![Graph showing the number of different OYP partners connected to youth.]

Note: Average number of connections per youth was 1.5.

**Connectivity Across OYP Member Organizations**

As explained above, most of the youth in the cohort were connected solely to the organization
that reported them. However, as the next figure indicates, when viewed from an organizational
standpoint, certain organizations appear to have more youth connected to them from across
the DISC network than other organizations.

In Figure 17 (next page), the average number of connections associated with an organization
indicates a basic degree of connectivity between it and other DISC partners. It is not simply
based on the average number of connections reported on each intake/survey form. Rather, the
average is based on the cumulative number of connections cited by *all youth with any
connection* to that organization.

For example, Teen Force’s average is based on the connections cited for the 22 youth that Teen
Force reported, *plus* the connections any of those same youth that happened to be reported by
other DISC organizations, *plus* all other youth reported by other organizations that cited a
connection to Teen Force. From that combined population of youth with some established
connection to Teen Force—now 80 youth—we can take the average number of connections
cited for that group, which comes to 3.7 connections per person.
Alternatively, an average of 1.0 connections would indicate that an organization’s set of reported youth had no known connections to organizations other than the one that reported them, and that no other organization reported any of its youth population as connected to that organization.

As shown below, Teen Force, Family and Children Services, and Silicon Valley Children’s Fund were the three organizations most highly connected to other OYP organizations, and most of those connections existed within that group of three. Most of the connectivity observed across these three organizations results from their shared focus on foster youth, which was the largest segment of the OYP cohort. Furthermore, the fact that these organizations already coordinate with each other made it more likely that they were aware of connections to other foster-serving organizations.

Conversely, the number of different connections found among CTC, San Jose Conservation Corps, and Planned Parenthood Mar Monte are closer to one, on average, indicating that the majority of youth they reported were not known to be connected to other organizations, and that few other organizations listed their youth as being connected to those three organizations.

**PLEASE NOTE:** The following chart reflects only the total known connections among organizations within the OYP DISC network. It does not account for connections shared outside the 11 organizations listed below, nor does it take into account the nature or duration of such connections, nor does it reflect connections within organizations that may provide a range of different services.

**Figure 17.** Average Connections Shared Per Organization Within the DISC Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Avg Number of Connections to Other OYP Orgs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEENFORCE</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVCF</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASV</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWC</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2F</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGC</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLY</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPMM</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCC</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Connectivity by OYP Eligibility**

Figure 18 (next page) is based 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 (2.04, on average), as compared with homeless youth (1.43), parenting and pregnant youth (1.22) and justice-engaged
youth (1.12). As mentioned in the previous section, the fact that foster youth are the largest segment of the OYP cohort may have increased the number of potentially observable connections within the 11-organization network.

**Figure 18. Connectivity By OYP Eligibility**

![Diagram showing connectivity by OYP eligibility]

Note: Overall average number of connections per youth was 1.5.
OYP Outcomes Analysis: Six-Month Follow-Up

This section examines the progress that occurred among Opportunity Youth toward achieving the medium and long term outcomes of OYP between November/December 2014 and May/June 2015. Those outcomes are:

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

[Note: Self-sufficiency cannot yet be analyzed because it was not collected until the second round of data collection.]

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

MATCHED COHORT ACROSS ROUNDS 1 AND 2

In Round 1 (Nov/Dec 2014), nine different OYP partners reported on 729 different Opportunity Youth that they were serving at that time. In Round 2 (May/June 2015), 207 additional youth were added, for a combined population of 936 individual youth across both time periods. However, the data for 294 youth from Round 1 were not collected again in Round 2, mostly due to youth who were no longer involved with those organizations by Round 2 (see Appendix for list of stated reasons). This left a total of 435 youth from Round 1 whose records were updated in Round 2, and could thus be analyzed across the two time points.

Figure 19. Opportunity Youth Data Collected in Rounds 1 & 2

Note: See Appendix for list of reasons why certain youth from Round 1 were not updated in Round 2.

On the following page, Figure 20 presents the number of youth from each of the nine organizations in Round 1 that were re-reported in Round 2. In most cases, the drop-off from Round 1 to Round 2 was due to youth completing programs or aging out of the services they had been participating in by Round 2.
Youth From Each OYP Organization That Remained From Round 1 to Round 2

Note: For youth with duplicate records, this table refers to organization that provided the most data for that youth. See Appendix for list of reasons why some youth from Round 1 were not updated in Round 2.

As Figure 21 indicates, the youth from Round 1 who remained in the cohort in Round 2 were represented in all four OYP eligibility categories. The largest decreases occurred among justice engaged (58 percent decline) and pregnant and parenting youth (36 percent decline).

Figure 20. Youth From Each OYP Organization That Remained From Round 1 to Round 2

Figure 21. Youth From Each OYP Criteria That Remained From Round 1 to Round 2

Demographics of Matched Cohort

Below is a brief summary of the demographic differences between the entire cohort reported across either round of data collection and the matched cohort containing only youth reported in both rounds. Figure 22 shows that the matched cohort contained a much higher percentage of foster youth (62 percent) than the overall known OY population (43 percent), as well as a higher percentage of females. Conversely, the matched cohort contained a lower proportion of pregnant or parenting youth, justice-engaged youth, and males. There was no notable difference in the age distribution of the matched cohort.
Figure 22. OYP Eligibility, Gender and Age Differences in Matched Cohort

Note: The percentages within all Opp. Youth and within the matched cohort both exceed 100% to different degrees because many youth qualify in multiple categories.

The race and ethnicity of the matched cohort closely resembled that of the overall cohort of Opportunity Youth (Figure 23, below).

Figure 23. Race/Ethnicity of Matched and Overall Cohorts

ROUND 1 YOUTH NOT REPORTED IN ROUND 2

The table below presents the different reasons why the data for some youth from Round 1 were not updated in Round 2.

Figure 24. Reasons Youth Records Were Not Updated in Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Pct.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program ended before Round 2, or youth were no longer eligible</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff unable to locate youth</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth graduated</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth withdrew from program</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth moved out of the area</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages added up exceed 100% because 42 youth fit into more than one category.
CHANGES IN EDUCATION ATTAINMENT & ENROLLMENT

Between rounds 1 and 2, the percentage of 18-24 year old OYP youth who had graduated from HS or completed a GED rose 14 percentage points (54% to 68%). In terms of enrollment status, however, there was little net change in the percentage of youth currently enrolled in school.

Figure 25. Net Changes in Educational Attainment and Enrollment Between Rounds 1 & 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 16-17 (N=130)</th>
<th>Ages 18-24 (N=305)</th>
<th>All Youth (N=435)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rd 1</td>
<td>Rd 2</td>
<td>Rd 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from HS/GED</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Enrolled in School / Educ. Program (any kind)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in Postsecondary Inst.</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Age range is based on youths’ ages on June 1, 2015.

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.

How Many Youth Re-Enrolled in School?

Of the 67 youth who were reported as not in school or other educational program in Round 1, 13 youth (19 percent) re-enrolled by Round 2.

How Many Youth Left School?

Out of 329 youth enrolled in school in Round 1, 29 youth (9 percent) had left school as of Round 2. Of those 29 youth that appeared to have disengaged from school by Round 2, nine of these youth were already HS/GED graduates in Round 1. Of the other 20 youth that had not completed HS in Round 1, six had since graduated from HS (or equivalent) since Round 1, and 14 appeared to have disengaged in school before completing high school.
CHANGES IN EMPLOYMENT

There was a net increase in youth employment of eight percentage points (35 to 43 percent) from Round 1 to Round 2. The increase was shared across both the under-18 and 18-and-above age groups. Likewise, the percentage of employed youth doing work that is related to their career interests increased from 23 to 25 percent (see Figure 26).

Figure 26. Employment and Career-Related Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 16-17 (N=130)</th>
<th>Ages 18-24 (N=305)</th>
<th>All Youth (N=435)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rd 1</td>
<td>Rd 2</td>
<td>Rd 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (or Internship)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Related to Career Interests (pct. of those employed)</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Jobs include paid and unpaid work experiences (e.g., internships).

HOW MANY UNEMPLOYED YOUTH FROM ROUND 1 GAINED JOBS BY ROUND 2?

Out of 254 unemployed youth in Round 1, 53 (21 percent) had gained employment by Round 2. Of these 53 youth that started new jobs, 43 (81 percent) were 18 or older.

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

Out of 137 youth employed in Round 1, 26 (19 percent) were no longer employed by Round 2. Of these 26 youth, 21 (81 percent) were 18 or older.

CHANGE IN NUMBER OF DISCONNECTED YOUTH

The percentage of disconnected youth (without jobs and not enrolled in school) increased slightly from 11 percent to 14 percent. The increase is largely attributable to those youth who had been in school in Round 1, then had graduated from high school before Round 2, and were neither in school or employed as of Round 2 (June 2015) (see Figure 27).

Figure 27. Changes in Disconnected Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ages 16-17 (N=130)</th>
<th>Ages 18-24 (N=305)</th>
<th>All Youth (N=435)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rd 1</td>
<td>Rd 2</td>
<td>Rd 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnected: No Employment/Internship and Not in School</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL YOUTH PROGRESS

This section examines the number of Opportunity Youth who made progress along their educational or employment pathway from Round 1 to Round 2. All percentages Figure 28 (below) are based on the entire matched cohort sample of 435 youth.

Overall, 89 percent of the matched cohort showed progress in at least one of five different ways. The largest segment of this group was the 69 percent who showed progress by continuing their education into Round 2. An additional six percent of the cohort re-enrolled in school. Forty-five 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, 26 percent of the cohort maintained employment or other work experiences into Round 2, while an additional 15 percent started new positions after not reporting any work experiences during Round 1.

NOTE: When examining Figure 28, it is important to note that some youth showed progress in more than one area. The 89 percent column on the right includes all youth who met at least one of the five criteria for progress.

**Figure 28. Percentage of Matched Cohort that Showed Progress Between Rounds 1 & 2**

Note: All percentages are based on a denominator of 435, the entire matched cohort sample.
Conclusion

During two rounds of data collection (December 2014 and June 2015), 11 member organizations of the OYP Design and Implementation Steering Committee reported on the status of 936 foster, justice-engaged, pregnant or parenting, and homeless youth across Santa Clara county. 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 the 936 youth included demographics, educational attainment and enrollment, employment, self-sufficiency and connections to other OYP organizations.

Results from the matched cohort between December 2014 and June 2015 show a 13 percentage point increase in high school completion, and an 8-point increase in youth employment (including internships). However, there was no net increase in youth enrolled in school or other educational programs, including postsecondary education, between the first and second rounds of data collection.

Overall, 89 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 recent of the two rounds of data collection that exist for each youth.

Indicator 1: Earn a secondary credential (HS diploma, equivalency)
  ✓ 35 percent have completed HS or equivalency.
    ○ 46 percent of 18-24 year olds
    ○ 9 percent of 16-17 year olds

Indicator 2: Complete an internship or related work experience
  ✓ 33 percent were employed or participating in an internship
    ○ 53 percent of HS graduates were employed (or in internship)
    ○ 22 percent of non-HS graduates were employed (or in internship)

Indicator 3: Enroll in a postsecondary institution
  ✓ 14 percent were enrolled in a postsecondary institution
    ○ 19 percent of 18-24 year olds
    ○ 2 percent of 16-17 year olds

Indicator 4: Earn a postsecondary credential
  ✓ 6 percent have earned a postsecondary credential (e.g., associate’s or bachelor’s degree, vocational certification)
    ○ 8 percent of 18-24 year olds
    ○ 0 percent of 16-17 year olds

Indicator 5: Gain employment in a career field
  ✓ 16 percent of positions held by youth were career-related.
CHANGES OBSERVED FROM ROUND 1 TO ROUND 2

Of the 936 Opportunity Youth that were reported in either Round 1 or 2, 435 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.

- **89 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 13 percentage points, from 39 to 52 percent, over the six month period ending June 2015.
- There was no substantial net shift in the percentage of youth enrolled in school, including postsecondary enrollment.
- There was an eight percentage point gain in the percentage of youth employed or participating in internships, from 35 percent to 43 percent.
- The percentage of jobs related to career interests increased slightly, from 23 to 25 percent.
- Due to the number of students who completed high school and were no longer in school or employed by the Round 2 data collection period, the percentage of disconnected youth rose slightly, from 11 to 14 percent overall.

OTHER KEY FINDINGS

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

The self-sufficiency indicators added in Round 2 revealed that education and income are areas where youth ages 18-24 have the most to gain. For example, at least 36 percent of 18-24 year olds do not have sufficient income to meet their basic needs. More positively, however, 99 percent of reported have either Medi-Cal or another form of comprehensive health care coverage, and 90 percent can meet their basic food needs (although most rely on public assistance of some kind). Foster youth reported the highest self-sufficiency ratings of the four categories of Opportunity Youth.

The data collected across Rounds 1 and 2 also revealed several valuable insights regarding connectivity and links between organizations. The average youth was reported to be connected to 1.5 out of 14 possible OYP partners (including the one that reported that youth). Foster youth reported an average of two connections (one with the agency that reported them, plus one more), whereas other OY reported between 1.1 and 1.4 connections, on average.

Furthermore, there was significant variation between organizations in the number of linkages they shared. For example, youth that had any connection to Teen Force, Family and Children Services/ILP, or Silicon Valley Children’s Fund tended to be connected to a wider array of existing OYP partners than those youth not engaged with those agencies. Based on these findings, it would appear there are significantly more opportunities for partners to refer youth and work collectively with each other than has been recently occurring.
RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Based on the findings provided above and other lessons learned over the first 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) **Seek to reduce the amount of missing data in key fields such as education and employment (e.g., wages, career-related work experience).**

2) **Determine whether youth from Round 1 whose data were not captured in Round 2 may be re-captured and updated for Round 3.**

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

3) **Consider alternative data collection intervals that would correspond with time periods in which educational progress is most easily observed.**

   For example, it may be difficult for partners to report educational status near the end of a typical school year (May/June) when final grades and graduations may not yet have been recorded. A schedule based on April/October data collection periods may be more practical in this regard.

4) **Continue to explore ways to understand the nature of connectivity among the OYP network, and how it might inform OYP’s collective impact approach.**

   For example: What new information, if any, needs to be collected regarding links between organizations? What forms of connectivity exist outside of the DISC network that would support collective impact?

5) **Continue to build and refine OYP’s collective impact approach.**

   Designate a sub-cohort of approximately 100 OY that will become the focus of specific coordination and data sharing efforts between DISC members and other partner organizations.
A Note of Thanks From Kids in Common

Addressing complex social problems requires more than good intentions. The work of improving outcomes for opportunity youth requires a multi-stakeholder approach that goes well beyond a general intention to collaborate. Rigorous accountability matched with fearless transparency form the bedrock of a new type of collaboration – collective impact. This work begins by arriving at a common understanding and definition of the problem, and it moves forward with stakeholders tackling all parts of a problem together, synchronizing individual efforts, and coming together as a system. We must be able to deliver our individual programs effectively and at the same time “co-labor” to achieve a common vision. Success requires a shared dedication to finding new ways to work together, dedication to a common agenda and a willingness to be accountable for results. We are required to re-imagine the definitions of success and renew our commitment to reliably and consistently moving young people toward durable self-sufficiency.

This approach requires tremendous investments of time, energy, and effort. It requires time to meet, to develop trusting relationships, and to collect data. 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.

Through the Opportunity Youth Partnership, nine organizations came together last winter to create a shared measurement system. Each organization put in the time to hammer out common indicators and definitions, to create the tools to collect the data, and, finally, to collect the data. Hundreds of hours went into this work. Six months later these organizations came back for a second round of data collection. Seeing the benefit of a shared measurement system, two more organizations joined the second round of collection. And for the third round, slated for November 2015, three additional agencies have committed. These 14 organizations have committed to using data to guide improvement, shift practice, and drive results.

These organizations are working together not because of financial rewards, 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 missed by others and subjugated to our policies and procedures—and commit to nurturing that promise into maturity. And while their work is with individual youth, our partners understand our work together is about designing a better system that makes certain every youth can achieve success in education and career.

As the backbone organization for the Opportunity Youth Partnership, Kids in Common believes this work will be a game-changer for our youth and young adults. We also recognize that success will not be achieved without the commitment of time and resources by our partners. We appreciate our partners for daring to believe that we can do better for our kids and that this work together will be the difference our community needs. For this, we thank our partners and look forward to our continued work together.
Opportunity Youth Partnership Funders
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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**

(7) No income or other financial assistance (including high school students who do not need income yet).
(8) Inadequate income; cannot meet basic needs (with or without subsidy).
(9) Can meet basic needs with assistance or subsidy.
(10) Can meet basic needs without assistance or subsidy.
(11) Can meet basic needs and has discretionary income.
(12) Don’t know.