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Executive Summary

Background and Methodology

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. With the goal of improving results for all Opportunity Youth in Santa Clara County, the OYP is prioritizing 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.

To better understand the needs of these youth, how OYP partner organizations can improve coordination to help the youth achieve self-sufficiency, and measure progress toward educational and employment goals, the OYP began collecting detailed data on youth served by OYP partner organizations in December 2014. It has continued to collect updated data on youth for five subsequent rounds, the last of which took place in April 2017.

This report is a follow-up assessment of the Opportunity Youth cohort from the first three years of the OYP initiative’s data collection period. It describes the status of education and employment attainment of youth that were served by the Design, Implementation and Services Committee (DISC) member organizations in April 2017; 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 multiple rounds of data collection (in 2015-2017).

Sample and Results: Round 6

Round 6 of data collection was conducted in April 2017, and included a total of 1,220 unduplicated youth across 13 organizations. As in previous rounds, foster youth were the most well-represented subgroup and the majority of youth were Latino. In an effort to increase the number of homeless youth included in data collection, Bill Wilson Center provided data for nearly all youth and young adults in its drop-in center. One limitation of this method is that information for these individuals came from existing administrative data (instead of the round 6 intake form) and so these individuals did not have data for all variables.

Approximately three-quarters of the sample were enrolled in school at the time of data collection, with the majority (62 percent of the sample) enrolled in secondary school. A relatively large percentage (41 percent) of young people with a high school degree or GED were not in school. Half of the overall sample was employed, and 67 percent of those with a secondary credential were employed.

With the exception of education, for all other domains of self-sufficiency, at least half of the sample was self-sufficient. Food and health care had the highest percentages of self-sufficient individuals (90% and 97% respectively).

Thirty-four percent of the sample had worked with more than one OYP partner organization. As in the past, foster youth had the highest average number of connections compared to other eligibility groups.
Sample and Results: Longitudinal Analysis

There were 900 youth and young adults who had at least two rounds of data between round 2 and round 6. Most (67 percent) had six months or one year between their earliest (Time 1, T1) and latest (Time 2, T2) round of data. Foster youth and pregnant/parenting young people were the most well-represented subgroups in the longitudinal sample, while only nine percent of youth and young people had been homeless.

Seventy-five percent of youth made educational progress from T1 to T2, defined by staying in school, enrolling in school, and/or earning an educational credential. The majority of youth enrolled in school at T1 were still enrolled in school at T2:

- Of the 371 youth and young adults who were enrolled in secondary school at T1, 85 percent were still in secondary school at T2. Of those in secondary school at time 1 who had graduated by time 2, 30 percent (n=33) were not enrolled in school at Time 2.
- Of the 206 youth and young adults enrolled in post-secondary school at T1, 84 percent were still in post-secondary at T2.

Youth and young people were more likely to make educational progress if: they did not have a secondary credential at T1; they were self-sufficient in housing and food; they had not been justice-engaged, and they had received services from Silicon Valley Children’s Fund or San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School.

Similar to education, most youth and young people employed at T1 were still employed at T2. Of the 308 youth and young adults employed at T1, 23 (76%) were still employed at T2. Among those who were not employed at T1, 28 percent became employed by T2.

Among those with four or five rounds of data, there were more fluctuations in employment status than in educational status.

Key Findings and Implications

While this report provides a wealth of information about the current status and trajectories of opportunity youth in Santa Clara County, some of the findings most relevant to OYP’s efforts include:

- **Transition from HS/GED completion to post-secondary**: While most youth and young adults who were enrolled in school (secondary or post-secondary) in an earlier round were still enrolled at a later round, there were indications that youth need more support transitioning to post-secondary school after receiving a secondary credential. This is supported by a number of findings, including: only 41 percent of HS/GED graduates in Round 6 were enrolled in school, and the decreased likelihood of educational progress among those with a secondary credential in an earlier round.

- **Justice-engaged youth**: Justice-engaged youth were significantly less likely to make educational progress than young people who had not been involved in the juvenile justice system, indicating it may be helpful to look at the specific factors that make it difficult for these youth to enroll in, and stay in, school. This finding also supports the suggestion of organizations participating in the Aspen 100 effort that other organizations serving justice-engaged youth are invited to participate in the Opportunity Youth Partnership.
• **Importance of housing**: Although the percentage of youth and young people who were not self-sufficient in housing was 21 percent in round 6, findings from the longitudinal analysis indicate that not being self-sufficient in this domain can decrease a young person’s likelihood of making educational progress. These findings support OYP’s efforts to address this need and to engage organizations that provide housing services for youth and young people.

• **Changes in Self-Sufficiency Take Time**: For both income and housing self-sufficiency, time between T1 and T2 was a significant predictor of becoming self-sufficient, indicating it can take time to see changes in these domains.
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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, and hold ourselves accountable to tracking them over time, and using that data to learn and move the needle. Over the past 4 years, through hard work, collaboration, and compromise the partners that are the Opportunity Youth Partnership have begun to measure the outcomes that matter 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 web of support 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. Rigorous accountability and the fearless transparency it fosters are the lifeblood of this work. This work begins by arriving at a common understanding and definition of the problem. It moves forward with stakeholders tackling all parts of a problem together, and synchronizing individual efforts to come together as a system. Success requires a shared dedication to finding new ways to work together in pursuit of a common agenda. We are required to re-imagine the definitions of success and renew our commitment to moving young people toward durable self-sufficiency. All of this is built upon a system of shared measurement focused on the outcomes that matter most.

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.

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 and young adult 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 youth and young adult can achieve success in education and career. This work together will be a game-changer for our 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. With the goal of improving results for all Opportunity Youth in Santa Clara County, the OYP is prioritizing youth and young adults 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. 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.

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 three 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 thirteen OYP partners. The Executive Committee meets monthly to monitor the progress of OYP and to provide guidance to OYP leadership and its broader membership.

The second is the OYP Leadership Council, composed of County systems leaders, elected officials, City staff, CBO executives, heads of local philanthropy, leaders in the business and labor communities, and education system leaders. The Leadership Council acts as the OYP’s advisory council, committed to removing obstacles and supporting systems change. The council meets twice a year to provide critical input and guidance, and identify tangible ways to move the work forward.

The third group is the OYP Design, Implementation, and Services Committee (DISC), which consists of representatives from community-based organizations and education institutions 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. Most recently, the work of the DISC has been centered on collectively piloting a new OYP data project, the Aspen 100 cohort.

The Aspen 100 cohort is a fixed sub-set of youth from the larger shared measurement, who are between 18-22-years-old and have agreed to participate in two interviews/assessments per year, and allow this data to be tracked and discussed among the OYP partners for two years. The Aspen 100 cohort was assembled in January 2017 with 75 Opportunity Youth participants. The purpose of the Aspen 100 is to create a manageable and defined group of young people that the OYP network can discuss concretely and share information on, to begin piloting new strategies for collectively serving Opportunity Youth. To help inform the conversations on behalf of these young people, partners provide monthly self-sufficiency updates for their Aspen 100 clients in addition to providing the interview/assessment data at the 6-month collection intervals. The ultimate goal of this project is to understand the mechanisms of high impact collaboration, and develop improved avenues of
steadily increasing service alignment, which can be adapted and implemented back with the larger population of Opportunity Youth.

Through all of the efforts described above, OYP intends to create a robust network of youth and young adult-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 and young adults 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) Obtain early work experience or career-related internships.
4) Obtain postsecondary degree or professional certification in a career field.
5) Obtain employment or job experience in a career field.

OYP-DISC (Design, Implementation, and Services Committee) Data Partner Organizations

From 2014 to 2017 members of the OYP Design, Implementation, and Services Committee (DISC) dedicated substantial time and labor to the process of collecting the data for this report.

- Bill Wilson Center
- Boys & Girls Clubs of Silicon Valley
- Child Advocates of Silicon Valley
- ConXion to Community (CTC)
- Family & Children Services (operates the Independent Living Program of Santa Clara Co.)
- First Place for Youth
- Fresh Lifelines for Youth (FLY)
- Planned Parenthood Mar Monte - AFLP & Teen Success
- San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School
- Silicon Valley Children’s Fund (SVCF)
- TeenForce
- Teen Success, Inc.
- Work2Future Foundation
Purpose of This Report

This report is a follow-up assessment of the Opportunity Youth cohort from the first three years of the OYP initiative. It describes the status of youth and young adults that were served by DISC member organizations from December 2014 to April 2017; attempts to quantify the degree of connectivity of those youth and young adults across different DISC member organizations; and examines the extent to which progress toward short and long term goals occurred for youth and young adults who participated in multiple rounds of data collection. The report includes an overview of all youth and young adults with data in round 6, and a separate section describing longitudinal results of youth and young adults with data from at least two rounds between round 2 and round 6. Finally, there is a brief section describing outcomes of Aspen 100 youth.
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 and young adults 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

Research Questions

Entire Cohort

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

1) What are the demographics and other characteristics of the Opportunity Youth population in April 2017?

*Among young people in multiple rounds (between 2015 and 2017), how many:

2) Improved their educational attainment?

3) Gained or maintained employment?

4) Improved their self-sufficiency?

5) Made positive steps of any kind?

6) Did not make any progress?

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

Aspen 100 Cohort

8) Was kind of progress did Aspen 100 youth make between January 2017 and April 2017?
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. OYP partners were instructed to report on the status of youth and young adults 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.

Data collection has occurred over six different periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Number of Organizations Participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>November-December 2014</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>May-June 2015</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to understand that the youth and young adults 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 or young adult they served. Certain organizations that work with many common youth and young adults coordinated to reduce duplicate reporting among their eligible populations.

To maintain data confidentiality, the data files automatically generated an encrypted ID for each youth and young adult based on the individual’s initials and date of birth. When the files were exported and submitted to ASR, the names 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 or young adult (and gender) were used to identify individuals 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 6)

The total number of youth and young adults who were reported by OYP member organizations in April 2017 (Round 6) was 1,408. However, 188 of these youth and young adults were found to have been reported by multiple organizations, yielding a final count of 1,220 unduplicated youth and young adults reported in Round 6. It is important to note that two organizations (Bill Wilson Center drop-in center and San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School (SJCC)) provided data for many or all of their youth and young adults by pulling from existing administrative data. For these youth and young adults, data were not available for variables not included in the administrative data.

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

Round 6 Opportunity Youth by Eligibility and Organization

Figure 1 (below) shows the number of youth and young adults reported in Round 6 by OYP member organizations within each of the four primary eligibility criteria. The categories are not exclusive; 16 percent of youth and young adults belonged to more than one category. There were 213 youth and young adults (of the 1,220) who had none of the eligibility categories indicated. Most of these (180) were from SJCC, which used administrative data. In addition to the 28 percent of the cohort that was homeless, an additional five percent had previously experienced homelessness. Thus, a total of 33 percent of the cohort had been homeless at some point in their lives. Nearly all of the young people currently homeless (307 of 339) were reported by Bill Wilson Center’s drop-in center.

Figure 1. Number and Percentage of Opp. Youth Reported, by Eligibility Criteria (April 2017)

Note: N=1,220. Opportunity Youth in Round 6. Percentages sum to over 100 percent because youth and young adults may fit in more than one category. Each of the four eligibility categories above includes all youth and young adults who have ever belonged to that category, except for Homeless. Youth and young adults reported as homeless are limited to those who were experiencing chronic or episodic homelessness during Round 6.

Figure 2 details the specific combinations of eligibility that exist across the cohort. The largest single groups are those who are only foster youth (22%) and those who are only homeless (22%). As noted above, this sample has a large representation of homeless youth and young adults by design.
Figure 2. OYP Eligibility Combinations (Disaggregated)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Combinations</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER (only)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMELESS (only)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREG/PARENT (only)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTICE (only)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTICE &amp; PREG/PARENT</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER &amp; PREG/PARENT</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER &amp; JUSTICE</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREG/PARENT &amp; HOMELESS</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSTER &amp; HOMELESS</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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. There were also 213 youth with no eligibility category indicated.

Figure 3 shows the number of total youth and young adults reported by each OYP member organization for Round 6. These totals represent all youth and young adults with valid data through Round 6 from each organization; youth and young adults reported by multiple organizations are included within each organization’s total.

Figure 3. Total Youth & Young Adults Reported by Each OYP Member Organization (April 2017)

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

Demographics

Overall, the Round 6 OYP cohort is 63 percent female and 74 percent Latino/Hispanic. Sixteen percent of youth and young adults 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 and young adults. The average age across all youth and young adults is 19 years; 24 percent are 16-17 years old, and 76 percent are 18-24 years old (as of May 1, 2017).

Figure 4.  Demographics of Overall OYP Cohort (Round 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pct(N=1220)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity (not exclusive)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hisp</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Afr. Amer.</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18%</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>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Needs/Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot report</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (as of May 1, 2017)</strong></td>
<td>Avg = 19.9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 19</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 and Up</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education Levels

High School Graduation Status

Out of all OYP youth with data in April 2017, **35 percent** had graduated from high school or received a GED. Among youth and young adults under age **18**, **3 percent** had graduated or received a GED, while **44 percent** of those **18 and older** had graduated or received a GED.

Figure 5.  Percent of Opportunity Youth With HS Diploma or GED

N=1171.

Current Enrollment

Figure 6 details the percentage of youth and young adults who were enrolled and not enrolled in school, by age and high school completion status—for those with available data. Approximately three-
quarters of the cohort were enrolled in school (or other educational program) as of April 2017. However, the enrollment rate was much lower for high school graduates; over 40 percent of these young people were not in school.

**Figure 6. Opportunity Youth Current Enrollment Status (April 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In School (Secondary)</th>
<th>In School (2-yr college)</th>
<th>In School (4-yr college)</th>
<th>In School (Voc/Prof &amp; Other)</th>
<th>Not In School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Opp. Youth (n=1030)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 (n=263)</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and Up (n=767)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduates (or GED) (n=271)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Graduated HS (n=728)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

There were a lot of missing data for the questions about whether or not the young person had been disconnected from school, possibly because providers were not able to get this information. The figure below shows the percentage of young people who had ever been disconnected from school and were currently disconnected from school, among those who had data for these questions.

**Figure 7. Disconnection from School, Ever and Currently (April 2017)**
Employment and Current Work Experience

There were quite a few youth and young adults (approximately one third of the sample) for whom employment status was not provided. The results below are for those young people who did have data for this outcome.

Figure 8 (below) indicates that 50 percent of Opportunity Youth were employed or engaged in some kind of work experience as of April 2017. This includes both paid and unpaid positions such as internships. Among high school graduates, 67 percent were working. Among youth and young adults that had not completed high school, 30 percent of those 16-18 were working, compared to 64 percent of those 19-24 years old.

Figure 8.  Current Work Experience, By HS Graduation Status

How Many Jobs Were Career Related?

Among 247 youth and young adults with data for this question, 61, or 25 percent, had a job related to their career interests.

Wages

Wage was reported for 263 youth and young adults. Among these individuals, 56 percent were making between $10.00-$11.99 per hour. Another 37 percent were making between $12.00-$16.99 per hour.
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 individual youth and young adults who were reported by OYP partners in April 2017.

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

- **35 percent have completed HS or equivalency.**
  - 44 percent of 18-24 year olds
  - 1 percent of 16-17 year olds

**Indicator 2:** Complete an internship or related work experience

- **50 percent were employed or participating in an internship**
  - 67 percent of HS graduates
  - 40 percent of non-HS graduates

**Indicator 3:** Enroll in a postsecondary institution

- **14 percent were enrolled in a postsecondary institution**
  - 48 percent of HS graduates

**Indicator 4:** Earn a postsecondary credential

- **6 individuals have earned a postsecondary credential (e.g., associate’s degree or vocational certification)**

**Indicator 5:** Gain employment in a career field

- **25 percent of positions held by youth and young adults were career-related.**

Self-Sufficiency

Five self-sufficiency indicators have been collected and updated for youth and young adults for Rounds two through six:

- Healthcare
- Food
- Housing
- Education
- Income

Within each area, youth and young adults 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 and young adults who are at least 18.

Figure 9 (below) displays the self-sufficiency scores for Opportunity Youth ages 18 and older who were reported in Round 6. A detailed description of the individual self-sufficiency scores is in the notes below the figure, and Self-Sufficiency Index definitions are in the appendix.

### Figure 9. Self-Sufficiency Ratings of Opportunity Youth, Age 18 and Older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>L5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=485  Note: Data include youth and young adults 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.

### 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 and young adults had been engaged in across the OYP DISC network, in addition to the services of the organization reporting that individual 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 currently existed or had ever existed.

The connections reported for youth with data through Round 6 are presented below.

Figure 10 indicates that most youth and young adults—66 percent—were connected to a single organization (i.e., the one that reported him/her). The other 34 percent of the cohort had worked with two or more different OYP DISC partner organizations at some point.
Figure 10. Number of Different OYP Partners Connected to Youth

![Bar chart showing the number of different OYP partners connected to youth.](image)

403 people (34%) have worked with more than one OYP partner organization.

Average Number of connections: 1.95

Connectivity within OYP DISC Network, by OYP Eligibility

Figure 11 displays the number of organizations reported per individual, disaggregated by OYP eligibility status. Connections include both past and current relationships with organizations.

As in past rounds, foster youth tended to have the most connections cited with other organizations (3.71, on average), pregnant/parenting youth and justice-engaged both had an average of two connections. The number is not provided for homeless youth, because only 34 of these youth had data about connections.

Figure 11. Connectivity Within OYP DISC Network, By OYP Eligibility

![Bar chart showing the average number of connections.](image)
Youth in Round 5 Not Updated in Round 6

There were 212 youth and young adults in round 5 for whom data could not be provided in round 6. The table below shows the reasons youth and young adults who participated in round 5 did not have data in round 6, for those for whom the organization answered the question. An individual could have multiple reasons for lack of follow-up.

The two most common reasons that a person’s information was not updated in round 6 were that the youth was removed from the program or the youth completed the program. The far right column shows the organizations that reported this reason the most frequently. For example, nearly all of the youth and young adults who could not be reported on because they were removed from the program were reported by San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School.

Figure 12. Reasons Youth Records Were Not Updated After Round 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Organizations with most youth and young adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth was removed from program (e.g., due to noncompliance/no participation)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>SJCC (n=98) PPMM_AFLP (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth completed program</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>SJCC (n=68) FLY (n=14) PPMM_AFLP (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff unable to locate youth (youth still in program)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>CASV (n=54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth withdrew from program</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>CASV (n=10) PPMM_AFLP (n=11) BGC (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth moved out of the area</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CASV, PPMM_AFLP, FCS, SJCC, SVCF, W2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth aged out of program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>FCS (n=7) PPMM_AFLP (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth became incarcerated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FLY (n=5) SJCC (n=4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section examines the progress that occurred among Opportunity Youth toward achieving the medium and long-term outcomes of OYP youth between 2015 (Round 2) and June 2017 (Round 6). 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

Sample for Longitudinal Analysis

Youth and young adults were included in the longitudinal analysis if they had data for at least two of the five rounds between round two to round six. This yielded a total of 900 youth and young adults with at least two rounds of data, as shown in the figure below.\(^1\) While 42 percent had only two rounds of data, 27 percent had four or five rounds of data.

The figure below shows the amount of time between the first and last round of data among youth and young adults in at least two rounds. It is important to note that an individual’s participation was not always consecutive. For example, a youth or young adult could have been in round 2 and round

\[\text{N}=900 \text{ youth and young adults with at least five rounds of data.}\]

\(^1\) There were an additional 1,157 youth and young adults who had data for only one of these rounds, yielding a total of 2,057 unique youth and young adults in rounds 2-6.
4 (but not in round 3). There were approximately six months between each round. Most youth and young adults had six months or one year between the first and last round, but one third had 18 or 24 months between first and last round.

![Figure 14. Number of Rounds Between First and Last Round with Data (among 900 youth with at least 2 rounds of data)](image)

**Demographics**

**Figure 15. Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Age in Longitudinal Cohort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent (N=1220)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity (not exclusive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hisp</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Afr. Amer.</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (as of first round of data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 and Up</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subgroup Membership**

The figure below shows the percentage of the longitudinal sample who were in each of the Opportunity Youth subgroups in at least one round. Foster youth and Pregnant/Parenting teens were the most represented. One-quarter were justice-engaged, and less than 10 percent were homeless. It is important to note that youth could have been in more than one group.

![Figure 16. Percentage of Longitudinal Sample in Each Subgroup (in at least one round)](image)
**Organizational Connections**

Youth and young adults were identified as being affiliated with an organization if they were reported by the organization and/or were reported to have received services from an organization in at least one round. The figure below shows the number of youth and young adults affiliated with each organization in at least one round. The organizations that were most represented included Planned Parenthood, Silicon Valley Children’s Fund and Child Advocates of Silicon Valley. These organizations focus on foster youth and pregnant/parenting young adults, which aligns with the numbers in the figure above. A figure in Appendix A shows intersections between organizations.

![Figure 17. Number of Youth Affiliated With Each Organization in at Least One Round](image)

N=900. Youth could be affiliated with more than one organization.

**Outcomes**

This section describes changes in the key outcomes between time 1 (T1), the first round of available data, and time 2 (T2), the last round of available data, for each young person. It is important to note that the amount of time between T1 and T2 varies depending on which rounds a young person had data for. As shown in figure 14 above, most youth and young adults had 6 or 12 months between T1 and T2.

**Key Indicators**

The table below shows the number, and in some cases percent, of young people achieving key outcomes between time 1 (T1) and time 2 (T2). Because some young people had missing data in some rounds, and some outcomes apply to only some people (e.g. only those without a secondary credential at T1 would be eligible to earn a secondary credential), the denominator for the outcomes
varies and is noted in the “Details” column. It is important to note that the numbers below are based on only the first and last round of data for each young person. A later section examines the trajectories of those who had data in all five rounds.

**Figure 18. Longitudinal Outcomes, Youth with at Least Two Rounds of Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>#/%</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Enrolled in secondary school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Of 52 non-HS graduates who were not enrolled in school at T1, 12 (23%) were enrolled in secondary school at T2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stayed enrolled in secondary school</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Of 371 youth and young adults who were enrolled in secondary school at T1 and did not have a secondary credential by T2, 314 (85%) were still enrolled in secondary school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earned a secondary credential</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Of 581 youth and young adults who did not have a secondary credential at T1, 117 (20%) had earned a secondary credential by T2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left secondary school program (without a</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Of 371 youth and young adults who were enrolled in secondary school at T1 and did not have a secondary credential by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>credential)</td>
<td></td>
<td>T2, 36 (10%) were not enrolled in secondary school at T2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Enrolled in a post-secondary program</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>There were 48 youth and young adults not enrolled in post-secondary school at T1 who were enrolled in post-secondary at T2. Most of these youth and young adults (41) were in secondary school at T1, and 7 were not enrolled in school (but had a secondary degree) at T1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stayed enrolled in post-secondary program</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Of the 206 youth and young adults enrolled in post-secondary at T1, 174 were still enrolled in post-secondary at T2. This included 15 youth and young adults who were in a 2-year or vocational program at T1 and a 4-year program at T2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earned post-secondary credential</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>There were 20 youth and young adults who did not have a post-secondary credential at T1, but did at T2. Most of these youth and young adults earned an associate’s degree and were enrolled in a 2-year college at T1. A few were enrolled in secondary school at T1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left post-secondary program (without a credential)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Of 206 youth and young adults in a post-secondary program at T1, 32 (16%) were not enrolled in post-secondary at T2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became employed</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Of the 519 youth and young adults without a job at T1, 144 (28%) were employed at T2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed employed</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Of the 308 youth and young adults employed at T1, 233 (76%) were still employed at T2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became unemployed</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Of the 308 youth and young adults employed at T1, 75 (24%) were not employed at T2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained employment in career field</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Of 118 youth and young adults without a career-related job at T1, 15 (13%) had gained a career-related job by T2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in self-sufficiency: income</td>
<td>161 (22%)</td>
<td>Of 731 youth and young adults with SSM data at T1 and T2, 22% increased their self-sufficiency related to income.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in self-sufficiency: housing</td>
<td>114 (16%)</td>
<td>Of 726 youth and young adults with SSM data at T1 and T2, 16% increased their self-sufficiency related to housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in self-sufficiency: food</td>
<td>114 (16%)</td>
<td>Of 707 youth and young adults with SSM data at T1 and T2, 16% increased their self-sufficiency related to food.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any educational progress:</td>
<td>653 (75%)</td>
<td>Of 873 youth and young adults with at least two rounds of enrollment data and/or two rounds of HS graduation data, 653 (75%) made educational progress, including enrolling in school, staying in school, and/or earning a credential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any self-sufficiency progress: Increased self-sufficiency in income, housing, and/or food</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>There were 289 youth and young adults who had an increase in at least one of these three domains of self-sufficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational Trajectories

Figure 19 on the following page shows the educational trajectories of the 767 youth and young adults with enrollment and high school graduation status for at least two rounds. The primary findings include:

- **Time 1 Status**: Of the 767 youth and young adults with available data for at least two time points, over half (63%) were in secondary school at time 1. Twenty-six percent were enrolled in post-secondary school (2-yr or vocational), and approximately 10% were not enrolled in school.

- **Unenrolled at Time 1**: Among youth and young adults not enrolled at time 1, most were not high school graduates at time 1. However, for both groups (high school grads and not high school grads), most youth and young adults were still not enrolled at time 2.

- **Enrolled in secondary school at Time 1**:
  - Of those in secondary school at time 1, most (77%) were still not high school grads by time 2; however, most of these youth and young adults were still enrolled in secondary school, indicating they were still making educational progress.
  - Of those in secondary school at time 1 who had graduated by time 2, 30 percent (n=33) were not enrolled in school at time 2.

- **Enrolled in post-secondary school at Time 1**:
  - Of those in post-secondary school (2-year or vocational) at time 1, most (68 percent) were still enrolled in a 2-year or vocational post-secondary program, and another 7 percent were enrolled in a 4-year post-secondary program. Sixteen percent were not enrolled in school at time 2.
  - All five youth and young adults in a 4-year post-secondary program at time 1 were still in that type of program at time 2.
Figure 19. Educational Trajectories from Time 1 to Time 2

All Youth with Enrollment and HS Grad Data for at least 2 rounds
N=767

T1: Earliest round of data
- Not Enrolled in School (n=79)
  - T1: Not HS Grad (n=52)
  - T1: HS Grad (n=27)
- Enrolled in Secondary (n=482)
- Enrolled in Post-Secondary (2-year/vocational) (n=201)
- Enrolled in Post-Sec. (4-yr) (n=5)

T2: Latest round of data
- Not Enrolled (n=79)
  - T2: Not HS Grad (n=371)
- Enrolled in Secondary (n=482)
- Enrolled in Post-Secondary (2-year/vocational) (n=201)
- Enrolled in Post-Sec. (4-yr) (n=5)

Legend:
- Not Enrolled
- Enrolled in Secondary
- Enrolled in Post-Secondary (2-yr or vocational)
- Enrolled in Post-Secondary (4-yr)
- Other
Factors Related to Educational Progress

Youth and young adults were considered to have made educational progress between time 1 and time 2 if any of they did any of the following:

- Enrolled in school
- Stayed in school
- Earned educational credential (secondary or post-secondary)

The table on the following page compares characteristics of youth and young adults who made educational progress and those who did not, and indicates whether or not the difference between the two groups was statistically significant. Logistic regression was used to identify the factors significantly associated with educational progress when examining all factors simultaneously. Only youth and young adults with at least one year between T1 and T2 were included in the analysis. The factors significantly associated with educational progress are listed below in order of strength of association (strongest to weakest):

- **High school graduation status at T1**: Youth and young adults who were not high school graduates at T1 had approximately three times the odds of making educational progress compared to those with a secondary credential at T1. This is likely because most youth and young adults who did not have a secondary credential at time 1 were enrolled in secondary school and remained enrolled, while some who were high school graduates did not necessarily proceed to post-secondary.

- **Housing and Food Self-Sufficiency**: Youth and young adults who were self-sufficient in housing had 2.5 times the odds of making educational progress compared to those who were not self-sufficient. The same was true for food self-sufficiency. Income self-sufficiency was not significantly associated with educational progress. Because of the overlap between housing self-sufficiency and being homeless, only one of these factors (housing self-sufficiency) was included in the analysis.

- **Justice Engaged (in any round)**: Youth and young adults who were not justice engaged had approximately twice the odds of making educational progress compared to those who were justice engaged.

- **Connection to specific organizations**: Youth and young adults who had received services from Silicon Valley Children’s Fund and/or San Jose Conservation Corps and Charter School were significantly more likely to make educational progress.

Other factors shown in the table below (e.g. age, gender, race/ethnicity, number of connections, employment) were not significantly linked to educational progress when considering all factors simultaneously.
Figure 20. Characteristics of Youth, by Educational Progress Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Educational Progress</th>
<th>No Educational Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (T1)***</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OY Category (In any round)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster ^</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Engaged*</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant/Parenting</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless***</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate (T1)***</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Self-Sufficient (T1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food***</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing***</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Organizations (T1)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Organizations (T2)*</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (T1)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (T2)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made employment progress (employed at T1 &amp; T2 or not employed at T1 &amp; employed at T2)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one year between first and last round</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1: Time 1 (earliest round of data); T2: Time 2 (latest round of data)
Factors Related to Self-Sufficiency Progress

A similar analysis was conducted to determine which factors were significantly associated with increases in self-sufficiency. Specifically, the analysis included young people who were not self-sufficient in each domain at T1 to determine which factors were associated with becoming self-sufficient by T2. The significant factors for each domain are below. Health care is not included because there were so few individuals who were not self-sufficient in this domain at T1.

Figure 21.  Factors Associated with Becoming Self-Sufficient, by Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Number Not SS at T1*</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Income | 292                  | • *High School Graduate at T2*: Those who were high school graduates at T2 (including those who became high school graduates and those who were also HS graduates at T1) had significantly higher odds of becoming self-sufficient for income. (This is even after controlling for age.)  
• *Time between T1 and T2*: Young people with more time between the first and last round of data were more likely to achieve self-sufficiency.  
• *Employment*: Those who had a job had twice the odds of becoming self-sufficient for income compared to those who were not employed. |
| Housing| 135                  | • *Time between T1 and T2*: Young people with more time between the first and last round of data were more likely to achieve self-sufficiency. |
| Food   | 92                   | • *Gender*: Males were less likely to become self-sufficient in this domain than females. |

*With data at T2.

As with the educational progress analysis, in the self-sufficiency analysis, other factors were examined and are not listed above because they were not significantly associated with progress. These include: age, race/ethnicity, number of connections, and OYP eligibility category.

Youth in All Five Rounds

There were 113 youth and young adults who had data in all five rounds (rounds 2-6). This section examines the trajectories of these individuals.

Education

Across the 113 youth and young adults with data in round 2 through round 6, approximately half (57) maintained their educational enrollment status across the five rounds. One-quarter progressed to a higher level of enrollment, and one-quarter regressed to a lower level of enrollment. In general there were not a lot of fluctuations in enrollment—there were not a lot of youth and young adults who had more than one change in enrollment status. If they became enrolled in a new level, or became unenrolled, they usually stayed at this new enrollment status.
Maintained \(n=57, 50\%\)
Among those who maintained the same level of educational enrollment,
- 26 began in secondary and stayed in secondary
- 26 began in post-secondary (2 yr/vocational) and stayed in post-secondary
- 5 began unenrolled, went in and out of school, and were unenrolled in round 6

Progressed \(n=25, 23\%\)
Among those who progressed to a higher level of education,
- 13 began in secondary and were in post-secondary in round 5 or 6
- 5 went from a 2-yr to a 4-yr institution
- 2 went from secondary to 4-yr
- 4 began unenrolled and then enrolled in secondary
- 1 began unenrolled and then enrolled in post-secondary

Regressed \(n=31, 27\%\)
Among those who regressed to a lower level of enrollment from T1 to T2,
- 18 began in secondary, became unenrolled and stayed unenrolled. Most of these were enrolled in secondary for several rounds then became unenrolled. It is likely that these were youth and young adults who graduated from high school and then did not enroll in post-secondary.
- 10 were enrolled in a 2-yr/vocational program for one or more rounds, then became unenrolled and stayed unenrolled.
- 3 started in secondary, entered post-secondary, and then became unenrolled.

Employment
As shown in the table below, among the 113 youth and young adults with data in rounds 2 through 6, 46 (41%) were employed in zero or one of those rounds and 37 (33%) were employed in 4 or 5 rounds. The rest were employed in 2 or 3 rounds. As expected, those who were not employed in most rounds were significantly younger than those who were employed in most rounds. The group employed in most rounds also had a higher percentage of high school graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Trajectory for Youth with 5 Rounds of Data</th>
<th>Number (Percent)</th>
<th>Average Age (Round 2)</th>
<th>High School Graduates (Round 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed in 0 or 1 rounds</td>
<td>46 (41%)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in 2 or 3 rounds</td>
<td>30 (27%)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in 4 or 5 rounds</td>
<td>37 (33%)</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was more fluctuation in employment status than in education enrollment status. Specifically, youth and young adults experienced more changes in employment status (e.g. going from employed to unemployed to employed again) than educational enrollment status.
Self-Sufficiency Scores

Income
There were very few youth and young adults with a 5 for income in any round. A common pattern was to have a 3 in all rounds (n=26, 23%). Most youth and young adults (68, 61%) were self-sufficient in this domain in all, or all but one, rounds. There were 15 (13%) youth and young adults who were not self-sufficient in all or most rounds. Those who were self-sufficient in most rounds were older and more likely to have a secondary credential.

Figure 23. Income Self-Sufficiency Trajectory, Youth with 5 Rounds of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number (Percent)</th>
<th>Average Age (Round 2)</th>
<th>High School Graduates (Round 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient in 0 or 1 rounds</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient in 2 or 3 rounds</td>
<td>31 (30%)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient in 4 or 5 rounds</td>
<td>64 (61%)</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=105

Housing
As with income, most young people were self-sufficient in housing in all or most rounds. Very few (4%) were self-sufficient in no, or almost no, rounds. It is important to note that the group of young people with five rounds of data had a relatively small percentage/number of individuals with housing challenges, likely because these young people may be more transient and thus less likely to stay connected to an organization collecting data.

Figure 24. Housing Self-Sufficiency Trajectory, Youth with 5 Rounds of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number (Percent)</th>
<th>Average Age (Round 2)</th>
<th>High School Graduates (Round 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient in 0 or 1 rounds</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient in 2 or 3 rounds</td>
<td>16 (16%)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient in 4 or 5 rounds</td>
<td>80 (80%)</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=100

Food
Nearly all youth and young adults were self-sufficient in the domain of food in all or nearly all rounds.

Figure 25. Food Self-Sufficiency Trajectory, Youth with 5 Rounds of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient in 0 or 1 rounds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient in 2 or 3 rounds</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient in 4 or 5 rounds</td>
<td>93 (95%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=98
Case Studies

This section describes the details of a small sample of young people with data in all five rounds, including some who were successful in making educational progress, and some who were less successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Education Trajectory</th>
<th>Employment Trajectory</th>
<th>Self-Sufficiency Trajectory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>More Successful (more educational progress)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Female</td>
<td>• Age (R2): 18.3</td>
<td>• Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>• Foster Youth</td>
<td>FCS, CASV, SVCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Male</td>
<td>• Age (R2): 18.1</td>
<td>• White</td>
<td>• Foster</td>
<td>SVCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Male</td>
<td>• Age (R2) 19.2</td>
<td>• Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>• Foster, Justice</td>
<td>FCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Successful (less educational progress)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Female</td>
<td>• Age (R2): 21.1</td>
<td>• Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>• Foster, Justice, Pregnant/Paren t (all rounds)</td>
<td>SVCF, CASV, FCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Female</td>
<td>• Age (R2) 18.8</td>
<td>• Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>• Foster</td>
<td>FCS, CASV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Male</td>
<td>• Age (R2): 17.3</td>
<td>• Hispanic/Latino and Native American</td>
<td>• Justice-engaged</td>
<td>FLY, CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aspen 100 Youth

Description of Aspen 100 Youth in January 2017

The following figures show the characteristics of Aspen 100 youth in January 2017, the first month of complete data for the cohort.

**Figure 26. Demographics of Aspen 100 Youth, January 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>(N=75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant or Parenting</td>
<td>26 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth</td>
<td>24 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously justice engaged</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>9 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently justice engaged</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant or Parenting</td>
<td>25 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age (as of October 2016)**

- 18.0-20.9 years: 60%
- 21.0-24.9: 40%

Nearly three-quarters of the Aspen 100 youth were employed, and just over half had a secondary credential in January 2017.

**Figure 27. Employment and HS Degree, Aspen 100 (January 2017)**

- Has HS degree/GED: 53%
- Has Job: 71%

Among the 63 young people with enrollment data, 41 percent were not enrolled in school, 33 percent were enrolled in secondary school and 25 percent were in post-secondary school in January 2017.

**Figure 28. School Enrollment, Aspen 100 (January 2017)**

- In Post-Secondary: 16
- In Secondary: 21
- Not Enrolled: 26
- No Data: 12
The figure below shows the cohort’s self-sufficiency scores in January. In each domain, over half of youth and young adults were self-sufficient, with the highest rates for health care and food.

**Figure 29. Self-Sufficiency Scores, Aspen 100 (January 2017)**

As shown below, 59 percent of youth and young adults were not self-sufficient in only zero or one domain, indicating that over half of youth and young adults were self-sufficient in all or nearly all domains.

**Figure 30. Number of Domains in Which Not Self-Sufficient**
Description of Aspen 100 Youth in Round 6

Of the 75 Aspen 100 youth with data in January 2017, 55 (73 percent) had data in round 6 (April 2017). For another 13 Aspen 100 youth, organizations provided information about why they could not report on them. Approximately half were still being served by the organization but were not in contact during the period of data collection; the others had completed the program or left for other reasons. The final seven were not in round 6 at all.

Figure 31. Aspen 100 Youth with Round 6 Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q22A: Cannot Update</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22B: Completed Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22C: Aged Out</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22E: Withdrew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22F: Moved Away</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22H: Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total is more than 13 because 2 youth had multiple reasons,

(N=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Youth</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant or Parenting</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Justice Engaged</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Justice Engaged</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (as of May 1, 2017)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.0-20.9 years</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0-24.9</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in Self-Sufficiency Scores: January 2017 to April 2017 (N=54)

The following table shows the number of Aspen 100 youth who became less self-sufficient, more self-sufficient, and maintained self-sufficiency between January 2017 to April 2017. Across the domains, most individuals had no change in their self-sufficiency in the four-month period. However, there were 13 young people who increased their housing self-sufficiency (compared to eight who decreased).
This improvement in housing self-sufficiency is also evident in the figure below, which shows that more people were self-sufficient in this domain in April compared to January.
Summary of Findings

Round 6
Below is a summary of the findings from round 6 data, including characteristics of the sample and educational, employment and self-sufficiency status.

Sample
- Foster youth continued to be the most well-represented group. As intended, and because of the administrative data from the Bill Wilson Center drop-in center, there was a much bigger percentage of homeless youth than in previous rounds. One limitation is that this was from administrative data and so data were not available for all variables.
- As with previous rounds, a majority of individuals were Latino.

Education and Employment
- Approximately three-quarters of the sample were in school, with the majority (62%) in secondary school.
- A relatively large percentage (41%) of young people with a high school degree or GED were not in school.
- Half of the overall sample was employed, and 67 percent of those with a secondary credential were employed.

Self-Sufficiency
- With the exception of education, for all other domains of self-sufficiency at least half of the sample was self-sufficient. Food and health care had the largest percentages of self-sufficient individuals (90% and 97%, respectively).

Connections
- Thirty-four percent of the sample had worked with more than one OYP partner organization.
- As in the past, foster youth had the most connections compared to other eligibility groups.

Longitudinal Analysis
Below is a summary of findings from the longitudinal analysis that examined changes for youth and young adults with at least two rounds of data.

Sample
- There were 900 youth and young adults who had at least two rounds of data between round 2 and round 6. Most (67%) had six months or one year between their earliest (Time 1, T1) and latest (Time 2, T2) round of data.
- Foster youth and pregnant/parenting young people were the most well-represented. Only nine percent of the sample had been homeless.

Education and Employment
- Of the 371 youth and young adults who were enrolled in secondary school at T1, 85 percent were still in secondary school at T2.
• Of those in secondary school at time 1 who had graduated by time 2, 30 percent (n=33) were not enrolled in school at time 2.
• Of the 206 youth and young adults enrolled in post-secondary school at T1, 84 percent were still in post-secondary at T2.
• Seventy-five percent made educational progress, defined by enrolling in school, staying in school and/or earning an educational credential.
• There were more fluctuations/changes in employment status than in educational status for young people with four or five rounds of data.

Factors Associated with Progress

• Factors associated with educational progress included:
  o Not being a high school graduate at T1 (HS graduates were less likely to make progress.)
  o Being self-sufficient in housing and food
  o Not being justice engaged (Justice-engaged youth and young adults were less likely to make educational progress.)
  o Receiving services from Silicon Valley Children’s Fund and/or San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School.

• Factors related to becoming self-sufficient included:
  o *Time between T1 and T2*: for Income and Housing, those with more time between T1 and T2 were more likely to achieve self-sufficiency.
  o *High School Graduate at T2*: Those who were high school graduates at T2 were more likely to become self-sufficient in income.
  o *Gender*: Males were less likely than females to become self-sufficient for food.
Appendix

Intersections Between Organizational Affiliations
(Longitudinal Sample)

The chart below shows the number of youth and young adults affiliated with each organization (first column labeled “All”) and the number of youth and young adults served by combinations of organizations. For example, the second row shows that 77 youth and young adults in the longitudinal sample were affiliated with Bill Wilson Center; 11 of these were also linked to San Jose Conservation Corps & Charter School, and 10 were linked to Silicon Valley Children’s Fund. The most common combinations were among Child Advocates of Silicon Valley, Silicon Valley Children’s Fund, and Teen Force. The Boys & Girls Club shared no youth and young adults with the other OYP organizations. The bolded numbers in each row indicate the organizations that have the most overlap.

Figure 34. Intersections Between Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>BWC</th>
<th>BGC</th>
<th>CASV</th>
<th>CTC</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>FPFY</th>
<th>FLY</th>
<th>PPMM</th>
<th>SJCC &amp;CS</th>
<th>SVCF</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TSI</th>
<th>W2F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Wilson Center</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Clubs of Silicon Valley</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Advocates of Silicon Valley</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConXion to Community (CTC)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Children Services</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Place for Youth</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Lifelines for Youth (FLY)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood Mar Monte – AFLP &amp; Teen Success</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Conservation Corps &amp;</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charter School</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>BWC</th>
<th>BGC</th>
<th>CASV</th>
<th>CTC</th>
<th>FCS</th>
<th>FPFY</th>
<th>FLY</th>
<th>PPMM</th>
<th>SJCC &amp;CS</th>
<th>SVCF</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>TSI</th>
<th>W2F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Children’s Fund (SVCF)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeenForce</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Success, Inc.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work2Future Foundation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All abbreviations are:  

- BWC: Birth Worker Collaborative  
- BGC: Birth to Grad Collaborative  
- CASV: Child Advocacy Services  
- CTC: Career Technical Center  
- FCS: Family and Community Services  
- FPFY: Foundations for Preparing Younger  
- FLY: Family Link  
- PPMM: Parent and Provider Mentoring  
- SJCC: Silicon Valley Junior College  
- &CS: SVCF and Children’s Fund  
- TF: TeenForce  
- TSI: Teen Success, Inc.  
- W2F: Work2Future Foundation
Self-Sufficiency Index Definitions

In the Round 2 intake/survey form, OYP member organizations reported on youth and young adults’ 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.