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## Definition of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
<td>Rate of school attendance as calculated by the Oregon Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Impact</td>
<td>A methodology for addressing social issues articulated by John Kania and Mark Kramer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>A self-identified collective of individuals, aligned with one or more local jurisdictional boundaries for the purposes of data indicator assessment and tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Grant</td>
<td>Grants designated for programs, services, and initiatives in communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Rate</td>
<td>Rate of school completion as calculated by the Oregon Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Appropriate</td>
<td>The ability to be effective for a specific culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparities in Rates</td>
<td>A difference in an indicator rate for the population as a whole and the same indicator rate for a defined portion of that population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of students enrolled in a given district as calculated by the Oregon Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout</td>
<td>As defined by the Oregon Department of Education, a dropout is a student who withdrew from school and did not graduate or transfer to another school leading to graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged Student</td>
<td>As defined by the National School Lunch Program, a student who meets the income eligibility guidelines for free or reduced meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education System</td>
<td>The collection of institutions in Oregon government that operate within the framework of the Oregon Education Investment Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>As defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, all civilians 16 years old and over who either were at work or with a job but not at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence Based</strong></td>
<td>Incorporating significant and relevant practices based on scientifically based research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free and Reduced Price Lunch Eligible</strong></td>
<td>Children of households whose income is at or below 185% of the federal poverty guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender-Identity</strong></td>
<td>A person’s innate, deeply felt psychological identification as male or female, which may or may not correspond to the person’s body or designated sex at birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Rate</strong></td>
<td>As defined by the Oregon Department of Education, the rate of high school graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeless Student</strong></td>
<td>As defined by the Oregon Department of Education, a child or youth who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idle Youth</strong></td>
<td>As defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, youth not living in group quarters who have not been enrolled in school for three months and are not in the labor force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators: Community</strong></td>
<td>Community level data points that track measures of social progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators: Individual</strong></td>
<td>Personal level data points that track measures of individual progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile Referral Rate</strong></td>
<td>The rate of law enforcement reports to juvenile departments alleging one or more felony or misdemeanor acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Force</strong></td>
<td>As defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, all people classified in the civilian labor force plus members of the U.S. Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited English Proficient Student</strong></td>
<td>As defined by the Oregon Department of Education, an individual who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school; who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English; who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minority Student
A student who has origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa; Hispanic culture; the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent or the Pacific Islands; or an American Indian or Alaskan Native having origins in any of the original peoples of North America; or whose first language is not English

Opportunity Youth
Youth age 16 to 24 who are neither enrolled in school nor participating in the labor force

Priority Youth
Youth ages 6 to 16 who are at risk of disconnecting from the education system, already disconnected from the education system, or at risk of being unable to transition successfully to the labor force

Statewide Assessments
The statewide assessments administered through the Oregon Department of Education at different grades designed to show a student’s progress toward meeting content standards

Student with Disabilities
As defined by the Oregon Department of Education, students who require special education because of: autism; communication disorders; deafblindness; emotional disturbances; hearing impairments, including deafness; intellectual disability; orthopedic impairments; other health impairments; specific learning disabilities; traumatic brain injuries; or visual impairments, including blindness

Underserved Races/Ethnicities
As defined by the Oregon Education Investment Board Equity Lens, Students whom systems have placed at risk because of their race, ethnicity, English language proficiency, socioeconomic status, gender, sexual orientation, differently abled, and geographic location
Executive Summary

The Oregon Youth Development Council was created through a series of gubernatorial policy directions and legislative bills as a part of recent education reform and restructure efforts that began in earnest in December of 2010. Senate Bill 909 of the 2011 Legislative Session, House Bill 4165 of the 2012 Legislative Session, and House Bill 3231 of the 2013 Legislative Session established and developed the Council as a part of a new Oregon Education System, all under the vision and direction of the Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB).

The Oregon Education Investment Board began its work with an audacious goal, that by 2025 Oregon ensures that 40 percent of adults will have earned a bachelor’s degree or higher, that 40 percent will have earned an associate’s degree or post-secondary credential, and that the remaining 20 percent or less will have earned a high school diploma or its equivalent. To meet this goal, the OEIB established three key strategies – first, to create a coordinated public education system; second, to focus state investment on achieving student outcomes; and third, to build statewide support systems.

Subsequent to the development of the OEIB, the Oregon Early Learning Council was created as a part of the re-envisioned education system. The Early Learning Council was handed the task of developing an early childhood system that ensured all Oregon children would meet the early benchmark of kindergarten readiness. The central idea was that as children found themselves on the path to kindergarten readiness and entered the Oregon K-12 education system, they would find themselves on a strong foundation for success.

Despite the positive educational outcomes expected from the development of a statewide early learning system, and aligning that system with the school system, there was an understanding that there are and always would be youth who encounter various forms of adversity in their lives. This adversity would be at times so significant, it would create real and detrimental barriers to education and workforce success. To meet these challenges, the legislature created the Youth Development Council (YDC).

The Youth Development Council was tasked with supporting the Oregon Education Investment Board and the overall education system by developing state policy and administering funding for supporting community-based youth development programs, services, and initiatives. Specifically, the Youth Development Council was to be responsible for looking at those youth who were encountering barriers to school and work success.
In order to accomplish the task presented by Governor John Kitzhaber and the Oregon Legislature, the council has spent the last six months working to develop policy and funding recommendations centered on three key questions:

1. How should the Youth Development Council best support and assist with the work of the Oregon Education Investment Board and the reform and restructure efforts of the education system?

2. How should the Youth Development Council align with the national conversation and nationwide efforts that currently exist to support education and career success for high needs youth and establish state policy with respect to youth development?

3. How should the Youth Development Council support community-based youth development programs, services, and initiatives with demonstrated outcomes and strategic objectives for high needs youth in a manner that aligns with the 40/40/20 goals of the state?

To answer these three questions, the Youth Development Council embarked on a process of community engagement with stakeholders across the state, data and research review on current policy and indicator trends, and an examination of various community-based methodological approaches to solving social issues. The council has concluded that the following recommendations should be implemented in order to fulfill the mandate given by the Governor and Legislature:

1. The population focus of the Youth Development Council should be on Opportunity Youth and Priority Youth, terms that will be explained in detail in this report.

2. The goals of the Youth Development Council should be reconnecting Opportunity Youth with education and career, establishing a secure connection for Priority Youth with education and career, and addressing youth violence and crime.

3. These goals should be accomplished by developing state policy and funding community-based efforts that address barriers to education and career success.

4. The funding that supports community-based efforts should be administered from the Youth Development Council in four need-based grant funds.
   
   i. The Youth and Community Grant Fund
   ii. The Youth and Gangs Grant Fund
   iii. The Youth and Innovation Grant Fund
   iv. The Youth and Crime Prevention Grant Fund
Opportunity Youth, Priority Youth and the National Conversation
Who are Opportunity Youth?

In June of 2012 the White House Council for Community Solutions released a final report entitled *Community Solutions for Opportunity Youth*. This report described the challenging landscape faced by many of the nation’s youth today, with a particular focus on those who are completely disconnecting from the education system and the labor force. As a part of the development of the report, the White House Council for Community Solutions jointly commissioned, with the Corporation for National and Community Service, an in-depth analysis by researchers at Queens College at the City University of New York and Teachers College at Columbia University. This analysis, entitled *The Economic Value of Opportunity Youth*, specifically examined which youth are disconnecting from school and work, why these youth are disconnecting, and the economic loss to the nation as a result. These two reports jointly provide context and vision for re-engaging these youth in the education system and labor force, and a foundation from which to build a policy agenda.

The term *Opportunity Youth* is one that has emerged nationally in the last several years. Historically referenced as disengaged youth in the 1990s and disconnected youth in the 2000s, the shift in language is an intentional effort to better reflect the economic cost of not having youth engaged in the education system and labor force. With Opportunity Youth not in school investing in their own human capital, and not at work developing skills and experience, these youth are associated with an economic loss to society. This loss comes both in the form of an increased general tax burden, as well as an increased level of social burden. In total, with an estimated 6.7 million Opportunity Youth nationally, the economic burden to the United States in 2011 present value terms is $7.31 trillion\(^1\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Loss</th>
<th>Social Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lost Tax Payments</td>
<td>• Lost Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Expenditures on Crime</td>
<td>• Victim Cost of Crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Expenditure on Health</td>
<td>• Private Expenditures on Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welfare Support Programs</td>
<td>• Lost Productivity Spillovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welfare Transfer Payments</td>
<td>• Marginal Excess Tax Burdens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is estimated that for any single Opportunity Youth, society experiences an immediate tax burden of $13,900 per year, and an immediate social burden of

---

$37,450 per year\(^2\). In addition, if a secure connection to school or work is not ever made, after the age of 25 any single Opportunity Youth will impose an additional future lifetime tax burden of $170,740 and future lifetime social burden of $529,030\(^3\).

To understand how to best support Opportunity Youth to re-engage in the education system and the labor force, it is necessary to understand who these youth are. At the national level, Opportunity Youth can be segmented in two distinct categories. The first, Chronic Opportunity Youth, are those who have had almost no formal education or work experience between the ages of 16 and 24. The second, Under-Attached Opportunity Youth, are those who are at the margin of school and work – they have some education, some have high school degrees, and some work experience, but do not have a consistent, secure connection to the education system or labor force. Chronic Opportunity Youth pose a far more expensive and substantial challenge to re-engage than those who are under-attached, and are often facing much more significant barriers to school and work.

The reasons for a lack of connection to school and work are generally individualized, but there are trends that clearly emerge at close examination. Opportunity Youth tend to be disproportionatenely low-income, immigrant, English language learner, single parent, rural household, youth of color, LGBT, and youth with disabilities. Many youth are working to balance familial responsibilities or are struggling with social issues such as behavioral health needs, addictions, or criminal involvement. Historical rates of Opportunity Youth were higher in young women, but the Great Recession led to a significant increase in the number of young men disconnected from school and work.

Despite these difficult circumstances, in-person interviews conducted for the White House report found that youth are still optimistic about their futures. Most are confident and hopeful that they will achieve their goals, get an education, and have a good career. Most believe that accomplishing these goals are their own responsibilities. But most also understand that they need some help along the way.

\(^3\) IBID
Oregon Youth

In Oregon, one in every seven youth is an Opportunity Youth, disconnected from the education system and the labor market. Of the estimated 465,000 youth age 16 to 24 in the state, nearly 66,500 are not in school and not working. Using national cost estimates, in a single year, Oregon experiences over a $924 million direct fiscal burden as a result of their disconnection from school and work, as well as an almost $2.5 billion social burden imposed upon individuals, families, and communities.

While the reasons for disconnection are unique for each youth, one theme is common among all — it is increasingly difficult to navigate the path from school to work. For those youth who regularly encounter barriers to learning and career success, the macroeconomic fallout from the Great Recession has only compounded these barriers and increased the difficulty in finding a secure attachment to school and work.

More work is needed to understand much of the data around Opportunity Youth in Oregon. Initial Oregon indicators reinforce national disparities for low-income, immigrant, English language learner, single parent, rural household, youth of color, LGBT, and youth with disabilities. Increasing employment rates for older workers at entry-level jobs will continue to have negative effects on the ability of younger workers to gain a foothold in the labor market. Declining real wage levels for an increasing share of the population will saddle more youth with familial responsibilities. The increasingly difficult-to-navigate transition from school to work may lead to increasing behavioral health issues, addiction issues, and criminal involvement. All of these factors and more create additional barriers to learning, leading to increased numbers of youth joining the ranks of Priority Youth, with the potential for them to become Opportunity Youth, disconnecting completely.

_____

4 Calculation based on applying the cost methodology (developed in Belfield, C.R., Levin, H.M., & Rosen, R. (2012). The Economic Value of Opportunity Youth. Washington D.C.: Civic Enterprises) to the number of Opportunity Youth in Oregon. The number of Opportunity Youth in Oregon based on estimates from the Measure of America methodology (Opportunity Index Data and Scoring Center. Indicator Map: http://opportunityindex.org/#5.00/43.804/-120.554/-Oregon) and analysis and the 2012 Census Bureau ACE Population Estimates. Further analysis is needed to gain a more detailed understanding of the gender, race/ethnicity, education, age, and socioeconomic status of Oregon Youth.
Who are Priority Youth?

When examining the research around youth disconnecting from school and work, the barriers these youth face do not begin at age 16. While the term Opportunity Youth fits well for those that within that age range in the education system or the labor force, the Youth Development Council found that another term was necessary for those youth ages 6 to 16. More specifically, a term was needed to describe youth below age 16, experiencing barriers to learning that may put them at risk of disconnecting from school, or struggling with the transition to work. Consequently, the council is using the term Priority Youth to describe those who are at risk of becoming Opportunity Youth. These are youth ages 6 to 16 who are at risk of disconnecting from the education system, who are already disconnected from the education system, or at risk of being unable to transition successfully to the labor force.

Priority Youth experience a variety of risk-producing conditions that can be barriers to school and work. Barriers can present themselves as environmental conditions in neighborhoods, families, and peer groups, as well as personally as individual factors. Examples of these conditions include poverty, teenage pregnancy, community violence, substance abuse, poor quality schools, criminal activity, disability, caregiver responsibilities, and institutional residence\(^5\).

While the terms vary slightly, research reinforces the existence of these factors. The increased number of barriers a youth faces, or the increased intensity of individual barriers, results in a higher-needs learner. These higher-needs youth will continue to struggle to succeed in the classroom setting until there is exposure to a mechanism that addresses the interfering factor and then re-engages the youth in learning\(^7\).

In Oregon, the mechanism that has been developed to support these youth within the education system is the Youth Development Council. With a specific mandate to develop statewide policy and fund community-based programs, services, and initiatives for high-needs youth, the council plays a distinct and differentiated role in supporting the state’s 40/40/20 education goals. As youth learners continue to navigate their path through the education system and transition to the labor force, it is the council’s role to identify youth that may be starting to disconnect, or already have, and develop and support the mechanisms necessary to reduce the risk of disconnection, or establish reconnection.

---

\(^6\) White House Council on Community Solutions 2012.
\(^7\) Adelman, H.S., Taylor, L. (2008)
The Youth Development Council
Community Investment Strategy
Foundational Principles

A Community is Self-Determined
Regardless of existing city, county, school district, educational service district, special service district, or other governmental jurisdictional boundaries, the development and existence of a community is a largely independently occurring process. To design a policy and funding model that supports community-based policy interventions, it must include a mechanism that allows communities to self-identify and deliver services in a manner that the community determines is culturally appropriate.

Resources Should Target Those Most in Need
With limited resources available to support communities, mechanisms must be built into the policy and funding model to identify and select funding applications that are focused on serving youth who are most in need. These youth are usually those from low-income, immigrant, English language learner, single parent, and rural households, youth of color, LGBT, and youth with disabilities.

Economic and Social Advancement is the Long-term Goal
Transformational change is what will enable upward economic and social mobility as well as long-term sustainability. This can be accomplished by supporting community efforts designed to aid youth in developing their own human capital, or accumulating labor market skills in the workforce. Community-based policy interventions must be wrapped around goals associated with education and career advancement, crime prevention, and breaking down barriers to school and work success.

Progress is Essential
In the end, when grants are distributed to communities, demonstrated outcomes will be necessary to illustrate progress toward education and career development goals. The policy and funding model must contain monitoring and evaluative mechanisms that track improvement and hold recipients responsible for reasonable and realistic results.
The Community Investment Strategy

With the passage of HB3231 during the 2013 Legislative Session, the Youth Development Council began a six-month process to design and develop a community investment strategy. This investment plan would need to support the strategic direction and efforts of the Oregon Education Investment Board, align with the education system being developed for the Early Learning Council, the Oregon Department of Education, Community Colleges and Workforce Development, as well as Post-Secondary Education Institutions through the Higher Education Coordinating Commission. More importantly, this investment plan would need to support community efforts in a manner that embraces community decision making, while maintaining a statewide vision and direction. This is a delicate equilibrium — one that has been recognized as important by individuals at all levels of government, and in all categories of organizations. To accomplish this task, the Youth Development Council identified three independent, but interconnected components of work — a community engagement process, a data and research analysis, and a review of community-based methodological approaches to solving social issues.

The council first embarked on a process of community engagement with stakeholders across the state. Council members and staff held over 100 meetings in over 30 communities in under four months. Regardless of where the meetings were held, who was participating, or what role the participants held, the process yielded a series of common themes. These themes have been presented as the foundational principles of the community investment strategy — that a community is self-determined, that resources should target those most in need, that economic and social advancement is the long-term goal, and that progress is essential. The conversations were at times difficult, which is unavoidable, considering the reform and restructure efforts that are underway, and the council is grateful for all who took the considerable time and effort needed to participate. The feedback received has been used to structure a model that will strengthen and enhance many of the successful efforts already occurring in communities to support the education and career goals of the Governor, and the Oregon Education Investment Board.

The second component of work was a data and research analysis on current policy and indicator trends as they relate to youth disconnecting from school and work. There has been an extensive amount of research undertaken over the past several decades to understand why some youth struggle in the education process and what factors are contributory. This research is critical, as it was used to identify and then reconcile what data indicators are currently available to the
council, and how they could be used to identify communities most in need. There are definite shortfalls that need to be acknowledged and addressed. Data availability and quality is considerably poorer for Native American youth, homeless youth, and LGBT youth, and much work is needed to obtain a more accurate understanding of how these youth are adversely impacted in our education and work systems. Nevertheless, the available data and research was able to provide a solid framework off which to build. This framework has established a common set of indicators of need that can be used across all Youth Development Council grant funds, as well as a common set of community and individual outcome measures that can be used to track progress.

Finally, a review of various community-based methodological approaches to solving social issues was conducted to determine what approach would best fit the work of the Youth Development Council. In the end, the Collective Impact methodology that is being used by other institutions in the education system, and is already quite widespread and successful in communities, was determined to be the approach that would best align with and support the work.
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