RECONNECTING CHICAGO’S YOUTH

A BRIEF ON ASSETS AND GAPS
TOGETHER WE CAN ENSURE THAT EVERY CHICAGO YOUTH THRIVES
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INTRODUCTION

Young people in Chicago are the city’s most important asset. When we give youth access to jobs and continued education options, they thrive and we all win. Yet a significant portion of Chicago’s youth - over 15% - are being left behind, disconnected from school and work. A large majority of these youth have earned a high school diploma, but most have not earned additional credentials.

To address this critical gap, Thrive Chicago launched an Opportunity Youth Working Group in 2016, comprised of 30+ public and private partners. Partners included youth-facing public sector agencies, local funders, research institutions, youth leaders, and community-based service providers. This group built new knowledge about Opportunity Youth (OY), 16-24 year-olds out of school and work, in Chicago and produced a set of shared solutions for connecting them back to employment and education.

At a summit in 2017, the Opportunity Youth Working Group unveiled a citywide campaign anchored on a bold goal of reconnecting 10,000 Opportunity Youth in three years, a set of ten citywide recommendations, and a framework for action. At the second Opportunity Youth Summit in 2018, Thrive announced the launch of the Reconnection Hubs, one of the ten recommendations, and issued its “Reconnecting Chicago’s Youth Annual Impact Report” on Chicago’s progress and collective efforts. This brief builds on the report with more detail on the assets and systemic gaps present in Chicago in serving Opportunity Youth.

THIS BRIEF HAS THREE SECTIONS THAT AIM TO GROW OUR COLLECTIVE UNDERSTANDING OF CHICAGO’S OPPORTUNITY YOUTH AND THE SUPPORTS AVAILABLE TO THEM:

1. The State of Opportunity Youth - In May of 2018 Thrive released an OY Impact Report which demonstrated our collective progress against the 10,000 Reconnected Campaign. This included a demographic analysis of the nearly 50,000 Opportunity Youth who are out of work and out of school. This State of OY is included in this brief for additional population level context.

2. Landscape Scan - A survey of more than 115 youth serving organizations, conducted by UChicago Urban Labs, to better understand the existing services available to support Chicago’s Opportunity Youth. Of the 84 Chicago organizations who report supporting OY, over 50% provide services to more than 100 OY per year.

3. Fiscal Scan - A documentation and assessment of the federal, state, and local funding streams, estimated at more than $40 million, that currently support or could be leveraged to support Opportunity Youth in Chicago.

THESE FINDINGS AIM TO:

- Dismantle biases and change negative narratives by building our collective understanding of Opportunity Youth.
- Help Opportunity Youth practitioners advocate by providing additional information and data.
- Push conversations about the varied needs and supports of this diverse population and the current resources allocated to support them.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WE HAVE NOT FULLY ALIGNED RESOURCES, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES TO FULLY MEET THE DIVERSE NEEDS OF OPPORTUNITY YOUTH. THERE IS AN INCREDIBLE OPPORTUNITY TO TAP INTO THE EXTENSIVE EXPERTISE OF COMMUNITY PARTNERS AND PUBLIC FUNDING STREAMS.

Key findings across sections:

THE STATE OF OPPORTUNITY YOUTH: see pages 10-15

- As published in Thrive's Reconnecting Chicago's Youth - Annual Impact Report, Chicago is home to nearly 50,000 OY, ages 16-24, who are out of school and out of work.
- Chicago OY tend to be disproportionately Black or Latinx, older and have a high school diploma: 80% are 20-24 and 64% have no more than a high school diploma. They are equally as likely to be male or female - 52% and 48% respectively. Three-quarters are low-income and a quarter, or over 12,000 OY, live in deep poverty.
- Racial disparities in unemployment and wages persist even between youth who have the same educational qualifications. Black youth with a bachelor's degree are more than three times as likely to be unemployed than their white counterparts, and those that are employed make on average $14,000 less than their white peers.

LANDSCAPE SCAN: see pages 16-31

- There are over 80 Chicago organizations working directly with OY to achieve reconnection to school or work. Over half of those organizations have been supporting OY for at least 10 years, and 70% could provide more services with additional funding.

KEY TAKEAWAYS:

1. Organizations are serving fewer women and youth over age 18
2. OY outreach and engagement are significant challenges
3. Few organizations report concrete connections with employers
4. Offering comprehensive services would better align with diverse youth needs

PROVIDER RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Reinvest in Prevention through Education
2. Equitable Economic Investment and Citywide Employer Engagement Strategy
3. Better Coordination of Services
4. Positive Youth Voice, Outreach and Engagement

FISCAL SCAN: see pages 32-43

Over $40 million in federal, state, and local public funding currently supports or could support Opportunity Youth in Chicago, including education services such as Chicago Public Schools' SOAR Centers, workforce development services such as job training and placement, and wraparound services such as legal aid. While this public funding is substantial, it is fragmented: funding streams tend to be allocated to specific programs rather than to the individual youth, which can be challenging for this population, as OY often need multiple types of services to be successfully reconnected.

FISCAL SCAN RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. OY service providers should leverage collective assets - OY service providers should collaborate to comprehensively provide wraparound services, decreasing funding fragmentation and interruption of services.
2. Private funders should invest in older, more disconnected youth - Many public funding streams are geared towards younger OY or are not flexible enough to serve more disconnected youth.
3. Public funders should identify opportunities to blend funding streams - Funding that serves similar populations should be assessed to see if it can be combined upstream to enable more flexible program funding models.
In 2016, Thrive Chicago launched an OY Working Group of 30+ public and private partners to build new knowledge about OY in Chicago and produce a set of shared solutions for connecting them to employment and education. Partners included youth-facing public sector agencies, local funders, research institutions, youth leaders, and community-based service providers.

In March 2017, the Working Group launched a citywide campaign to reconnect 10,000 Opportunity Youth anchored on ten recommendations and a framework for action.

Since then, Thrive has convened a diverse group of practitioners, funders, community partners, public sector leaders, and youth to drive concrete interventions to realize Chicago’s collective strategy for OY.

**WE TRACK OUR PROGRESS AGAINST THAT BOLD GOAL OF RECONNECTING 10,000 YOUTH IN TWO WAYS:**

1. Examining population level outcomes
2. Measuring system-level changes
CHICAGO’S YOUTH DISCONNECTION RATE HAS DECLINED SINCE 2012. AS DETAILED IN THRIVE’S RECONNECTING CHICAGO’S YOUTH ANNUAL IMPACT REPORT, THIS IS IN PART DUE TO CHANGES IN THE OVERALL YOUTH POPULATION, AS WELL AS TREMENDOUS COLLECTIVE EFFORTS UNDERWAY ACROSS CHICAGO.
In order to achieve systems change, we need to tackle problems from all sides. Funders - both public and private - should consider how they direct and place conditions on resources. Providers should continue to advocate for more flexible resources and policies that would allow them to reach the youth they want to serve - not just the OY they are able to immediately serve. Researchers and experts should continue to elevate the critical data and best practices that can inform and ultimately generate systemic change.

Only by recognizing the role of each individual, organization, and community can we address the six key conditions of systems change:

1. Thrive and its partners have already made important strides in addressing some of the conditions for systems change. Despite impact across numerous factors of systems change, the combined findings in this brief show that critical systemic gaps remain.

2. Measuring System-level changes

   **POLICIES**  **PRACTICES**  **RESOURCE FLOWS**  **RELATIONSHIPS & CONNECTIONS**  **POWER DYNAMICS**  **MENTAL MODELS**

   **PRACTICES: ORGANIZATIONAL AND NETWORK ACTIVITIES**
   Since 2015, Thrive, the Chicago Cook Workforce Partnership, and numerous community-based organizations have organized seven hiring fairs as part of the national 100k Opportunities Initiative. These fairs were attended by more than 6,000 youth and resulted in more than 2,000 job offers from 50 employers. Thrive has co-designed an Opportunity Youth Hiring Fair Toolkit with partners that documents best practices on reconnecting youth to jobs. These practices are now being executed by neighborhood-based organizations across the city.

   **RESOURCE FLOWS: ASSET ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION**
   After participation in the Opportunity Youth Working Group, Chicago’s Department of Family and Support Services revised its solicitation process to expand a youth workforce initiative to explicitly focus on Opportunity Youth. This also equipped delegate agencies with a longer (18 month) grant cycle to support the various needs of Opportunity Youth. In 2018, the City of Chicago also provided direct public resources to support Opportunity Youth. These resources support two of the key interventions that came out of the Opportunity Youth Working Group: launching of the first neighborhood-based Reconnection Hub and supporting neighborhood-based hiring fairs.

   **MENTAL MODELS: BELIEFS AND ASSUMPTIONS**
   Until Thrive’s Opportunity Youth Working Group, many people had assumptions that Opportunity Youth were primarily young men and justice-involved. However data provided to this group from UIC Great Cities Institute, Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago, and UChicago Urban Labs uncovered that nearly 50% of Opportunity Youth were women and the majority were not justice-involved. This mental model was able to be turned on its head thanks to disaggregated data. Thrive and its partners can now work to close the critical gap of who is and is not getting services.
A deeper look at Chicago’s Opportunity Youth (OY) population and the system that support them reveals a set of misalignments and gaps where the system’s resource flows, policies, and practices do not match the demographics of our OY population.

These gaps demonstrate the disparity between the OY we seek to serve and the system we’ve built to serve them. While most Chicago OY are older youth who are disconnected for longer periods of time and who need to be actively recruited, public funding streams are not flexible enough to meet the needs of older, more disconnected youth, resulting in more services for younger, less disconnected youth.

We cannot close these gaps one program or organization at a time. We need collective interventions that identify and address these systemic barriers to create a system that is tailored to the characteristics and needs of our OY.

Together, we can ensure that our Opportunity Youth, along with every Chicago youth, thrives.

---

**CURRENT STATE**

- **80%** of Chicago’s OY are 20-24 and an estimated 43% of OY have been disconnected for more than a year.

**EXISTING GAPS**

- Most publicly funded programming is geared towards youth under 18. The youth served by Chicago OY organizations are primarily 16-19 and have been disconnected less than one year.

- 48% of Chicago’s OY population are women. Organizations report only 40% of the OY they serve are women.

- At least 84 organizations in Chicago support OY. Only ~60% of organizations reported dedicated funding to support OY and most of those organizations receive less than $200K to do so.

- Youth that have been disconnected for long time periods often require more active recruitment to connect to services. Organizations that employ active recruitment techniques (e.g. street outreach) are more likely to have a waiting list than those that do not.

- Lack of dedicated investment in and capacity for active recruitment and outreach at organizations.

- OY tend to require various combinations of services to reconnect to school and work. Public OY funding streams tend to be allocated to specific programs or services rather than to serve youth comprehensively.
STATE OF OPPORTUNITY YOUTH

EXCERPT FROM RECONNECTING CHICAGO’S YOUTH: ANNUAL IMPACT REPORT
Despite considerable progress in graduating more Chicago youth from high school over the last decade, nearly 50,000 Chicago youth ages 16-24 in 2016 were neither working nor in school. This figure represents about 15% of all 16-24 year olds in Chicago, well above the national average of nearly 12%. In line with national, state, and county level trends since 2012, Chicago has seen a 3.5 percentage point decline in its Opportunity Youth population over the same period. Even as this population shrinks, more work remains to improve outcomes for the vast number of OY in Chicago and to achieve our collective goal of cutting the youth disconnection rate to under 12% by 2020.

Disconnection from pathways to employment carries a host of devastating impacts. Opportunity Youth are at an increased risk for long-term unemployment, poverty, substance abuse, and justice involvement. Although many community-based organizations, government agencies, funders, and others are working hard to help reconnect these youth, and while we have seen improvement in key education and economic outcomes for youth in recent years, progress has been in part driven by youth population dynamics.

We also see that racial disparities persist. As this section of the report illustrates, despite the positive trend in the decline of the OY population in Chicago, there remain tremendous systemic barriers that create persistent socioeconomic and racial opportunity gaps among our youth. We recognize the incredible talent that Chicago’s youth possess -- removing barriers preventing them from achieving employment and education success is an equity mission we must all embrace.
Changes in Chicago’s Overall Youth Population

Unlike other large cities like Los Angeles and New York City, which have seen relatively no change in their youth population, Chicago has experienced a 7% drop over the last four years. This decline is driven by both youth leaving the city and youth aging out (turning 25) faster than they are entering (turning 16) the OY age cohort. Using Census data, we estimate that aging out explains roughly 10% of the overall youth population decline during this period, whereas youth leaving the city accounts for 90% of the overall decline in Chicago’s youth population. It is highly likely that the overall youth population decline in Chicago, consisting of both youth leaving the city and aging out, is the primary driver of the city’s OY population decline.

Changes in Chicago’s Youth Education and Employment Trends

While youth population change is a significant factor in the overall downward trend in Chicago’s OY population, it does not fully paint the picture. The rate of Chicago’s youth who reported being in school and the employment rate of out-of-school youth both slightly increased from 2012 to 2016.

Chicago is home to an incredible constellation of organizations and institutions who are constantly leveraging best practices and evidence to connect young people back to school and work. Chicago Public Schools, local higher education institutions, and their partners, for instance, have greatly contributed to the increase in the city’s high school graduation and postsecondary enrollment rates. Moreover, the overall improvement in economic conditions in Chicago between 2012 and 2016, reflecting a national trend, and the efforts of our youth-serving ecosystem both have played vital roles in overall increases in youth employment in our city since 2012. These positive trends in youth education and employment outcomes partly explain the decline in Chicago’s OY population.
Much like the previous year, Chicago’s OY in 2016 continue to be disproportionately Black and Latinx, skew older, nearly half are female, and almost three-quarters have a high school diploma or higher.

In terms of socioeconomic status, 45% of our city’s OY live at or below poverty, and one quarter live at or below deep poverty, or 50% of the poverty line. Nearly three-quarters of Chicago’s OY live at or below twice the poverty line, which research suggests is what families need to earn to afford basic expenses.
As previously stated, disconnection disproportionately impacts youth of color. Almost a quarter of Black youth in Chicago are disconnected from school and work and the gaps between Black and Latinx youth with their White peers have not changed dramatically between 2012 and 2016.

Although Chicago has made tremendous strides in improving employment and education outcomes for youth, significant racial disparities persist on both areas. In 2016, the employment rates for out-of-school Black and Latinx youth were 60% and 72% respectively, compared with 93% for out-of-school White youth. While the gap between Black and White youth on this measure has narrowed between 2012 and 2014, the gap between Latinx and White youth has slightly widened.

Moving forward it is imperative we employ a racial equity lens to close opportunity gaps as we seek to hold our city accountable to our collective goal.
Similar racial disparities exist when looking at youth joblessness by educational attainment. Black and Latinx youth with a high-school diploma or college degree have higher rates of joblessness than their White peers. In fact, Black youth with a high-school diploma are twice as likely to be jobless than their White peers, and Black youth with a Bachelor’s degree are three times more likely to be jobless than their White peers. Progress toward closing these specific gaps in youth employment outcomes would have a positive impact on reducing the size of Chicago’s OY population.

In examining youth connection to education in Chicago, 51% of Black youth in Chicago were in school in 2016, compared with 60% of their White peers, a gap that has widened since 2012. On the other hand, the gap between in-school rates for Latinx and White youth almost closed entirely during this same period.

There are still nearly 50,000 young people disconnected from school and work in Chicago. We owe it to each of them to reach further and work harder. Thrive and its partners will continue to examine the root causes of these opportunity gaps, set goals with a racial equity lens, and adjust strategies to support youth across Chicago, especially in our most under-resourced communities.
Chicago has approximately 50,000 “Opportunity Youth” – youth ages 16-24 who are disconnected from school and work. This number represents 15% of all 16-24 year olds in Chicago, a rate that is 39% higher than the national average and larger than other peer cities, including LA and New York. What’s more, while the recent economic recovery has reduced the number of Opportunity Youth (OY) nationwide, recovery over the last five years has been far slower here in Chicago and practically non-existent for youth of color. For Black men the crisis is particularly stark: nearly half of all 20- to 24-year-old Black men are both unemployed and out of school.

Every year that passes, more youth become disconnected and remain jobless as adults. For these youth, disconnection from pathways to employment carries a host of devastating impacts. Opportunity Youth are more likely to report worse health status, including mental health hospitalization and receiving drug and alcohol treatment, and are more likely to be uninsured. They are also more than twice as likely to live below the poverty line, while their chances of finding and holding a job for a significant amount of time are much lower than those of their peers.

Yet it is not just the youth themselves facing grave consequences. Inaction also carries a high cost for society at large, with an estimated $37,000 annual cost for each Opportunity Youth or nearly $2 billion dollars per year in Chicago alone.¹

Stopping the flow of generations of youth not connected to employment or education is imperative for Chicago’s economic health and public safety.

We urgently need solutions to address this challenge. Many nonprofits and government agencies are working hard to help these youth.

An Incomplete Picture of the Varied Characteristics and Needs of Opportunity Youth

Opportunity Youth are a heterogeneous population. Some Opportunity Youth have dropped out of high school and spent time in juvenile detention; others enrolled in community college but had family obligations derail their education. This information is critical to designing well-targeted programs and to prioritizing scarce resources, but fragmentation of data across government agencies and a lack of analytic capacity within the public sector make it elusive.

Lack of a Comprehensive View of the Existing, Fragmented Landscape of Services

Chicago policymakers have no window into the breadth of programs that serve these youth. Programs operate in neighborhoods throughout the city, and many serve Opportunity Youth not by design, but simply because they serve an overlapping population. There is limited visibility into the actual program models and dosage required for these interventions. Understaffed providers lack the capacity to collect high-quality data on whom they serve and on the specific needs of youth, and public and philanthropic funding is highly fragmented.

Strikingly Little Evidence about How to Effectively Reach or Positively Impact Opportunity Youth

There is too little rigorous research on effective approaches to support this population, and the few programs that have been proven effective tend to be expensive. Identifying innovative practices and program models is challenging given that much innovation happens in small community-based organizations with few resources for data collection and limited expertise in program evaluation.

Poor Translation of Existing Evidence into Improved Practices

Evidence about what works to connect youth to education and employment opportunities has been inconsistently translated into specific practices that can easily be adopted by service providers.
Effectively addressing a problem of this scale in a city as large and diverse as Chicago requires an innovative and systemic cross-sector approach to building knowledge and capacity at scale. Pooling existing data on Opportunity Youth can improve our understanding of who they are and what circumstances increase their likelihood of disengaging from education and employment. A clearer picture of the characteristics and needs of Opportunity Youth will inform identification of current Opportunity Youth and effective prevention efforts.

In addition, it is not fully understood who is working to help these youth. Better understanding the universe of nonprofits, philanthropies, and government agencies working to engage Opportunity Youth can help facilitate increased cooperation and collaboration while growing a portfolio of promising interventions necessary to reach the scale of Opportunity Youth in Chicago. Once promising interventions are identified, rigorous scientific evaluation can provide invaluable insight into the courses of action that can have the most impact on helping Opportunity Youth reconnect to school and work.

There are many driven individuals and organizations working tirelessly to help disengaged youth in Chicago, yet without stronger coordination, more informed efforts, and collective action, the resources being channeled toward these efforts are not as impactful as they could be. With support from the Laura and John Arnold Foundation, Thrive and Urban Labs are partnering to bring together and mobilize the disparate organizations working to understand and support Opportunity Youth to improve knowledge, foster innovation, and accelerate the impact of social service providers’ efforts. The goals of this partnership are to fill in critical information gaps and guide informed action across the city by working with local, state, and national government agencies to:

- **Build a Comprehensive Data Infrastructure:** Pool existing data on Opportunity Youth and build a comprehensive picture of who Opportunity Youth really are and what risk factors make them more likely to disengage from school and work.

- **Conduct a Landscape Scan:** To help us gain visibility into the services available to meet the needs of Opportunity Youth, Urban Labs and Thrive have conducted a scan of the current landscape of programs and services.

- **Conduct a Coordinated Campaign:** Using information from both the data infrastructure and landscape scan, Thrive brings together organizations and stakeholders who want to help reduce the number of Chicago’s Opportunity Youth by giving them school and/or employment opportunities. These efforts will work to establish a common understanding of the challenge here in Chicago and align community efforts toward a common goal – reducing the number of Opportunity Youth to 12% by 2020. Thrive will work across these organizations to encourage sharing of best practices and the adoption and testing of promising, scalable innovations. Please refer to Thrive’s OY Impact Report to see progress and work to date on the coordinated campaign.

- **Rigorously Evaluate Promising Innovations:** Urban Labs will partner with leaders to help rigorously evaluate these promising innovations and provide feedback to all practitioners.

- **Broadly Adopt Effective Practices:** With results in hand, Thrive will work with partners in the nonprofit, philanthropic and government sectors to encourage the broad adoption of what works.
CITY-WIDE OY PROVIDER SCREENING SURVEY

During the summer of 2017, Urban Labs developed key research questions for the Landscape Scan and a web-based OY provider survey designed to be responsive to those questions. The research questions and survey were refined with input from the Thrive’s collaborative of OY stakeholders and one-on-one feedback sessions with key providers and stakeholders, including the Chicago Department of Family and Support Services, The Chicago Cook Workforce Partnership, the Chicago Workforce Funders Alliance, Northern Illinois University’s EdSystems team, and others. In September 2017, the survey was sent out to over 600 youth serving organizations in Chicago; 116 organizations responded.

INTERVIEWS WITH SELECTED OY PROVIDERS

In conjunction with the city-wide survey, Urban Labs conducted interviews with 13 Opportunity Youth serving organizations. These interviews were conducted in October and November of 2017 and were designed to gain a more detailed understanding of the program offerings provided to OY by these organizations and gather more detailed information on youth outreach efforts, programmatic goals and outcomes, dosage, data collection, funding, challenges and recommendations.

Opportunity Youth Landscape

In order to support these collaborative efforts with a greater understanding of the current landscape of services available to support Chicago’s Opportunity Youth, Urban Labs conducted a scan of public and private youth serving organizations in Chicago during the summer and fall of 2017. The Landscape Scan was spurred by limited visibility into the many existing services available to meet the needs of Chicago’s Opportunity Youth and where gaps in services exist. The approach developed was designed to provide both a broad, citywide view of supports and services, as well as an exhaustive inventory in key high-need neighborhoods. To date, Phase 1 of the Landscape Scan was completed, which was designed to provide a broad understanding of services to support OY.
**OBJECTIVE:**

UNDERSTAND THE LANDSCAPE OF PROVIDERS SUPPORTING OY IN RECONNECTING TO EDUCATION AND/OR EMPLOYMENT

1. What is the current capacity to serve OY in Chicago?
2. Which OY are served?
3. How is capacity distributed across the city?
4. What programs / services are provided to OY?
5. What are the goals of the services?
6. How are OY engaged in services?
7. What partnerships or collaborations are in place?
8. How are current programs funded?
9. What feedback or recommendations do providers have?
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF SERVICES

A TOTAL OF 116 ORGANIZATIONS RESPONDED TO THE WEB-BASED LANDSCAPE SCAN AND 13 ORGANIZATIONS WERE INTERVIEWED.

A number of the organizations interviewed also participated in the web-based survey, bringing the total number of organizations contributing data to the Landscape Scan to 121.

SIZE AND GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH SERVICES

Overall, responding organizations ranged from small to large, with 43% reporting annual budgets of less than $1 million, 34% between $1 million and $5 million and 22% over $5 million. Organizations also reported that services for all youth are concentrated in the south and west side communities of Chicago.

YOUTH SERVED BY RESPONDING ORGANIZATIONS

Over 50% of responding organizations reported serving fewer than 500 youth overall in 2016. The top at-risk populations served include high school aged youth (78%), unemployed youth (72%) and middle school aged youth (62%). Not surprisingly, organizations reporting larger annual budgets also reported additional capacity to serve youth.
1. ORGANIZATIONS ARE SERVING FEWER WOMEN AND YOUTH OVER AGE 18

While a wide variety of OY are receiving services, the profile of youth served tends to be younger and more recently disconnected. On the whole, it appears that the OY serving organizations in Chicago focus on supporting recent high school graduates, more often males, who have been disconnected for less than a year.

- At risk HS-aged youth are the most frequently cited population served, with 78% of responding organizations identifying this group as a population they serve.

- The largest age groups of OY served are 18 year olds, 17 year olds, and 19 year olds, which together make up 43% of the OY population served.

- While youth ages 20-24 comprise 80% of the population, services for Opportunity Youth peak at age 18.

- Organizations report that most OY served have a high school diploma, but no college level education (54%).

- Nearly 60% of OY served are male despite women comprising nearly half of the population.

- 68% of OY served have been disconnected for less than a year.

### PERCENT OF OPPORTUNITY YOUTH SERVED BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>16-19 Year-Old</th>
<th>20-24 Year-Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. OY OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT ARE SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGES

Finding and engaging OY is one of the greatest challenges facing OY serving organizations. This challenge appears in a variety of ways throughout the survey and interview results:

- Non-OY serving organizations cite lack of access to OY and a lack of structures and resources for engaging OY as the main barriers to serving this population.

- Despite the large number of OY in Chicago, nearly half of OY serving organizations (48%) report that they could serve more OY, and only 25% report having a waiting list for services.

- Engagement in programming is cited as a top goal for OY services.

- Interviewed organizations cited sustained youth engagement / perseverance and lack of youth trust in organizations as key challenges facing OY serving organizations.

- Survey responses indicate that less resource-intensive youth recruitment strategies, such as word of mouth, referrals, social media and program marketing materials, are far more frequently utilized than more resource-intensive strategies such as street outreach, providing transportation, peer recruiters and home visits.
• While fundraising and sustainable funding were frequently cited as organizational challenges or areas for additional capacity, this was very often related to the cost of outreach and engagement activities. This may play a role in skewing services toward younger, more recently disconnected OY who are easier to locate through partnerships with and referrals from schools and other CBOs. Funder requirements, including youth funding that cuts off at 18, short funding cycles and poorly aligned outcome requirements, may also make engaging more disconnected youth populations difficult.

• Interviewed organizations also identified the unique staffing models required to locate and successfully connect with OY as a challenge. This included locating staff near youth, scheduling staff during times when youth are likely to need services, and staffing positions with qualified individuals who are familiar with or from the neighborhood and can more easily connect with youth.

• Only 24% of organizations report having a waiting list.

• Organizations reporting waiting lists are more likely to recruit youth via referrals, easily accessible locations, texting/phone calls, street outreach, peer recruiters and home visits.

**Key Takeaways**

- **Organization with OY waiting list**
  - n=50

- **Organization without OY waiting list**
  - n=26

**Opportunity Youth Engagement Strategy Usage, by Presence of Waiting List**

- Word of mouth
  - 77% (85%) Notable Difference
- Referrals
  - 64% (85%) Notable Difference
- Social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)
  - 63% (65%)
- Program promotion/marketing
  - 63% (60%)
- Offering services in locations easily-accessible to youth
  - 50% (75%)
- Drop-in
  - 48% (45%)
- Texting/calling youth
  - 39% (50%)
- Street outreach/neighborhood canvassing
  - 39% (50%)
- Offering attendance incentives
  - 39% (40%)
- Providing transportation to programming
  - 39% (35%)
- Peer recruiters (former OY)
  - 30% (55%)
- Home visits or direct contact to families
  - 21% (40%)

Percentage of OY serving organizations
3. FEW ORGANIZATIONS REPORT CONCRETE CONNECTIONS WITH EMPLOYERS

Organizations serving OY report that lack of job opportunities, lack of work experience, and justice-involvement are the top three barriers facing OY.

**BARRES TO EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT**

- Lack of Job Opportunities: 41
- Lack of Work Experience: 36
- Justice Involvement: 36
- Lack of Education/Too Far Behind Academically: 28
- Loss of Interest in School/Perceived Irrelevance of Education to Future: 27

Though organizations serving OY report that lack of job opportunities and work experience are barriers, the top services provided are skills development and career exploration and preparation.

**PROGRAMMATIC GOALS FOR OY SERVICES**

- Skills Development: 66
- Career Exploration and Preparation: 52
- Job Placement and Retention Supports: 40
- Cash Management/Comprehensive Wrap Around Supports: 40
- Safety and Violence Prevention: 34
- Meet Basic Needs: 32
- Secondary Instruction and Supports: 32
- Post-Secondary Access and Transitions Supports: 32
- Post-Secondary Instruction and Supports: 16
- Legal Services: 11
- Health Services and Supports: 10
The third most common service provided to OY is Job Placement and Retention. The most common activities in this category are resume development, interview coaching, and job search assistance. Fewer organizations are able to directly place OY into jobs (e.g., subsidized work experience or summer employment).

Nearly 70% of OY serving organizations report that there are additional services they would like to provide for OY, but have been unable to fund.

The most commonly cited additional services (40%) related to workforce development / employment opportunities:

- Paid work experiences
- Transitional jobs
- Internships
- Apprenticeships
- Year-round employment opportunities

Organizations are partnering most often with other CBOs, educational institutions and local agencies, but few are partnering with employers. The small number of OY serving organizations partnering with employers may lead to the difficulties in placing OY directly into employment.
4. OFFERING COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES WOULD BETTER ALIGN WITH DIVERSE YOUTH NEEDS

Organizations most frequently report providing support to OY focusing on skills development, career exploration and preparation, job placement and retention, and case management. While these are the most commonly offered services, organizations also report that the youth they are serving have a wide variety of needs that frequently exceed the service offerings of any given provider. Thus, a commonly cited challenge facing OY-serving organizations is successfully connecting each youth with all of the varied supports they need to be successful. While most organizations have a particular area of expertise, such as workforce development, many youth need additional supports, like housing or child care.

Yet it appears that there is a demand for more comprehensive wrap-around services, as organizations reporting waiting lists for their services were more likely to offer job placement services and to bundle a variety of other needed supports. This suggests that youth may be more likely to engage in services where comprehensive wrap-around supports help them address underlying barriers while they work to reconnect to school or employment.

Many organizations expressed an interest in expanding their capacity to provide more holistic supports by exploring partnerships and flexible service delivery models designed to meet each youth where they are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Offered to OY</th>
<th>Percentage of Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills Development</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Exploration and Preparation/Training Programs</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement and Retention Supports</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management/Comprehensive Wrap-Around Supports</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Violence Prevention</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Access and Transition Supports</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Basic Needs</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Instruction and Supports (Including High School Re-Enrollment)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary Instruction and Supports</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services and Supports</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Offered to OY</th>
<th>Percentage of Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP 3 SERVICES OVERALL; ORGS WITH WAITING LIST MORE LIKELY TO OFFER JOB PLACEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ORGS WITH WAITING LISTS MORE LIKELY TO BUNDLE VARIETY OF SERVICES (AVERAGE 6 VS. 4 SERVICE TYPES OFFERED) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS WITHOUT OY WAITING LIST</th>
<th>n = 57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONS WITH OY WAITING LIST</td>
<td>n = 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM OY-SERVING ORGANIZATIONS
FOR THE CITY OF CHICAGO

While supports in CPS schools have been reduced over time, providers see reinvestment in this area as critical to preventing youth from dropping out and becoming OY. This included calls for:

• Expansion of instructional offerings focused on preparation for the workforce, such as CTE programs, STEM programs and other workforce readiness training and skill development offerings that lead to full time employment opportunities; Internships and other opportunities to gain work experience in the school setting.

• Equipping CPS counselors to provide high quality guidance on career pathways in addition to college.

• General reinvestment in high quality education, including school funding equity and smaller class sizes.

• Significant additional investment in school-based support services, such as additional social workers, psychologists, and counselors; behavioral health teams; expansion of trauma informed practices and restorative justice practices.

• More Community Based Organization and school partnerships to facilitate the delivery of needed supports and services to at-risk students before they dropout.

Providers called for citywide investment in the economic development of all Chicago communities, a strategy for increasing employer engagement to drive youth employment, and investment in intermediary organizations that work with both youth and businesses:

• Equitable investment to in all communities, including adoption of policies and practices focused on revitalizing de-invested communities in Chicago in areas such as housing, economic and community development to create more opportunities for all youth.

• Citywide strategy for developing and maintain deep partnerships with employers regarding hiring of the OY, including understanding market needs, systematically investing in efforts to help youth develop needed skills, developing messaging and incentives for employer engagement and creating a network of employers who want to partner to support OY and create the workforce the city needs to grow.

• Additional investment in programming that makes explicit connections to employment for youth.

• Develop a diverse set of pathways for youth. Educate them about options and support them along the way; Developmental process to support youth on pathway to career.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OPEN-ENDED SURVEY RESPONSES AND ORGANIZATIONAL INTERVIEWS OVERALL CALLED FOR MORE INVESTMENT IN YOUTH CITYWIDE. MOST OFTEN, THESE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL INVESTMENT WERE RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING AREAS OF NEED FOR CHICAGO’S YOUTH:

**Better Coordination of Services**

Providers called for better coordination of services for OY, more cohesive sector of providers supporting OY and a coordinated funder community creating a citywide investment strategy that is better aligned to the needs of OY:

- Better coordination of services for OY, including the creation of a public, free and vetted citywide directory of resources, and hubs for services to support OY.

- Development of a more cohesive, less fragmented sector of providers supporting OY to facilitate the sharing of knowledge and best practices across organizations, encourage greater collaboration among providers to ensure gaps in services are being addressed and avoid service duplication, and to more effectively weave OY supports into the fabric of existing systems.

- Coordination of the funder community to develop funding strategies that better fit the needs of OY, including revisiting funding barriers such as age limits, time limits, and documentation prerequisites that frequently keep youth out of the very supports designed to support them. In addition, providers cited a need for more transparency in funding opportunities, longer term funds and built-in start-up or planning time.

**Pozitive Youth Voice, Outreach and Engagement**

Providers recommended direct engagement of OY in the planning and development of supports and services to meet their needs, and additional investment in youth outreach efforts:

- Allow OY to be part of planning for their future, including developing youth-led community focus groups, preparing and supporting OY to understand decisions and policies that impact them, and listening to what the youth are suggesting.

- Tell their stories and create more opportunities to showcase / highlight positive youth voice, putting the focus on the potential of our youth rather than the barriers to their success.

- Invest in outreach and engagement strategies that are developed in partnership with youth and are based on an understanding of youth needs and recommendations.
NEXT STEPS

With the Provider Landscape Scan complete, as part of a multi-year effort, Urban Labs will continue to partner with Thrive to connect research and practice in the Opportunity Youth space. This includes:

1. **CONDUCTING FOCUS GROUPS AND INTERVIEWS WITH YOUTH.**
   Few qualitative studies identify the needs and goals of out of school and out of work youth. In particular, given the comparatively fewer services offered to young women in Chicago, a focus on better understanding the needs of disconnected women will allow us to disseminate these findings into the universe of nonprofits, philanthropies, and government agencies working to engage Opportunity Youth. The insights from this qualitative research will help facilitate increased cooperation and collaboration while growing a portfolio of promising interventions necessary to reach the scale of Opportunity Youth in Chicago.

2. **COMPLETION OF A SEGMENTATION AND GAP ANALYSES TO BUILD A COMPREHENSIVE PICTURE OF CHICAGO’S OPPORTUNITY YOUTH.**
   In this analysis, we will connect administrative datasets from city and state agency partners in order to identify barriers to disengagement, describe their pathways to disengagement, identify risk factors that make them more likely to disengage from school and work, and describe post-disengagement outcomes. The aggregated findings from this analysis will be combined with the findings from our Landscape Scan to enable the identification and mapping of current capacity to meet youth needs.

3. **LAUNCHING A COHORT OF QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS.**
   Urban Labs and Thrive are partnering to identify and scale the promising approaches to supporting youth in connecting to school and work. These quasi-experimental evaluations will help us build a stronger knowledge base on what works for disconnected youth. This work will inform program quality improvement activities, and resource allocation decisions, as well as encourage broad adoption of the most effective practices for supporting and reconnecting our youth through Thrive’s collective impact efforts.
FISCAL SCAN

AN EXAMINATION OF PUBLIC FUNDING FOR CHICAGO’S OPPORTUNITY YOUTH
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OUR ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL FUNDING STREAMS SUGGEST THAT CHICAGO RECEIVES MORE THAN $40 MILLION IN PUBLIC DOLLARS TO SUPPORT OPPORTUNITY YOUTH (OY).

This includes funding for education reconnection (for example, Chicago Public Schools’ SOAR Centers), workforce development and job retention (for example, Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Out-of-School Youth), and wraparound and case management supports (for example, Department of Family and Support Services’ Strong Futures and Chicago Housing Authority’s Family Works programs). While this public funding is substantial and indicates investment in OY at every level of government, the preliminary assessment of the public OY fiscal landscape suggests that:

1 FUNDING IS FRAGMENTED

Funding streams tend to be allocated to specific programs rather than to the individual youth, meaning that they may not be flexible enough to follow youth across all of the services they need (particularly if they need services from multiple agencies). OY who do not have access to the full set of services they need to be fully reconnected end up “swirling” in and out of programs.

2 FUNDING IS REACHING FEWER OLDER, MORE DISCONNECTED YOUTH

More programming supported by public dollars is allocated to younger, less disconnected youth, yet 80% of Chicago’s OY are 20 to 24 and are greater share have been chronically disconnected. While it is critical to maintain funding to reconnect younger, more recently disconnected OY before they become more disconnected, it is important that sufficient funding is in place to support OY across the spectrum.

3 FUNDING IS NOT SPECIFIC TO OY NEEDS

Many of the funding streams identified that can support OY are not specifically structured for this population. While these funding streams may incidentally serve many OY, many programs serving OY lack dedicated funding to holistically address the unique needs and circumstances of OY.
HOW TO USE THIS FISCAL SCAN

THIS FISCAL SCAN SEEKS TO IDENTIFY THE PUBLIC FUNDING STREAMS AT THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LEVELS THAT COULD BE LEVERAGED TO SUPPORT OPPORTUNITY YOUTH (OY) IN CHICAGO.

This fiscal scan aims to identify, for the first time, the various funding sources that support Chicago’s OY population. In particular, this fiscal scan seeks to document not just the traditional OY funding sources but also some broader funding streams to raise awareness of what other public dollars could be leveraged to address OY needs. In doing so, this elevates the need for discussion on how various funding streams can be more effectively combined to reach the OY population, as no one funding stream will likely be sufficient to fully serve Chicago’s OY population (estimated to be nearly 50,000).

The Goals of the Fiscal Scan:

ONE
RAISE AWARENESS AMONG OY SERVICE PROVIDERS OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT OY IN CHICAGO.

TWO
IDENTIFY THE FUNDING (BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE) THAT OY SERVICE PROVIDERS RECEIVE TO SUPPORT THIS POPULATION AND ASSESS OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT IN HOW THIS FUNDING IS DISTRIBUTED AND STRUCTURED.

THREE
RAISE AWARENESS AMONG PRIVATE FUNDERS OF OPPORTUNITIES TO AUGMENT PUBLIC INVESTMENTS TO MOST EFFECTIVELY AND EFFICIENTLY SUPPORT OY IN CHICAGO.

The aim of this fiscal scan is to provide new insights on how people can come together to support Chicago’s OY. If there are any missing public funding streams that reach this population, or if you have additional insights on how OY investments can be maximized, please email Thrive at info@thrivechi.org.
METHODOLOGY:

To begin, Thrive reviewed reports of federal funding streams available to Opportunity Youth across the country. From there, Thrive researched which Illinois public agencies received these federal funding streams and reviewed publicly-available grant databases to estimate the amount of funding that Chicago agencies and organizations received. Thrive staff then met with officials from Chicago, Cook County, and Illinois agencies to review these assessments and identify other funding sources that they leverage to support Chicago OY. Finally, Thrive reviewed the Provider Landscape Scan and sought to compare to the provider insights around OY funding and public funding landscape. Much of the data detailed below surfaced from the Urban Labs Provider Landscape Scan.

The estimates presented in this scan shed light on what funding is currently available to reconnect OY and raise awareness of opportunities to augment these public investments to most effectively and efficiently support this population.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The fact that Chicago receives more than $40 million in public dollars that can support OY is great news. This public funding provides a strong foundation of support for OY across Chicago, and many of the community-based organizations receiving one or more of these funding sources are able to augment this investment with private dollars to reach an even greater share of the population.

However, this analysis of public dollars for OY suggests that, in aggregate, this funding is fragmented, misaligned with Chicago’s OY demographics, and not specific to OY needs. To address these challenges, a few recommendations should be considered.

1 OY SERVICE PROVIDERS: LEVERAGE COLLECTIVE ASSETS

OY service providers that receive funding from diverse sources (e.g. a workforce development agency and an agency providing wraparound services) in a given community should work collaboratively with one another to comprehensively provide the range of services that a youth needs to reconnect to school or work. Rather than each applying for and managing fragmented funding to provide diverse services, organizations that partner together can collaboratively provide services based on the funding they receive. This is a key element of the OY Reconnection Hub model, outlined in the “Reconnecting Chicago’s Youth Annual Impact Report” published by Thrive in May 2018.

2 PRIVATE FUNDERS: INVEST IN OLDER, MORE DISCONNECTED YOUTH

Many public funding streams are geared towards younger OY or are not flexible enough to serve disconnected youth for as long or as intensive as is needed for this segment of the population. This fiscal scan has illustrated that private funding tends to reach the older, more disconnected OY population more than public funding, but this funding is limited compared to the size of this segment of the population. Additional investment from private funders should be geared towards the older, more disconnected population, while public funding can continue to support prevention interventions and younger OY.

3 PUBLIC FUNDERS: IDENTIFY OPPORTUNITIES TO BLEND FUNDING STREAMS

Where possible, funding that serves similar populations or has similar requirements should be assessed to see if funding can be combined upstream to enable service providers to build more flexible program models.
“When we solve problems for the most vulnerable, we solve them for everyone.”

- Angela Glover Blackwell
CEO of PolicyLink
OVERALL FUNDING

EVEN THE MOST CONSERVATIVE ESTIMATE OF INVESTMENT REQUIRED TO RECONNECT OY IS LESS THAN THE COST OF DISCONNECTION

**Total Distributive Cost of a Disconnected Youth**

**THE ESTIMATED COST OF AN OPPORTUNITY YOUTH IS $37,000 PER YEAR**³ BASED ON:

- **$9,760** IN LOST EARNINGS
- **$27,870** IN NET CRIME EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING FOR VICTIMS)
- **$2,380** IN NET HEALTH EXPENDITURES
- **$430** IN NET WELFARE EXPENDITURES
- **-$4,540** IN EDUCATION SPENDING
- **$1,540** IN MARGINAL EXCESS TAX BURDEN

**Total Distributive Spend Required to Reconnect OY**

The estimated investment to reconnect an Opportunity Youth ranges widely from $5,000 to $30,000⁵ per youth per year depending on the degree of wraparound and extended support they require to fully connect to school and work.
There are several local, state, and federal funding streams that are or can be leveraged in Chicago to reconnect Opportunity Youth to school and work. For some programs that serve a larger population beyond just OY, the estimated amount represents a percentage of the total funding. Please see endnotes for more detail.

### Education

**US Department of Education:**
- **$700K** Title I Delinquent (Chicago Public Schools)*
- **$240K** Trio Talent Search (Chicago Public Schools)

**US Department of Housing & Urban Development:**
- **$57K** Project SOAR

**Illinois State Board of Education:**
- **$2.6M** Truants Alternative and Optional Education Program (TAOEP) (Chicago Public Schools' SOAR Centers)

### Workforce Development

**US Department of Labor:**
- **$8.9M** Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA™)
- **$2M** YouthBuild®
- **$2M** Summer Jobs and Beyond®
- **$850K** Chicago Young Parents Project®

**US Department of Agriculture:**
- **$350K** Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Employment & Training

**US Department of Health & Human Services:**
- **$1M** Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

**US Department of Housing and Urban Development:**
- **$1.1M** CHA Jobs Plus Pilot
- **$331K** Chicago Housing Authority One Summer Chicago®

**Illinois Department of Human Services:**
- **$5.4M** Community Youth Employment Program

### Wraparound/Supportive Services

**US Department of Housing and Urban Development:**
- **$3.3M** Family Works

**Illinois Department of Human Services:**
- **$6M** Comprehensive Community Based Youth Services
- **$2M** Homeless Youth®
- **$550K** Emergency and Transitional Housing
- **$355K** Supportive Housing®

**Chicago Department of Family and Support Services®:**
- **$1.6M** Other OY Services (Including JISC, JISC Rise, and the Mayor’s Mentoring Initiative)
- **$1M** Strong Futures
- **$1M** Legal Aid
- **$720K** Behavioral Health Support
- **$700K** Bridges to Pathways
- **$500K** City of Chicago 2018 OY Investment ($500K)
DEDICATED OY FUNDING

THERE ARE FEWER SERVICES AVAILABLE FOR OLDER, MORE DISCONNECTED OY, WHICH REPRESENT THE GREATER SHARE OF CHICAGO’S OY POPULATION

80% of Chicago’s OY population falls between the ages of 20 and 24, and an estimated 43% have been disconnected for more than one year...

...but OY services peak at age 18 and only 32% of youth served have been disconnected for more than one year.

CHICAGO’S OY POPULATION BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHICAGO’S OY POPULATION BY ESTIMATED LEVEL OF DISCONNECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disconnection Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1 year</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% OY SERVED BY LEVEL OF DISCONNECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Disconnection</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent (last 6 months)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (last 6 months)</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant (12-23 months)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term (over 2 years)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Labs Landscape Scan | n=79
THERE ARE FEWER SERVICES AVAILABLE FOR OLDER, MORE DISCONNECTED OY

Why is this the case?

- Among the OY-serving organizations surveyed by Urban Labs, more than 41% report that they do not receive dedicated funding for OY (funding that is specifically for serving OY as opposed to general youth funding).
- Without dedicated OY funding, organizations likely cannot provide participants with the full range of services they need (either because the cost per youth would be too high or their current funding cannot be used to pay for certain services) and likely cannot serve youth for enough time to fully reconnect OY to school or work, as OY require unique services and longer engagements than the average youth.
- Given this misalignment between funding and population needs, organizations who do not receive dedicated OY funding will likely engage younger, more recently disconnected OY who may be easier to serve.
- Among organizations that receive dedicated OY funding and thus may have the capacity to serve older, more disconnected OY, more than half receive less than $200,000, which is not sufficient for the size or demographic breakdown of the OY population.

If more organizations received dedicated OY funding that enabled them to flexibly and comprehensively serve OY, it is likely that a greater number of older, more disconnected youth would be served.
ONLY ~60% OF OY SERVING ORGANIZATIONS RECEIVE DEDICATED FUNDING, AND THE MAJORITY RECEIVE LESS THAN $200K

The lack of dedicated funding for many OY-serving organizations likely drives misalignment between funding requirements (e.g. type of services provided, length of engagement, age limit, etc.) and the unique needs of OY.

ORGANIZATIONS WITH DEDICATED OY FUNDING SERVE MORE DISCONNECTED YOUTH AND ENGAGE YOUTH FOR LONGER

Dedicated OY funding likely enables organizations to provide OY-specific services, which allows those organizations to be served more disconnected youth for longer.

YOUTH SERVED BY ORGANIZATION

LENGTH OF ENGAGEMENT BY ORGANIZATION

All data represented on this page is from the Urban Labs Landscape Scan
Organizations with dedicated OY funding also tend to serve youth for more hours per week, suggesting more intensive support.

**Weekly Program Dosage**

![Bar chart showing weekly program dosage for organizations with and without dedicated OY funding.]

---

In particular, organizations with private funding tend to serve more disconnected youth and spend more per youth.

Private dollars tend to have fewer restrictions than public dollars, enabling organizations to spend more per youth and provide a wider range of services.

**Youth Served by Funding Source for Organizations with Dedicated OY Funding**

![Bar chart showing the number of organizations serving disconnected youth by funding source.]

**Spend per Youth by Funding Source for Organizations with Dedicated OY Funding**

![Bar chart showing the spend per youth by funding source.]

---

All data represented on this page is from the Urban Labs Landscape Scan.
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| 100 BLACK MEN OF CHICAGO, INC.         | DIME CHILD FOUNDATION   |
| 826CHI                                 | DIVINE PURPOSE YOUTH PERFORMING ARTS CENTER |
| AFTER SCHOOL MATTERS                   | ECON ILLINOIS           |
| ALLIANCE FOR COMMUNITY PEACE           | EMBARC                  |
| ALLIANCE OF THE SOUTHEAST (ASE)        | EMPLOYMENT & EMPLOYER SERVICES |
| ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL NETWORK             | ENLACE CHICAGO          |
| ARK OF ST. SABINA                      | ERIE NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE |
| BOTTOM LINE                            | FACING FORWARD TO END HOMELESSNESS |
| BOYS & GIRLS CLUBS OF CHICAGO          | FIFTH HOUSE ENSEMBLE    |
| BREAKTHROUGH URBAN MINISTRIES          | FIRST DEFENSE LEGAL AID |
| BRIGHTON PARK NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL     | FREE WRITE ARTS & LITERACY |
| BY THE HAND CLUB FOR KIDS              | GARDENERS               |
| CABRINI GREEN LEGAL AID                | GARY COMER YOUTH CENTER |
| CARA                                   | GENESYS WORKS CHICAGO   |
| CENTER FOR CHANGING LIVES              | GIRLS IN THE GAME       |
| CENTRAL STATES SER                     | GREEN SCENE CHICAGO     |
| CENTRAL UNITED COMMUNITY CHURCH        | HEALING HANDS RESOURCE CENTER |
| CHICAGO ARTS PARTNERSHIPS IN EDUCATION | HEARTLAND HUMAN CARE SERVICES, INC |
| CHICAGO COMMONS                        | HOLY FAMILY SCHOOL      |
| CHICAGO COOK WORKFORCE PARTNERSHIP     | HOWARD AREA COMMUNITY CENTER |
| CHICAGO DANZTHEATRE ENSEMBLE           | HYDE PARK NEIGHBORHOOD CLUB |
| CHICAGO DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND SUPPORT SERVICES | ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES |
| CHICAGO HOUSING AUTHORITY              | IMPACT FAMILY CENTER    |
| CHICAGO LIGHTS                         | INSPIRATION CORPORATION |
| CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS                 | INSTITUTE FOR LATINO PROGRESS |
| CHICAGO SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA             | JANE ADDAMS RESOURCE CORPORATION |
| CHICAGO TUTORING CONNECTION            | KLEO                    |
| CHICAGO URBAN ART RETREAT CENTER       | LAF                     |
| CHILDREN’S HOME AND AID                | LATIN UNITED COMMUNITY HOUSING ASSOCIATION |
| CIRCESTEEM                             | LAWNDALE CHRISTIAN LEGAL CENTER |
| CIVIC LEADERSHIP FOUNDATION            | LE PENSEUR YOUTH & FAMILY SERVICES |
| COMMUNITY ORGANIZING AND FAMILY ISSUES (COFI) | LEADERSUP |
| CONTEXTOS NFP                          | LEAVE NO VETERAN BEHIND |
The six conditions of systems change are outlined in FSG’s “The Water of Systems Change”, 2018.

According to a report from the Congressional Research Service titled “Disconnected Youth: A Look at 16 to 24 Year Olds Who Are Not Working or In School”, an estimated 2.4 million youth ages 16 to 24 were disconnected from school or work for more than one year in 2014. According to a Measure for America report titled “Zeroing In on Place and Race: Youth Disconnection in America’s Cities”, an estimated 5.5 million youth ages 16 to 24 total were disconnected from school or work in 2014. Based on these figures, Thrive estimates that roughly 43% of all OY in Chicago in 2015 were disconnected for more than one year.


The average reconnection cost varies depending on how disconnected a young person is, and as a result, the level of wraparound services he or she needs. Close to 70% of organizations serving OY surveyed by UChicago Urban Labs report costs up to $10,000 per OY served, of which 36% report costs between $1,000 and $4,999 per youth. However, we estimate that the low end of the distributive spend is $5,000, as many OY require services from multiple providers to be fully reconnected. Some organizations have reported costs per youth as high as $30,000 or more, and we assume these organizations are serving more significantly disconnected youth.

In 2017, CPS had $1M in Title I funding due to carry-over from the previous year. The annual amount granted from the DOE is $700K, which is allocated to juvenile justice re-engagement.

This WIOA estimate includes an estimate of funding allocated to programming for OY 16 to 24 through both the out-of-school youth (OSY) and adult funding streams (for OY 18 to 24). This also includes estimates for on-the-job training (OTA) and individual training accounts (ITA), as well as funding reserved for a WIOA-SOAR partnership.

The Chicago Young Parents Project is a joint program between the Chicago Cook Workforce Partnership and DFSS that braids Head Start and WIOA dollars for young mothers.

YouthBuild is a competitive 3-year grant from the US Department of Labor. There are currently two grant recipients in Chicago (MFS and Prologue, Inc.).

Summer Jobs and Beyond is a one-time, competitive grant that was awarded to the Chicago Cook Workforce Partnership in 2016. This grant is funding programming from 2016 to 2018.

Estimate of funding that may reach Chicago youth 18-24.

21% of youth participating in CHA’s One Summer Chicago (OSC) program in 2017 were OY, meaning that they were not in school or working before OSC. OSC can be an important bridge to work for OY.
[13] While not all homeless youth are OY, homelessness can be a driver of disconnection and homeless services represent an important wraparound support for this population. As such, we are including the total allocation to Chicago agencies of homeless youth grants.

[14] Supportive housing and emergency and transitional housing programs are two state programs that serve individuals ages 18 to 30. As noted above, we included funding for homeless services in this fiscal scan as a category of supportive services that could support this population. Because these programs serve a population that extends beyond age 24, we included an estimate of the total amount of funding allocated to Chicago agencies for youth ages 18 to 24.

[15] The DFSS youth programs included here serve OY as well as at-risk youth. The totals included here represent the estimated amount of funding allocated to OY in these programs.