## The Opportunity Youth Forum: Seizing the Moment to Advance a Movement

Snapshot: 2020 Aspen Forum for Community Solutions Opportunity Youth Forum

# ABOUT THE OYF NETWORK

The OYF network is home to


# 5.9 million

16 to 24-year-old youth

**657,000 (11%) are opportunity youth,** who are not in school and not working. Among OY:

- 24% are disconnected from high school
- 67% are disconnected from postsecondary education
- **9%** are disconnected from the workforce

Based on 2019 ACS data




#### **COLLABORATIVE CHARACTERISTICS**

AREAS OF FOCUS

**Collaboratives vary in focus area, size and experience,** adapting to meet the unique needs of their communities.





## **BACKBONE CHARACTERISTICS**

55%

**Backbone organizations are a critical component of the OYF network**, providing a structure and team to coordinate the work of each collaborative.



Homelessness



## BUDGET



## TAFF

## TIME FOCUSING ON OPPORTUNITY YOUTH

organization
Intermediary 18%

Education institution 12%

Community


based

Other organizations include:
• Workforce investment

- Community foundation or funder
- Tribal agency

board


 Cross-organizational partnership



### **CORE VALUES**

Equity, youth-led change, and community power building are foundational to OYF.
Collaboratives advanced in equity from 2019 to 2020, building on the national racial justice movement, while pandemic restrictions limited direct engagement – making youth-led change and community power building more challenging.

All collaboratives incorporated explicit acknowledgement of racial equity or other community-specific disparities in planning.



**81%** of collaboratives reported that their vision for opportunity youth work built the power of communities most impacted by the systems they sought to change.

**Healing-centered organizing** is an important component of youth-led change for OYF.

Most common healing-centered strategies:


- 68% of collaboratives provided training in youth organizing, advocacy, social justice or critical awareness
- 58% of collaboratives regularly incorporated celebration and positive acknowledgement

# ORGANIZING FOR SYSTEMS CHANGE

The 2020 evaluation examined two dimensions of communities in the OYF network:

- 1) Collaborative capacity: the infrastructure and processes necessary for the collaborative to carry out its opportunity youth agenda
- 2) Systems changes: "shifts to the conditions that hold a problem in place"\*—in this case, disconnected pathways and inequitable conditions that prevent young people from achieving education and employment outcomes

\*FSG, Water of Systems Change: https://www.fsg.org/publications/water\_of\_systems\_change




Values reflect the % of indicators reported as strong evidence by each collaborative.

• = collaborative

### **COLLABORATIVE CAPACITY**

Remained strong in convening diverse members and promising in data use, with shifts in focus from external communication to internal capacity work, when comparing 2019 and 2020.




**88% of collaboratives** reported **at least some evidence of the capacities needed** to support facilitation, planning, implementation, and management of their work.

The pandemic contributed to a reduced focus on external relationships and communications, compared with 2019, with collaboratives shifting attention inward — contributing to strengthening some aspects of data collection and use.

Collaboratives increased their ability to gather resources, support, and partner organizational commitment to advance OY work, compared to 2019 – possibly related to the availability of pandemic funding for immediate community needs.

#### **SYSTEMS CHANGES**

**Remained the most advanced in programmatic changes** on behalf of opportunity youth, with an increased focus on narrative change and data use, when comparing 2019 and 2020.



**Methods.** Findings come from the 2020 OYF Self-Assessment. Thirty-three collaboratives answered questions about their collaborative capacity and systems changes. The Assessment included indicators grouped into four types of capacities and seven types of systems changes, assessed on a four-point scale.

