

OKLAHOMA GOVERNOR'S COUNCIL FOR WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
YOUTH PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

State Workforce Youth Council

Meeting Date: April 5, 2019
 Meeting Time: 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.
 Meeting Location: Oklahoma State University-Oklahoma City
 900 N. Portland, Oklahoma City, OK
 BT 304A, Business Technologies Bldg., 3rd floor

AGENDA

Welcome & Introductions	Steve Shepelwich, Co-Chair	10:00am – 10:10am
Review of February 1 Meeting Minutes (Vote for approval)	Co-Chairs	10:10am – 10:15am
Panel Discussion on Resources and Outreach for Disconnected Youth	Steve Shepelwich, co-chair	10:15am – 11:00am
Subcommittee Discussion & Meeting Time	Subcommittee leads	11:00am – 11:40am
Updates from Subcommittees	Subcommittee leads	11:40am – 11:50am
Old Business New Business	Co-Chairs	11:50am – 12:00pm
Adjourn	Co-Chairs	12:00pm
Next Meeting June 7, 2019		

ATTACHMENTS

- February 1, 2019 Meeting Minutes (Draft for approval)

ATTENDEES

Steve Shepelwich, co-chair	Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City
Curtis Calvin, member	OETA
Karen Davidson, member	Southern Workforce Board

Joyce Jones, member	Kiamichi Technology Center
Kerry Manning, member	Southern Workforce Board
Lester Claravall, member	Oklahoma Department of Labor
Marissa Lightsey, member	Oklahoma State Department of Education
Norma Noble, member	Youth Advocate
Renee Sansom, member	OK Department of Rehabilitation Services
Rhonda Mize, member	Choctaw Nation
Tracy Keeley, member	Oklahoma Insurance Department
Darrell Strong, guest	OETA
Ed Long, guest	CrossSector Innovations
Darcee Simon, staff	Oklahoma Office of Workforce Development

MEETING MINUTES

Welcome & Introductions

At approximately 10:05am, Steve Shepelwich began the meeting by welcoming the committee members. He asked for everyone to introduce themselves.

Review and Approval of February 1, 2019 Minutes

Steve asked for a motion to approve the February 1, 2019 meeting minutes. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Karen Davidson and seconded by Curtis Calvin. The motion passed unanimously.

Panel Discussion on Resources and Outreach for Disconnected Youth

Steve noted that a big takeaway from the last meeting was an interest in learning about pressing issues, new resources, and also have time for committee work. He said the central focus for today's meeting was opportunity youth who are disconnected from both work and school. Steve mentioned that we would be hearing more about some national and community resources from guest presentations a bit later in the agenda.

Steve began the discussion by playing a two-minute episode from Marketplace NPR on "[The Cost of Youth Unemployment](#)" featuring disconnected youth in Cleveland. He shared data that lost wages and tax revenue can cost up to \$44,000/year. Norma Noble stated that she was impressed from the article that people are actually going to where the youth are, which is important since they don't come to you. Steve mentioned that it gives ideas for locations and potential partners like libraries, barber shops, basketball courts, etc. Lester Claravall liked the economic impact data to show results and use to support program ideas. Steve mentioned that the outreach in the article was funded

from both state and municipal sources. Curtis Calvin asked about the \$44,000 figure if it was per individual youth or collective. Steve clarified that the number was per youth in terms of lost wages to individual, lost profit to employer, increased social services costs, etc. The challenge to the number is that it is not being paid immediately by a single source so that there's not anyone feeling the direct burden of the cost. Steve referenced a 2-page packet with programs in other states and cities that fund similar type of work (ex. Denver – has 29 partners involved, Boston Opportunity Youth Collaborative, Aspen Institute Opportunity Youth Forum). He also referenced a map in the packet with a congressional district breakdown, observing that Oklahoma has a high number in the southeast area of the country ([Measure of America, Social Science Research Council, June 2018](#)). Norma asked if there were any national grant funds in Oklahoma specifically for opportunity youth. Steve replied that he wasn't aware of any for opportunity youth. Tracy Keeley was interested in how the numbers were determined since a challenge the committee has discussed is identifying and locating disconnected youth. Steve mentioned that a lot of the data came from the census and the map from the report was very interactive and could be zoomed in to specific areas beyond what he printed out.

Steve introduced Curtis Calvin and Darrell Strong from OETA to share more information about the American Graduate Initiative. Curtis explained that the American Graduate Initiative was public media's commitment to help youth become more prepared and ready for the workforce by engaging in educational and training opportunities. The resources from the initiatives can help professionals like youth council members better understand the circumstances of the youth to strategize how to best help them. He explained that public media has over 1,700 partners nationwide including public television stations like OETA who are involved in the efforts. Curtis stated that they had just finished the pre-planning for the American Graduate Initiative in Oklahoma in partnership with OKC Public Schools, the Office of Workforce Development, and two youth organizations in Oklahoma City, Class Matters and the Alpha Boys Institute. Curtis mentioned that the goal of the discussion today was to share resources beginning with a couple of video clips from the "Dropping Back In" series which interviews youth about their circumstances and the impact of the programs (<https://www.droppingbackin.org>). Darrell added that the two primary focus areas of the American Graduate program are improving high school drop-out rates and workforce readiness, while targeting on both in-school and out-of-school youth. They played two brief video clips from the series.

Curtis explained that the three basic components of the program are services to youth, amplification of youth voices, and driving community conversations that lead to action using the resources like the examples shown. Based on the two videos, Curtis posed a

question for discussion to the group, “what is your understanding of the situation in which opportunity youth have found themselves?” Rhonda Mize responded that they’re not in school and don’t appear to have positive mentors in their lives. Tracy Keeley added that they’ve had very negative experiences within the schools. Curtis noted that there are systemic failures for these kids and asked how they interpret those failures. He emphasized the importance of building trust with the students. He asked the group what motivated the young people in the videos to get involved in school or training programs. He mentioned that one of the videos showed a young man who had become a parent that wanted better for his child, but the other video showed the interview with the counselor that helped the student realize she wanted more for her life. Curtis emphasized the importance of having some kind of catalyst to inspire young people to want to change their situations, especially to retain them in the program. Norma Noble added that we needed to work on the assurance that something would be different for students to return. Curtis asked a final question about how the understanding of situations and motivations can inform our strategies for locating out of school youth. Tracy noted that you could identify the catalyst points such as having children, becoming involved in the justice system, etc. Curtis responded that they are probably closer than we think they are and may even be at home playing video games. They can be our family members, neighbors, or children of our friends. He stated that we need to be able to have open and honest conversations with people to uncover the catalysts and help them solve those problems.

Darrell pivoted the conversation to the local implementation of the American Graduate Initiative. He noted that OETA had convened a range of public and private sector partners to strategize how to engage youth in a workforce preparation program. With the two community organizations previously mentioned, Class Matters and the Alpha Boys Institute, there has been a component of introductory workshops that incorporate skills training for workforce readiness and a 3-month opportunity to practice those skills in a workforce environment. Curtis added that there was another set of videos in the program that talk about the timeframe for re-engaging youth, which amounts to 3 months before the youth are disengaged or lost again. Norma asked if the outplacement is an internship or work experience. Curtis responded that youth placement is in partnership with the Central Oklahoma Workforce Innovation Board for 5 youth who currently are in school that work and are paid a salary (\$13/hour). They have work experience, tutoring ACT preparation, and career planning. Darrell added that working with in-school youth prevents them from becoming opportunity youth, especially in terms of being a strong student who cannot obtain competitive ACT scores (such as one current student). Curtis noted that the example of this student demonstrated a need for additional wraparound services and academic support for

younger students in the program. In the case of this student, they learned that he had taken and passed Algebra I, but only had a teacher for one month out of the school year. Darrell added that an additional challenge was that the school may not have had the books or resources to deliver the material. Curtis described the program modification to meet 5 days each week at the library, where they've learned how to use the library for classes that don't have books so they can find information and resources related to the topics they're studying. Steve asked if there are any current videos in the series that are specifically Oklahoma students. Curtis responded that they will be as they bring the program here for full implementation. Darrell explained that the videos are tools to promote reflection for students. Norma clarified that the Oklahoma program was drop-out prevention rather than recovery. Curtis responded that it is at this point, but in the next 3-6 months it will expand into recovery. Steve stated that he would love to continue the conversation about how the youth council can support this program as it grows. Curtis shared that part of the planning was a focus group with community stakeholders as well as a focus group with kids and the differences in understanding the situations was very evident. They also tried to do a focus group with parents, but did not have a strong turnout. He noted parent engagement as another issue to consider.

Steve invited Ed Long to share more about a new program in Tulsa. Ed thanked the committee for inviting him to present about a project for one of his clients, Corporation for Supportive Housing, a national nonprofit based in New York City. Their goal is to help implement a supportive housing model across the country. While CSH does not exclusively focus on opportunity youth, this project does. Youth involved in child welfare and the juvenile justice system (transitioning out of foster care or OJA care) are at a higher risk of homelessness, which creates a costly cycle of supportive services and lower life outcomes. Ed shared that research in supportive housing and youth impact is very light, so this project will be a launch demonstration to identify what works in order to be scaled for broader impact. Dually involved youth (both in child welfare and juvenile justice systems) may cost 40% more than youth involved in only one system. Youth in supportive housing achieve housing stability rates of 40-80% and are more likely to achieve better outcomes related to education, employment, mental and physical health, and substance abuse. Ed mentioned the Individual Placement and Support (IPS) model as a resource for employers to supported employment for people with mental illness (<https://ipsworks.org>).

Ed mentioned that the supportive housing project began in June 2016 based on a study in other states. There was a challenge in identifying state dollars for success in partnership with private investors. The model is Pay For Success and is part of a current

bill going through the legislature with the governor's support that creates a pay for success fund to leverage public dollars towards programs like this after successful outcomes have been achieved by the programs. Steve referenced the \$44,000 figure from the earlier report that is not the burden of one person to carry, but could be alleviated through this type of a program model. Ed stated that this has really opened up new possibilities and creative ways of thinking by expanding opportunities for funding. Through an example program with DHS, the Arnall Family Foundation provided the up-front principal funding for an evidence-based program to retain children in their homes who were at risk for being removed. Based on the funding allocation for supportive services for those children, DHS is paying success payments based on program outcomes back to the Arnall Family Foundation until the principal is paid off and will then accrue the savings in services going forward. Ed added that the private funding capacity to expand programs through up-front investments fills in a gap that public funding cannot always adequately address because it is allocated to reactive or responsive activities.

Ed shared examples of three supportive housing pay for success models in Denver, Santa Clara and Massachusetts. The demonstration projects are scheduled to launch by this summer in Oklahoma City and Tulsa for 50 youth, aged 18-21 who are/have been dually involved with child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Within the two areas, they have identified approximately 250 youth who meet the criteria and focusing on 50 will be a sufficient sample size. The program will be for approximately 3 ¼ years. It targets households with barriers to housing and employment by providing affordable housing options and employment services. It engages tenants in flexible or voluntary services (mental health, substance abuse, counseling, etc.). The program will coordinate community partners to provide the services for the target population. Success metrics in this model must be narrowed to what is reasonable for repayment. Kerry Manning asked if they would be measuring reengagement with education or employment and Ed confirmed that they would. Kerry asked about Title I service provider engagement and Ed responded that it was a growth area as the current focus has been on homelessness and mental health service providers more than Title I at this point. One concern is that there is still a lack of evidence that stable housing days will lead to performance in WIOA metrics, which is something that can be built or looked at through this project. The goal will be to scale the project elsewhere in the state beyond the two metro areas. Ed mentioned that recidivism rates will be critical. Steve thanked Ed for the information and stated how he thought it was interesting how the program used data to find who to work with.



Steve invited the committee to engage in a broader discussion based on the information presented. He asked Kerry about incentive and restrictions through WIOA for pay for success for youth. She responded that it is allowable, but the Southern board has not explored it. She stated that Title I dollars require eligibility verification. Kerry added that 70% of the funds must be spent on out of school youth. She noted the transition when WIOA passed from in-school youth more towards out-of-school youth. Karen Davidson added that we've seen some results of that focus shift with increased demand from employers around areas of work readiness and soft skills of graduating students. Kerry mentioned summer youth programs that the tribal nations administer that are great.

Steve asked what he envisioned the role of the youth programs committee in continuing to work towards solutions for serving opportunity youth. Norma asked to learn more about what successes and challenges we've seen more specifically in terms of need in the Oklahoma landscape. She mentioned that outreach seems to be a common denominator, but as a state we haven't pulled the need together to see what the picture looks like as a whole. Kerry noted that youth is the target and there are opportunities to partner better with the juvenile justice system and engage all system partners in having resources to help those individuals. Marissa Lightsey mentioned that the growth of virtual schools will present additional shifts in terms of issues and solutions as drop-out rates may reduce with migration to virtual schools, but challenges will migrate with them. She noted that when drop-out rates are good, funding and priorities shift elsewhere, but it will impact our planning as we know what and where these problems are. We have an opportunity with the new report cards to look at and utilize school data, especially tracking chronic absenteeism which is a huge indicator for potential drop-outs. The indicators in the report cards can drill down to counties for strategizing and staging interventions. The report cards will offer data around prevention and supports. Marissa offered to invite her state team to talk more about the data and how to use it.

Tracy asked Marissa if we can still track students who go to virtual schools. Marissa responded that we are able to track them, but they tend to move to a virtual school to avoid dropping out and may be prolonging the inevitable. Those that do well in a virtual school setting have the same supports that they would in a brick and mortar school. The lack of supports that some students have follows them to the virtual school and may even increase their opportunity to drop out later on. Kerry asked how many virtual schools there are and if these trends are statewide, referencing a school in Tishomingo that is preparing to become virtual. Marissa responded that it's definitely becoming an issue to reign in and a prevention type of toolkit would be great for schools and

superintendents who start to push CareerTech or alternative education as a reaction to prevent dropping out and not knowing when to intervene. She mentioned legislative efforts that have changed graduation requirements as attempts to engage and retain students, but they are having big impacts on the skills and readiness of our workforce.

Curtis asked Marissa about the ICAP internship requirement and if it is specified as paid or unpaid. Marissa responded that it is not an internship requirement, but is work-based learning. Students are not allowed to be paid during instructional hours (school to work program). Karen recalled that it used to be a 40 hour cap on school and work hours weekly and Marissa clarified that it was instructional hours. Working after school and getting paid is fine. Marissa clarified that CareerTech programs are still intact as part of a program and not a separate job. Regarding work-based learning, a paid internship option is still something they're trying to work through. Many businesses aren't allowed to pay students for internships because of child labor laws, so they're still working through it. Kerry asked how many credit hours are allowed for an internship and Marissa responded that only ½ credit hour is allowed for each internship course, but it's an actual course. Part of the course may be about soft skills and professional skills before going out for a few weeks to complete the actual internship. Steve mentioned that this was a great topic to explore more at a future meeting.

Subcommittee Discussion & Meeting Time

Steve asked the subcommittees to meet for approximately 10 minutes to discuss on their big goals and focus before reporting back at the end of the meeting. He explained that there are 3 subcommittees: ICAP, Resources & Outreach, Work Ready/Career Ready Schools. The committee split up for subcommittee discussions at approximately 11:40am.

Updates from Subcommittees

At approximately 11:50am, Steve asked the committee to reconvene and for each subcommittee to share a brief update.

Work Ready/Career Ready Certification – Rhonda Mize reported that the subcommittee had held a good meeting on March 19th and made good progress. The subcommittee would like to schedule a longer ½ day working meeting to put their ideas together. Lester Claravall stated that the end goal is to provide a report for the Governor's Council as a recommendation for an initiative to adopt for school designation of career readiness. Lester expressed an interest in talking more with Marissa about avoiding ICAP duplication. Rhonda clarified that it would be a tool to help schools organize their efforts and not seek to add new requirements on schools.



ICAP – Marissa briefly demonstrated the new website for interactive school report cards and highlighted new indicators including programs of excellence (<https://www.oklaschools.com/>). Marissa acknowledged that educators and administrators are most aware of how to use this information and efforts are underway to support parents in using this information. She noted that business and community members are probably least aware of how to use this information. She informed the committee that the final ICAP resource website (www.okedge.com) is complete.

Resources & Outreach – Tracy noted that the direction of this new subcommittee will be to locate and organize resources in a format that can be shared and accessed across the Youth Council and the broader public. Steve added that this subcommittee would also be a good avenue for sharing information and meeting with superintendents and school stakeholders.

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Next Meeting

Friday, June 7th at 10am
Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City Campus
Business Technologies Building, 3rd Floor, BT304A

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:04am.

*Respectfully submitted,
Darcee Simon*

