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Information to Participate

• Call-in information
  • Phone number: 1 (562) 247-8422
  • Access code: 255-485-027

• To submit live questions, click on the “Questions” panel, type your question, and click “send”

• Presentation materials and audio will be posted at sent directly to you and posted at www.cafosteringconnections.org
Three-Part Series on CalYOUTH Study

• July 20: Housing
• September 29\textsuperscript{th}: Education
• November 17\textsuperscript{th}: Health
Panelists

- Laurie Kappe, IE Communications
- Mark Courtney, University of Chicago Chapin Hall
- Amy Lemley, John Burton Foundation
CalYOUTH Study Funders and Partners

- **Support** Chapin Hall research
- **Provide** guidance and feedback
- **Host** CalYOUTH Study section with results on website (co-invest.org—Resources)
- **Promote** via presentations and media outreach

---

California Child Welfare Co-Investment Partnership

California Department of Social Services

County Welfare Directors Association of California

The Judicial Council of California

Casey Family Programs

Conrad N. Hilton Foundation

Stuart Foundation

Walter S. Johnson Foundation

Zellerbach Family Foundation

*Annie E. Casey (Funder, not in Co-invest Partnership)*
Fostering Futures: A Forum on the CalYOUTH Study Findings

Fostering Futures: A Forum on the CalYOUTH Study Findings 9:30 AM-4:00 PM. Tuesday May 10th, Japanese American National Museum, Los Angeles, CA. This event included presentations and panels with Dr. Mark Courtney and his colleagues from Chapin Hall to facilitate a dialogue with stakeholders from Southern California on the policy and practice changes needed to improve the trajectories of youth in care. Click here for event Agenda and Panelist Bios.

CalYOUTH study Brief with Key Findings from the Second Wave of Youth Surveys at age 19

Chapin Hall and the California Child Welfare Co-Investment Partnership (2016)

Fostering Futures Panels and Panel Videos

Fostering Futures Study Overview
CalYOUTH in the Loop

• A Fund for Shared Insights Project
• “Closing the loop” between this research study and foster youth
• Invites youth to share their thoughts and opinions on extended foster care to inform policy and practice

Share with current or former transition-age foster youth!

LEARN MORE AT: calyouthintheloop.org

IF YOU WANT TO HELP: contact lgranillo@iecommm.org
Speak Up on issues that matter to you

Participate in our survey and learn about the results of the CalYOUTH Study. Researchers asked 19-year-olds how foster care has affected their transition to adulthood in areas like health, relationships, education and employment. Click on the options below to see the results and provide your own feedback to improve extended foster care in California!
My Purpose Today

• Briefly describe the policy context of extended foster care and California’s approach to extended care

• Share selected findings from the CalYOUTH Study

• Engage in discussion about the implications of the study findings for practice and policy

• Extends Federal Title IV-E funding (including guardianship and adoption subsidies), at state option, to age 21
  – Youth must be 1) completing high school or an equivalency program; 2) enrolled in post-secondary or vocational school; 3) participating in a program or activity designed to promote, or remove barriers to, employment; 4) employed for at least 80 hours per month; or 5) incapable of doing any of these activities due to a medical condition

• Foster Care Independence Program remains intact (i.e., $140 million; ETVs)

State option implies great inter-state variability!
California Fostering Connections Act of 2010 (and subsequent amendments)

• Extends foster care to age 21
• Extends court supervision of foster care to young adults, all of whom have a right to legal counsel
• More inclusive than extended care policy in many states:
  – Takes advantage of all the federal eligibility categories
  – Makes it relatively easy for youth to reenter care before age 21 if they leave after reaching 18
  – Allows for traditional foster care placements (though group care is restricted) as well as Supervised Independent Living Placements (SILPS) and supportive transitional housing (THP-Plus FC)
  – Allows many youth whose care is supervised by probation departments to remain in care

• However, California’s county-administered child welfare system allows for considerable between-county variation in services
Overview of the CalYOUTH Study

Evaluation of the impact of California Fostering Connections to Success Act (AB 12) on outcomes for foster youth

CalYOUTH Study includes:

- Longitudinal study of young people in CA foster care making the transition to adulthood
- Periodic surveys of caseworkers serving young people in CA foster care
- Analysis of government program administrative data
Purpose of the Longitudinal Youth Study

Obtain information about a broad range of life experiences & young adult outcomes

- Foster care placement
- Service utilization & preparation
- Perceptions of extended care
- Education and employment
- Health and development
- Social support
- Delinquency
- Pregnancy and children
Youth Surveys: Data Collection and Response Rate

• **Wave 1 Survey Period** (age 17; in care at least 6 months; child welfare supervised cases only)
  - April 2013 to October 2013
  - 51 counties included in final sample
  - Youth eligible for study $n = 763$
  - Completed interviews $n = 727$ (response rate = 95.3%)

• **Wave 2 Survey Period** (age 19)
  - March 2015 to December 2015
  - Youth eligible for study $n = 724$
  - Completed interviews $n = 611$ (response rate = 84.1%)
Purpose of Child Welfare Worker Study

Obtain perceptions of service delivery context
- County level availability of and need for services
- Coordination of services with other service systems
- Attitudes of caseworker, county court personnel, and youth toward extended care
Caseworker Surveys: Data Collection and Response Rate

- **First Caseworker Survey**
  - Sample of caseworkers across the state serving older foster care youth

- **Second Caseworker Survey**
  - Caseworkers serving young people in the longitudinal Youth Survey who were still in care as of June 1, 2015
  - Survey Period: July 2015 to October 2015
  - **Part A**: questions about service context in their county
    - 295/306 of eligible caseworkers completed surveys (96.4%)
  - **Part B**: questions about specific youth on their caseload
    - 493/516 surveys completed about youth on their caseloads (95.5%)
# Youth Demographic Characteristics

\( n=611 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed race</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language spoken at home</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foster Care Status at Age 19 Interview

Care Status at Wave 2 \( (n=611) \)
- In care (never left since Wave 1): 64%
- In care (exited and reentered after Wave 1): 13%
- Not in care: 23%

Age at Discharge \( (n=134) \)
- 17 or younger: 51%
- 18: 22%
- 19: 27%
How Youth Left Care ($n=134$)

- Exited to legal permanency: 34%
- Left care by own request: 10%
- Runaway, and discharged while away: 7%
- Incarceration in jail or prison, and discharged from there: 5%
- No longer meeting the requirements to stay in care after age 18: 9%
- Other: 35%
## Where Are Youth Living? Youth In-Care \((n = 477)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SILP</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THP-Plus FC</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of a relative</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster home with an unrelated foster parent</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of a nonrelated family member</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, treatment or rehab facility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group care</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Where Are Youth Living?

### Youth Out-of-Care ($n = 134$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Residence</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In home of another relative(s)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own place (apartment, house, etc.)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home of birth parent(s)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home of spouse/partner</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home of friend(s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own room in a motel, hotel or SRO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail or other correctional facility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home of former foster parent(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group home or treatment center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, treatment or rehab facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Are Youth in SILP’s, and THP+FC Faring Financially?

• Most youth reported paying less than $600 a month in rent however, differences between youth in THP+FC and SILP were present.
How Satisfied Are Youth In Their Living Situations?

- Nearly nine-in-ten youth indicated that they felt safe in their neighborhood.
How Many Youth Have Experienced Homelessness?

Homelessness since last interview
(In-Care)

- Never Homeless: 86%
- Ever Homeless: 14%

Homelessness since last interview
(Out-of-Care)

- Never Homeless: 66%
- Ever Homeless: 34%
How Many Youth Have Couch Surfed?

Couch surfed since last interview (In-Care)
- 77% Never Couch Surfed
- 23% Ever Couch Surfed

Couch surfed since last interview (Out-of-Care)
- 57% Never Couch Surfed
- 43% Ever Couch Surfed
Summary

• Youth in-care and out-of-care are living in different settings, and many youth in care live in nontraditional foster care settings
  – The majority of youth in-care are living in SILPS, the home of a relative, or a THP-Plus FC
  – The majority of youth out-of-care are living in the home of a birth parent, in the home of another relative, or in their own place
• The vast majority of youth are living with others
• Youth were more likely to feel “not prepared” in the area of housing than in any other area (not shown)
• Youth out-of-care are more likely than youth in-care to experience homelessness or couch-surfing
Housing Options

Caseworkers’ Perceptions of Availability of Housing Options
(N = 292)

- A wide range: 17%
- None: 2%
- Few: 43%
- Some: 39%

Caseworkers’ Perceptions of Appropriateness of Housing Options
(N = 292)

- Very Approp.: 23%
- Mostly not Approp.: 5%
- Slightly approp.: 24%
- Somewhat approp.: 48%
Caseworkers’ Satisfaction with Collaboration with Other Systems

Secondary ed.  Postsecondary ed.  Housing  Health  Employment  Mental health  Substance abuse treatment
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1  Completely dissatisfied  2  3  Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  4  5  Completely satisfied
Next Steps

• Analysis of the relationship between extended care and homelessness using youth and worker survey data
  – Through what mechanisms (e.g., living arrangements; services; relationships with adults) does extended care influence outcomes?

• Analysis of other risk and protective factors associated with homelessness using youth and worker survey data
Questions?

• Please type your question into the question section of the control panel.

• We will get to as many questions as possible.

• The presentation slides and recording will sent out after the web seminar.

• Following Q&A, we will discuss policy implications for California and beyond.
Policy Implications in California and Beyond

- Supportive services provided to NMDs, particularly in SILPs
- SILP rate and current housing crisis
- Placement options for youth with mental illness and other serious challenges.
- Foster parent recruitment/retention for NMDs
For more information…

- CalYOUTH: http://www.chapinhall.org/research/report/findings-california-youth-transitions-adulthood-study-calyouth