Information to Participate

• Call-in information
  
  Phone number: 1 (415) 655-0060
  
  Access code: 392-336-339

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

• Presentation materials and audio will be posted at www.jbaforyouth.org under “training archive”
Today’s Presenters

Amy Lemley | Executive Director
Simone Tureck | Associate Policy Director
Carolyn Ho | Project Associate
THP+FC at a glance….

- Current foster youth age 18-21 ("non-minor dependents")
- Title IV-E reimbursable foster care placement
- Modeled after THP-Plus program
- Est. 2012 with implementation of Extended Foster Care (AB12)

- 68 licensed providers;
- 59 currently operating 139 programs in
- 50 counties
THP-Plus at a glance....

- Former foster youth age 18-24
- Can access for up to 24 months
- Est. 2001, implemented 2005
- CWS Realignment funds, formerly state funded program
- $34.9 million annual budget

- 54 THP-Plus providers
- Operating 75 programs in
- 47 counties
Report Methodology

- **Survey of THP-Plus and THP+FC Providers:** 97% response rate for THP+FC providers & 100% response rate for THP-Plus providers.
- **2011 Realignment Report**
- **THP+FC & THP-Plus Participant Tracking Systems:** captures data on 56% of THP+FC participants & 54% of THP-Plus participants statewide.
- **California Child Welfare Indicators Project**
The number of youth in THP+FC continues to increase

- As of July 1, 2018, the number of Non Minor Dependents (NMDs) placed in THP+FC has increased to 1,916 - a 12% increase from last year.

- Between 2016 and 2018: 20 CA counties increased their number of THP+FC providers; 9 counties decreased their number of THP+FC providers.
The proportion of NMDs placed in THP+FC continues to increase

- Nearly 1 in 4 NMDs (23%) were placed in THP+FC as of July 1, 2018
- This number grew from 21% in 2017
The demographic profile of youth in THP+FC remains largely unchanged

- Slight shifts in ethnic/racial demographics.
- As in past years, participants more likely to be female than male.
- Proportion of youth supervised by juvenile probation decreased.
The total number of youth in THP-Plus increased for the first time since FY 2008-09

- THP-Plus bed capacity remained relatively unchanged from previous years.
- As of June 30, 2018, the THP-Plus bed capacity was 1,411.
- Providers in 17 counties reported a decrease in the number of THP-Plus youth served since FY15-16; providers in 25 counties reported an increase.
Statewide spending on THP-Plus also increased

Increase in spending follows a three-year reduction: Counties’ spending collectively dropped by 21% (between FY11-12 and FY14-15), immediately following 2011 Realignment & implementation of extended foster care.
The remote site/scattered site model is the most prevalent housing model in both THP+FC and THP-Plus.
The average monthly rate paid per youth to THP-Plus providers increased slightly

- There continues to be variability in the rates paid across counties.
- Over FY17-18, providers in 12 counties reported their THP-Plus rate had increased since the previous fiscal year.

![THP-PLUS RATES Graph](image)
The proportion of THP-Plus participants who are female and older continues to increase...

During 2017-18, 93% of participants who entered were between the ages of 21 and 24.
...while the percentage who were in the juvenile probation system is half of what it was 5 years ago.

% of youth in THP-Plus who were in juvenile probation:

- 2011-12: 15%
- 2012-13: 15%
- 2013-14: 11%
- 2014-15: 11%
- 2015-16: 9%
- 2016-17: 6%
- 2017-18: 6%
Findings: Housing
In THP+FC, one in five youth experience homelessness prior to entering.

YOUTH WHO ENTERED THP+FC DURING FISCAL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENTRANCE DATE</th>
<th>EXPERIENCED HOMELESSNESS PRIOR TO THP+FC</th>
<th>ENTERED THP+FC DIRECTLY FROM AN EMERGENCY SHELTER, HOMELESSNESS, OR OTHER UNSTABLE HOUSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In THP-Plus, over 1 in 3 youth experience homelessness prior to entering.
## Youth exit THP+FC and THP-Plus to different settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>THP+FC Entered</th>
<th>THP+FCExited</th>
<th>THP-Plus Entered</th>
<th>THP-PlusExited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A THP-Plus program</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A THP+FC program</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Independent Living Placement</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster care placement (other than THP+FC or SILP)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other supportive transitional housing program</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renting own / shared housing (paying rent)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with relative / other person in stable housing (free rent)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter, homeless, or other unstable housing (street, car, couch-surfing, etc.)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College dorm</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More youth exited THP+FC to THP-Plus than the year prior

% of youth who exited THP+FC to a THP-Plus program

- 14% in 2016-17
- 18% in 2017-18
More youth enter THP-Plus from homelessness than THP+FC, but a similar level exit to homelessness

12% of youth entered THP+FC from homelessness or unstable housing

7% of youth exited THP+FC to homelessness or unstable housing

20% of youth entered THP-Plus from homelessness or unstable housing

6% of youth exited THP-Plus to homelessness or unstable housing
THP+FC is less accessible in certain parts of the state

- 208 NMDs on a waiting list as of June 30, 2018
- Statewide, 23% of NMDs are placed in THP+FC
- The percentage of NMDs in 23 counties is below the state average, indicating there may be a need for additional THP+FC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>% of NMDs in THP+FC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Benito</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuolumne</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amador</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THP-Plus is inaccessible for a substantial number of youth, particularly in LA County

Statewide: 417 youth were on waiting lists for THP-Plus as of 6/30/18

- 2,627 NMDs in Los Angeles County of 7/1/18
- 31.4% of total NMDs in CA

LA County

- $2,165,106Y in THP-Plus funding allocated to Los Angeles County
- 6.2% of state THP-Plus budget
Youth who achieved permanence between 16 and 18 are unable to access THP-Plus

- 48% of THP-Plus programs reported that they were unable to serve youth who achieved permanence at 16

104 homeless former youth
THP-Plus experienced a decrease in involuntary exits; THP+FC did not.

Essentially unchanged from 2016-17, when it was 33%.

THP+FC:
- 68% Voluntary Exits
- 32% Involuntary Discharges

THP-Plus:
- 73% Voluntary Exits
- 27% Involuntary Discharges

Down from 36% in 2016-17.
The average program length increased for THP-Plus participants and decreased for THP+ FC participants

- Increase in average length of stay for THP-Plus participants may be partially attributed to:
  - an increase in the number of counties that have opted into the THP-Plus extension established by SB 1252
  - a decrease in the rate of involuntary exit from the THP-Plus program
Findings: Education & Employment
The majority of youth in both programs entered with a high school diploma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL STATUS</th>
<th>THP+FC</th>
<th></th>
<th>THP-Plus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth has not earned their high school diploma, GED or high school equivalent or higher</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth has earned their high school diploma, GED or high school equivalent or higher</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The percentage of youth with a high school diploma or higher increases during program participation in THP+FC.
- Youth in THP-Plus are not experiencing similar progress.
There was limited college achievement between entrance and exit in THP-Plus & THP+FC

**POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OF YOUTH WHO EXITED THP+FC AND THP-PLUS PROGRAMS DURING FY 2017-18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL STATUS</th>
<th>THP+FC</th>
<th></th>
<th>THP-Plus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending 2-year community college</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received AA/AS</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending 4-year college/university</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received BA/BS</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In THP+FC, the rate of college enrollment drops between entrance and exit.
- There is a modest increase in college achievement between entrance and exit in THP-Plus, however youth in THP+FC struggled considerably in this area.
More than half of the counties with THP-Plus programs opted into the THP-Plus extension, allowing youth enrolled in school to remain in the program for an additional year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alameda</th>
<th>Butte</th>
<th>Calaveras</th>
<th>Contra Costa</th>
<th>Del Norte</th>
<th>El Dorado</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>Glenn</th>
<th>Humboldt</th>
<th>Imperial</th>
<th>Inyo</th>
<th>Kern</th>
<th>Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Placer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One in five college students lost financial aid due to failure to make Satisfactory Academic Progress.

What is Satisfactory Academic Progress?

- **Maintaining minimum grade point average** (most schools require a 2.0)
- **Completing education goal in reasonable time** (students can receive financial aid for 150% of the units required to complete their program or degree)
- **Passing enough classes along the way** (67% rate of completion)
Employment continues to be the area where participants in both programs make gains

- Youth who exited THP-Plus in FY16-17 experienced a 23% increase in monthly income from entrance to exit; youth who exited THP+FC experienced a monthly income increase of just 5%.
- The percentage of employed youth who were working full-time also increased in both programs.
Findings: Health & Well-Being
Participants are largely enrolled in health insurance, with 1 in 3 receiving public benefits at exit

98% of youth in THP-Plus are enrolled in health insurance. All youth participating in THP+FC are automatically covered by Medi-CAL because they are dependents of the child welfare or juvenile probation systems.

Of the youth who exited the THP+FC program over FY17-18, 5% of participants were accessing public benefits at entrance, and 21% upon exit. Of youth who exited the THP-Plus program in the same year, 29% were accessing benefits at entrance and 34% at exit.
A significant number of young women became parents while they were participating in THP+FC and THP-Plus.
Policy & Practice Implications
THP-Plus should be expanded to address unmet need, notably in Los Angeles County

Possible strategies to pursue:
• Reallocate existing budget
• Augment existing budget
Eligibility for THP-Plus should be changed to align with other transition-age youth programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program for Transition-Age Foster Youth</th>
<th>Age in foster care to qualify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chafee Education and Training Voucher</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent student status (financial aid)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Adoption Assistance Program</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardianship Assistance Program</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living Skills Program</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Up</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other than extended foster care, THP-Plus is the only program that requires a youth to be in foster care at age 18*
The THP-Plus rate must grow with inflation to maintain providers and ensure access

Since 2008:
- Cost of living has increased 18.8% in California
- Average THP-Plus rate has increased 4.7%
- To keep pace with inflation, average rate in 2018 should be $2,732 (SS)
- This rate should be higher in high-cost coastal parts of the state
- At current rate, THP-Plus has lost 16% of its value since 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scattered Site Rate ($)</th>
<th># of Counties (43)</th>
<th>$ of State Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,639 to 2,048</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,049 to 2,457</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,458 to 2,732</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2,732</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100% or greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alameda County: $1,977
Los Angeles County: $2,200
San Francisco County: $2,540
Orange County: $3,090
Youth require assistance locating and securing housing

Housing navigation:
• identifying supportive adults that could provide housing as a SILP, and negotiating those arrangements;
• assisting NMDs with identifying realistic, safe and stable housing options in the private market;
• roommate matching;
• cultivating landlords to increase the availability of housing;
• assisting NMDs with communicating with landlords regarding leases and move-in arrangements; and
• providing NMDs with financial assistance associated with identifying and securing housing and stabilizing in housing including security deposits, moving costs, utility set-up and basic furnishing.
California requires more THP+FC placements for youth in extended foster care, particularly in certain parts of the state

• As of June 30, 208 youth were on a waiting list for THP+FC

• “SILP placements are for NMDs who are developmentally ready to live independently or in a less restrictive environment with less intensive services from a case manager or caregiver” (ACL 11-77)

• Youth placed in SILPs must first pass a readiness assessment; those who state they are not ready for a Supervised Independent Living Setting should not be placed in one

• If THP+FC has a waiting list, where are youth being placed that do not pass a readiness assessment and do not have permanent connections or caregivers to reside with?
Access to sexual and reproductive health services is critical, particularly for youth in THP+FC

- Talk to your county about when it will offer the SB 89 training
- Provide “Know Youth Rights” brochure to every youth in your care
- Evaluate whether your organization’s policies and procedures comply with state requirements
- Develop a training strategy to ensure all agency personnel understand their responsibilities; go over examples in Resource Guide
- Develop strategies to help staff build their skills when discussing this sensitive topic
- Engage youth in your organizations to provide input and feedback on strategies
California’s newly expanded Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is an important resource

• CA adopted a state EITC in 2015 to reduce poverty; **expanded** for 2017 tax year to include transition aged youth, 18-24 who are not parents

• $1,495 for youth with one child + $3,400 federal ETIC = $4,895
• $223 for non-parenting youth

• **What you can do:**
  • Order CalEITC materials: Jason.montiel@ftb.ca.gov
  • Develop outreach strategy; engage youth
  • Read technical assistance publication to be released in January
  • Attend 1/23 web seminar
Programs must be re-tooled to promote college enrollment, retention and completion

**Beyond the Safety Net**
- 31 THP-Plus and THP+FC providers
- Adopting new practices to promote college success
- Implementing Core Practice Model
Youth require support to prevent them from losing financial aid due to failure to maintain Satisfactory Academic Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Recommendations</th>
<th>Practice Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Remove SAP requirement from the Chafee ETV</td>
<td>• Educate youth on the financial aid process and SAP requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support youth in enrolling in a course load that meets their readiness level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grant foster youth automatic two-semester probation period after not making SAP before they lose aid</td>
<td>• Engage with youth throughout semester to identify crises before it’s too late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assist youth in filing an appeal if they lose financial aid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THP-Plus services should shift to meet the unique needs of young families

What you can do:

1. Ensure young parents receive key public benefits:
   • CalFresh, CalEITC, WIC

2. Establish THP-Plus rate for parenting youth in your county

3. Establish partnerships with home visiting programs, such as Nurse Family Partnership

4. Ensure access to reproductive and sexual health care
Practice & policy changes are required to reduce involuntary exits & increase length of stay

- Track rates at program, county and state levels
- Analyze data to identify trends
- Modify practices based on findings; incorporate findings into policy
- Adopt Housing First approach
Download the Report

The report is available for download at: http://www.jbaforyouth.org/2017-18-thp-annual-report/