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Purpose

- Share a summary of findings on outcomes for youth transitioning to adulthood from foster care in California through age 21
- Assess the relationships between the amount of time youth remained in extended foster care and selected outcomes
- Previous Analysis\(^1\)
  - Selected outcomes measured at second youth survey (age 19)
- Current Analysis
  - Selected outcomes measured at third youth survey (age 21)
  - Two analytic approaches used to evaluate the impact of EFC
    - State administrative data
    - Youth longitudinal surveys

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

Youth Surveys: 
Data Collection and Response Rate

- **Wave 1 Survey Period (age 17)**
  - 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%)

- **Wave 3 Survey Period (age 21)**
  - **Stay tuned!**
  - Wave 4, 2019, Age 23
  - Youth eligible for study $n = 721$
  - Completed interviews $n = 616$ (response rate = 84.7%)
### Foster Care Status

**Age at Discharge**

(n=614)

- 17 or younger: 7%
- 18: 11%
- 19: 8%
- 20: 7%
- 21: 68%

### Youth’s Connections to Positive Social Institutions

*Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago*
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**Connected to School or Work (n=613)**

- Employed only: 39%
- Enrolled only: 31%
- Neither enrolled nor employed: 18%
- Both enrolled and employed: 12%

1 Three youths were not asked these questions during the interview.

---

**Education Status and Enrollment**

- 80% of youth had a high school diploma or equivalency certificate
- 29% of youth were currently enrolled
- Among those enrolled, 81% were in college

Type of School Enrolled in (n=161)

- High school/Continuation school: 60%
- GED classes: 9%
- Private vocational training school: 9%
- 2yr or community college: 21%
- 4yr college: 1%

---
College Student Loan Debt (n=293)

- No student loan debt: 89 (33.7%)
- $1 to $2,500: 55 (22.3%)
- $2,501 to $5,000: 31 (12.3%)
- $5,001 to $10,000: 37 (13.1%)
- $10,001 or more: 23 (7.9%)

About 12% of youth had $5,000 or more in student loan debt

1 Includes both youth who were enrolled at Wave 3, and youth who were enrolled since their last interview.

---

College Involvement (n=293)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in campus support program for F.Y.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involved most of college</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved some of college</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved for just a short while</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College offers program but was never involved</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure if a program is offered</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in other college activities</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOPS or Student Support Services</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with professors / TAs outside class</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes both youth who were enrolled at Wave 3, and youth who were enrolled since their last interview.
Employment (n=612)

- 88% of youth reported ever having a job
- 57% were currently employed
- Among youth not in school, 56% were currently employed
- Among all unemployed youth, most want a job (82%)

Current Employment and Earnings among Youth Working 10+ Hrs/Week (n = 325)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of current jobs</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One job</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more jobs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of hours worked per week at main job</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 hours</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34 hours</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 hours</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hours</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 hours</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average hourly wage at main job (Mean (SD)) | $12.48 ($3.43) |
Assets

- About 56% of youth ($n=342$) reported that they had a checking, savings, or a money market account
- Of those with an account, average balance in all accounts is $2,894 (median= $1,000)
- 47% of youth said they own a vehicle

Economic Hardship and Food Insecurity in Past 12 Months

- Any Economic Hardship: 49%
- Food Insecure: 30%
### Living Arrangements and Homelessness

#### Where Are Youth Living? (n = 616)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Arrangement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own place or own room (apartment, house, trailer, a motel, hotel or single room, etc.)</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of birth parent(s)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of another relative(s)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of spouse/partner</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of a friend or friends</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of former foster parent(s)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing Placement (THP-Plus)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group quarters (residential treatment center, dormitory, jail, prison, hospital, rehab facility, etc.)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless (have no regular place to stay)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Many Youth Have Experienced Homelessness? 
(n = 616)

- About 1 in 4 youth (24.6%) had ever been homeless since their last interview

Number of times homeless since last interview (n=148)

- 1 time: 24%
- 2 times: 13%
- 3 times: 18%
- 4 times: 16%
- 5+ times: 29%

Total days homeless since last interview (n=148)

- 1 day: 36%
- 2 to 7 days: 26%
- 8 to 30 days: 18%
- 31 to 90 days: 18%
- More than 90 days: 3%

It’s More than Just Survival: Youth’s Health and Well-Being
Supportive Relationships

Size of Social Support Network (mean/median) and Adequacy of Support (%)

\[(n=615)\]

- Emotional: Mean: 4.1 people, Median: 3 people
- Tangible: Mean: 3.0 people, Median: 2 people
- Advice/Guidance: Mean: 3.1 people, Median: 2 people

Number of people in support network:
- Enough people
- Too few people
- No one to count on

Criminal Justice Involvement

Criminal Justice Involvement Since Last Interview (%)

\[(n=606)\]

- Arrested
  - Male: 24%
  - Female: 10%
- Convicted of a crime
  - Male: 12%
  - Female: 5%
- Incarcerated
  - Male: 22%
  - Female: 7%

* Significant difference between females and males
**Behavioral Health**

![Behavioral Health Graph]

1 Suicidal ideation and suicide attempt were assessed “since last interview.”

**Health Services & Insurance**

![Health Services & Insurance Graph]

- 14% of youth said they were unable to receive needed physical care
- 12% of youth said they were unable to receive needed dental care
- Most youth reported having medical insurance
  - Health insurance: 89%
  - Dental insurance: 78%
Medication & Hospitalization

Counseling, Medication, & Hospitalization in Past Year\(^1\) (%)
\((n=615)\)

- Received counseling: 22%
- Received psychotropic medication: 12%
- Received SA treatment: 7%
- Ever hospitalized for mental health: 7%

- Hospitalized for any reason since last interview: 31%

\(^1\) Counseling, psychotropic medication, and SA treatment was “in the past year.” Mental health hospitalization was “since last interview.”

Pregnancy, Parenting, and Romantic Relationships

Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago
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Pregnancy History (Females) (n=376)

- Since the last interview...
  - 41% of females had become pregnant
  - 29% of females gave birth

- Among females who got pregnant since last interview (n=150)...
  - 45% wanted to get pregnant
  - 34% did not want to get pregnant
  - 31% were not seen by a doctor or nurse during their first trimester

Children and Parenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents (n =193)</th>
<th>Males (n=38; 17.1%)</th>
<th>Females (n=155; 41.3%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of living children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent lives with all children **</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one child is a dependent of the court</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Statistically significant difference (p<.01)
Marriage & Romantic Relationships

- 6.4% of youth were married

Among youth who were not married (n=578):

- Currently in a romantic relationship:
  - Yes: 44%
  - No: 56%

- Relationship with current partner (n=330):
  - Steady basis: 87%
  - Not on a steady basis: 13%

- Lives with partner (n=317):
  - Yes: 59%
  - No: 41%

Relationships between Extended Care and Youths’ Outcomes

Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago
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Analytic Approaches, Data, & Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytic Approach</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>California CWS/CMS</td>
<td>Over 40,000  Youths</td>
<td>Data linked to college attendance, employment, earnings, and need-based public food assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth in care least 6 months sometime after 16th birthday (between 2006-2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth turned 18 before or after AB12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CalYOUTH longitudinal surveys</td>
<td>616 Youths</td>
<td>Data drawn from three waves of interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth between 16.75 and 17.75 years old at the end of 2012 and had been in care for at least 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth turned 18 after AB12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>727 Wave 1 respondents, present analyses restricted to youth who completed the first and third interview waves (n = 616)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis and Study Methods

EFC was evaluated by estimating the impact that a year in extended care had on each of the outcomes
- Instrumental variable approach used for models leveraging administrative data
- Several types of statistical models used with longitudinal youth surveys (based on measure of outcome)
  - E.g., Instrumental variable, linear probability model, OLS
- Controlled for a wide range of youth-level and county-level characteristics
Domain Areas with Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Each additional year in extended foster care¹:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Increased the probability that youth completed a high school credential by about 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased their expected probability of enrolling in college by 10–11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Increased number of quarters youth were employed between 18 and 21 by .6 quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>Increased amount of money youth had in back accounts by about $404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardships</td>
<td>Decreased receipt of need-based public food assistance by more than $700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased odds of an additional economic hardship between 17-21 by about 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased odds of being homeless or couch-surfing between 17-21 by about 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>Increased odds youth described professionals as source of social support by about 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Formation</td>
<td>Decreased odds that youth became pregnant (females) or impregnated a female (males) between 17-21 by about 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Decreased odds that youth had been arrested between 17-21 by about 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased odds that youth had been convicted of a crime between 17-21 by about 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Results displayed are from the administrative data analyses and the youth survey analyses that found statistically significant (p < .05) relationships between extended foster care and listed outcomes.

Outcome Domains Where Statistically Significant Impacts Were Not Found

Outcomes not found to be significantly associated with the number of years in extended care:

- College persistence
- Number of semesters completed (among college entrants)
- Earnings between ages 18-21
- Food insecurity
- Physical and behavioral health
- Victimization
Limitations

• Data limitations
  – E.g., Employment and public assistance data collects only work/assistance in CA

• Longitudinal survey analysis only includes post-AB12 youth
  – May be differences between youth who spent more/less time in EFC that are not accounted for in statistical models
  – Some outcomes are related to EFC eligibility requirements (chicken-and-egg problem)

• Both Analyses use generic sets of control variables

• Still relatively early in EFC implementation

Conclusions

• Findings from present analysis reinforce findings from earlier analysis

• Findings thus far are encouraging
  – EFC appears to have positive impact several domains, including education, employment, savings, hardships, pregnancy, CJ involvement, social support

• Some future directions
  – Harness new data (e.g., criminal justice; vital stats on birth and deaths)
  – Explore impact beyond age 21 (e.g., to 23)
  – Explore between-county differences
  – More nuanced approach to investigating each outcome
  – Examine how EFC affects outcomes (mediators)
For more information…

CalYOUTH report on outcomes at 21:
https://www.chapinhall.org/research/calypouth-wave3/

CalYOUTH report on extended care and outcomes at 21:
https://www.chapinhall.org/research/improved-outcomes-at-age-21-for-youth-in-extended-foster-care/

CALYOUTH IN THE LOOP
Foster Youth perspectives // CalYOUTH Study results
About CalYOUTH in the Loop

- **Outreach strategy** testing surveys and other communications methods
- **Collects feedback / reactions to the CalYOUTH Transitions to Adulthood Study**
- **Objective: Build a feedback loop** between TAY from foster care and researchers / stakeholders / service providers

How do we collect feedback?

[www.CalYouthInTheLoop.org](http://www.CalYouthInTheLoop.org)

Speak Up!

The latest wave of results has just been published. Learn how youth across California have been impacted by extended foster care. Add your voice and ideas to make a difference!

5-min Online Survey

At our Website
WAVE 3: How you can help
● Connect CYL with your network of youth to seek their feedback
● Share our surveys, website, and other materials
● Tell us what you’d like to learn from this project
● Youth who participate could be compensated
● All information would remain confidential

CALYOUTH IN THE LOOP
CONTACT

Laurie Kappe, President
*i.e. communications*
LKappe@iecomm.org

Lilia Granillo, Associate
CalYOUTH in the Loop Coordinator
LGranillo@iecomm.org