



# **2010 Report to the Legislature and the Governor for the Foster Youth Services Program**

## **Foster Youth Services Program**

(California *Education Code* sections 42920–42925)

Counseling, Student Support, and Service-Learning Office  
California Department of Education

February 15, 2010

# 2010 Report to the Legislature and the Governor for the Foster Youth Services Program

## Introduction

This report is submitted in accordance with the provisions of California *Education Code* (EC) Section 42923(b) which requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to report to the Legislature and the Governor on services provided by school districts for foster children by February 15 of each even-numbered year. This EC section further stipulates that the report is to be prepared with input from the providers of foster youth services (FYS) and that it shall include recommendations regarding the continuation of services, effectiveness of services, and broadening of services; data on the academic achievement, expulsion, and truancy rates of foster youth; and a discussion of the data.

## Program History and Purpose

A large percentage of children placed in foster care experience physical and emotional trauma as a result of abuse, neglect, separation from family, and impermanence. Although youth are placed in foster care for their safety, foster youth often do not find the security and stability they need through the foster care system. Foster youth commonly experience multiple placements in foster homes (FHs) and licensed children's institutions (LCIs), coupled with numerous transfers between schools. The Institute for Higher Education Policy estimates that a change in placement occurs about once every six months and, due to this movement, foster youth lose an average of four to six months of educational attainment.<sup>1</sup>

A recent report titled *California Connected by 25: Efforts to Address the K-12 Needs of Transitioning Foster Youth* by Heidi Sommer, Lynn Wu, and Jane Mauldon (January 9, 2009) made the following literature review findings:

Three-quarters perform below their grade level and over half are held back in school at least one year.<sup>2</sup> Foster youth earn lower grades and achieve lower scores on standardized achievement tests in reading and mathematics,<sup>3</sup> they have lower levels of engagement in school (39 percent versus 20 percent), high levels of behavioral and emotional problems (27 percent versus 7 percent), and

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas R. Wolanin, *Higher Education Opportunities for Foster Youth: A Primer for Policy Makers*. The Institute for Higher Education Policy. December 2005, 29. <http://www.ihep.org/Publications/publications-detail.cfm?id=58> (Outside Source) (accessed December 20, 2007).

<sup>2</sup> Parrish T., Dubois, J., Delano, C., Dixon, D., Webster, D., Berrick, J.D. & Bolus, S. (2001). *Education of Foster Group Home Children: Whose Responsibility is it? Study of the Educational Placement of Children Residing in Group Homes*. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.

<sup>3</sup> Emerson, J. & Lovitt, T. (2003). The Educational Plight of Foster Children in Schools and What Can be Done About it. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24(4), 199-2003.

are half as likely to be involved in extracurricular activities.<sup>4</sup> Many foster youth have mental health problems, which may be associated with behavioral problems and special-education placement. Foster youth are placed in special education at a much higher rate (30 to 52 percent) than their peers (10 to 12 percent)<sup>5</sup>, and one study found foster youth were twice as likely to be suspended and four times as likely to be expelled as non-foster youth.<sup>6</sup> Nearly a third suffer from at least one affective or substance use disorder and nearly a quarter use prescription drugs to treat a psychological or psychiatric condition.<sup>7</sup> When mental and physical health needs are not addressed, they can lead to or compound pre-existing academic difficulties.<sup>8</sup>

The long-term consequences of poor academic experiences are significant. Foster youth are twice as likely as other students to drop out of school before graduation. Only 45 percent have graduated from high school at the time of emancipation,<sup>9</sup> in comparison to an estimated public school graduation rate in the United States of 71 percent and in California of 68 percent in 1998.<sup>10</sup> Courtney and Dworsky (2006) found that 32 percent of current and former foster youth ages eighteen to twenty were neither employed nor in school (compared with 12 percent of nineteen year olds in the general population), and 37 percent of females (11 percent of males) were receiving one or more government benefits.<sup>11</sup> Another study found that two to four years after leaving the foster care system, only half of the young adults were regularly employed, nearly half had been

---

<sup>4</sup> Kortenkamp, K., & Ehrle, J. (2002). The Well-being of Children Involved with the Child Welfare System: A National Overview. The Urban Institute. Available at: [http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310413\\_anf\\_b43.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310413_anf_b43.pdf) (PDF; Outside Source).

<sup>5</sup> Courtney, M., Terao, S. & Bost, N. (2005). Executive Summary: Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Foster Youth: Conditions of Youth Preparing to Leave State Care. Chapin Hall Center for Children. University of Chicago; Parrish T., Dubois, J., Delano, C., Dixon, D., Webster, D., Berrick, J.D. & Bolus, S. (2001). Education of Foster Group Home Children: Whose Responsibility is it? Study of the Educational Placement of Children Residing in Group Homes. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research; Weinberg, L., Zetlin, A. & Shea, N. (2001). Literature Review on the Educational Needs of Children Involved in Family and Juvenile Court Proceedings. Bennetson, CA: Judicial Council of California, Center for Children, Families and the Court; Goerge, R.M., Van Voorhis, J., Grant, S., Casey, K. & Robinson, M. (1992). Special Education Experiences of Foster Children: An Empirical Study. *Child Welfare*, 71, 419-437.

<sup>6</sup> Courtney, M., Terao, S. & Bost, N. (2005). Executive Summary: Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Foster Youth: Conditions of Youth Preparing to Leave State Care. Chapin Hall Center for Children. University of Chicago.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid

<sup>8</sup> Ayasse, R.H. (1995). Addressing the Needs of Foster Children: The Foster Youth Services Program. *Social Work in Education*, 17(4), 207-216; Altschuler, S.J. (1997). A Reveille for School Social Workers: Children in Foster Care Need our Help! *Social Work in Education*, 19(2), 121-127.

<sup>9</sup> Finkelstein, M., Wamsley, M., & Miranda, D. (2002). What Keeps Children in Foster Care from Succeeding in School? Views of Early Adolescents and the Adults in their Lives. New York, New York: Vera Institute of Justice.; Casey Family Programs. (2002). Improve Special Education for Children With Disabilities in Foster Care (Education Issue Brief). Seattle, WA: Wingerden, C., Emerson, J. & Ichikawa, D., 13.

<sup>10</sup> Greene, J. (2002). Revised Version of High School Graduation Rates in the United States. The Manhattan Institute for Policy Research.

<sup>11</sup> Courtney, M. & Dworsky, A. (2006). Findings from the Milwaukee TANF Applicant Study. Series of Reports available at: [http://www.chapinhall.org/article\\_abstract.aspx?ar=1339](http://www.chapinhall.org/article_abstract.aspx?ar=1339) (Outside Source).

arrested, a quarter had experienced homelessness, and more than half of the young women had given birth.<sup>12</sup> It is estimated that among youth who emancipated from the foster care system, only 10 to 30 percent have attended at least some college (versus 60 percent of American youth in general) and only 1 to 5 percent of foster youth earn a bachelor's degree (compared with roughly 25 percent of all youth nationwide).<sup>13</sup> Former foster youth also earn significantly less than their same-age peers with over 75 percent earning less than \$5,000 a year and 90 percent earning less than \$10,000 a year, a gap that is surely due in part to their limited education.<sup>14,15</sup>

Frequent changes in home and school placements can also have a detrimental effect on foster youth academic performance and future success in life. According to a report by the Child Welfare League of America, the number of changes in youth FH placements is associated with their having at least one severe academic skill delay.<sup>16</sup>

Some of the barriers that foster youth face as a result of frequent changes in placement include:

- Loss of education records, resulting in potential loss of academic credits and time spent in school and increased risk of dropping out of school
- Loss in their continuity of education, which further exacerbates the learning gaps that these students face
- Loss of health records, resulting in possible duplication of immunizations and a potential break in continuity of essential health care and medication
- Difficulties adjusting to changing care and school environments, resulting in stress and behavioral problems

---

<sup>12</sup> Cook, R. (1991). A National Evaluation of Title IV-E Foster Care Independent Living Programs for Youth: Phase 2 Final Report. Rockville, MD: Westat; Courtney, M., Terao, S. & Bost, N. (2005). Executive Summary: Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Foster Youth: Outcomes at Age 19. Chapin Hall Center for Children. University of Chicago.

<sup>13</sup> The Youth Transition Funders Group Foster Care Work Group. (2004). Connected by 25: A Plan for Investing in Successful Futures for Foster Youth; Merdinger, J. M., Hines, A. M., Osterling, K.L., & Wyatt, P. (2005). Pathways to College for Former Foster Youth: Understanding Factors that Contribute to Educational Success. *Child Welfare*, 84(6), 867-896; Wolanin, T. (2005). Higher Education Opportunities for Foster Youth: A Primer for Policymakers. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

<sup>14</sup> Courtney, M., Terao, S. & Bost, N. (2005). Executive Summary: Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Foster Youth: Outcomes at Age 19. Chapin Hall Center for Children. University of Chicago.

<sup>15</sup> An individual with a high school diploma earns an average of \$6,000 more annually than someone with only 11 years of schooling, according to Rouse, C.E. & Barrow, L. (2006). U.S. Elementary and Secondary Schools: Equalizing Opportunity or Replicating the Status Quo? *The Future of Children*, 16(2), 99-123.

<sup>16</sup> Patricia Edmonds, "The Children Left Behind—Educational Barriers Are High for School-Hopping Foster Children." *The Children's Beat* (Fall 2003).

- Loss of contact with persons familiar with their health, education, and welfare needs, resulting in inadequate care and inappropriate school placements
- Lack of permanent family or family-like support systems upon emancipation from the foster care system
- Lack of pro-social bonding with peers, which can lead to higher risk of delinquency

The California Legislature recognized that a high percentage of foster youth were working substantially below grade level, were being retained at least one year at the same grade level, and were dropping out of school. Recent studies conducted in connection with legislation to support the expansion of the FYS Program show that 75 percent of foster youth students are working below grade level, 83 percent are being held back by the third grade, and 46 percent become high school dropouts.<sup>17</sup> Other studies indicate that 44 percent of foster youth entering the system in grades three through eight are in the bottom quartile in reading;<sup>18</sup> and on statewide achievement scores, foster youth perform 15 to 20 percentile points below their peers.<sup>19</sup> This results in significant numbers of foster youth who continue to struggle academically throughout their kindergarten through grade twelve career and ultimately fail to graduate.<sup>20</sup> Chapter 721, Statutes of 1981, declares that the instruction, counseling, tutoring, and related services for foster children that provide program effectiveness and potential cost savings shall be a state priority and mandated the FYS Program through *EC* sections 42920–25 (Appendix A).

The 1981 legislative mandate also provided funding for these services to the following school districts that had successfully operated FYS Program sites since 1973: (1) San Juan Unified; (2) Mount Diablo Unified; (3) Sacramento City Unified; and (4) Elk Grove Unified. In 1988 the Legislature established uniform data collection for these four FYS Core District (CD) Programs, requiring biennial reports on their progress and effectiveness. In 1992 the Legislature funded two additional FYS CD Programs, administered by the Paramount Unified School District and the Placer/Nevada Counties Consortium. The primary purpose of the six FYS CD Programs is to provide advocacy and direct services to support the educational success of **all** foster youth attending school in their districts.

---

<sup>17</sup> Assembly Bill 490, Chapter 862, Statutes of 2003. An overview of AB 490 (Steinberg, *Helping Foster Children Make the Grade*) developed by the California Youth Connection, Children’s Advocacy Institute, and Children’s Law Center of Los Angeles (2004), appears at the end of this report in Appendix E. The complete law can be viewed at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov> (Outside Source).

<sup>18</sup> C. Smithgall, and others. *Educational Experiences of Children in Out-of-Home Care*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall Center for Children (2004).

<sup>19</sup> M. Burley and M. Halpern, *Educational Attainment Of Foster Youth: Achievement And Graduation Outcomes For Children In State Care*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2001).

<sup>20</sup> Loman, L.A. & Siegel, G.L. (2000). *A Review of the Literature on Independent Living of Youth in Foster and Residential Care*. St. Louis, MO: Institute of Applied Research.

The demonstrated success of the six FYS CD Programs resulted in renewed annual funding for the existing FYS CD Programs and the creation of the FYS Countywide (CW) Programs through the Budget Act of 1998 (Appendix B). The intent of the FYS CW Programs is to provide academic and social support services to all youth, ages four to twenty-one, living in LCIs (also referred to as group homes) in California. Foster youth residing in LCIs represent approximately 12 percent of the total foster youth population in California. The Budget Act of 1998 provided \$3 million in half-year funding to initiate the FYS CW Programs, with annual full-year funding provided in each Budget Act thereafter. The California Department of Education (CDE) released an initial Request for Applications (RFA) in 1999 to all county offices of education (COEs) to solicit applications for FYS funding. Through this initial noncompetitive process, the CDE funded 24 FYS CW Programs in fiscal year (FY) 1998-99. In the 2005-06 FY, 55 COEs were operating FYS CW Programs, serving approximately 11,200 students<sup>21</sup> residing in LCIs.

The Budget Act of 2006 provided \$18.3 million to expand services originally only targeting foster youth living in LCIs to include foster youth residing in FHs, Foster Family Agencies (FFAs), Court Specified Placements (CSPs) and Juvenile Detention (JD) Facilities. With this budget augmentation, the CDE invited the remaining three counties to apply for CW funding. This process resulted in expanding CW Programs to 57 COEs<sup>22</sup> in FY 2007–08, which funded programs to serve approximately 29,100 students.<sup>23</sup>

A significant change to FYS programming was the inclusion of monies to serve foster youth in JD facilities. These foster youth are often referred to as “crossover youth” because they have contact with child welfare and the juvenile justice systems. They are also referred to as dual jurisdiction or dual status youth.<sup>24</sup> There are three main ways in which a youth becomes a dual status youth. The most frequent manner is when a current foster youth commits a crime and enters the juvenile justice system. The second pathway is when a youth who had prior contact with the child welfare system commits a crime and enters the juvenile justice system. The third pathway is when a crime is committed by a youth who has never had contact with the child welfare system, but has been referred by juvenile justice for an investigation of neglect and/or abuse.<sup>25</sup>

Early child abuse and neglect increase the risk for juvenile arrests by 55 percent and

---

<sup>21</sup> Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Glasser, T., Williams, D., Zimmerman, K., Simon, V., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Frerer, K., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Lou, C., Peng, C. & Holmes, A. (2009). *Child Welfare Services Reports for California*. Retrieved 10/23/2009, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site.

URL: [http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare) (Outside Source).

<sup>22</sup> Tuolumne was unsuccessful in the application for FYS Countywide funding process.

<sup>23</sup> Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Glasser, T., Williams, D., Zimmerman, K., Simon, V., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Frerer, K., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Lou, C., Peng, C. & Holmes, A. (2009). *Child Welfare Services Reports for California*. Retrieved 10/23/2009, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site.

URL: [http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare) (Outside Source).

<sup>24</sup> Halemba, G. J., Siegel, G., Lord, R. D., & Zawacki, S. (2004, November 30). *Arizona dual jurisdiction study: Final report*. Pittsburg, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid

increase the risk of violent crime arrests by 96 percent.<sup>26</sup> Various studies indicate that foster youth are involved with the juvenile justice system at higher rates than youth in the general population.<sup>27</sup> One study found that on average, youth who were involved with the child welfare system had a 47 percent greater rate of delinquency. In addition, several research studies have examined the negative impact of out-of-home placements and have concluded that youth in these settings are approximately two times more likely than their in-home peers to engage in delinquency.<sup>28, 29</sup>

The number of changes in placement has also been shown to increase the risk of delinquency in foster youth. One study indicates that males who have had three placements are 1.54 times more likely to enter the juvenile justice system, than males who have had only placement. In addition, males who have experienced four or more placements, are 2.13 times more likely to enter the juvenile justice system.<sup>30</sup>

There may be an assumption that these youth have had a long history of delinquency and therefore the likelihood of higher rates of involvement in the juvenile justice system is to be expected, but a recent Los Angeles study of crossover youth indicated that 79 percent of these youth were first time offenders.<sup>31</sup> It is also important to note that a study of foster youth indicates that 61 percent of boys and 41 percent of girls have been arrested by the age of seventeen.<sup>32</sup> It is also noted that 20 percent of foster youth become incarcerated within two years of emancipating from the child welfare system.<sup>33</sup>

The recent research report written by Dr. Denise Herz and Dr. Joseph Ryan, *Building Multisystem Approaches in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice* (2008) provides a great framework for increasing collaboration among systems, which include education systems to ensure that crossover youth are afforded the same opportunities as their peers. There is strong evidence that often when youth are released from juvenile hall, their transition back to school at the time of arrest is difficult because there are often no clear protocols between schools, child welfare, or probation as to how enrollment should occur. This report also indicates that each system is unclear as to what roles each entity plays, and youth often find themselves out of school for long periods of time, which directly impacts their ability to successfully transition into the community.

---

<sup>26</sup> Widom, C. S. (1989). Child abuse, neglect, and violent criminal behavior. *Criminology*, 27, 251-271.

<sup>27</sup> T. Festinger. *No One Ever Asked Us... A Postscript to Foster Care*. New York: Columbia University Press (1983).

<sup>28</sup> English, D., Widom, C., & Branford, C. (2000). *Childhood victimization and delinquency, adult criminality, and violent criminal behavior: A replication and extension*. (Grant #97-IJ-CX-0017) National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.

<sup>29</sup> Ryan, J. P., & Testa, M. K. (2005). Child maltreatment and juvenile delinquency: Investigating the role of placement and placement instability. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27, 227-249.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid

<sup>31</sup> Ryan, J. P., Marshall, J. M., Herz, D., & Hernandez, P. (2008). Juvenile delinquency in child welfare: Investigating group home effects. *Children and Youth Services Review*.

<sup>32</sup> "Mental Health Issues in the Child Welfare System, Best Practice Next Practice: Family-Center Child Welfare." Washington, D.C.: National Child Welfare Resource Center for Family-Centered Practice, Children's Bureau (Summer 2003), 2.

<sup>33</sup> Mark E. Courtney and Irving Piliavin, *Foster Youth Transitions to Adulthood: Outcomes 12 to 18 Months After Leaving Out-Of-Home Care*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin (1998).

Recognizing that a correlation existed between the foster care system and juvenile justice system and a strong need to support educational services for foster youth, the Legislature included \$643,000 in the budget augmentation to expand services to foster youth in JD facilities with a strong emphasis on educational transition services. In accordance with the expansion, the CDE released an initial 2006-07 RFA for the FYS JD Program and another RFA in 2007-08. This has resulted in the establishment of 28 FYS JD Programs in FY 2007-08.

The FYS JD Programs are intended to provide foster youth placed in county-operated JD facilities the same access to comprehensive educational and support services available to students who are not in the juvenile justice system. In addition, the primary focus of the program is intended to assist foster youth in the smooth transition from juvenile court school to an appropriate school placement within their community of residence.

Due to California's fiscal climate, the Budget Act of 2008 provided 15.1 million dollars for all FYS Programs in FY 2009-10. This included a 0.32 percent reduction for a decline in average daily attendance and a 19.84 percent reduction due to the Categorical Program Tier II classification.<sup>34</sup>

The goal of the CDE is to establish effective and sustainable FYS CW Programs in every county in California and to establish FYS JD Programs where feasible.

The FYS Programs reflect the mandates of *EC* sections 42920–25, which were amended by Assembly Bill 1808 (2006) (Appendix C) and key educational mandates of Senate Bill 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998), which were enacted to effect group home reform (Appendix D). The mandates of SB 933 are intended to ensure collaboration among local agencies in counties receiving FYS CW Program funding to facilitate appropriate placements and provide comprehensive services for foster youth living in LCIs.

Although the FYS CD, CW, and the JD Programs differ in the structure and location of the foster youth populations they serve, the overarching goals of the FYS Programs are similar. The following items summarize the goals common to all programs:

- Identify the educational, physical, social, and emotional needs of foster youth.
- Determine gaps in the provision of educational and social support services and provide those services, either directly or through referral to collaborative partners.
- Identify inadequacies in the completion and timely transfer of health and education records to facilitate appropriate and stable care and educational placement.

---

<sup>34</sup> Categorical Program Flexibility provisions that were granted to LEAs with the enactment of Senate Bill X3 5, exclude Foster Youth Services monies from being redirected for other educational purposes, but applied across the board budget reduction.

- Improve student academic achievement and reduce student truancy, dropout rates, and delinquent behavior.
- Provide advocacy to promote the best interests of foster youth throughout California.

## **Organization of the 2010 Report to the Legislature and the Governor for the Foster Youth Services Program**

This report includes five parts: Part I—FYS CD Programs Report; Part II—FYS CW Programs Report; Part III—FYS JD Program; Part IV—Recommendations of the Foster Youth Programs; and Part V—Conclusion.

Part I displays quantitative outcome data for the six FYS CD Programs: improvement in pupil academic achievement, incidence of pupil discipline problems, and pupil dropout rates or truancy rates are reported, as mandated in *EC* Section 42923(b).

Part II provides documentation of the progress and success of the 57 FYS CW Programs in providing services to foster youth residing in LCIs, FHs, FFAs, and CSPs during FY 2008–09. These services are provided through effective collaborations among local government, nonprofit, and private-sector agencies. Part II of this report contains the following:

- Evidence of progress in the establishment of advisory groups of collaborative partners in participating counties to plan the FYS CW Program
- Evidence of progress in the establishment of collaborative partners to provide services to foster youth residing in county boundaries (services include, but are not limited to, educational assessments, tutoring, mentoring, counseling, transitional services, vocational education, training for LCI staff and partner agencies, and emancipation/independent living services)
- Evidence of progress in the development of a mechanism for the efficient and timely transfer of health and education records
- Description of the challenges reported by the 57 participating COEs in the implementation of various aspects of the FYS CW Program
- Description of significant accomplishments reported by the FYS CW Programs
- Goals and objectives for FY 2009–10

Part III provides documentation of the progress and success of the 28 FYS JD Programs in providing services to foster youth residing in JD facilities in FY 2008–09. These services are provided through effective collaborations among probation, local government, nonprofit, and private-sector agencies. Part III of this report contains the following:

- Evidence of progress in the establishment of advisory groups of collaborative partners in participating counties to plan the FYS JD Program
- Evidence of progress in the establishment of collaborative partners to provide services to foster youth in JD (services include, but are not limited to, educational assessments, tutoring, mentoring, counseling, transitional services, vocational education, training for staff and partner agencies, and emancipation/independent living services)
- Evidence of progress in the development of a mechanism for the efficient and timely transfer of health and education records
- Description of the challenges reported by the 28 participating COEs in the implementation of various aspects of the FYS JD Program
- Description of significant accomplishments reported by the FYS JD Programs
- Goals and objectives for FY 2009–10

Part IV provides recommendations from the coordinators for the 6 FYS CD Programs, 57 FYS CW Programs, and 28 FYS JD Programs regarding the continuation of services, effectiveness of the services, and broadening of the application of services provided to foster youth.

Part V provides a conclusion and a summary of the FYS Programs discussed throughout this report.

## Part I—Foster Youth Services Core District Programs Report

This section includes information generated by the six FYS CD Programs on program effectiveness during the 2008–09 school year. The outcome data reported in this section are for all students served by the six FYS CD Programs. The outcome data represent the degree to which three objectives for student performance have been achieved. The data have been compiled from the six FYS CD Programs and aggregated to form one report to the Legislature. The evaluation design was approved by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Department of Finance and was codified in *EC* Section 42923. Student performance objectives were established to measure program impact of the FYS CD Programs on pupil academic achievement, incidence of pupil discipline problems or juvenile delinquency, and pupil dropout or truancy rates.

### Objective One: Impact on Pupil Academic Achievement

**Rationale:** A majority of foster youth students are academically deficient; therefore, the FYS CD Programs measured program impact on academic achievement. Seventy-five percent of foster youth are working below grade level, as reported in *Child Welfare in California, Facts at a Glance*.<sup>35</sup> Because of the academic similarity between foster youth and Title I low-achieving students, the measure for success was designed to be comparable to the standard of growth for the Title I population. The adopted measure is one month of growth for every month tutored.

**Target objective:** Sixty percent of foster youth students will gain one month of academic growth for every month of tutoring received.

**Findings: The target objective of 60 percent was surpassed with 74 percent of the students having gained at least one month of academic growth per month of tutoring received.** Of the 579 students who were both pre- and post-tested, 428 achieved the goal and 151 did not. Results from the Student Achievement Test Data Form indicate that the average rate of academic growth was 4.02 months for each month of tutoring. Some programs serving students in grades seven, eight, nine, ten, and eleven did not meet the target objective for those grade levels, though the aggregate average indicates that the CD Programs have met their target objective. Many programs serving youth in these grade levels indicate difficulty in retaining qualified tutors and the high mobility of youth as factors that impact student achievement at these grade levels. The FYS CD Programs used the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program's reading and math assessments from Renaissance Learning and the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT).

The STAR assessments are norm-referenced, pre-tests and post-tests that are research-based and computer-adaptive.

---

<sup>35</sup> *Child Welfare in California, Facts at a Glance*. California Department of Social Services, August 26, 2004.

**Table 1: Data for Pupil Academic Achievement**  
**Students Achieving Academic Growth Objective<sup>a</sup>**  
**During School Year 2008–09**

Grade Level	Number of Students Tested <sup>b</sup>	Number of Students Achieving Objective	Percent Achieving Objective
K	15	15	100%
1	56	42	75%
2	53	37	70%
3	66	50	76%
4	57	45	79%
5	56	41	73%
6	58	46	79%
7	39	26	67%
8	43	25	58%
9	45	32	71%
10	42	34	81%
11	32	21	66%
12	17	14	82%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>74%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Academic growth objective is one month of growth per one month of tutoring.

<sup>b</sup> K-12 students received at least three months of tutoring and were pre-tested and post-tested.

### Data for High School Completion

In addition to pre- and post-testing students who received tutoring services, CD Programs were asked to track the high school completion data for twelfth grade students who received services from FYS. Table 2 outlines the High School Completion Data. The data reflects a 71 percent high school completion rate. Of this 71 percent completion rate; 81 percent are recipients of high school diplomas, 2 percent passed the General Educational Development Test (GED), 1 percent passed the California High School Proficiency Exam (CHSPE), and 16 percent received certificates of completion.<sup>36</sup> The data indicates that students who are served by the CD Programs are completing high school more successfully than their peers in the child welfare system.

<sup>36</sup> Certificates of Completion are often issued to Special Education Students who may have completed core coursework as determined by the Local Educational Agency, but may have not been able to complete all of the requirements for a high school diploma.

**Table 2: Data for High School Completion**

	Number of eligible twelfth graders	Number of twelfth graders who completed HS Program	Number of High School Diplomas	Number of GED	Number of CHSPE	Number of Certificate of Completion
<b>Total Number</b>	246	184	147	4	1	29
%	N/A	71%	81%	2%	1%	16%

**Objective Two: Impact on Incidence of Pupil Discipline Problems**

**Rationale:** Foster children often exhibit maladaptive behaviors that interfere with their school success. Such problem behaviors include excessive truancy, assault, and substance abuse, all of which constitute grounds for expulsion. The FYS CD Programs measured program impact on the incidence of student discipline problems or juvenile delinquency.

**Target objective:** Fewer than 5 percent of the foster youth population will be expelled during the school year.

**Findings:** Of the 3,645 students served in the 6 programs, only 0.69 percent (25 students) were expelled, which significantly surpassed the target objective of fewer than 5 percent of students expelled.

**Table 3: Data for Pupil Discipline Problems**

**Students Expelled for Discipline Problems  
During School Year 2008–09**

Number of Students Served	Number of Students Expelled	Percent of All Students Expelled
3,645	25	0.69%

**Objective Three: Impact on Pupil Truancy Rates**

**Rationale:** Truancy has been identified as one of the barriers to academic success for foster youth. Studies show that 70 percent of non-foster youth complete high school, while

only 50 percent of foster youth complete high school.<sup>37</sup>

**Target objective:** Foster youth students will achieve an average attendance rate of 90 percent during the school year.

**Findings:** Foster youth enrolled in comprehensive school programs achieved a 96 percent attendance rate, exceeding the 90 percent target objective. Foster youth students attending alternative education programs achieved an attendance rate of 92 percent, exceeding the target objective.

**Table 4: Data for Pupil Truancy  
Comprehensive School Student Attendance  
For Program Year 2008–09**

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Attendance Rate</b>
K	137	96%
1	135	97%
2	144	97%
3	134	98%
4	153	97%
5	138	98%
6	188	95%
7	172	95%
8	254	95%
9	250	94%
10	286	94%
11	233	95%
12	193	96%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,417</b>	<b>96%</b>

**Table 5: Additional Data for Pupil Truancy  
Alternative Education Student Attendance  
For Program Year 2008–09**

<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Attendance Rate</b>
863	92%

---

<sup>37</sup> Thomas R. Wolanin, *Higher Education Opportunities for Foster Youth: A Primer for Policy Makers*. The Institute for Higher Education Policy (December 2005). Executive Summary, v.

## **Core District Programs' Response to the Legislative Analyst's Office Report**

In May 2009, the California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) released a report titled the *Education of Foster Youth in California*.<sup>38</sup> One recommendation included the elimination of CD Programs in an effort to streamline FYS implementation efforts. The following is the CD Programs' response to the LAO report.

Foster youth benefit from the services and support provided by FYS CD Programs in the following ways: (1) increased school attendance; (2) improved grades; (3) reduced emotional and behavioral difficulties at school; (4) increased graduation rates; and (5) reduced rates of homelessness and unemployment after exiting the foster care system, all due to the individualized attention to each student's particular needs. This information is well documented in the annual FYS Program Year-End Reports (YERs) submitted to the CDE.

The FYS CD Programs are able to identify their foster students and address individual issues that would be challenging to the larger FYS CW Programs, collaborate with one another to problem-solve systems-related and service delivery concerns, and provide a leadership role to the FYS CW Programs. The FYS CD Programs are in a unique position to base services and support at schools. The inherent relationships that school districts have with the local community provide a platform for grants and partnerships that would be more challenging for a large CW Program. This makes it more feasible for FYS CD Programs to leverage outside funding and resources.

If FYS CD Programs were eliminated, as recommended in the 2009 LAO Report, there would be no platform on which to expand effective FYS strategies in the future. Dismantling these programs would eradicate some of the most effective support and services that meet the particular needs of foster youth in California. Large COEs are not in a position to replicate the individualized services provided by FYS CD Programs. It is a recommendation of this group to expand district level programs, for better identification, assessment of individual needs, and supportive services for foster students in the state of California.

---

<sup>38</sup> *Education of Foster Youth in California* (May 2009), CA Legislative Analyst's Office, [http://www.lao.ca.gov/2009/edu/foster\\_children/foster\\_ed\\_052809.pdf](http://www.lao.ca.gov/2009/edu/foster_children/foster_ed_052809.pdf) (PDF; Outside Source), accessed October 24, 2009

## **Part II—Foster Youth Services Countywide Programs Report**

This section will report on progress made by the FYS CW Programs in meeting the goals established in the guiding legislation, SB 933.<sup>39</sup> It will also describe program challenges, accomplishments, and goals and objectives for 2009–10.

### **Establishment of Local Advisory Group**

**Evidence of progress made in the establishment of a local advisory group (LAG) of collaborative partners in each participating county to plan the FYS CW Program, to advise on the direction of program services, and to collaborate on providing those services.**

All 57 of the FYS CW Programs operating in 2008–09 reported the existence of a LAG that serves as a steering committee and/or service provider for foster youth living within county boundaries. The majority of counties (62 percent) reported having established the LAG from scratch rather than adopting an existing interagency committee to serve as the LAG. The counties that have adopted an existing interagency committee to satisfy the LAG function are primarily small, rural counties that lack a large government and social-services infrastructure. The adoption of existing interagency committees is an efficient utilization of existing staff and resources in these counties.

In addition, as FYS Programs become more evolved, they are increasingly integrating into the local collaborative frameworks that include more collaborative partnerships with the courts, social services, probation and other social service related agencies. This ensures that the FYS Program is sustainable over time and can leverage resources effectively to benefit the educational achievement of foster youth in their local communities.

The FYS CW LAGs are composed of a wide array of agency representatives to address the comprehensive needs of foster youth. The LAGs represent a multidisciplinary approach to meeting the unique educational, social, emotional, physical, and legal needs of foster youth. The FYS CW Programs have succeeded in establishing comprehensive LAGs that meet the holistic needs of foster youth.

The following table shows a breakdown of LAG representatives for the FYS CW Programs and the percentages of counties that include these representatives in their LAGs.

---

<sup>39</sup> SB 933, Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998. See Appendix D for a summary of key concepts in SB 933. A complete copy of SB 933 can be accessed at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/> (Outside Source).

## Local Advisory Group Representatives for the FYS CW Programs

Agency Representative	Percent of Counties with Representative	
	FY 2008–09	FY 2006–07
County Department of Social Services	99%	100%
Schools and District Offices	98%	91%
County Probation	96%	93%
Independent Living Skills Programs	91%	85%
County Mental Health	88%	84%
Community-Based Organizations	84%	71%
Colleges/Universities	82%	69%
Group Home Providers	80%	71%
Former and Current Foster Youth	79%	62%
Courts	75%	55%
County Public Health	71%	67%
Alcohol/Drug Programs	61%	49%
Foster Youth Advocacy Groups	59%	42%
County Employment Development Offices	54%	47%
Faith-Based Organizations	27%	16%
Private Industry	27%	20%
Tribal Organizations	21%	16%
Foster Parents	16%	9%
Special Education Local Plan Areas	14%	9%
Foster Family Agencies	13%	7%
Court Appointed Special Advocates	13%	16%

The variance of agency representation on LAGs for the FYS CW Programs ranged from 4 to 30 representatives. Predictably, the larger counties had the greatest number of representatives from various agencies. The smaller counties having only four or five representatives in their LAGs included representatives from county social services, county mental health, county probation, and local educational agencies (LEAs). Overall, counties reported an increase in the number of advisory group representatives. Most notable since the 2008 FYS Program Report to the Legislature and the Governor was issued, advisory group representation has increased among courts by 20 percent; foster youth by 17 percent; colleges and universities by 13 percent; community-based organizations by 13 percent; alcohol/drug programs by 12 percent; and faith-based organizations by 11 percent. Though the data indicates there may be a decrease in advisory participation rates for social services, this is the first time Amador County reported separately from San Joaquin County, which serves as the lead county in the consortia and local collaborative. The data indicates increased involvement of local agencies, which indicates increased leveraged resources.

## **Establishment of Collaborative Partners**

**Evidence of progress made in the establishment of collaborative partners to provide services to foster youth residing in county boundaries. (Services to be provided through collaborative partners include, but are not limited to, educational assessments, tutoring, mentoring, counseling, transition services, vocational education, emancipation/independent living services, transfer of health and education records, and training for LCI staff and partner agencies.)**

One of the most vital aspects of the FYS CW Programs is the development of collaborations among social workers, probation officers, group home staff, school staff, and community service agencies to influence foster care placement and to enhance the academic success of foster youth. Specifically, Assembly Bill 490 (Chapter 862, Statutes of 2004) requires collaboration between placing agencies, educators, care providers, and juvenile courts to ensure that foster youth: (1) have a meaningful opportunity to meet state academic achievement standards; (2) are able to maintain stable school placements; (3) are placed in the least restrictive care and educational environments; and (4) have access to the academic resources, services, and enrichment activities available to all other students. AB 490 also places a limit on the amount of time allowed for the transfer of health and education records and requires that foster youth be enrolled in school immediately, even without the requisite health and education records. To ensure accountability, AB 490 requires LEAs to designate a staff person as a foster youth education liaison to ensure proper educational placement and timely transfer and enrollment.<sup>40</sup>

In addition to AB 490, on October 7, 2008, the federal government also recognized the importance of education for foster youth and passed Public Law 110-351, *Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008*, which included provisions very similar to AB 490. An important change in federal law is the requirement for Child Welfare Agencies (CWAs) to work with their LEAs to develop case plans that support the “educational stability of a child while in foster care.” This new mandate for CWAs has created a new opportunity to further strengthen existing collaborative focused on supporting positive educational outcomes for foster youth.

While the concept of collaboration is readily accepted as necessary in addressing the comprehensive needs of foster youth, the actual attainment of effective collaboratives has proven to be a challenge. Collaboratives are built and maintained through ongoing communication and interaction among collaborating agencies. Many agency directors and staff simply do not have adequate time to develop new collaborative relationships and responsibilities. As noted in a study by the American Institutes for Research, “Even among agencies with a history of successful interagency collaboration, no one reported

---

<sup>40</sup> AB 490, Chapter 862, Statutes of 2003.

it is an easy accomplishment.”<sup>41</sup> A recurrent comment in the 2008–09 FYS CW Programs’ YERs was the difficulty encountered in establishing and maintaining effective collaborations with partner agencies that often are underfunded, overworked, and understaffed particularly in light of California’s budget crisis.

Despite the difficulties of collaboration, the FYS CW Programs provided strong evidence of the development of effective collaborations throughout the state in service to foster youth. Common strategies used to facilitate the development of collaborative relationships with partner agencies are described as follows:

**Co-location:** Several counties, varying in size and demographic composition, reported the establishment of the FYS CW Program service site at a location other than the COE. The most common co-location sites reported were school campuses, school district offices, and county health and human services offices. A primary benefit of co-location, as reported by FYS CW Program staff, is the increased interaction of FYS staff with their collaborative partners. The ability to interface on a daily basis helps build working relationships among collaborative partners. Co-location also makes the sharing of information more efficient, enhances the effectiveness of staff development training, maximizes the coordination of services, and results in overall cost savings. Several counties reported having co-located in order to collect and transfer the health and education records of foster youth more efficiently.

**Interface with existing services:** In addition to developing new collaboratives, FYS CW Programs also interface with existing programs to supplement support services provided to foster youth. These existing programs include Title I Neglected and Delinquent Youth, Healthy Start, Systems of Care, Special Education, Workforce Investment Act’s School to Career Program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Education, and Independent Living Skills. In many instances the coordinators for the FYS CW Programs also manage the aforementioned programs for the COEs, further maximizing the coordination of services and leveraged resources.

**Participation in county multidisciplinary team meetings and other interagency group meetings:** A majority of the FYS CW Programs reported that their FYS Program coordinators or other FYS Program staff are members of multiple children’s interagency councils or county multidisciplinary teams (MDTs). Examples of councils and interagency groups include the Juvenile Justice Commission, the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, Court Appointed Special Advocates, Children’s Services Coordinating Council, Superintendents’ Council, Schools Advisory Group, Health Advisory Council, Providers’ Network, Transition Coalition, foster parents’ associations, and tribal councils. A key role of the FYS representative is to alleviate the division between programs and systems by serving as a bridge between education, social services, law enforcement/courts, placing agencies, and care

---

<sup>41</sup> *Education of Foster Group Home Children, Whose Responsibility is it Anyway? Study of the Educational Placement of Children Residing in Group Homes.* (American Institute for Research, SRA Associates and the University of California at Berkeley Child Welfare Research Center, January 2001).

providers. The FYS representative acts as a liaison and provides a voice for foster youth in the team decision-making process to ensure that their holistic needs are addressed. In addition to these collaboratives, on August 15, 2008, the California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care submitted final recommendations to the Judicial Council which established Local Blue Ribbon Commissions (LBRCs) to focus on local collaboration with judicial leadership. Many of these LBRCs have chosen to have a focus on educational outcomes and have successfully engaged FYS Programs in developing implementation strategies. This is a unique collaborative because it is spearheaded by the courts and judiciary.

The following agencies and their respective services are reported by a majority of FYS CW Programs to be commonly found in collaborative partnerships:

<b>Collaborative Agencies</b>	<b>Services Provided</b>
County Courts/ Local Blue Ribbon Commissions	Judicial guidance and leadership in regard to the case management challenges to support the health and well-being of youth in care, which include but are not limited to education
County Departments of Mental Health	Counseling, psychological evaluations, medication consultation, behavior management techniques, and assistance in completing health and education records
County Departments of Social Services/ Probation	Case management, counseling, monitoring, appropriate behavioral reinforcement, and assistance in completing health and education records
County Departments of Employment and Human Services	Employment training and assistance
County Public Health Departments	Health and education records, provision of public health services at schools, workshops for foster youth and group home staff, and funding for eyeglasses
County Probation Departments	Monitoring and reinforcement of appropriate behavior, meetings with family and school personnel, and information regarding placement changes for foster youth
Local Educational Agencies	Educational assessment to determine appropriate special education services and school placement, assistance through the School Attendance Review Board, tutoring services, and school attendance monitoring/truancy intervention
Colleges and Universities	Tutoring and mentoring services, counseling, financial aid information, and outside evaluations of FYS Programs

<b>Collaborative Agencies</b>	<b>Services Provided</b>
Family Resource Centers and Other Community-Based Organizations	Case management, training for group home providers, employment services (work experience, job skills, career assessments, and Regional Occupation Program credits, etc.), and funding for school clothes
Tribal Organizations	Leisure/recreational activities, family therapy, development of social skills, problem solving, team building, and cultural awareness
Independent Living Skills Programs	Career development services, life skills classes, transition and emancipation services, and vocational education
Churches and Private-Sector Organizations	Funding for extracurricular activities, toys, gift certificates for basic needs, and mentoring
Caregivers	Address the needs of foster youth in their care
Other Foster Youth Service Countywide Programs	Technical assistance, sharing of best practices, data collection procedures, and operational databases

The following items represent less common collaborative efforts, as reported by the FYS CW Programs, which are noteworthy for their ingenuity:

- A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the county probation department and the county superintendent of schools focused on the development of a Web-based FYS Information System (FYIS) to store health, education, and placement information for foster youth on probation. A collaborative work group of representatives from the FYS Program, COE, Juvenile Court, Department of Health and Human Services, Probation Department, and County Technology Office was created to support implementation of the FYIS.
- A collaboration between the COE and the County Department of Human Services resulted in the initial creation and subsequent expansion of “Independent City,” a simulated experience of life in a “real” city. Sixteen- and seventeen-year-old foster youth encounter in this simulation what life is like outside of foster care by applying for jobs, renting apartments, buying cars, enrolling in college, and opening bank accounts.
- The FYS Programs and several COEs collaborated to implement the Community Service Program Grant, wherein AmeriCorps volunteers create meaningful community service opportunities for foster youth who participate in a combination of intervention and prevention programs.
- A collaborative partnership among a FYS CW Program, the California Student Aid Commission, community colleges, universities, juvenile court community schools, health and human services agency representatives, and independent living skills contractors worked to create an FYS College Connection Advisory Council to

increase the number of foster youth who attend postsecondary education.

- A youth-focused collaborative which included FYS, social services, private industry, LEAs, local employment agencies and local non-profits to develop a youth center to meet all of the comprehensive needs of youth.

The collaborative relationships developed by the FYS CW Programs have resulted in a substantive base of comprehensive services provided to foster youth. Services are provided primarily through referrals to partner agencies, with some instances of direct service provision.

The following table summarizes the FYS services provided statewide, either directly through FYS CW Programs or through referral to partner agencies, and the percentage of FYS CW Programs that provided the various services during the period of this report.

**Table 5: Services Provided through the FYS CW Programs**

<b>Services Provided</b>	<b>Number of Direct Services</b>	<b>Number of Indirect Services</b>	<b>Number of Referred Services</b>	<b>Percent Providing Services Directly</b>
Training (for LEAs, Social Services, Caregivers and Other Agencies)	976	N/A	N/A	100%
Advocacy and Consultation	7,122	6,729	2,751	88%
Postsecondary Preparation/ Higher Education Support Services	4,333	2,575	1,245	84%
Academic Counseling	6,032	4,029	3,062	82%
Academic Tutoring	4,487	1,386	2,121	77%
Vocational Education	3,843	3,849	2,076	75%
Emancipation/Independent Living	2,708	7,299	2,177	71%
Link to Community Services	2,216	2,146	3,620	71%
Educational Assessment	4,104	739	1,938	64%
Mentoring	3,323	1,692	870	63%
School Based Behavioral Support Services	1,375	372	1,291	45%
Other	6,068	2,983	160	39%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>46,587</b>	<b>33,799</b>	<b>21,311</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**Direct Services**—indicates the number of students who received services provided by the FYS Program directly. Example: FYS staff or contractors were directly involved in tutoring, advocating, or doing educational case management.

**Indirect Services**—indicates the number of students who received services provided by the FYS Program in collaboration with local partners. Example: FYS staff provided a transfer of record.

**Referred Services**—indicates the number students who were referred to other agencies or departments for services. Example: FYS staff have referred students for tutoring at a local school site. The indirect and referral services are often provided to foster youth in Kinship and Guardian placement because the 2008 Budget Act did not provide monies to serve youth in this type of placement. Kinship and Guardian placements represent 46 percent of the foster care population.<sup>42</sup>

## **Transfer of Health and Education Records**

### **Evidence of progress made in developing a mechanism for the efficient and timely transfer of health and education records.**

AB 490 requires LEAs to transfer education information and other records to a foster student's next educational placement within two business days of receiving a transfer request. The information to be transferred includes determination of seat time, full or partial credits earned, classes, grades, immunizations, and individualized education programs (IEPs) for special education services. AB 490 further stipulates that LEAs must designate a staff person to serve as the foster youth educational liaison to ensure the timely transfer of complete health and education records.

The Health and Education Passport (HEP) is the essential instrument used to ensure that the health and education records of FYS students are current. County placing agencies have the primary responsibility for completing the HEP. The health information for the HEP is most often completed by public health nurses, while the education information generally is completed by social workers for foster youth. Counties report that HEPs frequently are incomplete and that the length of time necessary to locate prior school records remains a common barrier.

Facilitation of the timely transfer of complete health and education records has been a principal goal of the FYS CW Program since its inception. Over the past nine years, FYS coordinators have worked diligently to improve record transfers through collaboration with placing agencies, evaluation of administrative systems, and the bridging of communication and operational gaps between various agencies involved in the placement and education of foster youth. Several FYS coordinators report that their CW Programs have recently dedicated staff, co-located, or entered into a MOU or MOA to advance a more expeditious, accurate, and efficient record transfer process.

In FY 2008–09, 57 FYS CW Programs reported having facilitated the transfer of more than 21,729 records to school districts throughout California to enroll foster youth in school. The number of records transferred has decreased by 6,802, or 14 percent, since the 2008 FYS Program Report to the Legislature and the Governor. The reported range of days taken to transfer records was one to three days, with the average number being 2.75. Thus, the average number of days taken to transfer records has decreased slightly from the 2.78

---

<sup>42</sup> CWS/CMS Dynamic Report System, April 2007. [http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/PIT.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/PIT.aspx) (Outside Source) (accessed October 25, 2009).

average reported in the 2008 FYS Program Report. The transfer of health and education records within a two-day period, as stipulated by AB 490, remains a top priority for the FYS CW Programs to ensure that students have appropriate placements in the absence of school stability.

### Challenges in 2008–09

#### Description of the challenges reported by the 57 participating COEs in the implementation of various aspects of the FYS CW Program

Many of the FYS CW Programs reported common challenges in implementing effective FYS Programs. The challenges listed in the following table were reported most frequently.

Challenge in Implementing Effective FYS Program	Percent Reporting Challenge
Education Records Tracking/Collection	45%
Funding/Budget Cuts	39%
Foster Youth Transiency	14%
Insufficient Collaboration with Partner Agencies	14%
Identifying Person with Education Rights	9%

Some of these challenges are described as follows:

**Record sharing:** Issues of confidentiality related to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) of 1996 and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 2000 have resulted in difficulty sharing foster youth records. Although the majority of counties have employed collaborative agreements, developed MOUs, or utilized standing court orders to address confidentiality issues related to the sharing of health and education records of foster youth among schools, social services, and probation, some counties continue to report barriers in this area. These counties reported difficulties in acquiring health and, in some cases, education records for foster youth transferring into their districts. These difficulties are brought about by federal privacy standards under HIPAA and FERPA relative to protecting the confidentiality of health and education records. While both HIPAA and FERPA contain clauses that allow the sharing of health and education records with appropriate agencies, some agencies that possess health and education information have a conservative interpretation of HIPAA and FERPA in regard to sharing this information with schools and other agencies because of the potential legal ramifications of breaching compliance with HIPAA and/or FERPA regulations.

**Data Collection:** A challenge for all FYS CW Programs is the high mobility rate of foster youth. AB Bill 490 is designed to reduce the mobility rate of foster youth by requiring placing agencies to consider placements that promote educational stability.

Though much progress has been made to reduce the number of school placements for youth, many programs still indicate that there are significant numbers of youth who experience multiple moves within a school year. The high mobility of foster students makes tracking the success of services provided and data collection difficult.

**Budget Cuts/Funding Decrease:** This FY proved to be a challenge, given California's fiscal crisis. All FYS Programs received an unanticipated 15.4 percent reduction mid-year, which negatively impacted the ability of programs to serve students as originally planned for the year. In addition to this, the 2008 Budget Act further reduced FYS funding by 20.16 percent, and key collaborative partners such as child welfare, the courts, probation, and LEAs also received deep cuts to their budgets. Though the challenge of implementing effective programs with drastic budget reductions is difficult, programs are looking at better leveraging existing dollars and resources, as well as looking to strengthen their public-private partnerships with the support of the foundation sector.

### **Significant accomplishments reported by the Foster Youth Service Countywide Programs**

**FYS Outcomes:** The FYS CW Programs have worked diligently for more than a year to establish measurable outcomes that demonstrate the significant impact of the services they provide to foster youth. In August 2005 the FYS Program coordinators collaboratively developed four FYS Program outcomes. The coordinators have subsequently assessed the most appropriate performance indicators and measures that will be used to collect data and report on each outcome. The FYS CW Programs are extremely diverse in size, resources, method of service provision, and collaborative partnerships. To a certain degree, therefore, the way in which services are provided in each program will determine the most appropriate measures of performance. The agreed-upon FYS Program outcomes are as follows:

- Foster youth will experience successful transition to independent living or higher education.
- Foster youth will advocate for their own needs.
- Foster youth will experience timely and appropriate school placement.
- Foster youth will successfully complete their educational programs.

The following are additional accomplishments reported by FYS CW Programs:

**Academic tutoring:** In an effort to meet the significant academic tutoring needs of foster youth, many counties reported increased use of contracts/agreements/ MOUs for the provision of: (1) tutoring services; (2) credentialed teachers; (3) AmeriCorps volunteers; (4) teachers in training through local universities; and (5) federal Title I Neglected or Delinquent funding to offset tutoring costs. As a result of these efforts, at least 9,163

foster youth benefited from academic tutoring in FY 2008–09, either through direct service from the FYS CW Programs or through referral to a partner agency.

**Collaborative agreements:** Approximately 63 percent of FYS CW Programs report the increased development of collaborative partnerships, interagency agreements, and MOUs as one of their most significant accomplishments in 2008–09 to address the educational support needs of foster youth. Forty-six percent of FYS Programs have increased formal collaboration in regard to data sharing education records between social services and LEAs.

**Educational advocacy:** Virtually all FYS Programs devote a substantial amount of time to educational advocacy on behalf of foster youth. In the 2008–09 program year, most FYS CW Programs have provided AB 490 training to multiagency representatives, several have created FYS Program and educational rights pamphlets for school site distribution, several programs have developed and distributed AB 490 and FYS educational binders to partner agencies, and at least one CW Program has developed a new FYS Web site referencing a wealth of resources. The information can be found on the Foster Youth Educational Services Web site at <http://www.fosteryouthservices.fcoe.net> (Outside Source).

**Emancipation services:** Emancipation services provide a critical link that assists foster youth in becoming productive and self-supporting adults. Several studies over the last 15 years have found that by two to four years after leaving foster care, only half of all the youth studied were regularly employed; over half the young women had given birth to a child and were dependent on welfare support; nearly half the population had experienced arrest; and a quarter had been homeless.<sup>43</sup>

Given the significance of emancipation services for foster youth, a number of FYS CW Programs report substantial increases in the scope and quality of these services as an important accomplishment. A sampling of these programs and services designed to support foster youth in a successful transition to independent living was provided in 2006 to Assembly Speaker Karen Bass, the former Chairperson of the Assembly Select Committee on Foster Youth; this list of programs and services is included in this report as Appendix G.

**Accessing additional funding sources:** A number of FYS CW Programs reported increased utilization of additional funding sources, such as Title I Neglected or Delinquent funds and the Workforce Investment Act's School to Career funds, to provide tutoring and other services. Several programs have also applied for and received various grants for the provision of services to foster youth in their CW Program.

---

<sup>43</sup> Michael Wald and Tia Martinez, "Connected by 25: Improving the Life Chances of the Country's Most Vulnerable 14–24 Year Olds." William and Flora Hewlett Foundation Working Paper (November 2003), 11.

## Reported Goals and Objectives for 2009–10

The FYS CW Programs have made significant progress on the goals and objectives identified in the 2008 FYS Program Report. The evidence of this progress is found in the increased data that is provided in this report. Despite this progress, the four goals identified in the 2008 Report continue to be priorities for the FYS CW Programs. The following list includes their primary goals and objectives for FY 2009–10:

- **FYS outcomes:** Determine appropriate performance measures and collect outcome data for the four FYS outcomes described above in this report (under the heading “Significant accomplishments reported by the Foster Youth Service Countywide Programs” on page 24).
- **Health and education records:** Improve the accuracy, efficiency, and timely transfer of health and education records for foster youth who experience a change in school placement.
- **Collaboration with partner agencies:** Further develop collaborative relationships with partner agencies to facilitate the sharing of records, ensure appropriate school placements, and more effectively meet the holistic needs of foster youth.
- **Provision of services:** Increase the provision of services (tutoring, counseling, mentoring, transition and emancipation services) to ensure that foster youth receive comprehensive support services.
- **Data Collection:** Expand automated foster youth data collection systems to track service delivery and to document program outcomes.

### Part III—Foster Youth Services Juvenile Detention Programs Report

This section will describe an overview of the issues facing foster youth in JD as they pertain to education and report on progress made by the FYS Programs in developing JD Programs as outlined in *EC* Section 42921 to address these challenges. It will also describe FYS JD Program challenges, accomplishments, and goals and objectives for 2009–10.

While research-based literature and data on educational outcomes for foster youth are fairly accessible, the same is not true for a particular sub-group of foster youth: those who enter JD programs. Therefore, educational conclusions regarding foster youth who enter JD programs can best be drawn indirectly through analyzing literature and data regarding foster youth education and juvenile correctional education. Since discussion of foster youth and education has previously been reviewed, this section will focus on county-based juvenile correctional education in order to come to some theories about educational outcomes and best practices for foster youth who enter JD programs.

Youth can be incarcerated in a county-based detention center or a state administered facility such as the California Youth Authority. When foster youth enter a county facility the provision of educational services may be determined by the county board of supervisors.<sup>44</sup> Often youth are held in detention centers because they have been arrested and are awaiting trial; others are incarcerated in secure congregate care facilities because they have been sentenced for a crime.<sup>45</sup> In these instances, *WIC* Section 850 mandates that the board of supervisors in every county shall provide and maintain at the expense of the county "... a suitable house or place for the detention of wards and dependent children of the juvenile court and of persons alleged to come within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court." This type of facility is more commonly known as the county "juvenile hall." In addition to this, county governments are responsible for the provision of local services for juveniles who are detained. Employment, health, education, and economic development services are critical services that are to be offered to incarcerated youth.<sup>46</sup> Research has shown that almost all youth who enter juvenile custody are at significant risk of failure when they exit.<sup>47</sup>

Other studies indicate that confined youth lose daily contact with their families, community, lose valuable school time, and are unlikely to have their health and mental health needs met. They become much more at risk of being susceptible to negative influences and have increased odds of negative adult outcomes. For adolescents, incarceration jump starts a

---

<sup>44</sup> *Welfare and Institutions Code* Section 856 states, "The board of supervisors may provide for the establishment of a public elementary school and of a public secondary school in connection with any juvenile hall, juvenile house, day center, juvenile ranch, or juvenile camp, or residential or nonresidential boot camp for the education of the children in those facilities."

<sup>45</sup> *KIDS COUNT Data Book* (2008). Annie E. Casey Foundation. <http://www.kidscount.org/sld/databook.jsp> (Outside Source), (accessed October 25, 2008).

<sup>46</sup> S. Nadel-Haynes and D. Macallair. *Restructuring Juvenile Corrections in California: A Report to the Legislature* (2005). Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice.

<sup>47</sup> *KIDS COUNT Data Book* (2008). Annie E. Casey Foundation. <http://www.kidscount.org/sld/databook.jsp> (Outside Source), (accessed October 25, 2009)

downward spiral of life choices that cause the adolescent to end up in the adult criminal system.<sup>48</sup> These factors often are compounded for youth who are in the foster care system because historically there has not been a concrete method to determine exactly how many foster youth have “crossed over” to the criminal justice jurisdiction.

The recent expansion of FYS to include transition services to foster youth in JD programs has presented a great opportunity to address some of the needs of foster youth in JD.

The statewide average stay for a youth in a JD facility is 27 days.<sup>49</sup> In addition to this, their educational progress is further compromised because school districts are often reluctant to re-enroll youth upon their release and often refuse to accept any academic credits that they may have earned while incarcerated.<sup>50</sup> According to Herz and Ryan, collaboration with educational providers (i.e., schools) was extremely weak, based on the findings of an anonymous survey conducted among several stakeholders.<sup>51</sup> Due to the many challenges faced by youth transitioning from juvenile hall to school communities, many of the FYS JD strategies have focused on the transition services needed to ensure that youth are re-enrolled and appropriately placed in school communities in a timely manner.

A key component to the provision of these services is a strong collaboration with their local partners and service providers.

**Evidence of progress made in the establishment of a LAG of collaborative partners in each participating county to plan the FYS JD Program, to advise on the direction of program services, and to collaborate on providing those services**

All 28 of the FYS JD Programs in 2008–09 reported the existence of a LAG that serves as a steering committee for their JD Programs. Many programs utilized their existing FYS CW collaboratives to satisfy the LAG function to develop a more streamlined continuum of services focused on various needs of foster youth in the JD system.

The table that follows shows a breakdown of LAG representatives for the FYS JD Programs and the percentages of counties that include these representatives in their LAGs.

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Herz, D. & Ryan, J., *Building Multisystem Approaches in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice*, (2008) <http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/pdfs/wingspreadpart3.pdf> (PDF; Outside Source)(accessed October 25, 2009)

## Local Advisory Group Representatives for the FYS JD Programs

Agency Representative	Percentage of Counties with Agency Representative	
	<i>FY 2008-09</i>	<i>FY 2006-07</i>
County Probation	100%	94%
County Department of Social Services	100%	88%
Schools and District Offices	100%	81%
Independent Living Skills Programs	89%	75%
County Mental Health	89%	75%
Community-Based Organizations	89%	63%
Colleges/Universities	86%	75%
Group Home Providers	86%	69%
Former and Current Foster Youth	75%	50%
County Public Health	71%	50%
Courts	68%	44%
Alcohol/Drug Programs	57%	31%
Foster Youth Advocacy Groups	57%	31%
County Employment Development Offices	50%	31%
Faith-Based Organizations	36%	25%
Tribal Organizations	29%	19%
Private Industry	25%	25%

There has been significant progress in collaboration since the 2008 FYS Program Report to the Legislature and the Governor was issued. Some of the most notable increases are as follows: advisory group representation has increased among Alcohol and Drug Programs by 26 percent; Community-Based Organization by 26 percent; Foster Youth Advocacy Groups by 26 percent; Former and Current Foster Youth by 25 percent; Courts by 24 percent; County Public Health by 21 percent; County Employment Development Offices by 19 percent; Group Home Providers by 17 percent; County Mental Health by 14 percent; and Independent Living Skills Programs by 14 percent.

### **Evidence of progress made in the establishment of collaborative partners to provide services to foster youth in JD facilities**

The following table summarizes the FYS services provided statewide, either directly through FYS JD Programs or through referral to partner agencies, and the percentage of FYS CW Programs that provided the various services during the period of this report.

**Table 6: Services Provided through the FYS CW Programs**

<b>Services Provided</b>	<b>Number of Direct Services</b>	<b>Number of Indirect Services</b>	<b>Number of Referred Services</b>	<b>Percentage Providing Services Directly</b>
Academic Counseling	2,661	809	493	71%
Vocational Education	947	1,572	110	61%
Educational Assessment	2,680	244	436	64%
Academic Tutoring	709	216	244	50%
Advocacy and Consultation	1,750	1,002	448	71%
Post-Secondary Preparation/Higher Education Support Services	1,132	1,283	89	68%
Emancipation/independent living	824	2,777	527	61%
Mentoring	1,467	299	423	46%
Other	804	245	415	21%
Link to Community Services	662	404	208	54%
School Based Behavioral Support Services	1,182	185	431	32%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14,778</b>	<b>9,036</b>	<b>3,824</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**Direct Services**—indicates the number of students who received services provided by the FYS Program directly. Example: FYS staff or contractors were directly involved in tutoring, advocating, or doing educational case management.

**Indirect Services**—indicates the number of students who received services provided by the FYS Program in collaboration with local partners. Example: FYS staff provided a transfer of record.

**Referred Services**—indicates the number of students who were referred to other agencies or departments for services. Example: FYS staff have referred students for tutoring at a local school site

In addition to these services, 3,807 education records were transferred for foster youth in JD in an average of 2.53 days. This data indicates a .38 decrease in the amount of time it takes to transfer records. Given the short time frame in which youth are in JD, it is impressive that FYS Programs are able to gather and transfer records in a prompt manner to ensure that the educational needs of foster youth are prioritized during their stay in juvenile hall.

**Description of the challenges reported by the 28 participating COEs in the implementation of various aspects of the FYS JD Program**

All programs described some challenges in implementing and developing an educational

support services program without a foundation. Many programs described the lack of infrastructure and existing protocols that interface with education systems and child welfare systems. The most common challenge described by 43 percent of programs was the process for identifying crossover youth. The second most common challenge described by 36 percent of programs was the budget challenge faced by all agencies. To this end, it was difficult for programs to provide comprehensive services until protocols to identify foster youth were developed and approved by juvenile hall administrators. Due to the limited funding and the amount of time that it took to establish JD Programs, El Dorado and Napa counties decided not to continue their JD Programs in the 2007-08 program year.

<b>Challenge in Implementing Effective JD FYS Program</b>	<b>Percent Reporting Challenge</b>
Identifying Crossover Youth	43%
Funding/Budget Cuts	36%
Foster Youth Transiency	32%
Insufficient collaboration with partner agencies	11%

**Significant accomplishments reported by the Foster Youth Services Juvenile Detention Programs**

Given the challenges of implementing a new program and the current budget constraints, many FYS Programs acknowledge that this was a year to “fine-tune” collaboration with key partners in an effort to develop a more streamlined approach to service delivery for foster youth in JD. Notably, 64 percent of FYS JD Programs identified significant progress in the establishment of their local collaborations focused on crossover issues. For example, through their collaboration with the courts, one program is working on developing strategies to focus on Native American issues, so that these youth may be able to stay in their county of origin instead of being sent to other counties due to facilities issues.

## Part IV—Recommendations Regarding Foster Youth Services Programs

### Recommendations regarding the continuation of services

- **FYS CD, CW, and JD Programs unanimously recommend a continuation of the FYS Program.**
- **FYS Programs further recommend allocation of an adequate level of funding to support continuation of those programs.**

The FYS Program coordinators report that FYS Programs are unique and critically needed in that they address the educational and psychosocial needs of foster youth. These programs have been instrumental in providing services that improve the academic achievement and quality of life for foster youth throughout California. While AB 490 has helped broaden services to all foster youth, it has provided no additional funding for the services. Funding constraints, at both the county and state levels, have made the expansion and continued development of the FYS Programs challenging. The FYS CW Programs report that the existing funding model, wherein allocations fluctuate on the basis of a point-in-time count of foster youth placed in specified placements, makes long-term program planning difficult. In addition to this, with the statewide movement to focus more on kinship placement and permanency, the funding structure for FYS will be greatly impacted, because FYS Programs are not currently funded to provide services to foster youth in kinship and guardian placements. Given that many of the issues faced by foster youth do not end once they are reunited with family members or find permanent placement, FYS Program coordinators recommend the exploration of a more stable funding structure.

**CDE Response:** The CDE recommends a continuation of the FYS CD, CW, and JD Programs.

### Recommendation regarding the effectiveness of services

- **The FYS Program coordinators recommend that a statewide database for sharing foster youth health and education information and for collecting outcome data be developed.**

The FYS Programs, particularly those in operation over a number of years, report substantial progress in the establishment of database systems to manage health and education records for foster youth. Despite this progress, a large number of FYS Programs must rely on data systems developed and maintained by collaborative agencies. These programs report ongoing difficulties with importing and consolidating information from multiple data systems that often are incompatible with FYS Program needs. The FYS Programs report that the mobility of foster youth is too great to be tracked by counties that cannot share data in a timely manner, and they recommend the creation of a statewide database capable

of linking all school districts and placement agencies with the same data for foster youth.

**CDE Response:** The CDE recognizes the need for FYS Programs to have access to a uniform database containing up-to-date health and education information on foster youth. Such a statewide system is not currently available, nor is there funding for one. The Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) is the system currently utilized for foster youth health and education information. However, FYS Program staff, for the most part, do not have access to this system. Allowing FYS Program staff, or other appropriately designated school personnel, access to the health and education portions of the CWS/CMS would be a cost-efficient means of addressing this challenge in the short term.

Related to this issue is language contained in AB 1858 (Steinberg, Chapter 914, Statutes of 2004), which added *EC* Section 49085, which states: “The department shall ensure that the California School Information Services system meets the needs of pupils in foster care and includes disaggregated data on pupils in foster care.” Unfortunately, AB 1858 did not provide specific mandated authority for the CDE to actually collect the data, and the California School Information Services system does not currently have the capability to provide disaggregated data for foster youth. Discussions are currently underway with the Department of Social Services to explore a feasible means by which to share data collected by both departments.

### **Recommendations regarding broadening the application of services**

- **FYS Programs strongly recommend that FYS CW Programs be expanded to include all foster youth, including youth in kinship and guardian placement.**
- **FYS Programs further recommend that additional funding be provided to support an expansion of services.**

Data from the CWS/CMS show that as of April 1, 2009, approximately 70,000 youths were in the foster care system in California.<sup>52</sup> Of those 70,000 youths, approximately 32,000 or 46 percent, reside in Foster Homes, Foster Family Agencies, Group Homes, and Court Specified Placements.

The FYS CW Programs identified approximately 46,000 eligible youths living in their county boundaries;<sup>53</sup> the 6 FYS CD Programs serve an estimated additional 3,600 foster youths who attend schools in their districts each school year; and the 28 FYS JD Programs served approximately 3,900 identified foster youths in JD.


Even with the expansion of monies, approximately 38,000 or 54 percent of foster

---

<sup>52</sup> CWS/CMS does not track the number of foster youth in JD. Some research indicates that 20 percent of the JD populations are foster youth.

<sup>53</sup> Some of the numbers may be duplicated cases because many foster youth are often moved between county lines and served by multiple county FYS programs.

youth are currently not receiving the counseling, tutoring, mentoring, and other vital services provided through the FYS Programs. These youth are often placed in kinship and relative guardian placement. The graph below summarizes this information.



**CDE Response:** The CDE recognizes that 54 percent of California's foster youth are not directly receiving FYS Program services at this time and supports the recommendation for an expansion of services. The CDE also acknowledges that with statewide support for permanency and family settings, more support for transition to kinship and guardian placements must be provided to help promote the academic success of foster youth. The CDE also recognizes that a portion of the foster youth not currently participating in a FYS Program do receive services through Title I Neglected or Delinquent programs, special education, remedial education, and other programs provided by their local schools. Therefore, the CDE recommends increasing foster youth access to existing services through their local school districts. The CDE further recommends that the Legislature and Governor consider increasing funding to support foster youth in all placement types to ensure that there is a streamlined continuum of support services focused on academic success.

## Part V—Conclusion

Education has the potential to provide foster youth the necessary academic, vocational, and life skills to counterbalance the separation and impermanence experienced by youth in out-of-home care. Positive school experiences: (1) enhance foster youth attitudes toward school, their confidence about learning, and their educational aspirations; and (2) increase foster youth opportunities for economic self-sufficiency. The FYS Programs are designed to provide support services that help reduce the trauma of transition and displacement from family and schools.

Specifically, FYS Programs help to:

1. Obtain health and school records to determine appropriate school placements and coordinate instruction.
2. Provide direct service and referrals for counseling, tutoring, mentoring, vocational training, emancipation services, and training for independent living.
3. Facilitate education advocacy, training, and collaboration among partner agencies and systems.

While many foster youth are at increased risk of failure in school, the services provided through the FYS Programs offset this risk and increase foster youth opportunities for success in school. Evidence of the positive impact of these services is found in the outcome data on academic gains, expulsion rates, and attendance rates, all of which surpassed the identified targets reflected in Part I of this report.

The number of counties currently participating in FYS CW Programs has grown to 57, all of which have provided YERs for 2008-09. It has expanded to 28 FYS JD Programs, all of which have provided YERs for 2008-09. These FYS Programs have demonstrated substantial progress in building collaborative relationships between various agencies and systems that interface with the lives of foster youth. Interagency agreements and MOUs have been used with increasing frequency to formalize and document agreements between partner agencies. The collaborative relationships developed by the FYS CW Programs have resulted in substantive comprehensive services being provided to foster youth. In addition, the FYS CW Programs' ability to transfer more than 25,536 student records in an average of 2.68 days during 2008-09 is at least in part a result of cooperation with partner agencies.

The FYS Programs continue to face many challenges, including:

1. Incomplete or untimely transfer of health and education records
2. Inadequate funding
3. Transportation to remain in school of origin
4. Confidentiality issues related to the sharing of records
5. Mobility of foster youth
6. Resistance to immediate enrollment

Despite these challenges, FYS Programs have made significant accomplishments and contributions to ensure that students in foster care have the opportunity to meet state academic achievement standards and have access to the academic resources, services, and enrichment activities available to other students. The development of FYS Program outcomes is an important accomplishment that will lead to performance measures that will demonstrate the impact of the services provided to foster youth in 2009-10. These outcomes address the transition to independent living and higher education, self-advocacy, timely and appropriate school placements, and completion of the students' educational programs. Additional noteworthy accomplishments include increases in academic tutoring, education advocacy and training, collaborative agreements, and transition/emancipation services.

In closing, evidence shows that the FYS CD and CW Programs have continued to provide essential academic and support services that significantly enhance the ability of foster youth to achieve academic standards and to access resources, support services, and enrichment activities; and the new JD Programs show much promise providing comprehensive transition services for foster youth from juvenile hall back to local school districts.

In addition, these programs support foster youth in experiencing a sense of school "connectedness," completing their education programs, and making a smooth transition to adult life.

**However, the funding that is currently provided for FYS Programs only allows for services to approximately 46 percent of California's foster youth. At least 54 percent of foster youth, the majority of whom are living in kinship and guardian placements, do not receive these services.**

Ensuring that **all** foster children have the same access to educational resources and future economic opportunities as other children is one of the state's greatest challenges. Responsible leadership requires California to meet its obligation to care for and nurture all foster children by investing the resources necessary to promote their success. Failure to do so will result in greater fiscal and human costs in terms of increased poverty, unemployment, homelessness, incarceration, and welfare dependency.

## Resources

- Ayasse, R. H. "Addressing the Needs of Foster Children: The Foster Youth Services Program," *Social Work in Education* Vol. 17, No. 4 (1995), 206-216.
- Ayasse, R.H. (1995). Addressing the Needs of Foster Children: The Foster Youth Services Program. *Social Work in Education*, 17(4), 207-216; Altschuler, S.J. (1997). A Reveille for School Social Workers: Children in Foster Care Need our Help! *Social Work in Education*, 19(2), 121-127.
- Barth, R.; Courtney, M.; Duerr-Berrick, J.; and Albert, V. *From Child Abuse to Permanency Planning: Child Welfare Services Pathways and placements*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994.
- Barth, R.; Prince, A. "Shared Family Care: Providing Services to Parents and Children Placed Together in Out-of-Home Care," *Child Welfare*, Vol. 78, No. 1 (1999), 88-107.
- Berrick, J. D. "When Children Cannot Remain Home: Foster Family Care and Kinship Care." *The Future of Children: Protecting Children from Abuse and Neglect*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (1998), 72-87.
- Burley, M., and Halpern, M. *Educational attainment of foster youth: Achievement and graduation outcomes for children in state care*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2001.
- C. Smithgall, et al. *Educational Experiences of Children in Out-of-Home Care*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall Center for Children (2004).
- Clark, H. B., and others. "Children Lost Within the Foster Care System: Can Wraparound Strategies Improve Placement Outcomes?" *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1996), 39-54.
- Cohen, D. L. "Foster-care Reforms Often Ignore Problems Children Face in School." *Education Week*, Vol. 10, No. 37 (1991).
- Cook, R. (1991). A National Evaluation of Title IV-E Foster Care Independent Living Programs for Youth: Phase 2 Final Report. Rockville, Maryland: Westat; Courtney, M., Terao, S. & Bost, N. (2005). Executive Summary: Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Foster Youth: Outcomes at Age 19. Chapin Hall Center for Children. University of Chicago.
- Cormier, G. M. "Increasing Knowledge and Assessment of Foster Care Children Through In-Service Training for Elementary School Educators." *Ed.D. Practicum Report*, Nova University, 1994.
- Courtney, M. & Dworsky, A. (2006). Findings from the Milwaukee TANF Applicant Study. Series of Reports available at: [http://www.chapinhall.org/article\\_abstract.aspx?ar=1339](http://www.chapinhall.org/article_abstract.aspx?ar=1339) (Outside Source).
- Courtney, M., Terao, S. & Bost, N. (2005). Executive Summary: Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Foster Youth: Conditions of Youth Preparing to Leave State Care. Chapin Hall Center for Children. University of Chicago; Parrish T., Dubois, J., Delano, C., Dixon, D., Webster, D., Berrick, J.D. & Bolus, S. (2001). Education of Foster Group Home Children: Whose Responsibility is it? Study of the Educational Placement of Children Residing in Group Homes. Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research.

- Weinberg, L., Zetlin, A. & Shea, N. (2001). Literature Review on the Educational Needs of Children Involved in Family and Juvenile Court Proceedings. Bennetson, California: Judicial Council of California, Center for Children, Families and the Court.
- Goerge, R.M., Van Voorhis, J., Grant, S., Casey, K. & Robinson, M. (1992). Special Education Experiences of Foster Children: An Empirical Study. *Child Welfare*, 71, 419-437.
- Courtney, M., Terao, S. & Bost, N. (2005). Executive Summary: Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Foster Youth: Conditions of Youth Preparing to Leave State Care. Chapin Hall Center for Children. University of Chicago.
- Courtney, M., Terao, S. & Bost, N. (2005). Executive Summary: Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Foster Youth: Outcomes at Age 19. Chapin Hall Center for Children. University of Chicago.
- Courtney, Mark E., and Piliavin, Irving. *Foster Youth Transitions to Adulthood: Outcomes 12 to 18 Months After Leaving Out-Of-Home Care*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1998.
- Diagnostic Centers: Year-end Report 1998-99*. Sacramento: California Department of Education, 1999.
- Eastfield, M. Q. *Implementing Wraparound: Individualized Care Strategies for Children, Youth, and Families*. Campbell, California: Family Partnership Institute, 1998.
- Eastfield, M. Q. *The Perspectives of Youth, Families, and Service Providers: Reexamination of the Role of Group Care in a Family-Based System of Care*. Campbell, California: Family Partnership Institute, 1999.
- Eber, L.; Osuch, R.; and Redditt, C. A. "School Based Applications of the Wraparound Process: Early Results on Service Provision and Student Outcomes." *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1996), 83-99.
- Emerson, J. & Lovitt, T. (2003). The Educational Plight of Foster Children in Schools and What Can be Done About it. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24(4), 199-2003.
- Festinger, T. *No One Ever Asked Us... A Postscript To Foster Care*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Finkelstein, M., Wamsley, M., & Miranda, D. (2002). What Keeps Children in Foster Care from Succeeding in School? Views of Early Adolescents and the Adults in their Lives. New York, New York: Vera Institute of Justice.; Casey Family Programs. (2002). Improve Special Education for Children With Disabilities in Foster Care (Education Issue Brief). Seattle, Washington: Wingerden, C., Emerson, J. & Ichikawa, D., 13.
- Fitzharris, T. L. "Educational Services for Children in Foster Care." A report to the Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Development Services. Sacramento: Children's Services Foundation, 1989.
- Herz, D & Ryan J (2008) Bridging Two Worlds: Youth Involved in the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems, A Policy Guide for Improving Outcomes. URL: <http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/resources.html> (Outside Source) (accessed October 23, 2009).
- Greene, J. (2002). Revised Version of High School Graduation Rates in the United States. The Manhattan Institute for Policy Research.
- Greene, J. P., and Forster, G. "Public High School Graduation and College Readiness Rates in the United States." Education Working Paper No. 3. New York: Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute, 2003.

- KIDS COUNT Data Book* (2008). Annie E. Casey Foundation (2008).  
<http://www.kidscount.org/sld/databook.jsp> (Outside Source) (accessed October 23, 2009).
- Kortenkamp, K., & Ehrle, J. (2002). *The Well-being of Children Involved with the Child Welfare System: A National Overview*. The Urban Institute. Available at:  
[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310413\\_anf\\_b43.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310413_anf_b43.pdf) (PDF; Outside Source).
- Kossick, K. *Great Start Young Adult Program: Transitions Services to Foster Youth*. Sacramento: Sacramento Employment and Training Agency, 1999.
- Loman, L.A. & Siegel, G.L. (2000). *A Review of the Literature on Independent Living of Youth in Foster and Residential Care*. St. Louis, Missouri: Institute of Applied Research.
- M. Burley and M. Halpern, *Educational Attainment Of Foster Youth: Achievement And Graduation Outcomes For Children In State Care*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2001).
- McDonald, B. A., and others. "Recommended Individualized Wraparound Strategies for Serving Foster Youth with Emotional/Behavioral Disturbances and Their Families." *Community Alternatives: International Journal of Family Care*, Volume 7 (1995), 63-82.
- Morton, N., and Browne, K. D. "Theory and Observation and Appendix and Its Relation to Child Maltreatment: A Review." *Child Abuse and Neglect*, Vol. 22, No. 11 (1998), 1093-1104.
- Nadel-Haynes, S., and Macallair, D. *Restructuring Juvenile Corrections in California: A Report to the Legislature*. San Francisco: Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, 2005.
- Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Glasser, T., Williams, D., Zimmerman, K., Simon, V., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Frerer, K., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Lou, C., Peng, C. & Holmes, A. (2009). *Child Welfare Services Reports for California*. Retrieved 10/23/2009, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: [http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare) (Outside Source).
- Nielsen, M. A., and Hatter, R. A. *Meeting the Educational Needs of Children in the Child Welfare System*. Sacramento: California Department of Education, 1999.
- Parrish T., Dubois, J., Delano, C., Dixon, D., Webster, D., Berrick, J.D. & Bolus, S. (2001). *Education of Foster Group Home Children: Whose Responsibility is it? Study of the Educational Placement of Children Residing in Group Homes*. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.
- Patricia Edmonds, "The Children Left Behind—Educational Barriers Are High for School-Hopping Foster Children." *The Children's Beat* (Fall 2003).
- Rosen, L. D., and others. "Satisfaction, Involvement, and Unconditional Care: The Perceptions of Children and Adolescents Receiving Wraparound Services." *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, Volume 3, No. 1 (1994), 55-67.
- Rosenblatt, A. "Bows and Ribbons, Tape and Twine: Wrapping the Wraparound Process for Children with Multi-System Needs." *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1996), 101-116.
- School-age Children in Foster Care*. Sacramento: California Health and Welfare Agency, 1981.

- Smithgall, C. Gladen, R.M., Howard, E. George, R., Courtney, M.E. *Educational Experiences of Children in Out-of-Home Care*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children, 2004.
- Statewide Independent Living Program: Annual Report 1998-99*. Sacramento: Community College Foundation, 1999.
- Still in Our Hands: A Review of Efforts to Reform Foster Care in California*. Sacramento: Little Hoover Commission, 2003.
- Pathways to College for Former Foster Youth: Understanding Factors that Contribute to Educational Success. *Child Welfare*, 84(6), 867-896;
- Wolanin, Thomas R. *Higher Education Opportunities for Foster Youth: A Primer for Policy Makers*. The Institute for Higher Education Policy, December 2005, p. 29.  
<http://www.ihep.org/assets/files/publications/m-r/OpportunitiesFosterYouth.pdf> (PDF; Outside Source) (accessed October 24, 2007).
- Yip, D. K., and Acredolo, C. *Group Home Reexamination Study*. Davis, California: University of California, 1999.
- Yu, E.; Day, P.; and Williams, M. *Improving Educational Outcomes for Youth in Care: A National Collaboration*. Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League of America Press, 2002.

**California Codes**  
**Education Code Sections 42920–42925**

**42920.** (a) The Legislature finds as follows:

(1) It is essential to recognize, identify and plan for the critical and unique needs of children residing in licensed community care facilities.

(2) A high percentage of these foster children are working substantially below grade level, are being retained at least one year in the same grade level, and become school dropouts.

(3) Without programs specifically designed to meet their individual needs, foster children are frequently dysfunctional human beings at great penal and welfare costs.

(b) The Legislature further finds and declares that the instruction, counseling, tutoring, and related services for foster children that provide program effectiveness and potential cost savings shall be a state priority. Funding for that purpose is hereby provided to the following unified school districts and consortia that have successfully operated foster children services program sites: Elk Grove, Mount Diablo, Sacramento City, San Juan, and Paramount, and the Placer-Nevada consortium.

**42920.5.** (a) Commencing with fiscal year 1982-83, and each fiscal year thereafter, each of the six program sites specified in subdivision (b) of Section 42920 shall receive, in addition to the base revenue limit, an allowance from the amount annually transferred to Section A of the State School Fund equal to the amount the district spent on foster children service programs in fiscal year 1981-82, adjusted to reflect cost-of-living increases by the total percentage increase received by all categorical education programs. In no event shall this cost-of-living adjustment exceed the inflation adjustment provided pursuant to Section 42238.

This allowance shall be used exclusively for foster children services.

The six program sites may continue to record revenue received pursuant to this subdivision in the same manner used to record revenue received for foster children services in the 1981-82 fiscal year.

The six program sites shall maintain their foster children services programs in fiscal year 1995-96 and each subsequent fiscal year at a program level comparable to that at which they administered those programs in fiscal year 1994-95.

(b) Commencing with fiscal year 1982-83, the base revenue of each of the six school districts specified in subdivision (b) of Section 42920 shall be permanently reduced in an amount equal to the amount spent on foster children services in fiscal year 1981-82.

**42921.** (a) In addition to the six program sites specified in Section 42920, any county office of education, or consortium of county offices of education, may elect to apply to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for grant funding, to the extent funds are available, to operate an education-based foster youth services program to provide educational and support services for foster children who reside in a licensed foster home or county-operated juvenile detention facility. The provision of educational and support services to foster youth in licensed foster homes shall also apply to foster youth services programs in operation as of July 1, 2006, and receiving grant funding.

(b) Each foster youth services program operated pursuant to this chapter, if sufficient funds are available, shall have at least one person identified as the foster youth educational services coordinator. The foster youth educational services coordinator shall facilitate the provision of educational services pursuant to subdivision (d) to any foster child in the county who is either under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court pursuant to Section 300 of the Welfare and Institutions Code or under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court pursuant to Section 601 or 602 of the Welfare and Institutions Code who is placed in a licensed foster home or county-operated juvenile detention facility. A program operated pursuant to this chapter may prescribe the methodology for determining which children may be served. Applicable methodologies may include, but are not limited to, serving specific age groups, serving children in specific geographic areas with the highest concentration of foster children or serving the children with the greatest academic need. It is the intent of the Legislature that children with the greatest need for services be identified as the first priority for foster youth services.

(c) The responsibilities of the foster youth educational services coordinator shall include, but shall not be limited to, all of the following:

(1) Working with the child welfare agency to minimize changes in school placement.

(2) Facilitating the prompt transfer of educational records, including the health and education passport, between educational institutions when placement changes are necessary.

(3) Providing education-related information to the child welfare agency to assist the child welfare agency to deliver services to foster children, including, but not limited to, educational status and progress information required for inclusion in court reports by Section 16010 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

(4) Responding to requests from the juvenile court for information and working with the court to ensure the delivery or coordination of necessary educational services.

(5) Working to obtain and identify, and link children to, mentoring, tutoring, vocational training, and other services designed to enhance the educational prospects of foster children.

(6) Facilitating communication between the foster care provider, the teacher, and any other school staff or education service providers for the child.

(7) Sharing information with the foster care provider regarding available training programs that address education issues for children in foster care.

(8) Referring caregivers of foster youth who have special education needs to special education programs and services.

(d) Each foster youth services program operated pursuant to this chapter shall include guiding principles that establish a hierarchy of services, in accordance with the following order:

(1) Provide, or arrange for the referral to, tutoring services for foster youth.

(2) Provide, or arrange for the referral to, services that meet local needs identified through collaborative relationships and local advisory groups, which may include, but shall not be limited to, all of the following:

(A) Mentoring.

(B) Counseling.

(C) Transitioning services.

(D) Emancipation services.

(3) Facilitation of timely individualized education programs, in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1400 et seq.), and of all special education services.

(4) Establishing collaborative relationships and local advisory groups.

(5) Establishing a mechanism for the efficient and expeditious transfer of health and education records and the health and education passport.

(e) For purposes of this section, "licensed foster home" means a licensed foster family home, certified foster family agency home, court-specified home, or licensed care institution (group home).

**42922.** Any school district which provides educational services for foster children pursuant to Section 42921 shall receive funding in any fiscal year for those services only by such sums as may be specifically appropriated by the annual Budget Act of the Legislature for that fiscal year for support of those school-centered foster children services which provide program effectiveness and potential cost savings to the state.

The Legislature may appropriate moneys from the General Fund for this purpose, or, if sufficient funds are available, from the Foster Children and Parent Training Fund pursuant to the provisions of Section 903.7 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

**42923.** (a) Each school district providing foster children services pursuant to this chapter shall, by January 1 of each even-numbered year, report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction any information as may be required by the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the purpose of subdivision (b).

(b) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall, by February 15 of each even-numbered year, report to the Legislature and the Governor on the foster children services provided by school districts. The report shall be prepared with the advice and assistance of providers of foster children services and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) Recommendations regarding the continuation of services.

(2) Recommendations regarding the effectiveness of the services, unless program effectiveness is assessed in any other report covering the same time period.

(3) Recommendations regarding the broadening of the application of those services.

(4) Information which shall be sufficient to determine, at a minimum, whether these services have resulted in a major quantitative improvement or deterioration in any of the following indicators:

(A) Pupil academic achievement.

(B) The incidence of pupil discipline problems or juvenile delinquency.

(C) Pupil dropout rates or truancy rates.

(5) A discussion of the meaning and implications of the indicators contained in paragraph (4).

**42924.** Any funds allocated to school districts for foster children services pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 42920 or Section 42922 shall be used only for foster children services and any funds not used by districts for those services shall revert to the state General Fund.

**42925.** (a) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall form an advisory committee to make recommendations regarding the allocation of available funds to school districts applying to receive funding for foster children programs pursuant to subdivision (b). The advisory committee shall include, but not be limited to, representatives from the Department of the Youth Authority, from the State Department of Social Services, and from foster children services programs. Members of the advisory committee shall serve without compensation, including travel and per diem.

(b) Any school district which chooses to provide foster children services programs pursuant to Section 42921 may apply to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and to the advisory committee for funding for those programs.

(c) On or before November 1 of each year, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall provide the Governor with a proposed sum to be included in the Governor's budget for the ensuing fiscal year for allocation to school districts wishing to provide foster children services programs pursuant to Section 42921. Recommendations regarding the specific programs to be funded and the amount to be allocated to each shall be included with the proposed sum.

**1998 Budget Bill Section 6110-121-0001  
Foster Youth Programs (Proposition 98)  
Program 20.40.060**

**Provisions**

The funds appropriated in this item are provided to annualize funding for the Foster Youth Services Program to children residing in licensed children's institutions (LCIs), pursuant to Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 42920) of part 24 of the California *Education Code* and guidelines developed by the State Department of Education. These funds shall be allocated on the basis of the number of pupils residing in LCIs in each county, and shall be used to supplement, and not supplant services currently provided to students residing in LCIs through this program.

**Assembly Bill 1808, Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006  
Amending California *Education Code* Section 42921**

SEC. 4. Section 42921 of the *Education Code* is amended to read:

42921. (a) In addition to the six program sites specified in Section 42920, any county office of education, or consortium of county offices of education, may elect to apply to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for grant funding, to the extent funds are available, to operate an education-based foster youth services program to provide educational and support services for foster children who reside in a licensed foster home or county-operated juvenile detention facility. The provision of educational and support services to foster youth in licensed foster homes shall also apply to foster youth services programs in operation as of July 1, 2006, and receiving grant funding.

(b) Each foster youth services program operated pursuant to this chapter, if sufficient funds are available, shall have at least one person identified as the foster youth educational services coordinator. The foster youth educational services coordinator shall facilitate the provision of educational services pursuant to subdivision (d) to any foster child in the county who is either under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court pursuant to Section 300 of the *Welfare and Institutions Code* or under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court pursuant to Section 601 or 602 of the *Welfare and Institutions Code* who is placed in a licensed foster home or county-operated juvenile detention facility.

A program operated pursuant to this chapter may prescribe the methodology for determining which children may be served. Applicable methodologies may include, but are not limited to, serving specific age groups, serving children in specific geographic areas with the highest concentration of foster children or serving the children with the greatest academic need. It is the intent of the Legislature that children with the greatest need for services be identified as the first priority for foster youth services.

(c) The responsibilities of the foster youth educational services coordinator shall include, but shall not be limited to, all of the following:

- (1) Working with the child welfare agency to minimize changes in school placement.
- (2) Facilitating the prompt transfer of educational records, including the health and education passport, between educational institutions when placement changes are necessary.
- (3) Providing education-related information to the child welfare agency to assist the child welfare agency to deliver services to foster children, including, but not limited to, educational status and progress information required for inclusion in court reports by Section 16010 of the *Welfare and Institutions Code*.
- (4) Responding to requests from the juvenile court for information and working with the court to ensure the delivery or coordination of necessary educational services.
- (5) Working to obtain and identify, and link children to, mentoring, tutoring, vocational training, and other services designed to enhance the educational prospects of foster children.
- (6) Facilitating communication between the foster care provider, the teacher, and any other school staff or education service providers for the child.

(7) Sharing information with the foster care provider regarding available training programs that address education issues for children in foster care.

(8) Referring caregivers of foster youth who have special education needs to special education programs and services.

(d) Each foster youth services program operated pursuant to this chapter shall include guiding principles that establish a hierarchy of services, in accordance with the following order:

(1) Provide, or arrange for the referral to, tutoring services for foster youth.

(2) Provide, or arrange for the referral to, services that meet local needs identified through collaborative relationships and local advisory groups, which may include, but shall not be limited to, all of the following:

(A) Mentoring.

(B) Counseling.

(C) Transitioning services.

(D) Emancipation services.

(3) Facilitation of timely individualized education programs, in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1400 et seq.), and of all special education services.

(4) Establishing collaborative relationships and local advisory groups.

(5) Establishing a mechanism for the efficient and expeditious transfer of health and education records and the health and education passport.

(e) For purposes of this section, "licensed foster home" means " licensed foster family home, certified foster family agency home, court-specified home, or licensed care institution (group home).

## **Key Educational Concepts of Senate Bill 933 (Thompson, Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998)**

Senate Bill 933 set into motion a number of activities and concepts at the state and local levels that directly involve participants in the FYS CW Program. Many of these legal mandates are intended to ensure a coordinated effort to protect foster youth and secure appropriate, stable placements. A number of California code sections reinforce the importance of this collaborative effort and provide an avenue for service delivery and coordination for foster youth in group home care.

### **Educational Options for Foster Youth**

*Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC)* Section 48850 mandates every county office of education shall make available to agencies that place children in LCIs information on educational options for children residing in LCIs within the jurisdiction of the county office of education for use by the placing agencies in assisting parents and foster children to choose educational placements.

### **Placement Notification of Local Educational Agency**

*WIC* Section 48852 mandates every agency that places a child in an LCI shall notify the local educational agency at the time a pupil is placed in an LCI. As part of that notification, the placing agency shall provide any available information on immediate past educational placements to facilitate prompt transfer of records and appropriate educational placement. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit prompt educational placement prior to notification.

### **County Multidisciplinary Teams**

*Family Code* Section 7911.1 mandates the State Department of Social Services or its designee shall investigate any threat to the health and safety of children placed by a California county social services agency or probation department in an out-of-state group home pursuant to the provisions of the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children. This authority shall include the authority to interview children or staff in private or review their file at the out-of-state facility or wherever the child or files may be at the time of the investigation. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the State Department of Social Services or its designee shall require certified out-of-state group homes to comply with the reporting requirements applicable to group homes licensed in California pursuant to Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations for each child in care regardless of whether he or she is a California placement, by submitting a copy of the required reports to the Compact Administrator within regulatory timeframes. The Compact Administrator, within one business day of receiving a serious events report, shall verbally notify the appropriate placement agencies and within five working days of receiving a written report from the out-of-state group home, forward a copy of the written report to the appropriate placement agencies.

## **Mental Health Services**

*WIC* Section 5867.5 mandates county mental health departments that receive full system of care funding, as determined by the State Department of Mental Health in consultation with counties, shall provide to children served by county social services and probation departments mental health screening, assessment, participation in multidisciplinary placement teams and specialty mental health treatment services for children placed out of home in group care, for those children who meet the definition of medical necessity, to the extent resources are available. These counties shall give first priority to children currently receiving psychoactive medication.

## **Collaborative Efforts**

*WIC* Section 18987.6 (a) Permits all counties to provide children with service alternatives to group home care through the development of expanded family-based services programs and to expand the capacity of group homes to provide services appropriate to the changing needs of children in their care; (b) Encourages collaboration among persons and entities including, but not limited to, parents, county welfare departments, county mental health departments, county probation departments, county health departments, special education local planning agencies, school districts, and private service providers for the purpose of planning and providing individualized services for children and their birth or substitute families; (c) Ensure local community participation in the development of innovative delivery of services by county placing agencies and service providers and the use of the service resources and expertise of nonprofit providers to develop family-based and community-based service alternatives.

## **Statewide Collaboration**

SB 933, SEC. 72. also mandates the State Department of Social Services shall convene a working group of representatives of County Welfare Directors, Chief Probation Officers, foster and former foster youth, group home providers, and other interested parties to develop protocols outlining the roles and responsibilities of placing agencies and group homes regarding emergency and nonemergency placements of foster children in group homes.

(c) The model protocols shall at a minimum address all of the following:

(1) Relevant information regarding the child and family that placement workers shall provide to group homes, including health, mental health, and education information pursuant to Section 16010 of the *WIC*.

(2) Appropriate orientations to be provided by group homes for foster children and, if appropriate, their families, after a decision to place has been made.

(3) County and provider responsibilities in ensuring the child receives timely access to treatment and services to the extent they are available identified in the child's case plan and treatment plan, including multidisciplinary assessments provided in counties

involved in the Systems of Care Program under Part 4 (commencing with Section 5850) of Division 5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

(4) County and provider responsibilities in the periodic monitoring of foster children to ensure the continued appropriateness of the placements and the continued progress toward achieving the case plan and treatment plan goals.

(5) Appropriate mechanisms, timelines, and information sharing regarding discharge planning.

### **Health and Education Passport**

*EC* Section 49069.5 responds to the disruption of the educational experience for pupils in foster care that results from a high level of mobility. Whenever an LEA in which a pupil in foster care has most recently been enrolled is informed of the pupil's next educational placement, that LEA must cooperate with the county social services or probation department to ensure that educational background information for the pupil's health and education record is transferred to the receiving LEA in a timely manner.

This information must include, at a minimum, the following:

- Location of the pupil's records
- Pupil's last school and teacher
- Pupil's current grade level
- Any information deemed necessary to enable enrollment at the receiving school, to the extent allowable under state and federal law

Notice must be made within five working days, and information must be transferred within five working days of receipt of notification regarding the new education placement of the pupil in foster care.

### **Recommendations to the Judicial Council**

Senate Bill 933 recommends that the Judicial Council adopt appropriate rules, standards, and forms regarding the education placement of children in foster care. The purpose of the recommendation is to ensure that state courts routinely indicate the party that is to maintain or assume the education rights of a child placed in foster care to facilitate the child's prompt education placement. When the parent maintains educational authority for the child, the parent also has the right to designate another person or entity to maintain educational authority. The Judicial Council is also encouraged to ensure that state courts consistently authorize the agencies that place children in foster care to receive the children's records.

## Assembly Bill 490 Overview

Effective January 1, 2004, Assembly Bill 490 (Steinberg), Chapter 862, imposed new duties and rights related to the education of youth in foster care (wards and dependents). The key provisions of the legislation are as follows:

- Established legislative intent that foster youth shall be ensured the **same opportunities as those provided to other students** to meet the academic achievement standards to which all students are held
- Established that **stable school placements** shall be maintained
- Established that foster youth shall be placed in the **least restrictive education placement**
- Established that foster youth shall have **access to the same academic resources, services, and extracurricular and enrichment activities as all other students**
- Established that **education and school placement decisions** shall be dictated by the **best interest of the child**
- Created **school stability** for foster children by allowing them to remain in their school of origin for the duration of the school year when their **placement changes** and when remaining in the same school is in the child's best interests
- Required county placing agencies to promote educational stability by **considering the child's school attendance area in placement decisions**
- Required LEAs to designate a staff person as a **foster care education liaison** to ensure proper placement, transfer, and enrollment in school for foster youth
- Made LEAs and county social workers or probation officers jointly responsible for the **timely transfer of students and their records** when a change of schools is in the child's best interest
- Required that a **comprehensive public school** be considered the **first school placement option** for foster youth
- Provided a foster child **the right to remain enrolled in and attend his or her school of origin** pending resolution of school placement **disputes**
- Required a foster child to be **immediately enrolled in school** even if all typically required school records, immunizations, or school uniforms are not available

- Required school districts to calculate and accept **credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed by the student** and earned during attendance at a public school, juvenile court school, or nonpublic, nonsectarian school
- Authorized the **release of education records of foster youth to county placing agency**, for the purposes of compliance with *W/C* Section 16010, case management responsibilities required by the juvenile court or law, or assistance with the transfer or enrollment of a pupil, without the consent of a parent or a court order
- Ensured that foster youth **will not be penalized for absences caused by placement changes, court appearances, or related court-ordered activities**

## California Department of Education Foster Youth Services

### Statewide Coordinators

Jacqueline Wong, MSW, PPSC,  
Consultant  
Counseling, Student Support, and Service-  
Learning Office  
1430 N Street, Suite 6408  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901  
916-327-5930; Fax 916-323-6061  
[jawong@cde.ca.gov](mailto:jawong@cde.ca.gov)  
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy>

Margarita Garcia, Consultant  
Counseling, Student Support, and Service-  
Learning Office  
1430 N Street, Suite 6408  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5901  
916-323-5029; Fax 916-323-6061  
[mgarcia@cde.ca.gov](mailto:mgarcia@cde.ca.gov)

### Foster Youth Services Core District Program Coordinators

#### Elk Grove Unified

Kim Parker  
Elk Grove Unified School District  
9510 Elk Grove-Florin Road, Room 110  
Elk Grove, CA 95624  
916-686-7797; Fax 916-323-6061  
[kparker@egusd.net](mailto:kparker@egusd.net)

#### Mount Diablo Unified

James Wogan  
Mount Diablo Unified School District  
205 Pacifica Avenue  
Baypoint, CA 94565  
925-458-6858; Fax 925-458-6981  
[woganj@mdusd.k12.ca.us](mailto:woganj@mdusd.k12.ca.us)

#### Nevada County

Mary Jane Ryan-Connelly  
Nevada County Superintendent of Schools  
112 Nevada City Highway  
Nevada City, CA 95959  
530-478-6400; Fax 530-478-6410  
[maryjane@nevco.k12.ca.us](mailto:maryjane@nevco.k12.ca.us)

#### Paramount Unified

James Monico  
Paramount Unified School District  
15110 California Avenue  
Paramount, CA 90723  
562-602-6035; Fax 562-602-8121  
[jmonico@paramount.k12.ca.us](mailto:jmonico@paramount.k12.ca.us)

#### Placer/Nevada County

Patty Archer-Ward  
Placer County Office of Education  
360 Nevada Street  
Auburn, CA 95603  
530-745-1390; Fax 530-745-1367  
[parcher-ward@placercocoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:parcher-ward@placercocoe.k12.ca.us)

#### San Juan Unified

Margaret Jones  
San Juan Unified School District  
3738 Walnut Avenue  
Carmichael, CA 95608  
916-971-7157; Fax 916-971-7404  
[mjones@sanjuan.edu](mailto:mjones@sanjuan.edu)

#### Sacramento City Unified

Stacey Bell  
Sacramento City Unified School District  
5735 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Box 763  
Sacramento, CA 95824  
916-643-7991; Fax 916-643-6469  
[stacey-bell@sac-city.k12.ca.us](mailto:stacey-bell@sac-city.k12.ca.us)

## Foster Youth Services Countywide Program Coordinators

### Alameda

Elizabeth Tarango  
Alameda County Office of Education  
313 West Winton Avenue, Room 244  
Hayward, CA 94544  
510-670-7750; Fax 510-670-4536  
[lizt@acoe.org](mailto:lizt@acoe.org)

### Amador

(See San Joaquin/Amador)

### Butte

Lee Wood  
Meagan Meloy  
Butte County Office of Education  
1870 Bird Street  
Oroville, CA 95965  
530-532-5745; Fax 530-532-5747  
[lwood@bcoe.org](mailto:lwood@bcoe.org)  
[mmeloy@bcoe.org](mailto:mmeloy@bcoe.org)

### Calaveras

Barbara Bernstein  
Calaveras County Office of Education  
509 East Saint Charles  
San Andreas, CA 95249  
209-754-6862; Fax 209-754-3293  
[bbernstein@co.calaveras.ca.us](mailto:bbernstein@co.calaveras.ca.us)

### Colusa

Ben Flores  
Colusa County Office of Education  
345 Fifth Street, Suite D  
Colusa, CA 95932  
530-458-0350; Fax 530-458-8054  
[bflores@ccoe.net](mailto:bflores@ccoe.net)

### Contra Costa

Catherine Giacalone  
Contra Costa County Office of Education  
77 Santa Barbara Road  
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523  
925-942-3308; Fax 925-942-3490  
[cgiacalone@cccocoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:cgiacalone@cccocoe.k12.ca.us)

### Del Norte

Karen Sullivan  
Del Norte County Office of Education  
301 West Washington Boulevard  
Crescent City, CA 95531  
707-464-0773; Fax 707-465-5116  
[ksullivan@delnorte.k12.ca.us](mailto:ksullivan@delnorte.k12.ca.us)

### El Dorado

Sheila Silan  
El Dorado County Office of Education  
6767 Green Valley Road  
Placerville, CA 95667  
530-295-2412; Fax 530-295-1273  
[ssilan@edcoe.org](mailto:ssilan@edcoe.org)

### Fresno

Pamela Hancock  
Fresno County Office of Education  
2011 Fresno Street, Suite 102  
Fresno, CA 93721  
559-265-4003; Fax 559-265-4005  
[phancock@fcoe.org](mailto:phancock@fcoe.org)

### Glenn

Robin Smith  
Glenn County Office of Education  
311 South Villa Street  
Willows, CA 95988  
530-934-6575; Fax 530-934-6576  
[rsmith@glenncoe.org](mailto:rsmith@glenncoe.org)

**Humboldt**

Roger Golec  
Humboldt County Office of Education  
901 Myrtle Avenue  
Eureka, CA 95501  
707-499-0276; Fax 707-445-7071  
[rgolec@humboldt.k12.ca.us](mailto:rgolec@humboldt.k12.ca.us)

**Inyo**

Nancy Willard  
Inyo County Office of Education  
166 Grandview Avenue  
Bishop, CA 93514  
760-873-3262; Fax 760-873-3324  
[nancy\\_williard@inyo.k12.ca.us](mailto:nancy_williard@inyo.k12.ca.us)

**Kings**

Susan Steward  
Kings County Office of Education  
876 East D Street  
Lemoore, CA 93245  
559-589-7076; Fax 559- 589-7006  
[ssteward@kingscoe.org](mailto:ssteward@kingscoe.org)

**Lassen**

Lester Ruda  
Lassen County Probation Department  
107 South Roop Street  
Susanville, CA 96130  
530-251-8173; Fax 530-257-9160  
[lruda@co.lassen.ca.us](mailto:lruda@co.lassen.ca.us)

**Madera**

Elizabeth Rodriguez  
Madera County Office of Education  
28123 Avenue 14  
Madera, CA 93638  
559- 662-3842; Fax 559- 661-3551  
[erodriguez@maderacoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:erodriguez@maderacoe.k12.ca.us)

**Imperial**

Kristina Contreras  
Imperial County Office of Education  
1398 Sperber Road  
El Centro, CA 92243  
760-312-5500; Fax 760-312-5580  
[kcontreras@icoe.org](mailto:kcontreras@icoe.org)

**Kern**

Tom Corson  
Carrie Bloxom  
Kern County Superintendent of Schools  
1300 17th Street  
Bakersfield, CA 93301  
661-636-4488; Fax 661-636-4501  
[tocorson@kern.org](mailto:tocorson@kern.org)  
[cabloxom@kern.org](mailto:cabloxom@kern.org)

**Lake**

Doreen Gilmore  
Lake County Office of Education  
1152 Main Street  
Lakeport, CA 95453  
707-994-0669; Fax 707-994-9637  
[dgilmore@lake-coe.k12.ca.us](mailto:dgilmore@lake-coe.k12.ca.us)

**Los Angeles**

Patricia Levinson  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
3055 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
213-637-3103; Fax 213-637-3115  
[levinson\\_patricia@lacoed.edu](mailto:levinson_patricia@lacoed.edu)

**Marin**

Deborah Hemphill  
Marin County Office of Education  
1111 Las Gallinas Avenue  
P.O. Box 4925  
San Rafael, CA 94913  
415-491-0792; Fax 415-491-9624  
[dhemp@marin.k12.ca.us](mailto:dhemp@marin.k12.ca.us)

**Mariposa**

Aaron Rosander  
Mariposa County Unified School District  
P.O. Box 8  
Mariposa, CA 95338  
209-742-0221; Fax 209-966-3674  
[arosander@mariposa.k12.ca.us](mailto:arosander@mariposa.k12.ca.us)

Karen Rust

Mariposa Unified School District  
5044 Jones Street  
P.O. Box 5002  
Mariposa, CA 95338  
209-742-0340; Fax 209-742-0383  
[krust@mariposa.k12.ca.us](mailto:krust@mariposa.k12.ca.us)

**Modoc**

Carol Griffin  
Modoc County Office of Education  
807 West 8 Street  
Alturas, CA 96101  
530-233-7115; Fax 530-233-7133  
[cmcculley@modoccoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:cmcculley@modoccoe.k12.ca.us)

**Monterey**

Frank Beitz  
Monterey County Office of Education  
2600 Garden Road, Suite 211  
Monterey, CA 93940  
831-655-0405; Fax 831-655-3845  
[frank@startbuildingfutures.com](mailto:frank@startbuildingfutures.com)

**Nevada**

Mary Jane Ryan-Connelly  
Nevada County Superintendent of Schools  
112 Nevada City Highway  
Nevada City, CA 95959  
530-478-6400; Fax 530-478-6410  
[maryjane@nevco.k12.ca.us](mailto:maryjane@nevco.k12.ca.us)

**Mendocino**

Abbey Kaufman  
Mendocino County Office of Education  
2240 Old River Road  
Ukiah, CA 95482  
707-467-5104; Fax 707-468-3364  
[ab@mcoe.us](mailto:ab@mcoe.us)

**Merced**

Mae Pierini  
Sandra Stevens  
Merced County Office of Education  
632 West 13th Street  
Merced, CA 95340  
209-381-6681/209-381-4519  
Fax 209-385-5343  
[mpierini@mcoe.org](mailto:mpierini@mcoe.org)  
[sstevens@mcoe.org](mailto:sstevens@mcoe.org)

**Mono**

Jan Carr  
Mono County Office of Education  
P.O. Box 130  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546-0130  
760-934-0031; Fax 760-934-1443  
[jcarr@monocoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:jcarr@monocoe.k12.ca.us)

**Napa**

Jeannie Morris  
Napa County Office of Education  
2121 Imola Avenue  
Napa, CA 94559  
707-253-6954; Fax 707-251-1050  
[jmorris@ncoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:jmorris@ncoe.k12.ca.us)

**Orange**

Betsy Degarmoe  
Orange County Department of Education  
1220 Village Way, Suite A  
Santa Ana, CA 92705  
714-835-4909; Fax 714-560-0585  
[bdegarmoe@access.k12.ca.us](mailto:bdegarmoe@access.k12.ca.us)

**Placer**

Patty Archer-Ward  
Placer County Office of Education  
360 Nevada Street  
Auburn, CA 95603  
530-745-1390; Fax 530-745-1367  
[parcher-ward@placercoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:parcher-ward@placercoe.k12.ca.us)

**Riverside**

Leland Daniels  
Stephan McPeace  
Riverside County Office of Education  
2300 Market Street  
Riverside, CA 92501  
951-826-2647; Fax 951-826-4447  
[ldaniels@rcoe.us](mailto:ldaniels@rcoe.us)

**San Benito**

Frank Beitz  
San Benito County Office of Education  
460 Fifth Street  
Hollister, CA 95023  
831-655-0405; Fax 831-655-3845  
[frank@startbuildingfutures.com](mailto:frank@startbuildingfutures.com)

**San Diego**

Michelle Lustig  
San Diego County Office of Education  
8333 Clairmont Mesa Boulevard,  
Suite 212  
San Diego, CA 92064  
858-503-2628; Fax 858-503-2636  
[mlustig@sdcoe.net](mailto:mlustig@sdcoe.net)

**San Joaquin/Amador**

Mark Yost  
San Joaquin County Office of Education  
P.O. Box 213030  
Stockton, CA 95213  
209-468-5954; Fax 209-468-4984  
[myost@sjcoe.net](mailto:myost@sjcoe.net)

**Plumas**

Cathy Rahmeyer  
Plumas County Office of Education  
50 Church Street  
Quincy, CA 95971  
530-283-6500; Fax 530-283-3155  
[crahmeyer@pcoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:crahmeyer@pcoe.k12.ca.us)

**Sacramento**

Trish Kennedy  
Sacramento County Office of Education  
P.O. Box 269003  
Sacramento, CA 95826-9003  
916-228-2730; Fax 916-228-2216  
[tkennedy@scoe.net](mailto:tkennedy@scoe.net)

**San Bernardino**

Margaret Hill  
San Bernardino County Superintendent of  
Schools  
601 North E Street  
San Bernardino, CA 92410-3093  
909-386-2902; Fax 909-386-2940  
[margaret\\_hill@sbcss.k12.ca.us](mailto:margaret_hill@sbcss.k12.ca.us)

**San Francisco**

Maya Webb  
San Francisco Unified School District  
1515 Quintara Street  
San Francisco, CA 94116  
415-242-2615; Fax 415-242-2618  
[webbm1@sfusd.edu](mailto:webbm1@sfusd.edu)

**San Luis Obispo**

John Elfers  
San Luis Obispo County Office of  
Education  
3350 Education Drive  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405  
805-782-7209; Fax 805-594-0739  
[jelfers@slocoe.org](mailto:jelfers@slocoe.org)

**San Mateo**

Renee Vorrises  
Dorothy Burge  
San Mateo County Office of Education  
31 Tower Road  
San Mateo, CA 94402  
650-312-5585/650-312-5573  
Fax 650-802-5503  
[rvorrises@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:rvorrises@co.sanmateo.ca.us)  
[dburge@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:dburge@co.sanmateo.ca.us)

**Santa Clara**

Sonja House  
Santa Clara County Office of Education  
1290 Ridder Park Drive-MC 213  
San Jose, CA 95131-2398  
408-453-6956; Fax 408-441-7824  
[sonja\\_house@sccoe.org](mailto:sonja_house@sccoe.org)

**Shasta**

Heidi Brahms  
Shasta County Office of Education  
1644 Magnolia Street  
Redding, CA 96001  
530-229-8076; Fax 530-229-8081  
[hbrahms@shastacoe.org](mailto:hbrahms@shastacoe.org)

**Siskiyou**

Colette Bradley  
Siskiyou County Office of Education  
609 South Gold Street  
Yreka, CA 96097  
530-842-8461; Fax 530-842-8436  
[coco@sisnet.ssku.k12.ca.us](mailto:coco@sisnet.ssku.k12.ca.us)

**Sonoma**

Mandy Hoffman  
Sonoma County Office of Education  
5340 Skylane Boulevard  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
707-524-2707; Fax 707- 524-2709  
[mhoffman@scoe.org](mailto:mhoffman@scoe.org)

**Santa Barbara**

Bonnie Beedles  
Santa Barbara County Education Office  
3970 La Colina Road, Suite 9  
Santa Barbara, CA 93110  
805-946-4710; Fax 805-563-1103  
[beedles@sbceo.org](mailto:beedles@sbceo.org)

**Santa Cruz**

Michael Paynter  
Santa Cruz County Office of Education  
400 Encinal Street  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
831-466-5729; Fax 831-466-5730  
[mpaynter@santacruz.k12.ca.us](mailto:mpaynter@santacruz.k12.ca.us)

**Sierra**

Barbara Weaver  
Sierra County Office of Education  
P.O. Box 157  
Loyalton, CA 96118  
530-993-4454; Fax 530-993-4667  
[bweaver@sierra-coe.k12.ca.us](mailto:bweaver@sierra-coe.k12.ca.us)

**Solano**

Becky Cruz  
Golden Hills Education Center  
2460 Clay Bank Road, Bldg. 7-A  
Fairfield, CA 94533  
707-646-7605; Fax 707-438-2667  
[bcruz@solanocoe.net](mailto:bcruz@solanocoe.net)

**Stanislaus**

Kathleen Dennis  
Stanislaus County Office of Education  
1100 H Street  
Modesto, CA 95354  
209-238-1506; Fax 209-238-4216  
[kdennis@stancoe.org](mailto:kdennis@stancoe.org)

**Sutter**

Graciela Espindola  
Sutter Superintendent of Schools  
970 Klamath Lane  
Yuba City, CA 95993  
530-822-2969; Fax 530-822-3074  
[gracee@sutter.k12.ca.us](mailto:gracee@sutter.k12.ca.us)

**Trinity**

Alan Sanger  
Trinity County Office of Education  
P.O. Box 1256  
Weaverville, CA 96093  
530-623-2861  
Fax 530-623-4489  
[asanger@tcoek12.org](mailto:asanger@tcoek12.org)

**Ventura**

Laura Welbourn  
Ventura County Office of Education  
5189 Verdugo Way  
Camarillo, CA 93012  
805-437-1525; Fax 805-437-1535  
[lwelbourn@vcoe.org](mailto:lwelbourn@vcoe.org)

**Yuba**

Chris Reyna  
Yuba County Office of Education  
1104 E Street  
Marysville, CA 95901  
530-749-4005; Fax 530-741-6500  
[chris.reyna@yubacoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:chris.reyna@yubacoe.k12.ca.us)

**Tehama**

Jo Kee  
Denise Rochlitz  
Tehama County Department of Education  
1135 Lincoln Street  
Red Bluff, CA 96080  
530-528-7394/530-528-7398  
Fax 530-529-4120  
[jkee@tehamaed.org](mailto:jkee@tehamaed.org)  
[drochlit@tehamaed.org](mailto:drochlit@tehamaed.org)

**Tulare**

Kaye Van Gilluwe  
Tulare County Office of Education  
2637 West Burrel  
P.O. Box 5091  
Weaverville, CA 93278-5091  
559-733-6714; Fax 559-730-2511  
[kayev@tcoe.org](mailto:kayev@tcoe.org)

**Yolo**

Jessica Larsen  
Yolo County Office of Education  
1280 Santa Anita Court, Suite 100  
Woodland, CA 95776  
530-668-3791; Fax 530-668-3850  
[larsen@ycoe.org](mailto:larsen@ycoe.org)

## Juvenile Detention Program Coordinators

### Alameda

Elizabeth Tarango  
Alameda County Office of Education  
313 West Winton Avenue, Room 244  
Hayward, CA 94544  
510- 670-7750; Fax 510- 670-4536  
[lizt@acoe.org](mailto:lizt@acoe.org)

### Colusa

Chris Boyles  
Ben Flores  
Colusa County Office of Education  
345 Fifth Street, Suite D  
Colusa, CA 95932  
530-458-0350; Fax 530-458-8054  
[cboyles@ccoe.net](mailto:cboyles@ccoe.net)  
[bflores@ccoe.net](mailto:bflores@ccoe.net)

### Del Norte

Karen Sullivan  
Del Norte County Office of Education  
301 West Washington Boulevard  
Crescent City, CA 95531  
707-464-0733; Fax 707-465-5116  
[ksullivan@delnorte.k12.ca.us](mailto:ksullivan@delnorte.k12.ca.us)

### Inyo

Pamela Jones  
Inyo County Office of Education  
166 Grandview Avenue  
Bishop, CA 93514  
760-873-3262; Fax 760-873-3324  
[pamela\\_jones@inyo.k12.ca.us](mailto:pamela_jones@inyo.k12.ca.us)

### Los Angeles

Patricia Levinson  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
3055 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1100  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
213-637-3103; Fax 213-637-3115  
[levinson\\_patricia@lacoedu](mailto:levinson_patricia@lacoedu)

### Butte

Lee Wood  
Meagan Meloy  
Butte County Office of Education  
205 Mira Loma Drive, Suite 16  
Oroville, CA 95965  
530-532-5745; Fax 530-532-5747  
[lwood@bcoe.org](mailto:lwood@bcoe.org)  
[mmeloy@bcoe.org](mailto:mmeloy@bcoe.org)

### Contra Costa

Catherine Giacalone  
Contra Costa County Office of Education  
77 Santa Barbara Road  
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523  
925-942-3308; Fax 925-942-3490  
[cgiacalone@cccocoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:cgiacalone@cccocoe.k12.ca.us)

### Fresno

Pamela Hancock  
Fresno County Office of Education  
2011 Fresno Street, Suite 102  
Fresno, CA 93721  
559-265-4003; Fax 559-265-4005  
[phancock@fcoe.org](mailto:phancock@fcoe.org)

### Lake

Doreen Gilmore  
Lake County Office of Education  
1152 South Main Street  
Lakeport, CA 95453  
707-994-0669; Fax 707-994-9637  
[dgilmore@lake-coe.k12.ca.us](mailto:dgilmore@lake-coe.k12.ca.us)

### Madera

Elizabeth Rodriguez  
Madera County Office of Education  
28123 Avenue 14  
Madera, CA 93638  
559-662-3842; Fax 559-661-3551  
[erodriguez@maderacoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:erodriguez@maderacoe.k12.ca.us)

**Monterey**

Frank Beitz  
Monterey County Office of Education  
2600 Garden Road, Suite 211  
Monterey, CA 93940  
831-655-0405; Fax 831-655-3845  
[frank@startbuildingfutures.com](mailto:frank@startbuildingfutures.com)

**Placer**

Patty Archer-Ward  
Placer County Office of Education  
360 Nevada Street  
Auburn, CA 95603  
530-745-1390; Fax 530-745-1367  
[parcher-ward@placercoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:parcher-ward@placercoe.k12.ca.us)

**Sacramento**

Carol Guardia  
Sacramento County Office of Education  
P.O. Box 269003  
Sacramento, CA 95826-9003  
916-228-2347; Fax 916-228-2216  
[cguardia@scoe.net](mailto:cguardia@scoe.net)

**San Bernardino**

Margaret Hill  
San Bernardino County Superintendent of  
Schools  
601 North E Street  
San Bernardino, CA 92410-3093  
909-386-2902; Fax 909-386-2940  
[margaret\\_hill@sbcss.k12.ca.us](mailto:margaret_hill@sbcss.k12.ca.us)

**San Francisco**

Maya Webb  
San Francisco Unified School District  
1515 Quintara Street  
San Francisco, CA 94116  
415-242-2615; Fax 415-242-2618  
[webbm1@sfusd.edu](mailto:webbm1@sfusd.edu)

**Orange**

Betsy DeGarmoe  
Orange County Office of Education  
1220 Village Way, Suite A  
Santa Ana, CA 92705  
714-835-4909; Fax 714-560-0585  
[bdegarmoe@access.k12.ca.us](mailto:bdegarmoe@access.k12.ca.us)

**Riverside**

Leland Daniels  
Stephan McPeace  
Riverside County Office of Education  
2300 Market Street  
Riverside, CA 92501  
951-826-2647; Fax 951-826-4447  
[ldaniels@rcoe.us](mailto:ldaniels@rcoe.us)

**San Benito**

Frank Beitz  
San Benito County Office of Education  
460 Fifth Street  
Hollister, CA 95023  
831-655-0405; Fax 831-655-3845  
[frank@startbuildingfutures.com](mailto:frank@startbuildingfutures.com)

**San Diego**

Michelle Lustig  
San Diego County Office of Education  
8333 Clairmont Mesa Boulevard,  
Suite 212  
San Diego, CA 92064  
858-503-2628; Fax 858-503-2636  
[mlustig@sdcoe.net](mailto:mlustig@sdcoe.net)

**San Luis Obispo**

John Elfers  
San Luis Obispo Office of Education  
3350 Education Drive  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405  
805-782-7209; Fax 805-594-0739  
[jelfers@slocoe.org](mailto:jelfers@slocoe.org)

**Santa Barbara**

Bonnie Beedles  
Santa Barbara County Education Office  
3970 La Colina Road, Suite 9  
Santa Barbara, CA 93110  
805-946-4710; Fax 805-563-1103  
[beedles@sbceo.org](mailto:beedles@sbceo.org)

**Siskiyou**

Colette Bradley  
Siskiyou County Office of Education  
609 South Gold Street  
Yreka, CA 96097  
530-842-8461; Fax 530-842-8436  
[coco@sisnet.ssku.k12.ca.us](mailto:coco@sisnet.ssku.k12.ca.us)

**Tehama**

Jo Kee  
Denise Rochlitz  
Tehama Department of Education  
1135 Lincoln Street  
Red Bluff, CA 96080  
530-528-7394/530-528-7398  
Fax 530-529-4120  
[jkee@tehamaed.org](mailto:jkee@tehamaed.org)

**Ventura**

Laura Welbourn  
Ventura County Office of Education  
5189 Verdugo Way  
Camarillo, CA 93012  
805-437-1525; Fax 805-437-1535  
[lwelbourn@vcoe.org](mailto:lwelbourn@vcoe.org)  
[watson@vcoe.org](mailto:watson@vcoe.org)

**Santa Clara**

Sonja House  
Santa Clara County Office of Education  
1290 Ridder Park Drive-MC 213  
San Jose, CA 95131-2398  
408-453-6956; Fax 408-441-7824  
[sonja\\_house@sccoe.org](mailto:sonja_house@sccoe.org)

**Stanislaus**

Kathleen Dennis  
Stanislaus County Office of Education  
1100 H Street  
Modesto, CA 95354  
209-238-1506; Fax 209-238-4216

**Trinity**

Alan Sanger  
Trinity County Office of Education  
P.O. Box 1256  
Weaverville, CA 96093  
530-623-2861; Fax 530-623-4489  
[asanger@tcoek12.org](mailto:asanger@tcoek12.org)

**Yuba**

Chris Reyna  
Yuba County Office of Education  
935 14th Street  
Marysville, CA 95901  
530-749-4005; Fax 530-741-6500  
[chris.reyna@yubacoe.k12.ca.us](mailto:chris.reyna@yubacoe.k12.ca.us)

## **Model Foster Youth Educational and Support Programs and Services Focused on Youth Emancipation**

The foster youth programs and services described in this Appendix are provided through county offices of education (COEs) or Foster Youth Services (FYS) Core District (CD) Programs that receive FYS funding through the California Department of Education (CDE). Typical services provided to foster youth through FYS Programs include educational assessments, tutoring, mentoring, counseling, and transition services. These services are provided either directly or through collaborative partnerships. The following small sampling represents model educational programs and services being provided throughout the state to support California's foster youth in successful transitions to independent living.

### **Alameda County Office of Education**

**Emancipation Specialist Program:** The Alameda County Office of Education (ACOE) FYS Program provides for emancipation services through the First Place Fund for Youth, a nonprofit organization that operates the Emancipation Specialist Program (ESP). The ESP serves approximately 70 foster youths per year. The program provides discharge planning and weekly case management for youth who are within one year of discharge. Emancipation specialists consider the psychological needs of youth in helping them to develop plans, emancipation goals, and community linkages in the areas of housing, education, and employment. These specialists are trained clinicians who deliver therapeutic case management services in nontraditional settings. In addition to the ESP, First Place Fund for Youth also operates an Emancipation Training Center, which provides training and assistance to approximately 450 current and former foster youth annually, and a Supported Housing Program, which provides affordable housing and a wide range of services and supports.

**Alameda County Foster Youth Alliance:** The ACOE FYS is a member of this coalition of foster youth service agencies, providers, and citizens whose goal is to improve services (e.g., housing, education, mental health, independent living, higher education, and employment) for current and former foster youth.

### **Glenn County Office of Education**

**Independent Living Program Team Approach:** The Glenn County Office of Education (GCOE) FYS Program participates as a collaborative member of the Independent Living Program (ILP) team with the social services ILP coordinator, WorkAbility, and a representative from the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA).

**Emancipation Conferencing:** The GCOE FYS Program participates in emancipation conferencing for foster youth in their senior year of high school. The emancipation meetings are youth-led and provide an opportunity for youth to discuss their feelings about what will happen after their emancipation hearing. Other members of the emancipation conference team include foster parents, relatives or adults who may be support persons for the youth, a WIA representative, and social workers. The team develops a plan to ensure that foster youth have a support system in place when they leave the foster care system. The plan includes strategies to address living arrangements, continuing or higher education, career plans, adult connections, and the building of a support network.

**Youth Transition Action Team:** The Youth Transition Action Team (YTAT) team applies the “All Youth–One System” principles of providing an integrated set of services across systems that include four core elements: academic excellence, career preparation, youth development and support, and youth leadership. The team consists of foster parents, community members, and representatives of WIA, law enforcement, the probation department, the board of supervisors, the ILP, child welfare, community colleges, mental health, California Youth Connection, former foster youth, GCOE FYS, WorkAbility, and youth employment services. The YTAT meets monthly and focuses on successful transitions for foster youth. The YTAT is developing a mentoring program to provide every foster youth in the county with a supportive, caring, and consistently available adult.

## **Lake County Office of Education**

**All Youth-One System:** This is the model used by the Lake County Office of Education (LCOE) FYS Program to promote effective transitions for foster youth in Lake County. This model uses a four-pronged approach:

1. Youth development is addressed through such activities as “Independent City” in which the LCOE FYS Program participates each year in partnership with Child Protective Services. In addition, FYS offers a curriculum called “Personal Development for Teens.”
2. Youth leadership is addressed by connecting youth to “Leadership Summits” and other opportunities for students to develop and showcase their leadership skills.
3. Academic excellence begins the moment a foster youth enters care through the services coordinated by the FYS Program. During the summer between the eighth and ninth grades, FYS assists the youth in developing an academic plan, helping to ensure that every foster youth is given the opportunity to earn a diploma and to stay in a stable school placement.

Follow-up meetings are conducted to address barriers, assess how the plan is working, and revise the plan as necessary.

4. Career preparation is addressed through an extensive process of assessment; referral to such partners as WIA and Transition Partnership Programs for job development and career placement; and exploration of trade schools and colleges. Independent living and related skills necessary for employment are addressed through “Life on my Own,” a program developed in collaboration with Child Protective Services. This program is offered to foster youth in high schools. Youth are also connected to regional occupational programs and community college classes that align with their career goals.

### **Mount Diablo Unified School District**

**Fostering Readers Project:** Fostering Readers is a new project developed by a collaborative partnership composed of the Mount Diablo Unified School District (USD), the West Contra Costa County USD, the Contra Costa County Department of Social Services, the Contra Costa COE, and the Independent Living Skills Program. Fostering Readers aims to improve the reading skills of foster youth in Contra Costa County by at least one grade level. The goal is that if a child remains in the county for the duration of the school year and receives tutoring from the beginning of the school year, she or he will advance two levels. The project utilizes AmeriCorps members to provide remediation (tutoring) to promote literacy among the county’s foster youth.

### **Placer County Office of Education**

**Kaleidoscope of Employment for Youth Success:** Kaleidoscope of Employment for Youth Success (KEYS) is a collaborative effort between the Placer (PCOE) FYS Program, Pride Industries, and the California Department of Rehabilitation. The KEYS provides employment services to sixteen- through nineteen-year-old foster youth who face significant barriers to employment and are in out-of-home placement.

Employment services include enhanced skills development in the following areas: comprehensive vocational assessment, paid community work experience, job placement, job search techniques, job specific tours, linkage to community resources, résumé writing, interviewing techniques, money management, peer support, and job retention. Youth have an opportunity to be placed in an External Situational Assessment, a five- to ten-day paid community-based work experience in an identified area of interest.

**Supplemental Instruction in the Arts, Humanities, and Language Arts:** Supplemental educational activities and programs are provided for foster youth in out-of-home care to ensure that they have the same well-rounded educational experiences as do their peers who live in more stable environments. Involvement in

performing arts stimulates the brain in many ways and contributes to learning by improving a student's self discipline, attention, emotional expression, creativity, interpersonal relationships, overall well-being, ability to memorize, and ability to handle stress. Over the past year and a half, the PCOE FYS Program has provided supplemental instruction and activities in the following areas: wildlife animal art lessons, stained glass workshop, film and theatre experiences, summer day camp experiences through the Roseville Science and Technology Access Center, drum making, and guitar lessons. In coordination with local music studios and instructors, the PCOE FYS has provided 25 foster youths with guitar lessons, supplying each youth with a new guitar, guitar case, and instruction book.

### **San Diego County Office of Education**

**College Connection:** College Connection is composed of a FYS College Connection Advisory Council, with representatives from community colleges, universities, health and human services agencies, community service agencies, and others working together to create a seamless approach to increasing awareness of available opportunities to further education for foster youth. This program provides opportunities for foster youth to experience college and university campuses through College Connection Day events designed to optimize real-life higher education experiences. A typical event involves upward of 75 foster youths who spend a day on a college campus. Students may simulate applying to the college, registering for classes, attending mock classes, or participating in a variety of other activities. To date, nine College Connection events have been hosted by six campuses in San Diego County. Three events are scheduled for the spring, and two new partner universities are joining the program.

**Tutor Connection:** Tutor Connection is a unique collaboration between the San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) FYS Program, Casey Family Programs, the California State University San Marcos (CSUSM), San Diego County Health and Human Services, and Child Welfare Services. Casey Family Programs provides a standard curriculum to future teachers enrolled in a prerequisite course, Pluralism in Schools, within the College of Education at CSUSM. In turn, the future teachers provide one-on-one tutoring to youth in foster care as a community service learning project. More than 675 future teachers have participated in the program to date. More than 800 foster youths have received tutoring services through this program and have demonstrated academic growth in as little as 12 weeks. The SDCOE FYS Program serves as a referral source to the Tutor Connection, acts as an intermediary to ensure that substitute caregivers allow for service provision, provides a curriculum to CSUSM students that is specific to foster youth legislation and mandates, and plans to replicate the Tutor Connection model at another university in San Diego County.

## Tulare County Office of Education

**Tulare County Permanency Team:** The Tulare County Permanency Team has been in operation since December 2004. It includes a coalition of agencies and nonprofit organizations focused on improving services provided to Tulare County foster youth to support them in achieving permanency following emancipation. Critical issues identified by the team include living skills development, transitional housing, regard for foster children as valued assets, mentoring, and promotion of foster youth's awareness of their rights. Members of the team include representatives from the Tulare (TCOE) FYS Program, Court Appointed Special Advocates of Tulare County, College of the Sequoias, foster parent education, Community Services & Employment Training, Inc., juvenile court attorneys in private practice, Tulare County Child Welfare Services/Independent Living Program, Tulare County Foster Youth Advisory Council, Tulare County Housing Authority, Tulare County Juvenile Court, Tulare County Probation Department, Tulare County Public Defender (Juvenile Division), and Youth Development Zone.

## Foster Youth Services Program Sites

### Core District Program Sites

Elk Grove Unified School District	Placer/Nevada County Offices of Education
Mount Diablo Unified School District	Sacramento City Unified School District
Paramount Unified School District	San Juan Unified School District

### Countywide Program Sites

Alameda County Office of Education	Orange County Office of Education
Alpine County Office of Education	Placer County Office of Education
Amador County Office of Education	Plumas County Office of Education
Butte County Office of Education	Riverside County Office of Education
Calaveras County Office of Education	Sacramento County Office of Education
Colusa County Office of Education	San Benito County Office of Education
Contra Costa County Office of Education	San Bernardino County Office of Education
Del Norte County Office of Education	San Diego County Office of Education
El Dorado County Office of Education	San Francisco County Office of Education
Fresno County Office of Education	San Joaquin County Office of Education
Glenn County Office of Education	San Luis Obispo County Office of Education
Humboldt County Office of Education	San Mateo County Office of Education
Imperial County Office of Education	Santa Barbara County Office of Education
Inyo County Office of Education	Santa Clara County Office of Education
Kern County Office of Education	Santa Cruz County Office of Education
Kings County Office of Education	Shasta County Office of Education
Lake County Office of Education	Sierra County Office of Education
Lassen County Office of Education	Siskiyou County Office of Education
Los Angeles County Office of Education	Solano County Office of Education
Madera County Office of Education	Sonoma County Office of Education
Marin County Office of Education	Stanislaus County Office of Education
Mariposa County Office of Education	Sutter County Office of Education
Mendocino County Office of Education	Tehama County Office of Education
Merced County Office of Education	Trinity County Office of Education
Modoc County Office of Education	Tulare County Office of Education
Mono County Office of Education	Ventura County Office of Education
Monterey County Office of Education	Yolo County Office of Education
Napa County Office of Education	Yuba County Office of Education
Nevada County Office of Education	

**Foster Youth Services Program Sites**

**Juvenile Detention Program Sites**

Alameda County Office of Education	Riverside County Office of Education
Butte County Office of Education	Sacramento County Office of Education
Colusa County Office of Education	San Benito County Office of Education
Contra Costa County Office of Education	San Bernardino County Office of Education
Del Norte County Office of Education	San Diego County Office of Education
Fresno County Office of Education	San Francisco County Office of Education
Glenn County Office of Education	San Luis Obispo County Office of Education
Inyo County Office of Education	Santa Barbara County Office of Education
Lake County Office of Education	Santa Clara County Office of Education
Los Angeles County Office of Education	Siskiyou County Office of Education
Madera County Office of Education	Stanislaus County Office of Education
Monterey County Office of Education	Tehama County Office of Education
Orange County Office of Education	Trinity County Office of Education
Placer County Office of Education	Ventura County Office of Education