

Overview of the Use of the Transitional Housing Placement for Minors (THP-M) for Youth who are Custodial Parents or have a History of Commercial Sexual Exploitation

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide an overview of the use of the Transitional Housing Placement for Minors (THP-M) for youth who are custodial parents or who have a history of commercial sexual exploitation. The information included in this document was collected by John Burton Advocates for Youth from a survey of 12 of the 13 licensed and operational THP-M providers, county child welfare agencies, and the California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP). For a list of licensed THP-M programs and the number of youth they serve, refer to Table 1 in the Appendix.

Background on THP-M

THP-M is a state-licensed, Title IV-E-reimbursable foster care placement for 16- and 17-year-olds. THP-M providers must utilize a single site housing model, which is defined as the following:

- 1) Programs in which one or more participants live in an apartment, single-family dwelling or condominium with an adult employee of the provider; or
- 2) Programs in which a participant lives independently in an apartment, single-family dwelling, or condominium rented or leased by the provider located in a building in which one or more adult employees of the provider reside and provide supervision.

The THP-M foster care rate is set at the county level, based on a rate structure set in statute that is 75 percent of the average foster care expenditures for foster youth 16 to 18 years of age, inclusive, in group home care in the county in which the program operates.¹ Actual THP-M rates vary greatly, with the lowest rate being \$2,100 in El Dorado County, and the highest rate being \$4,819 in Santa Clara County. For a full list of rates by county, refer to Table 2 in the Appendix.

Statewide Overview of THP-M

Number of youth in THP-M:

- According to CCWIP, 93 youth were placed in THP-M programs as of July 1, 2019. This figure is nearly consistent with the figure reported in August 2019 by survey respondents, which stated they were serving 87 youth in THP-M.

Number of placing counties:

- A total of 25 counties place youth in THP-M. For a full list of counties that place in THP-M, refer to Table 3 in the Appendix.²

Number and location of THP-M providers:

- According to the California Department of Social Services, there are 14 nonprofit organizations

¹ California Welfare & Institutions Code Section 11403.3(a)(1)(A)

² Not all 25 counties have THP-M programs located in their county. Some place in programs located in neighboring counties.

licensed to provide THP-M. One of the licensed providers is currently non-operational.

- The thirteen operational licensees are operating 23 THP-M programs located in 17 counties.

THP-M For Custodial Parents

- Of the 87 youth placed in THP-M as of August 2019, nine (10%) were custodial parents.
- One THP-M program reported that they do not serve custodial parents. This survey respondent noted that their program statement does not specify parenting youth, and therefore they do not serve this population.
- Five THP-M programs are currently serving one or more custodial parents in their programs.
- Three THP-M programs indicated they utilize a program model specific to parenting youth. The models consist of the following practices:
 - Linkages to WIC, Public Health, First 5, Parent-Child Interaction Therapy (for children 2 or older if they are having difficulty managing behaviors);
 - Weekly contracting and budgeting with separate budget for babies needs;
 - Expectation to complete parenting classes and First Aid and infant CPR training;
 - Participation in ILP Parenting group;
 - Referrals to mommy and me groups so they can bond with other parents and babies;
 - Enrollment in a high school which has a comprehensive parenting component including taking their babies to school with them; and
 - Development of a CFT meeting and coordinated case plans to ensure all the youth needs are being met.
- Although other THP-M programs did not describe having a program model specific to custodial parents, they utilized a number of practices to meet the needs of this population. These practices include:
 - Individualizing the program to meet the needs of the young parent/family;
 - Ensuring the youth is well connected to services in the community;
 - Incorporating pregnancy and (co)parenting information, strategies, techniques, resources and safe sexual health practices in the youth's service plan and goals;
 - Providing a spacious enough room for a child;
 - Accessing wraparound services, then assisting youth with accessing Full Service Partnership (if eligible) upon turning 18; and
 - Adding additional resources and staff hours.

THP-M for Youth with a History of Commercial Sexual Exploitation

- As of August 2019, of the 87 youth placed in THP-M, 17 (20%) had histories of commercial sexual exploitation (CSE).
- Two THP-M programs noted that they typically do not serve youth with histories of CSE. Their reasoning for this included the following factors:
 - Their program location was not appropriate/ideal for youth with histories of CSE.
 - To adequately keep this population safe would require 24-hour supervision, which is not part of the THP-M program model.
 - The group environment associated with the THP-M model (whether in a single apartment

building with separate units or in a single home with separate rooms) is not ideal for youth with CSE because of the risk of influence/recruitment when intermingled with youth without histories of CSE.

- Their county typically refers youth with histories of CSE to a group home specifically tailored for this population.
- Six THP-M programs indicated they were currently serving one or more youth with a history of CSE.
- Three THP-M programs indicated they utilize a program model specific to youth with histories of CSE. The models consist of the following practices:
 - Maintaining a bed designated for youth with histories of CSE;
 - Staff training on CSE and Trauma-Informed Care;
 - Case plans that incorporate the California CSE harm reduction principles and safety planning;
 - Provider participation in CSE collaborative meetings with county partners;
 - County augments cost of program to provide additional services and supports to CSE youth (San Luis Obispo);
 - Partnership with Community Solutions so as soon as a youth is identified as CSE, they are linked with an advocate;
 - Individual counseling for youth if they choose to participate;
 - Safety planning developed with youth and regularly reviewed and updated;
 - Legal assistance provided by local legal services organization through monthly workshops on rights, understanding the legal system, obtaining restraining orders, etc.; and
 - Provider and youth have established a relationship with county detective to meet the youth needs.
- Although other THP-M programs did not describe having a program model specific to youth with histories of CSE, they utilized a number of practices to meet the needs of this population. These practices include:
 - Incorporate strategies, resources, interventions and various techniques to shift youths' focus and address trauma, while continuing to listen to their voice and allowing them to make their own informed decisions;
 - Trainings that are continuously improved and updated; and
 - Making the program flexible to meeting youths' individual goals and needs.

Table 1: Licensed THP-M programs and Number of Youth they Serve

Organization	Number of Programs	Number of Youth Served as of August 2019	Countries Where Programs Are Located
Side by Side	1	7	Alameda
Mountain Circle	5	1	Butte Lassen Plumas Shasta Sutter
N.C. Youth and Family Programs	2	14	Butte Shasta
Uplift Family Services	1	12	Contra Costa
Redwood Children's Services	1	2	Mendocino
Peacock Acres	1	2	Monterey
Olive Crest	1	6	Orange
Family Care Network	2	7	San Luis Obispo Santa Barbara
Bill Wilson Center	1	19	Santa Clara
St. Andrew's Residential S.T.A.R.	1	12	Santa Clara
Krista Foster Homes	1	0	Shasta
TLC Child & Family	1	5	Sonoma
Environmental Alternatives	5	Unknown	El Dorado Lassen Nevada Placer Plumas

Table 2: THP-M Rate by County

Data is derived from the California Department of Social Services Rates and Audits Branch

County	Rate
Alameda	\$ 4,074.00
Butte	\$ 3,310.50
Contra Costa	\$ 3,805.00
El Dorado	\$ 2,100.00
Lassen	\$ 2,821.00
Mendocino	\$ 2,933.00
Monterey	\$ 3,535.00
Nevada	\$ 3,000.00
Orange	\$ 4,005.00
Placer	\$ 4,010.00
Plumas	\$ 2,910.50
San Luis Obispo	\$ 4,039.00
Santa Barbara	\$ 4,039.00
Santa Clara	\$ 4,819.00
Shasta	\$ 3,319.00
Sonoma	\$ 3,262.00
Sutter	\$ 2,821.00

(non-weighted) AVERAGE:	\$ 3,459.00
------------------------------------	--------------------

Table 3: Counties that Place Youth in THP-M and Number of Youth Placed as of July 1, 2019

Data is derived from the California Child Welfare Indicators Project

County	# of Foster Youth Placed
Alameda	5
Butte	4
Contra Costa	9
Glenn	2
Humboldt	3
Lassen	1
Los Angeles	1
Mendocino	1
Monterey	3
Nevada	1
Orange	8
Placer	2
Plumas	1
Sacramento	3
San Benito	1
San Francisco	8
San Luis Obispo	3
San Mateo	2
Santa Barbara	2
Santa Clara	24
Santa Cruz	1
Shasta	3
Siskiyou	1
Solano	1
Sonoma	3