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Evaluation of the impact of CA Fostering Connections to Success Act (AB 12)

1. What impact does EFC have on youth well-being outcomes?
2. What factors influence supports that youth receive through EFC?
3. How do living arrangements and other supports mediate the relationships between EFC and outcomes?

CalYOUTH Study includes:

- **Longitudinal study** of young people in CA foster care making the transition to adulthood (n = 727)
- Periodic **surveys of caseworkers** serving young people in CA foster care
- Analysis of government program **administrative data**
  - Child welfare: sample of 113k youths in care age 16+ b/w 2006 to 2019
  - Link to other administrative data sources (e.g., public benefits, unemployment insurance & wage data, National Student Clearinghouse)
**CalYOUTH Study Funders and Partners**

- **Support** the research
- **Provide** guidance and feedback
- **Host** CalYOUTH Study section with results on website co-invest.org/resources
- **Promote** via presentations and media outreach
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Casey Family Programs*
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Longitudinal Youth Study

**Purpose:** Obtain information about a broad range of life experiences & young adult outcomes
  - E.g., Foster care placement, Service utilization & preparation, Education & employment, Health & development, Social support

**Sample:** Youths age 16.75-17.75 in CA foster care for 6+ months as of December 2012
  - Stratified random sample by county groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview wave</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Age of youths</th>
<th># Participants</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 4</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus of Today’s Presentation

- Trends in youth outcomes between 17 and 23 years of age
- Relationships between extended foster care and youth outcomes at age 23
- Summary of CalYOUTH findings on the importance of county context for youth outcomes
- Summary of CalYOUTH findings on the differences between THP-NMD providers in outcomes experienced by the youth they serve
- Next steps for CalYOUTH

Disclaimer: The findings reported herein were performed with the permission of the California Department of Social Services. The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are solely those of the authors and should not be considered as representing the policy of the collaborating agency or any agency of the California government.
Trends in Youths’ Outcomes Over Time
Methods

• This part of the presentation draws on data collected over the six-year course of the study from interviews with youths at ages 17, 19, 21, and 23

• Trends in the outcomes are displayed separately for males and females. The full report describes statistically-significant differences in outcomes by race and ethnicity

• All of the youth who participated in each interview wave were used to calculate the percentages displayed in the figures for that interview wave
Trends in Young Women’s Educational Attainment

- High school diploma/GED:
  - Age 17: 10.7%
  - Age 19: 69.1%
  - Age 21: 82.4%
  - Age 23: 83.2%

- At least some college:
  - Age 17: 4.5%
  - Age 19: 60.6%
  - Age 21: 47.0%
  - Age 23: 63.9%

- College degree:
  - Age 17: 0.0%
  - Age 19: 0.4%
  - Age 21: 3.4%
  - Age 23: 12.6%
Trends in Young Men’s Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Age 17</th>
<th>Age 19</th>
<th>Age 21</th>
<th>Age 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma/GED</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least some college</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends in Current Employment by Gender

- **Males**
- **Females**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends in Parenthood Among Females

- Gave birth to at least one child:
  - Age 17: 9.6%
  - Age 19: 27.2%
  - Age 21: 41.3%
  - Age 23: 52.3%

- Lives with at least one child:
  - Age 17: 7.7%
  - Age 19: 24.3%
  - Age 21: 35.7%
  - Age 23: 45.2%
Trends in Parenthood Among Males

- Fathered at least one child:
  - Age 17: 2.6%
  - Age 19: 9.5%
  - Age 21: 17.1%
  - Age 23: 23.7%

- Lives with at least one child:
  - Age 17: 0.5%
  - Age 19: 4.0%
  - Age 21: 9.8%
  - Age 23: 12.8%
Trends in Homelessness by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends in Criminal Justice System Involvement Among Females

- Arrested pre-baseline: Age 17 = 38.5%
- Convicted pre-baseline: Age 17 = 18.6%
- Incarcerated pre-baseline: Age 17 = 22.3%

- Arrested since last interview:
  - Age 17: 10.3%
  - Age 19: 10.2%
  - Age 21: 13.5%

- Convicted since last interview:
  - Age 17: 5.5%
  - Age 19: 5.1%
  - Age 21: 5.8%

- Incarcerated since last interview:
  - Age 17: 9.1%
  - Age 19: 6.5%
  - Age 21: 10.3%
Trends in Criminal Justice System Involvement Among Males

- Arrested pre-baseline:
  - Age 17: 42.4%
  - Age 19: 21.1%
  - Age 21: 15.7%
  - Age 23: 23.4%

- Convicted pre-baseline:
  - Age 17: 26.9%
  - Age 19: 12.6%
  - Age 21: 12.4%
  - Age 23: 8.8%

- Incarcerated pre-baseline:
  - Age 17: 30.6%
  - Age 19: 18.3%
  - Age 21: 22.4%
  - Age 23: 17.2%
Summary of Findings on Trends in Outcomes

• Declining enrollment in school, but significant number of youths are enrolled in college at 23

• Increasing employment, stabilizing at about two-fifths employed at a point in time between 21 and 23

• Increasing percentage of youths are parents of children, but males are much more likely than females to be noncustodial parents

• Troubling levels of involvement with the criminal justice system, but at lower rates than those found in earlier studies

• Over two-thirds of youths are connected to either school or work as young adults
Relationships between Extended Foster Care and Youths’ Outcomes at Age 23
Background

• Extended foster care (EFC) is intended to promote human capital acquisition, positive social connections, and general well-being as youth in foster care transition to adulthood.

• Previous CalYOUTH Study research has found more time in EFC is significantly associated with outcomes at age 21:
  – Education (secondary school completion & college enrollment)
  – Employment (more time employed)
  – Savings (greater amount in savings)
  – Social support (more connections to professionals)
  – Hardships (lower public food assistance, fewer economic hardships, less homelessness/couch-surfing)
  – Family formation (decreased pregnancy)
  – Criminal justice (lower arrest & conviction)

^Courtney, Okpych, & Park, 2018; Okpych & Courtney, 2019
Research Questions

Purpose of the current study is to examine the associations between EFC and youth outcomes at age 23, about 2 years after EFC age limit

Is more time in EFC associated with age-23 outcomes?

• About 2 dozen outcomes evaluated
• Span many developmental domains (e.g., education and employment, hardships, family formation, physical and behavioral health, criminal justice system involvement)
Study Methods

Sample
CalYOUTH participants (n = 622) completed interviews at age 23 in 2019/2020

Outcomes
• Created from Wave 4 interview questions
• Supplemental analyses: college outcomes constructed from National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) data obtained in May 2019 and employment outcomes using Unemployment Insurance data through Q1 2020 (i.e., pre-COVID)

Main predictor
Number of years youth spent in foster care between their 18th and 21st birthdays (calculated from CDSS’s CWS/CMS data)

Statistical Analyses
Estimated the influence that a year in extended care had on each of the outcomes
• Several types of statistical models used (based on measure of outcome)
• Controlled for a wide range of youth- and county-level characteristics
Control Variables Measured at Wave 1 (age 17)

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS**
- Sex
- Race/ethnicity
- Ages at Wave 1 and Wave 4
- Number of years since last completed interview

**FOSTER CARE HISTORY**
- History of neglect
- History of physically abuse
- History of sexually abuse
- History of other abuse
- Age first entered FC
- Total number episodes before age 18
- Total number of placements before age 18
- Placement change rate before age 18
- Ever in congregate care
- Ever in kinship care
- Satisfied with FC experience

**EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT**
- Highest completed grade
- Ever repeated graded
- Ever in special education classroom
- Reading proficiency standardized score (WRAT)
- Ever worked for pay

**PHYSICAL AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH**
- Self-rated health
- Any mental health disorder
- Any alcohol/substance use disorder (MINI-Kid)
- Ever been pregnant/impregnated female
- Has any living children
- Number of nominated social supports

**CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND VICTIMIZATION**
- Average delinquency score
- Ever spent a night in jail
- Physically assaulted in past 12 months
- Had gun/knife pulled/used on them in past 12 months
- Ever sexually abused/molested before entering FC

**COUNTY CHARACTERISTICS**
- Size/urbanicity (4 groups)
- Fair market housing rent quintiles
- Youth unemployment rate quintiles
## Results: Descriptive Statistics on Outcomes at Age 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% or Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Completed high school diploma, GED, other credential (%)</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever enrolled in college (%)(^a)</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled in college between last interview and W4 (%)(^b)</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed a 2-year or 4-year college degree by W4 (%)(^c)</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Worked in last 12 months before W4 at a job that lasted 3 or more months &amp; worked at least 20 hours per week (%)</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of income from employment in 12 months before W4 (Mean/[SD])</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>$14,761 ($18,019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>Current balance of all checking, savings, and money market accounts (Mean [SD])</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>$1,704 ($5,749)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)NSC estimate: 60.8% enrolled in college prior to May 2019  
\(^b\)NSC estimate: 31.6% enrolled in college between 21\(^{st}\) birthday and May 2019  
\(^c\)NSC estimate: 4.0% completed 2yr/4yr college degree before May 2019
## Results: Descriptive Statistics on Outcomes at Age 23 (con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% or Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardships</td>
<td>Number of economic hardships in past year before Wave 4 (scale of 0–6; Mean [SD])</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>1.2 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>USDA Food Insecurity Measure at Wave 4 (%)</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Ever homeless or couch surfed since last completed interview (%)</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of times homeless since last completed interview (0–5 or more; Mean (SD))</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>0.7 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of days homeless since last completed interview (0–365; Mean [SD])</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>30.0 (81.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public assistance</td>
<td>Amount of CalFresh benefits received in 12 months before W4; Mean [SD])</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>$850 ($1,495)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Descriptive Statistics on Outcomes at Age 23 (con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% or Mean(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General health</strong></td>
<td>General health rating (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor/Fair</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral health</strong></td>
<td>Any mental health disorder¹</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any alcohol/substance use disorder</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social support</strong></td>
<td>Total number of nominated supports (maximum of 9; Mean(SD))</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>2.8 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of nominated professionals (maximum of 3; Mean(SD))</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>0.18 (0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequacy of social support (scale of 0 to 6; Mean(SD))</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>4.63 (1.61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Includes any of the following: major depressive episode (current and recurrent), manic episode, hypomanic episode, panic disorder, social phobia, obsessive compulsive disorder, posttraumatic stress disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, antisocial personality disorder, anorexia, or bulimia.
Results: Descriptive Statistics on Outcomes at Age 23 (con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% or Mean(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy and parenthood</td>
<td>Became pregnant/impregnated female since last completed interview⁹ (%)</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had a child since last completed interview⁷ (%)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice system involvement</td>
<td>Arrested since last completed interview (%)</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convicted of a crime since last completed interview (%)</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization</td>
<td>Physically assaulted in 12 months prior to Wave 4 (%)</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weapon pulled or used on respondent in 12 months prior to Wave 4 (%)</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual victimization since last completed interview (%)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ 41.6% of females became pregnant and 18.8% of males impregnated a female

⁷ 20.7% of females had a child and 10.9% of males had a child
## Relationships between EFC and Age 23 Outcomes
(only statistically significant associations shown, control variables not shown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Each additional year in extended foster care:</th>
<th>Outcome unit</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Increased the expected probability that youth completed a high school credential by about 8 percentage points.</td>
<td>Percentage points</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased their expected probability of ever enrolling in college by about 10-12 percentage points(^a)</td>
<td>Percentage points</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased their expected probability of enrolling in college since last completed interview by about 7 percentage points(^b)</td>
<td>Percentage points</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased their expected probability of completing a 2-yr or 4-yr college degree by about 3 percentage points(^c)</td>
<td>Percentage points</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>Increased their expected probability of working in past year for 3+ months, 20+hrs/week by about 5 percentage points.</td>
<td>Percentage points</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased amount of money youth had in bank accounts by about $640</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>$642</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)NSC estimate: Increased probability of ever enrolling in college by May 2019 by 9.6 percentage points.

\(^b\)NSC estimate: Increased probability of ever enrolling in college between 21\(^{st}\) birthday and May 2019 by 6.8 percentage points.

\(^c\)NSC estimate: Not significantly associated with completing 2yr/4yr college degree before May 2019 (-0.1, p=.533)
## Relationships between EFC and Age 23 Outcomes

(only statistically significant associations shown, control variables not shown) (con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Each additional year in extended foster care:</th>
<th>Outcome unit</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public food assistance</td>
<td>Decreased receipt of need-based public food assistance by about $140 in past year</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>-$143</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>Decreased odds of being food insecure in past year by about 21%</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Decreased odds of being homeless or couch-surfing since their last interview by about 19%</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased risk of additional time homeless by 23%</td>
<td>Relative risk ratio</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased expected number of days homeless since last interview by about 10 days</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>-9.5</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Decreased odds that youth had been arrested since last interview by about 28%</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>Increased the likelihood of youth feeling like they have adequate support by about 25%</td>
<td>Relative risk ratio</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes not found to be significantly associated with the number of years in extended care:

- Earnings from employment in past year
- Number of economic hardships in past year
- Physical and behavioral health
- Number of nominated supports and professionals
- New pregnancies and childbirths since last interview
- Conviction of crime since last interview
- Victimization in past year
Administrative Data: Study Methods

**Sample**
Youth in care least 6 months sometime after 16th birthday (between 2006-2017)
- Includes youths in pre-AB12 era and post-AB12 era
- N = 47,666 for postsecondary education analyses
- N = 50,762 for employment analyses

**Outcomes**
CWS/CMS data linked to:
- Data on postsecondary education outcomes from the National Student Clearinghouse
- Data on employment and earnings from the Unemployment Insurance system
- Looked at outcomes through age 23 and between ages 21 and 23

**Main predictor**
Number of years youth spent in foster care between their 18th and 21st birthdays (calculated from CDSS’s CWS/CMS data)

**Statistical Analyses**
Estimated impact a year in EFC had on each outcome
- Used Ordinary Least Squares regression, and more rigorous Instrumental Variable regression to test sensitivity of findings
- Controlled for youth- and county-level characteristics available in CWS/CMS data
### Administrative Data: Relationships between EFC and Age 23 Outcomes

(only statistically significant associations shown, control variables not shown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Each additional year in extended foster care:</th>
<th>Outcome unit</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>P-value (IV model)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Increased the estimated odds that a youth enrolled in college since age 21 by about 23 percent</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased the estimated odds that a youth ever enrolled in college by age 23 by about 40 percent</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased the estimated odds that a youth earned a certificate or a 2yr/4yr/graduate degree by age 23 by about 9 percent</td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased the estimated odds of completing a 2-yr or 4-yr college degree by age 23 by about 11 percent</td>
<td>Percentage points</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>Increased the estimated number of quarters a youth was employed between 21 and 23 by about two weeks</td>
<td>Quarters employed</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased a youth’s estimated earnings between 21 and 23 by about $1,300</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>$1,309</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes not found to be significantly associated with the number of years in extended care:

- Persistence through the first two college semesters between 21 and 23
- Number of college semesters/quarters completed between 21 and 23

Findings on the positive relationships between extended care and enrolling in college between 21 and 23, and overall credential and degree completion, should be viewed with caution.
Limitations

- **Data limitations**
  - E.g., self-report data may not be accurate
  - NSC data did not capture college graduations occurring in May/June 2019

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

- Analyses use generic sets of control variables, and key control variables may not have been included

- The study period includes early years when EFC was still very much a work in progress
Conclusions

• Findings from present analysis reinforce many findings from earlier analyses of outcomes at ages 19 and 21

• Findings thus far are encouraging
  – EFC appears to positively influence a wide range of outcomes, including education, employment, savings, food insecurity, criminal justice system involvement, and social support
  – We have found no evidence of harm associated with time in EFC
Implications of CalYOUTH Findings on County Context

Not surprisingly, county context influences the services youth receive (e.g., EFC) and crucial outcomes they experience during their transition to adulthood.

Policymakers and program managers should consider how county contexts may create disparities in EFC participation and education and employment outcomes.

County child welfare agencies are in a better position to influence some aspects of the county context than others:

- They have limited ability to influence labor and housing markets, but they are responsible for helping youth achieve education and employment outcomes that are powerfully influenced by those social forces.
- As the providers of many social and health services, counties are in a position to influence the availability of services and coordination between service systems and providers.
Summary of CalYOUTH findings on the influence of THP-NMD providers on youths’ postsecondary education and employment outcomes

- More than 80% of the youth were served by one-third of the total THP-NMD providers, and around 10 providers serve over three-fifths of all youth served.
- Outcomes of youth vary depending on which provider they stayed with:
  - Youth background characteristics appear to explain some of the differences between providers in average outcomes experienced by the youths they serve.
  - Average provider-level outcomes are also strongly associated with the mix of counties they serve.
Next steps for CalYOUTH…

• CalYOUTH MOU with CDSS extended through 12/31/2022

• Continued analysis of our survey and administrative data to answer our core research questions:
  – Influence of EFC on additional outcomes (e.g., justice system involvement; parenting; community college credit accumulation)
  – Deepening understanding of mechanisms through which EFC influences outcomes (e.g., county contexts; placement type; services and supports)

• Explore possibilities of using existing CalYOUTH administrative data on youth outcomes to help support efforts to improve policy and services for TAY:
  – Ongoing monitoring of statewide and county-level outcomes for young people currently or formerly in foster care
  – Providing aggregate-level data to service providers on outcomes experienced by the youth they serve
For more information:

https://www.chapinhall.org/research/calyouth/

https://co-invest.org/resources/california-youth-transitions-adulthood/