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## Executive Summary

This report is prepared pursuant to California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 42923(b). For every even year, the California Department of Education (CDE) provides a report to the Governor, the Legislature, and the Legislative Analyst’s Office with the activities of the California’s Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program (FYSCP) and student learning outcomes of foster youth. This report includes such information for the school years 2017–18 and 2018–19.

The FYSCP was established pursuant to Assembly Bill 854 of 2015, replacing the Foster Youth Service (FYS) Program. The FYSCP changed the foster youth service delivery model from providing direct services to collaborating with county agencies and local educational agencies (LEAs). To support this realignment, the Budget Act of 2015 (Senate Bill 97 Line Item 6100-119-0001) increased the foster youth allocation by an additional $10 million for a total of $25.4 million. The goal of the increased appropriation was to provide integrated educational services to pupils in foster care. The Budget Act of 2018, SB 840, allocated $26.5 million for the FYSCP. The Budget Act of 2019, AB 74, allocated $27.3 million for the FYSCP.

The purpose of the FYSCP is to increase the overall capacity of the education community at the county level in order to expand access to services and to assist LEAs in the delivery of direct services for foster youth with the explicit goal of improving foster youth educational outcomes.

Pupils in foster care represent one of the most vulnerable and academically underperforming subgroups enrolled in California schools. The instability in home and school placements often negatively impacts students’ learning achievement. In California, foster youth perform lower on all educational outcomes than any other student group in the state including homeless youth, English learners, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

California has made serving foster youth a high priority in recent years through legislation, funding policy, and accountability. The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) enacted in 2013 significantly increased funding for high-needs students and provides greater flexibility to LEAs in how to meet the needs of these students. The California School Dashboard (Dashboard) launched in March 2017 AND includes foster youth as a reporting subgroup. LCFF requires LEAs to identify in their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) how resources, including LCFF supplemental and concentration grant funds, will be leveraged to best serve high-needs students. The revised LCAP template recently adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) requires LEAs to provide specific actions in their plans to meet the needs of high-needs students.

During the past two years, the FYSCP has greatly improved the coordination of foster youth services among county agencies. County-administered FYSCPs actively engaged in interagency collaboration to support LEAs serving foster youth.

The delivery of such services is more efficient through county-based Executive Advisory Councils (EACs) and formal interagency agreements. FYSCP supports LEAs in their development of LCAPs to meet the needs of foster youth. The development of EACs and formal interagency agreements allow for coordination of foster youth services and the implementation of new policies and practices which have braided resources and eliminated redundant services among county agencies. The county FYSCPs also supported the development of school district and charter school transportation plans as required by Section 6312(c)(5) of Title 20 of the United States Code (U.S.C.) (20 U.S.C. Section 6312), of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

For foster youth learning outcomes, there is notable improvement in this reporting period:

* Increased foster youth academic outcomes in English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics; particularly, the 1.5 percentage points of increase in ELA is larger than the state average of 1.2, showing a trend of narrowing the achievement gap
* Increased high school graduation rate; particularly, the 5.2 percentage points of increase is much larger than the 1.8 increase of non-foster youth, showing a significant step toward narrowing the achievement gap
* Increased foster youth college-going rates, a 1.5 percentage points of increase compared to a decrease of 0.8 of non-foster youth. This narrows the achievement gap by 2.3 percentage points
* Improved foster youth school engagement as seen in a decrease in the number of suspension rates; the 0.1 percentage point decrease, though small, is better than the non-foster youth flat suspension rates in the same period

These improvements are worth celebrating; however, much work still needs to be done in addressing the achievement and opportunity gaps that our foster youth experience.

For the program service activities and data details provided in the following pages, this report recommends the continuation of the FYSCP.

If you have any questions regarding this report or would like a copy of this report, please contact Deborah Avalos, Education Programs Consultant, Integrated Student Support and Programs Office, Student Achievement and Support Division, by phone at 916-323-5113 or by email at [DAvalos@cde.ca.gov](mailto:DAvalos@cde.ca.gov). This report will be posted on the CDE FYSCP web page at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/>.

**Report to the Governor and the Legislature   
Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program (FYSCP)**

## Introduction

This report is submitted in accordance with the provisions of *EC* Section 42923(b), which requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) to provide a report to the Governor and the Legislature about the FYSCP in even-numbered years. *EC* Section 42923(b) further stipulates that the report is to be prepared with input from the providers of the FYSCP and that it shall include recommendations regarding the effectiveness and continuation of services; data on the academic achievement, graduation, expulsion, and absenteeism rates, as well as other educational outcomes of foster youth; the amount of funds allocated and expended in the previous two fiscal years (FYs); and a discussion of the data.

The FYSCP was established in 2016 as the result of enactment of AB 854, replacing the previous FYS program which the CDE had administrated since 1973.[[1]](#footnote-1) AB 854 amended *EC* sections 42920–42926 to support LEAs to better serve foster youth. The FYSCP shifts the responsibilities of providing direct educational services for students in foster care from county offices of education (COEs) to LEAs. COEs are now responsible for establishing ongoing collaboration among child welfare agencies, county probation departments, and other organizations for purposes of implementing school-based supports for students in foster care. In addition to coordination of services, the administered COE FYSCPs are focused on building the capacity of LEAs to improve foster youth educational outcomes.

The CDE has administered the FYSCP since it replaced the FYS Program. Under AB 854, the CDE partnered with the Shasta COE and the Orange County Department of Education to create the FYSCP Technical Assistance Program (TAP) during 2017–18 and 2018–19 FYs. The FYSCP TAP provides support, guidance, and leadership to all county FYSCP Coordinators for the implementation of the requirements of AB 854.

This is the second legislative report specifically reporting on the FYSCP established in 2016. The first 2018 FYSCP Legislative Report can be found on the CDE FYSCP 2018 - Legislative Report web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/lrlegreport2018.asp>.

## Program History

The FYS Program was established in 1973 as a pilot project in a handful of school districts and expanded to COEs in 1998, with a focus on providing supplemental education services for foster youth living in group homes.[[2]](#footnote-2)

In 1981, the Legislature recognized that a high percentage of foster youth were achieving significantly below grade level, being retained at least one year at the same grade level, and were dropping out of school. In response, the Legislature mandated that the instruction, counseling, tutoring, and provision of related services for foster youth be a state priority and provided ongoing funding for the pilot project.[[3]](#footnote-3) By 2006, the FYS Program expanded to all counties. The Budget Act of 2006 provided $18.3 million for the FYS Program.[[4]](#footnote-4) This amount included an additional $8.2 million to expand services to foster youth beyond those residing in licensed children’s institutions or group homes, including those in juvenile detention facilities.

In 2013, the Governor and the Legislature changed the landscape of education for foster youth at the district and county levels with the passage of LCFF. The LCFF made a historic shift in how California funds its public schools. This funding mechanism significantly increases funding for high-needs students, including foster youth, and provides greater flexibility to LEAs in how to meet the needs of these students. Through their LCAPs, LEAs identify how resources, including LCFF supplemental and concentration grant funds, will be leveraged to best serve each high-needs student subgroup. The LCFF unduplicated pupil count is used to allocate funds in such a way as to avoid over-allocation of funds when a student satisfies more than one category of high-need. The unduplicated pupil categories are English learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and foster youth.

In 2015, the CDE and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) entered into a data sharing agreement whereby the CDSS provides the CDE with a weekly file of the youth who meet the LCFF definition of foster youth. These weekly files are matched with student enrollment data in the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) so that schools and districts are able to identify foster youth and thus provide them with the supports and services they need.

To track the progress of student educational outcomes in California, the SBE and CDE launched the new California accountability system, the Dashboard, in 2017.[[5]](#footnote-5) The Dashboard allows for educational outcomes to be identified across student groups for each LEA and school. Foster youth are identified as a separate student subgroup on the Dashboard. Parents, educators, and the public are able to track the progress of schools through the annual reports to verify the performance of districts, schools, and student groups, including foster youth. Now that foster youth are a designated high-needs subgroup, LEAs must specify in their LCAPs how resources will be leveraged to best serve this population. Using the Dashboard reports, LEAs are able to develop local plans, which includes allocation of supplemental funds for unduplicated pupils. The LCAP process allows LEAs and community members to provide services to meet the needs of their students. In January 2020, the SBE adopted the revised LCAP Template.[[6]](#footnote-6) The new instructions encourage LEAs to provide specific actions in their plans to meet the needs of foster youth. For foster youth, this means that schools are able to not only provide direct services, such as tutoring, but also provide services which promote school stability, such as ensuring transportation to the student’s school of origin, if this is in the best interest of the youth.

Since this major change, the Legislature, CDE, and SBE have been providing guidance to improve foster youth services and build capacity for LEAs to best serve foster youth in school districts and charter schools. The CDE and SBE established state Priority 10, specific only to COEs, which requires “the coordination of services with welfare agencies, probation and courts, responding to the needs of the juvenile court system to ensure appropriate educational placement and transfer records*”.*[[7]](#footnote-7)

State Priority 10 means that COEs must address their coordination of foster youth services in their LCAPs, including working with the county child welfare agency to share information, respond to the needs of the juvenile court system, and transfer health and education records. To monitor the progress of COEs on Priority 10, the Dashboard uses a local accountability indicator. The COE reports this indicator by preparing an annual review about the coordinating services for students in foster care in eight specific areas, as shown in Table 34. In addition, COEs must report to the CDE that they either met or did not meet their goals. The data requirement is part of the annual report specifications about COEs’ FYSCPs. Part III of this report describes the details of the reporting data.

The LCFF made two impactful changes related to foster youth in California. First, the LCFF greatly expanded the number of foster youth eligible for educational services in the state. It revised the definition for “foster youth” in *EC* Section 42238.01(b) that had been used by the FYS Program since it its establishment. The LCFF definition included all foster youth with an open dependency case, regardless of the living arrangement in which they have been placed by the state. This new definition also included two more groups of foster youth: children in relative placements and in family maintenance. This expansion increased the numbers of foster youth eligible for educational services in the state by threefold. Prior to LCFF alignment, approximately 20,000 students were eligible for foster youth services. Under LCFF, LEAs must develop plans based on their local needs. Any school district or charter school must develop its LCAP to address the needs of the students attending their schools. This requirement has a direct impact on foster youth as LEAs must address local foster youth needs to ensure foster youth experience school stability and have access to educational supports and services. These two changes were the impetus for AB 854 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015).

Recognizing the need to align the existing county structure of supports for foster youth to the one that is focused at the LEA level, the Legislature enacted AB 854, which established the FYSCP and further defined that approach for county agencies and LEAs to collaboratively meet the educational needs of foster youth by amending *EC* sections 42920–42926. The legislation also aligned the definition of foster youth to include the LCFF definition, as stated above, and included youth in juvenile detention centers. After the adoption of AB 854, approximately 60,000 students were eligible for FYSCP services.[[8]](#footnote-8) To support this realignment, the Budget Act of 2015 (SB 97 Line Item 6100-119-0001) allocated an additional $10 million for a total of $25.4 million to provide increased and more integrated educational services to pupils in foster care. In 2018, SB 840 allocated about $26.5 million for the FYSCP.

AB 854 prioritizes the educational stability of pupils in foster care as a joint responsibility of educational and child welfare agencies and other partners. This new law creates the much-needed opportunity to increase access to more meaningful educational supports for pupils in foster care by shifting the focus of the FYS Program from a direct service model to a systems integration model in the FYSCP. This new model incorporates assistance to LEAs by building policies and developing protocols and case management strategies. By identifying foster youth and tracking their educational data, LEAs are positioned to ultimately produce improved educational outcomes.

To support these efforts, the legislation further requires the CDE, in collaboration with the CDSS, to share data and, through a statewide match, inform districts about which of their students are foster youth so that they can be served.

## FYSCP Purpose

Since 2016, California has built the infrastructure of the FYSCP that enables the CDE and COEs to support LEAs serving foster youth in California schools. The CDE and COEs, in collaboration with LEAs and various social service agencies, work to build the capacity of schools and districts to ensure California foster youth educational rights are met as defined in legislative mandates such as the right of foster youth to remain in their school of origin.

Foster care is a temporary service provided by states for children who cannot live with their family because either their parents cannot care for them or they are mistreated and/or neglected and therefore require oversight by the county child welfare agency. In the United States (U.S.) in 2018, approximately 687,000 children were placed out of home, and on a given day (September 30, 2019), about 437,000 children were placed out of their homes in licensed foster family homes, non-family group homes, or residential treatment settings.[[9]](#footnote-9) Also reported by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in California, 78,215 children were placed in foster care in 2018, and 52,337 children were placed outside their homes on September 30, 2019.[[10]](#footnote-10)

There are many reasons for children to be placed in foster care. According to the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the two major circumstances associated with children’s removal from their natural born parents are neglect and parent drug abuse. In the AFCARS Report for 2018, neglect accounts for 62 percent of removals, and parent drug abuse accounts for 36 percent removals.[[11]](#footnote-11) These percentages remain the same compared to the AFCARS Report for 2017.[[12]](#footnote-12)

In the U.S. children stay in foster care for various time periods from less than one month to more than five years. In 2018, the mean time in care was 19.7 months, and the median time in care was 13.2 months.[[13]](#footnote-13) Approximately 28 percent of children in care stay for more than two years.[[14]](#footnote-14) There are two major reasons for children to be discharged from foster care. In 2018, 49 percent of children exited foster care through reunification with parent(s) or primary caretaker(s) and 25 percent through adoption.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Children in foster care commonly experience multiple placements in foster homes and licensed children’s institutions. According to the most recent National Workgroup on Foster Care and Education report, 65 percent of foster youth experienced at least two living placements while in foster care, and 27 percent of foster youth experienced at least four placements.[[16]](#footnote-16) Because of high mobility due to changes in living placements, many foster youth change schools multiple times in their kindergarten through grade 12 education. In the same report, more than 34 percent foster youth ages seventeen to eighteen experienced five or more school changes.

It is widely reported, long before foster youth were identified as a unique student group in the California school accountability system, that the learning achievement of foster youth was much lower than their peers with who are not in foster care.[[17]](#footnote-17),[[18]](#footnote-18) Students in foster care face many obstacles in achieving learning success. Researchers found these major factors underlining the poor educational outcomes of foster youth:

* Changing schools hinders academic achievement.[[19]](#footnote-19) Students in foster care experience school changes more than their non-foster care peers.[[20]](#footnote-20),[[21]](#footnote-21) School mobility has negative effects on academic achievement,[[22]](#footnote-22) school attendance,[[23]](#footnote-23) and the likelihood of earning a high school diploma or equivalent.[[24]](#footnote-24) Students who experience frequent school changes face challenges in developing and sustaining supportive relationships with teachers or with peers.[[25]](#footnote-25)
* Delays in school enrollment for foster youth, often due to entry into foster care, change of placement, or failure to transfer records in a timely manner, can cause adverse consequences such as lowering school attendance, having to repeat courses, failure to address special education needs, and enrollment in appropriate classes.[[26]](#footnote-26)
* Behavioral problems manifested by childhood maltreatment and traumatic experience severely interfere with learning.[[27]](#footnote-27),[[28]](#footnote-28) There is a large percentage of children and youth placed in foster care who experience physical and emotional trauma as a result of abuse, neglect, separation from family, and impermanence.[[29]](#footnote-29) 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. Most children who enter foster care have been exposed to many conditions that have undermined their chances for healthy development.[[30]](#footnote-30) The detrimental effects of environmental, social, biological, and psychological risk factors such as abuse and neglect, exposure to illicit drugs, and poverty have significantly undermined the well-being of foster youth mental health. Therefore, students in foster care face more challenges in achieving learning success than their peers not in foster care.[[31]](#footnote-31)

Recognizing the above adverse factors that underline foster youth learning achievement in schools, California’s FYSCP focuses on coordinating with schools and social service agencies to help remove those barriers for foster youth to achieve learning success. Much of the FYSCP services are targeted at foster youth school stability, learning achievement, and college and career readiness. These services include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

* Education case management
* College transition services
* College tours/fairs
* Youth workshops
* Transportation
* Independent living services
* Counseling
* Tutoring

In addition to the creation of the FYSCP through AB 854, the CDE recognized the need to have timely and accurate data for monitoring and accountability in order to support the needs of foster youth. As such, in 2019 the CDE created an Education Research and Evaluation Consultant (EREC) position as a dedicated data specialist working on foster youth. The EREC’s work is centered on supporting and working toward improvements in the foster match process between the CDE and the CDSS. This work includes, but is not limited to, the following activities:

* Working directly with the CDSS programmers, COEs, and school districts to ensure students are identified as foster youth in a timely fashion that allows for educators to provide foster youth with the appropriate educational supports and services
* Providing supports to the CDE FYSCP with monitoring and analyzing educational outcomes for foster youth
* Working with the CDSS on creating data sharing agreements that are used to meet mandates. The data sharing also enables the collaboration aimed at better understanding of the intersection of the CDE and CDSS data systems, as well as how both systems can better support the complex needs of foster youth
* Providing trainings and presentations to a variety of stakeholders about the educational outcomes and experiences of foster youth in California schools

With the enhanced data expertise, the CDE is able to monitor the effectiveness of the program. It is also able to provide this report, which meets the data reporting requirements specified by the legislation. Pursuant to *EC* Section 49085(c), the SSPI provides this report with the educational outcomes for pupils in foster care at the county level, to the extent allowable by federal law, the number of pupils, and their academic achievement, suspension and expulsion rates, attendance rates, graduation rates, and dropout rates.

For the 2020 Report to the Governor and Legislature as required by *EC* Section 49085(c), the CDE provides the comprehensive educational data on the academic achievement and other educational metrics of foster youth. The data reported here are obtained from three sources:

1. The publicly available DataQuest,[[32]](#footnote-32) which provides aggregated data annually about California students, teachers, and schools, including aggregated data on foster youth
2. The publicly available Dashboard,[[33]](#footnote-33) which provides aggregate educational accountability data for schools, LEAs, and COEs for all students and for foster youth
3. CALPADS[[34]](#footnote-34) which tracks an array of students’ performance indicators over years

## Organization of the2020 Report for the Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program

Pursuant to *EC* Section 42923(b), this report comprises four parts:

Part I—Recommendations regarding the effectiveness and continuation of the FYSCP;

Part II—Aggregate foster youth educational outcome data by county;

Part III—FYSCP report; and

Part IV—Conclusion

### Part I—Recommendations Regarding the Effectiveness and Continuation of the FYSCP

Based on the data report showing improvement of foster youth in some of the learning indicators specified in the Dashboard presented in Part II of this report and the FYSCP activities presented in Part III of this report, the CDE believes the FYSCP has built an effective infrastructure in California to provide ongoing support to foster youth. The CDE strongly recommends the continuation of the FYSCP in order to ensure the support infrastructure remains in place.

During this reporting period between 2017 and 2019, there has been a great improvement in graduation rates for foster youth compared to non-foster youth. As shown in Part II, Table 21, the graduation rate for foster youth increased 5.2 percentage points over two years. This increase is much larger than the 1.8 percentage points of increase in graduation rates of non-foster youth over the same time period. Although the achievement gap in graduation rates between foster youth and non-foster youth remains large, the increases in the past two years are a significant step toward closing this achievement gap. These increases are largely due to the effectiveness of an established FYSCP, which reported almost all COEs are now providing services to high school foster youth around planning for a successful transition to college and engaging foster youth in staying in school.

With the dedicated data specialist at the CDE and improved data sharing between the CDE and CDSS, the FYSCP provided guidance for COEs to establish policies and procedures that ensure that LEAs place foster youth in schools in a timely manner and in an appropriate educational placement in accordance with state and federal laws. The FYSCP focused on enrolling foster youth in a timely fashion or keeping foster youth in their school of origin by sharing information and providing transportation if necessary; supporting foster youth emotionally and academically with mentoring and tutoring; and assisting foster youth with college and career transition with college fair, application supports, and the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) completion.

The COE’s FYSCPs provide support with transferring of school records and other relevant educational information so that foster youth are available for inter-district transfers. All FYSCPs have established local interagency EACs that coordinate and leverage resources for LEAs, child welfare agencies, and county probation offices to support foster youth education. All counties are developing countywide transportation plans, data sharing agreements, and agreements with the child welfare agencies to leverage Title IV-E of the federal Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. Section 301) funds. These agreements establish procedures to promote school stability for foster youth and provide support for transitions to independent living. Through these agreements, protocols have been established by LEAs, child welfare agencies, county probation departments, and other organizations (shown in Table 29) to work collaboratively to meet the educational needs of foster youth.

Tables 14 and 15 provide the number of foster youth receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility and the detention rates by county for foster youth in the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years. The juvenile detention rate for foster youth decreased by 0.5 percentage points from 2017–18 to 2018–19, from 9.0 percent in 2017–18 to 8.5 percent in 2018–19 representing more than 576 fewer foster youth receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility. This shows a significant success for the foster youth population.

### Part II—Aggregate Educational Outcome Data by County

This section includes information for each county in which there were at least 15 pupils in foster care who attended school, by county pursuant to *EC* Section 42923(b). In order to protect student privacy, data may be suppressed and indicated by an asterisk (\*) if the foster youth population is less than 11 in a given county.

1. The number of pupils in foster care who attended school in the county
2. The academic achievement of the pupils in foster care who attended school in the county
3. The number of pupils in foster care who were suspended or expelled
4. The number of pupils in foster care who were placed in a juvenile hall, camp, ranch, or other county-operated juvenile detention facility because of an incident of juvenile delinquency
5. The chronic absence rates, attendance rates, graduation rates, and dropout rates for pupils in foster care
6. The number of pupils in foster care who successfully transition to postsecondary education
7. The amount of funds allocated and expended by each FYSCP in the previous two fiscal years (FY)

Table 1 below shows the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school year’s Census Day[[35]](#footnote-35) enrollment of matched foster youth who were enrolled in school, by county. Census Day enrollment numbers are used to determine funding allocations. Because Census Day enrollment numbers are calculated at a point in time, these numbers are smaller than the enrollment numbers that are collected throughout the entirety of the school year.

Table 2 below shows the 2017–18 and 2018–19 statewide cumulative enrollment[[36]](#footnote-36) of matched[[37]](#footnote-37) foster youth. Cumulative enrollment numbers are used for accountability purposes as these numbers reflect the entirety of the school year. The county of enrollment may or may not be the same as the county of jurisdiction, which is the county that has legal jurisdiction over the foster youth. Foster youth enrollment counts are unduplicated at each reporting level (i.e., state, county, district, and school). For example, foster youth are counted once for each county in which they had one or more enrollments during the academic year but only counted once at the state-level.

Table 3 below shows the cumulative enrollment of foster youth by grade level for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years. The enrollment of foster youth by grade is relatively evenly distributed in both school years. In 2018–19, the lowest percent of the total statewide enrollment of foster youth was 6.6 percent in grade five with 3,081 youth. In 2018–19 the highest percent of the total statewide enrollment of foster youth was 9.6 percent in kindergarten with 4,479 youth.

Table 4 below shows the total cumulative enrollment for foster youth by county of enrollment. As shown, 3 of the 58 counties in California had fewer than 10 foster youth attend school in their county in the 2018–19 school years: Alpine, Mono, and Sierra counties. Los Angeles County had the highest number of foster youth enrolled in both the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years, representing 34 percent and 36 percent of all foster youth enrolled in the state, respectively. There was a decline in the total number of foster youth enrolled from the 2017–18 to 2018–19 school year of 3,437 foster youth.

#### Table 1: Census Day Foster Youth Enrollment by County for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| County | 2017–18 (N) | 2018–19 (N) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alpine | 0 | 0 |
| Alameda | 529 | 460 |
| Amador | 36 | 48 |
| Butte | 293 | 303 |
| Calaveras | 74 | 83 |
| Colusa | 26 | 32 |
| Contra Costa | 656 | 632 |
| Del Norte | 72 | 55 |
| El Dorado | 255 | 209 |
| Fresno | 1,414 | 1,445 |
| Glenn | 40 | 39 |
| Humboldt | 233 | 259 |
| Imperial | 249 | 290 |
| Inyo | 47 | 46 |
| Kern | 1,223 | 1,165 |
| Kings | 262 | 228 |
| Lake | 34 | 50 |
| Lassen | 49 | 39 |
| Los Angeles | 10,774 | 10,646 |
| Madera | 227 | 203 |
| Marin | 87 | 91 |
| Mariposa | 33 | 26 |
| Mendocino | 151 | 154 |
| Merced | 436 | 428 |
| Modoc | 29 | 22 |
| Mono | 3 | 1 |
| Monterey | 199 | 153 |
| Napa | 74 | 60 |
| Nevada | 68 | 63 |
| Orange | 1,594 | 1,639 |
| Placer | 211 | 198 |
| Plumas | 23 | 18 |
| Riverside | 2,778 | 2,477 |
| Sacramento | 1,318 | 1,251 |
| San Benito | 44 | 40 |
| San Bernardino | 3,666 | 3,622 |
| San Diego | 1,383 | 1,168 |
| San Francisco | 304 | 324 |
| San Joaquin | 962 | 947 |
| San Luis Obispo | 207 | 222 |
| San Mateo | 168 | 171 |
| Santa Barbara | 194 | 207 |
| Santa Clara | 599 | 557 |
| Santa Cruz | 153 | 130 |
| Shasta | 256 | 257 |
| Sierra | 2 | 5 |
| Siskiyou | 49 | 56 |
| Solano | 301 | 294 |
| Sonoma | 332 | 366 |
| Stanislaus | 528 | 519 |
| Sutter | 101 | 113 |
| Tehama | 95 | 109 |
| Trinity | 38 | 30 |
| Tulare | 686 | 804 |
| Tuolumne | 37 | 34 |
| Ventura | 501 | 407 |
| Yolo | 184 | 239 |
| Yuba | 139 | 129 |
| **Statewide** | **34,426** | **33,563** |

#### Table 2: Statewide Cumulative Enrollment for Foster Youth and Non-Foster Youth for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| Academic Year | Foster (N) | Non-Foster (N) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2017–18 | 50,247 | 6,334,672 |
| 2018–19 | 46,810 | 6,283,073 |

#### Table 3: Statewide Cumulative Enrollment for Foster Youth by Grade for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| Grade | 2017–18 (N) | 2018–19 (N) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Kindergarten | 4,650 | 4,479 |
| First Grade | 4,232 | 3,680 |
| Second Grade | 3,993 | 3,782 |
| Third Grade | 3,606 | 3,412 |
| Fourth Grade | 3,460 | 3,213 |
| Fifth Grade | 3,432 | 3,081 |
| Sixth Grade | 3,370 | 3,101 |
| Seventh Grade | 3,278 | 3,162 |
| Eight Grade | 3,177 | 3,177 |
| Ungraded Elementary | 6 | 0 |
| Ninth Grade | 4,169 | 3,806 |
| Tenth Grade | 4,096 | 4,016 |
| Eleventh Grade | 4,152 | 3,886 |
| Twelfth Grade | 4,523 | 4,015 |
| Ungraded Secondary | 103 | 0 |
| Total | 50,247 | 46,810 |

#### Table 4: Foster Youth Cumulative Enrollment by County for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| County | 2017–18 (N) | 2018–19 (N) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 1,026 | 884 |
| Alpine | 0 | 2 |
| Amador | 76 | 71 |
| Butte | 486 | 468 |
| Calaveras | 160 | 165 |
| Colusa | 67 | 61 |
| Contra Costa | 1,112 | 976 |
| Del Norte | 121 | 88 |
| El Dorado | 650 | 492 |
| Fresno | 2,381 | 2,256 |
| Glenn | 77 | 67 |
| Humboldt | 402 | 385 |
| Imperial | 436 | 453 |
| Inyo | 145 | 99 |
| Kern | 2,027 | 1,801 |
| Kings | 453 | 398 |
| Lake | 81 | 70 |
| Lassen | 100 | 94 |
| Los Angeles | 17,041 | 15,697 |
| Madera | 454 | 371 |
| Marin | 162 | 148 |
| Mariposa | 69 | 57 |
| Mendocino | 228 | 257 |
| Merced | 827 | 794 |
| Modoc | 56 | 34 |
| Mono | 11 | 6 |
| Monterey | 368 | 288 |
| Napa | 138 | 143 |
| Nevada | 193 | 152 |
| Orange | 2,683 | 2,617 |
| Placer | 410 | 384 |
| Plumas | 12 | 37 |
| Riverside | 4,618 | 4,044 |
| Sacramento | 2,313 | 2,063 |
| San Benito | 79 | 80 |
| San Bernardino | 6,645 | 6,197 |
| San Diego | 2,289 | 1,907 |
| San Francisco | 729 | 702 |
| San Joaquin | 1,715 | 1,612 |
| San Luis Obispo | 378 | 353 |
| San Mateo | 316 | 260 |
| Santa Barbara | 380 | 394 |
| Santa Clara | 1,125 | 965 |
| Santa Cruz | 270 | 202 |
| Shasta | 454 | 447 |
| Sierra | 2 | 6 |
| Siskiyou | 100 | 108 |
| Solano | 547 | 501 |
| Sonoma | 627 | 601 |
| Stanislaus | 963 | 911 |
| Sutter | 264 | 216 |
| Tehama | 198 | 187 |
| Trinity | 78 | 69 |
| Tulare | 1,197 | 1,186 |
| Tuolumne | 80 | 88 |
| Ventura | 854 | 705 |
| Yolo | 394 | 409 |
| Yuba | 261 | 235 |
| **Statewide** | **50,247** | **46,810** |

The California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) is the state testing system used to measure the academic achievement of students. The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments (Smarter Balanced) are part of the state testing system, and they test students’ knowledge and skills in, among other subjects, ELA and mathematics.[[38]](#footnote-38) Students in grades three through eight and grade eleven take the Smarter Balanced for ELA and mathematics.[[39]](#footnote-39) Test scores on the Smarter Balanced fall into one of four performance levels: standard exceeded, standard met, standard nearly met, and standard not met.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Tables 5 and 6 below show the Smarter Balanced Performance Levels for foster youth in ELA for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years, by county, respectively. For ELA, in 2017–18 the statewide average for foster youth who met or exceeded the state standard was 22.1 percent, as shown in Table 5. In 2018–19, the foster youth who met or exceeded the state standard in ELA was 23.6 percent (Table 6), which shows an increase of 1.5 percentage points. Looking further back, from the 2016–17 to 2017–18 school years, the percent of foster youth who met or exceeded standards in ELA increased by 0.9 percentage points. This indicates a three-year-trend in increased academic achievement for foster youth in ELA.

Tables 7 and 8 show the Smarter Balanced Performance Levels for foster youth in mathematics for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years. For the 2017–18 school year mathematics assessments, the statewide percent of foster youth who met or exceeded the state standard was 13.8 percent, as shown in Table 7. For 2018–19, Table 8 shows that the statewide percent of foster youth who met or exceeded the state standard was 14.6, which shows an increase of 0.8 percentage points. Looking further back, from the 2016–17 to 2017–18 school years, the percent of foster youth who met or exceeded standards in mathematics increased by 0.7 percentage points. This indicates a three-year-trend increased academic achievement for foster youth in mathematics.

#### Table 5: Foster Youth Achievement on 2017–18 CAASPP in ELA by County

| County | Standard Not Met (%) | Standard Nearly Met (%) | Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%) | Standard Met (%) | Standard Exceeded (%) | Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 57.5 | 17.7 | 75.2 | 16.0 | 8.9 | 24.8 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 28.6 | 47.6 | 76.2 | 19.1% | 4.8 | 23.8 |
| Butte | 52.4 | 25.1 | 77.5 | 18.7 | 3.7 | 22.5 |
| Calaveras | 50.0 | 30.0 | 80.0 | 18.0 | 2.0 | 20.0 |
| Colusa | 54.8 | 25.8 | 80.7 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 19.4 |
| Contra Costa | 54.5 | 23.3 | 77.8 | 18.5 | 3.8 | 22.3 |
| Del Norte | 59.6 | 17.0 | 76.6 | 14.9 | 8.5 | 23.4 |
| El Dorado | 44.4 | 29.0 | 73.4 | 21.8 | 4.8 | 26.6 |
| Fresno | 53.8 | 21.2 | 75.0 | 16.9 | 8.1 | 25.0 |
| Glenn | 47.4 | 36.8 | 84.2 | 10.5 | 5.3 | 15.8 |
| Humboldt | 51.6 | 28.0 | 79.6 | 14.7 | 5.7 | 20.4 |
| Imperial | 51.2 | 31.0 | 82.1 | 13.7 | 4.2 | 17.9 |
| Inyo | 54.6 | 18.2 | 72.7 | 18.2 | 9.1 | 27.3 |
| Kern | 56.5 | 24.3 | 80.7 | 14.3 | 5.0 | 19.3 |
| Kings | 49.2 | 27.3 | 76.5 | 19.1 | 4.4 | 23.5 |
| Lake | 66.7 | 14.3 | 81.0 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 19.0 |
| Lassen | 67.7 | 20.6 | 88.2 | 8.8 | 2.9 | 11.8 |
| Los Angeles | 55.1 | 23.0 | 78.1 | 16.4 | 5.5 | 21.9 |
| Madera | 59.7 | 22.3 | 82.0 | 13.7 | 4.3 | 18.0 |
| Marin | 46.0 | 16.0 | 62.0 | 30.0 | 8.0 | 38.0 |
| Mariposa | 50.0 | 8.3 | 58.3 | 41.7 | 0.0 | 41.7 |
| Mendocino | 63.0 | 17.0 | 80.0 | 17.0 | 3.0 | 20.0 |
| Merced | 58.1 | 23.8 | 82.0 | 13.4 | 4.7 | 18.1 |
| Modoc | 54.6 | 36.4 | 90.9 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 63.3 | 18.8 | 82.0 | 10.9 | 7.0 | 18.0 |
| Napa | 41.8 | 25.5 | 67.3 | 25.5 | 7.3 | 32.7 |
| Nevada | 38.2 | 35.3 | 73.5 | 20.6 | 5.9 | 26.5 |
| Orange | 53.6 | 20.8 | 74.4 | 19.4 | 6.1 | 25.6 |
| Placer | 46.1 | 21.7 | 67.8 | 21.7 | 10.4 | 32.2 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 53.8 | 23.1 | 76.9 | 17.0 | 6.2 | 23.1 |
| Sacramento | 58.4 | 24.4 | 82.8 | 13.5 | 3.7 | 17.2 |
| San Benito | 50.0 | 27.3 | 77.3 | 18.2 | 4.6 | 22.7 |
| San Bernardino | 56.1 | 22.0 | 78.1 | 16.6 | 5.4 | 21.9 |
| San Diego | 50.4 | 25.7 | 76.0 | 17.1 | 6.9 | 24.0 |
| San Francisco | 61.6 | 19.5 | 81.1 | 13.2 | 5.7 | 18.9 |
| San Joaquin | 58.9 | 24.2 | 83.2 | 12.5 | 4.3 | 16.8 |
| San Luis Obispo | 37.7 | 32.3 | 70.0 | 26.2 | 3.9 | 30.0 |
| San Mateo | 47.9 | 27.1 | 75.0 | 18.8 | 6.3 | 25.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 58.3 | 22.6 | 80.9 | 15.7 | 3.5 | 19.1 |
| Santa Clara | 53.5 | 23.8 | 77.3 | 17.7 | 5.1 | 22.7 |
| Santa Cruz | 54.9 | 22.0 | 76.8 | 17.1 | 6.1 | 23.2 |
| Shasta | 51.4 | 29.1 | 80.5 | 14.5 | 5.0 | 19.6 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 55.9 | 26.5 | 82.4 | 5.9 | 11.8 | 17.6 |
| Solano | 54.1 | 21.9 | 76.0 | 19.4 | 4.6 | 24.0 |
| Sonoma | 44.4 | 30.5 | 74.9 | 17.1 | 8.0 | 25.1 |
| Stanislaus | 59.6 | 19.1 | 78.7 | 16.2 | 5.1 | 21.3 |
| Sutter | 49.3 | 30.1 | 79.5 | 16.4 | 4.1 | 20.6 |
| Tehama | 59.0 | 19.2 | 78.2 | 15.4 | 6.4 | 21.8 |
| Trinity | 53.3 | 20.0 | 73.3 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 26.7 |
| Tulare | 48.9 | 29.7 | 78.6 | 17.3 | 4.1 | 21.4 |
| Tuolumne | 57.1 | 28.6 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| Ventura | 51.9 | 26.2 | 78.1 | 18.4 | 3.5 | 21.9 |
| Yolo | 55.8 | 22.1 | 77.9 | 15.9 | 6.2 | 22.1 |
| Yuba | 55.8 | 22.1 | 77.9 | 18.6 | 3.5 | 22.1 |
| **Statewide** | **54.6** | **23.4** | **77.9** | **16.6** | **5.5** | **22.1** |

#### Table 6: Foster Youth Achievement on 2018–19 CAASPP in ELA by County

| County | Standard Not Met (%) | Standard Nearly Met (%) | Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%) | Standard Met (%) | Standard Exceeded (%) | Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 57.6 | 20.8 | 78.4 | 14.0 | 7.6 | 21.6 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 43.5 | 34.8 | 78.3 | 13.0 | 8.7 | 21.7 |
| Butte | 56.9 | 24.0 | 80.8 | 15.6 | 3.6 | 19.2 |
| Calaveras | 55.3 | 29.8 | 85.1 | 10.6 | 4.3 | 14.9 |
| Colusa | 52.6 | 21.1 | 73.7 | 26.3 | 0.0 | 26.3 |
| Contra Costa | 54.6 | 22.7 | 77.3 | 18.3 | 4.4 | 22.7 |
| Del Norte | 47.2 | 27.8 | 75.0 | 16.7 | 8.3 | 25.0 |
| El Dorado | 51.5 | 20.2 | 71.7 | 22.2 | 6.1 | 28.3 |
| Fresno | 52.9 | 22.0 | 74.9 | 19.0 | 6.1 | 25.1 |
| Glenn | 48.2 | 33.3 | 81.5 | 7.4 | 11.1 | 18.5 |
| Humboldt | 54.9 | 22.2 | 77.2 | 18.5 | 4.3 | 22.8 |
| Imperial | 42.4 | 31.4 | 73.8 | 22.0 | 4.2 | 26.2 |
| Inyo | 72.2 | 16.7 | 88.9 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 11.1 |
| Kern | 56.2 | 23.1 | 79.3 | 16.2 | 4.6 | 20.7 |
| Kings | 50.9 | 20.3 | 71.2 | 25.8 | 3.1 | 28.8 |
| Lake | 75.0 | 14.3 | 89.3 | 7.1 | 3.6 | 10.7 |
| Lassen | 71.0 | 12.9 | 83.9 | 12.9 | 3.2 | 16.1 |
| Los Angeles | 53.8 | 22.4 | 76.2 | 17.7 | 6.1 | 23.8 |
| Madera | 54.6 | 25.2 | 79.8 | 14.3 | 5.9 | 20.2 |
| Marin | 56.1 | 19.5 | 75.6 | 19.5 | 4.9 | 24.4 |
| Mariposa | 78.6 | 0.0 | 78.6 | 14.3 | 7.1 | 21.4 |
| Mendocino | 70.8 | 14.2 | 84.9 | 13.2 | 1.9 | 15.1 |
| Merced | 54.7 | 21.5 | 76.2 | 17.7 | 6.0 | 23.8 |
| Modoc | 53.9 | 23.1 | 76.9 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 45.9 | 27.5 | 73.4 | 21.1 | 5.5 | 26.6 |
| Napa | 42.6 | 27.7 | 70.2 | 23.4 | 6.4 | 29.8 |
| Nevada | 51.7 | 17.2 | 69.0 | 20.7 | 10.3 | 31.0 |
| Orange | 49.3 | 23.9 | 73.2 | 18.3 | 8.6 | 26.8 |
| Placer | 46.7 | 21.3 | 68.0 | 24.6 | 7.4 | 32.0 |
| Plumas | 50.0 | 41.7 | 91.7 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
| Riverside | 53.4 | 23.4 | 76.8 | 17.1 | 6.2 | 23.2 |
| Sacramento | 51.8 | 25.6 | 77.5 | 17.1 | 5.4 | 22.6 |
| San Benito | 62.1 | 17.2 | 79.3 | 17.2 | 3.5 | 20.7 |
| San Bernardino | 53.7 | 24.7 | 78.4 | 16.5 | 5.1 | 21.7 |
| San Diego | 47.1 | 23.7 | 70.8 | 20.1 | 9.2 | 29.2 |
| San Francisco | 57.6 | 19.4 | 77.1 | 17.4 | 5.6 | 22.9 |
| San Joaquin | 54.9 | 25.6 | 80.5 | 14.2 | 5.3 | 19.5 |
| San Luis Obispo | 40.8 | 25.8 | 66.7 | 27.5 | 5.8 | 33.3 |
| San Mateo | 58.0 | 17.1 | 75.0 | 19.3 | 5.7 | 25.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 50.4 | 22.5 | 72.9 | 21.7 | 5.4 | 27.1 |
| Santa Clara | 55.2 | 19.2 | 74.3 | 18.6 | 7.1 | 25.7 |
| Santa Cruz | 52.5 | 29.5 | 82.0 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 |
| Shasta | 52.8 | 25.8 | 78.5 | 14.1 | 7.4 | 21.5 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 65.0 | 12.5 | 77.5 | 17.5 | 5.0 | 22.5 |
| Solano | 55.4 | 20.4 | 75.8 | 19.1 | 5.1 | 24.2 |
| Sonoma | 48.4 | 21.5 | 69.9 | 21.5 | 8.5 | 30.1 |
| Stanislaus | 62.1 | 18.2 | 80.3 | 13.8 | 6.0 | 19.8 |
| Sutter | 51.9 | 24.7 | 76.5 | 19.8 | 3.7 | 23.5 |
| Tehama | 57.5 | 26.0 | 83.6 | 13.7 | 2.7 | 16.4 |
| Trinity | 46.2 | 38.5 | 84.6 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 15.4 |
| Tulare | 47.3 | 27.5 | 74.8 | 20.0 | 5.2 | 25.2 |
| Tuolumne | 60.0 | 23.3 | 83.3 | 13.3 | 3.3 | 16.7 |
| Ventura | 51.3 | 24.6 | 75.9 | 18.1 | 6.0 | 24.1 |
| Yolo | 51.9 | 26.5 | 78.4 | 16.7 | 4.9 | 21.6 |
| Yuba | 56.6 | 31.6 | 88.2 | 10.5 | 1.3 | 11.9 |
| **Statewide** | **53.2** | **23.2** | **76.4** | **17.7** | **5.9** | **23.6** |

#### Table 7: Foster Youth Achievement on 2017–18 CAASPP in Mathematics by County

| County | Standard Not Met (%) | Standard Nearly Met (%) | Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%) | Standard Met (%) | Standard Exceeded (%) | Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 64.0 | 23.6 | 87.6 | 6.9 | 5.5 | 12.4 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 63.6 | 31.8 | 95.5 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Butte | 58.4 | 29.7 | 88.1 | 10.8 | 1.1 | 11.9 |
| Calaveras | 67.4 | 18.4 | 85.7 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| Colusa | 51.6 | 38.7 | 90.3 | 6.5 | 3.2 | 9.7 |
| Contra Costa | 69.7 | 20.6 | 90.3 | 7.4 | 2.2 | 9.7 |
| Del Norte | 60.4 | 29.2 | 89.6 | 6.3 | 4.2 | 10.4 |
| El Dorado | 55.1 | 21.3 | 76.4 | 20.5 | 3.2 | 23.6 |
| Fresno | 59.9 | 23.5 | 83.4 | 10.9 | 5.7 | 16.6 |
| Glenn | 47.4 | 42.1 | 89.5 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 10.5 |
| Humboldt | 62.4 | 24.8 | 87.3 | 9.6 | 3.2 | 12.7 |
| Imperial | 59.2 | 27.8 | 87.0 | 10.1 | 3.0 | 13.0 |
| Inyo | 58.3 | 25.0 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
| Kern | 67.9 | 20.5 | 88.4 | 9.0 | 2.6 | 11.6 |
| Kings | 58.2 | 25.3 | 83.5 | 12.6 | 3.9 | 16.5 |
| Lake | 71.4 | 19.1 | 90.5 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 9.5 |
| Lassen | 61.8 | 29.4 | 91.2 | 5.9 | 2.9 | 8.8 |
| Los Angeles | 64.3 | 21.9 | 86.2 | 10.1 | 3.8 | 13.8 |
| Madera | 65.3 | 22.7 | 88.0 | 9.2 | 2.8 | 12.1 |
| Marin | 57.1 | 24.5 | 81.6 | 8.2 | 10.2 | 18.4 |
| Mariposa | 63.6 | 27.3 | 90.9 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
| Mendocino | 70.0 | 23.0 | 93.0 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 7.0 |
| Merced | 70.3 | 21.7 | 92.0 | 5.4 | 2.5 | 8.0 |
| Modoc | 63.6 | 36.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 65.9 | 20.6 | 86.5 | 9.5 | 4.0 | 13.5 |
| Napa | 48.2 | 31.5 | 79.6 | 13.0 | 7.4 | 20.4 |
| Nevada | 64.7 | 17.7 | 82.4 | 11.8 | 5.9 | 17.6 |
| Orange | 58.3 | 23.9 | 82.2 | 12.9 | 4.9 | 17.8 |
| Placer | 57.8 | 25.0 | 82.8 | 11.2 | 6.0 | 17.2 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 63.2 | 23.2 | 86.3 | 10.3 | 3.4 | 13.7 |
| Sacramento | 66.5 | 22.3 | 88.8 | 8.5 | 2.7 | 11.2 |
| San Benito | 72.7 | 9.1 | 81.8 | 13.6 | 4.6 | 18.2 |
| San Bernardino | 66.2 | 21.1 | 87.3 | 9.2 | 3.5 | 12.7 |
| San Diego | 60.5 | 23.9 | 84.4 | 12.2 | 3.4 | 15.6 |
| San Francisco | 64.7 | 21.6 | 86.3 | 10.5 | 3.3 | 13.7 |
| San Joaquin | 68.2 | 20.9 | 89.1 | 8.1 | 2.8 | 10.9 |
| San Luis Obispo | 51.6 | 26.6 | 78.1 | 16.4 | 5.5 | 21.9 |
| San Mateo | 55.9 | 23.7 | 79.6 | 11.8 | 8.6 | 20.4 |
| Santa Barbara | 67.6 | 19.8 | 87.4 | 10.8 | 1.8 | 12.6 |
| Santa Clara | 60.5 | 23.4 | 83.9 | 12.1 | 4.0 | 16.1 |
| Santa Cruz | 64.6 | 24.1 | 88.6 | 8.9 | 2.5 | 11.4 |
| Shasta | 61.7 | 23.9 | 85.6 | 10.6 | 3.9 | 14.5 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 55.9 | 26.5 | 82.4 | 5.9 | 11.8 | 17.6 |
| Solano | 67.5 | 24.7 | 92.3 | 5.2 | 2.6 | 7.7 |
| Sonoma | 51.9 | 27.6 | 79.5 | 16.8 | 3.8 | 20.5 |
| Stanislaus | 69.0 | 17.9 | 86.9 | 9.3 | 3.8 | 13.1 |
| Sutter | 49.3 | 28.8 | 78.1 | 16.4 | 5.5 | 21.9 |
| Tehama | 55.1 | 30.8 | 85.9 | 11.5 | 2.6 | 14.1 |
| Trinity | 53.3 | 33.3 | 86.7 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 13.3 |
| Tulare | 62.2 | 25.0 | 87.2 | 9.8 | 3.0 | 12.8 |
| Tuolumne | 66.7 | 28.6 | 95.2 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 4.8 |
| Ventura | 64.4 | 22.1 | 86.5 | 11.0 | 2.5 | 13.5 |
| Yolo | 62.5 | 24.1 | 86.6 | 9.8 | 3.6 | 13.4 |
| Yuba | 57.0 | 26.7 | 83.7 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 16.3 |
| **Statewide** | **63.6** | **22.6** | **86.3** | **10.1** | **3.6** | **13.8** |

#### Table 8: Foster Youth Achievement on 2018–19 CAASPP in Mathematics by County

| County | Standard Not Met (%) | Standard Nearly Met (%) | Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%) | Standard Met (%) | Standard Exceeded (%) | Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 66.4 | 18.5 | 84.9 | 10.5 | 4.6 | 15.1 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 78.3 | 17.4 | 95.7 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 |
| Butte | 64.9 | 21.2 | 86.1 | 12.7 | 1.2 | 13.9 |
| Calaveras | 53.2 | 31.9 | 85.1 | 10.6 | 4.3 | 14.9 |
| Colusa | 52.6 | 26.3 | 79.0 | 15.8 | 5.3 | 21.1 |
| Contra Costa | 68.0 | 21.0 | 89.0 | 8.5 | 2.5 | 11.0 |
| Del Norte | 56.8 | 24.3 | 81.1 | 16.2 | 2.7 | 18.9 |
| El Dorado | 60.4 | 25.0 | 85.4 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 14.6 |
| Fresno | 62.1 | 20.8 | 82.9 | 10.8 | 6.3 | 17.1 |
| Glenn | 57.7 | 30.8 | 88.5 | 7.7 | 3.9 | 11.5 |
| Humboldt | 57.7 | 24.5 | 82.2 | 14.7 | 3.1 | 17.8 |
| Imperial | 48.4 | 33.5 | 81.9 | 14.9 | 3.2 | 18.1 |
| Inyo | 88.9 | 5.6 | 94.5 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 5.6 |
| Kern | 66.7 | 23.1 | 89.7 | 7.6 | 2.7 | 10.3 |
| Kings | 62.2 | 18.9 | 81.1 | 17.1 | 1.8 | 18.9 |
| Lake | 71.4 | 25.0 | 96.4 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Lassen | 56.7 | 30.0 | 86.7 | 10.0 | 3.3 | 13.3 |
| Los Angeles | 62.8 | 22.1 | 84.8 | 10.7 | 4.5 | 15.2 |
| Madera | 61.8 | 23.6 | 85.4 | 10.6 | 4.1 | 14.6 |
| Marin | 70.5 | 18.2 | 88.6 | 9.1 | 2.3 | 11.4 |
| Mariposa | 78.6 | 21.4 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Mendocino | 72.8 | 18.5 | 91.3 | 6.8 | 1.9 | 8.7 |
| Merced | 65.2 | 23.5 | 88.6 | 8.3 | 3.0 | 11.4 |
| Modoc | 66.7 | 26.7 | 93.3 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 6.7 |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 56.4 | 27.3 | 83.6 | 13.6 | 2.7 | 16.4 |
| Napa | 55.6 | 17.8 | 73.3 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 26.7 |
| Nevada | 66.7 | 20.0 | 86.7 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 13.3 |
| Orange | 57.7 | 23.6 | 81.2 | 11.6 | 7.2 | 18.8 |
| Placer | 54.5 | 22.0 | 76.4 | 14.6 | 8.9 | 23.6 |
| Plumas | 54.6 | 27.3 | 81.8 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 18.2 |
| Riverside | 64.5 | 22.1 | 86.5 | 10.6 | 2.9 | 13.5 |
| Sacramento | 61.9 | 24.1 | 86.0 | 10.4 | 3.5 | 14.0 |
| San Benito | 63.0 | 22.2 | 85.2 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 14.8 |
| San Bernardino | 65.5 | 21.7 | 87.2 | 10.4 | 2.5 | 12.8 |
| San Diego | 55.6 | 27.4 | 83.0 | 12.8 | 4.2 | 17.0 |
| San Francisco | 65.2 | 17.8 | 83.0 | 13.3 | 3.7 | 17.0 |
| San Joaquin | 66.5 | 21.8 | 88.4 | 9.1 | 2.6 | 11.7 |
| San Luis Obispo | 50.8 | 31.2 | 82.0 | 13.1 | 4.9 | 18.0 |
| San Mateo | 62.1 | 20.7 | 82.8 | 13.8 | 3.5 | 17.2 |
| Santa Barbara | 61.2 | 23.3 | 84.5 | 13.2 | 2.3 | 15.5 |
| Santa Clara | 64.3 | 20.2 | 84.5 | 10.1 | 5.4 | 15.5 |
| Santa Cruz | 63.8 | 20.7 | 84.5 | 10.3 | 5.2 | 15.5 |
| Shasta | 61.0 | 27.0 | 88.1 | 10.1 | 1.9 | 12.0 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 72.5 | 15.0 | 87.5 | 5.0 | 7.5 | 12.5 |
| Solano | 66.0 | 19.5 | 85.5 | 9.4 | 5.0 | 14.5 |
| Sonoma | 60.3 | 22.5 | 82.8 | 12.3 | 4.9 | 17.2 |
| Stanislaus | 70.2 | 18.0 | 88.1 | 9.3 | 2.6 | 11.9 |
| Sutter | 55.4 | 27.7 | 83.1 | 13.3 | 3.6 | 16.9 |
| Tehama | 71.1 | 18.4 | 89.5 | 6.6 | 4.0 | 10.5 |
| Trinity | 61.5 | 30.8 | 92.3 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 7.7 |
| Tulare | 60.9 | 25.2 | 86.0 | 11.2 | 2.8 | 14.0 |
| Tuolumne | 63.3 | 23.3 | 86.7 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 13.3 |
| Ventura | 60.5 | 26.2 | 86.7 | 9.9 | 3.4 | 13.3 |
| Yolo | 60.3 | 24.8 | 85.1 | 10.6 | 4.4 | 14.9 |
| Yuba | 60.0 | 32.0 | 92.0 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 8.0 |
| **Statewide** | **62.8** | **22.6** | **85.4** | **10.7** | **4.0** | **14.6** |

Table 9 compares the statewide suspension rates between foster youth and non-foster youth for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years. The total count of students suspended was calculated using both in-school and out-of-school suspensions. If a student is suspended multiple times, the student is counted only once, providing an unduplicated count of students suspended. Suspensions are calculated by dividing the unduplicated count of students suspended by the cumulative enrollment at the selected entity. In both school years, foster youth were suspended over four times the rate of non-foster youth.

Table 10 compares the suspension rates for foster youth by grade span for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years. Foster youth in kindergarten through grade three were suspended the least, with a suspension rate in 2018–19 of 5.2 percent. Foster youth in grades seven through eight were suspended the most in 2018–19, with a rate of 24.9 percent. Overall, every grade span saw a decline in the percent of students suspended between the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years, with the exception of foster youth in grades seven through eight. The suspension rate for foster youth in grades seven through eight increased from 24.7 percent in 2017–18 to 24.9 percent in 2018–19. The overall statewide suspension rate for foster youth decreased by 0.1 percent from a rate of 15.2 in 2017–18 to 15.1 in 2018–19.

Table 11 shows the suspension rate and unduplicated count of foster youth who were suspended one or more times during the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years by county. In the 2017–18 school year, the total unduplicated count of foster youth suspended was 7,651. In 2018–19, the total unduplicated count of foster youth suspended was 7,070. This is a decrease of 581 foster youth. As seen in Table 11, the suspension rates for foster youth vary by county, ranging from the lowest suspension rate for foster youth in 2017–18 of 0.0 percent in Plumas County to 30.4 percent in Mariposa County. In 2018–19 the lowest suspension rate for foster youth was 2.0 percent in Inyo County, and the highest suspension rate was 29.8 percent in Mariposa County.

The decrease in the statewide number (581 foster youth) and percentage (0.1 percent) of foster youth suspended, as well as the highest suspension rate by county decreasing from 30.4 percent to 29.8 percent (a decrease of .6 percent) point to a measurable benefit in part due to the FYSCP, which provided comprehensive communication, coaching, and training among the county-administered FYSCPs. Counties with a reduced suspension rate were able to share best practices statewide to help counties with the most suspensions and reduce the number of suspensions statewide.

#### Table 9: Suspension of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| Academic Year | Foster Youth (%) | Non-Foster Youth (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2017–18 | 15.2 | 3.4 |
| 2018–19 | 15.1 | 3.4 |

#### Table 10: Suspension of Foster Youth by Grade Span for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| Academic Year | Kindergarten–Third (%) | Fourth–Sixth (%) | Seventh–Eighth (%) | Ninth–Twelfth (%) | All Grades(%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2017–18 | 5.4 | 12.2 | 24.7 | 23.1 | **15.2** |
| 2018–19 | 5.2 | 12.1 | 24.9 | 22.6 | **15.1** |

#### Table 11: Suspension of Foster Youth by County for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| County | 2017–18 Suspension (%) | 2017–18 Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Suspended One or More Times (N) | 2018–19 Suspension (%) | 2018–19 Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Suspended One or More Times (N) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 13.3 | 136 | 13.7 | 121 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 14.5 | 11 | 2.8 | 2 |
| Butte | 16.5 | 80 | 15.8 | 74 |
| Calaveras | 11.3 | 18 | 16.4 | 27 |
| Colusa | 10.4 | 7 | 8.2 | 5 |
| Contra Costa | 15.9 | 177 | 18.6 | 182 |
| Del Norte | 9.9 | 12 | 23.9 | 21 |
| El Dorado | 8.2 | 53 | 5.5 | 27 |
| Fresno | 19.8 | 472 | 20.8 | 470 |
| Glenn | 14.3 | 11 | 13.4 | 9 |
| Humboldt | 18.4 | 74 | 16.4 | 63 |
| Imperial | 9.6 | 42 | 8.6 | 39 |
| Inyo | 1.4 | 2 | 2.0 | 2 |
| Kern | 14.4 | 291 | 15.1 | 272 |
| Kings | 18.1 | 82 | 14.3 | 57 |
| Lake | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Lassen | 16 | 16 | 22.3 | 21 |
| Los Angeles | 11.3 | 1,926 | 11.4 | 1,794 |
| Madera | 18.5 | 84 | 20.5 | 76 |
| Marin | 17.9 | 29 | 13.5 | 20 |
| Mariposa | 30.4 | 21 | 29.8 | 17 |
| Mendocino | 24.6 | 56 | 24.5 | 63 |
| Merced | 14.6 | 121 | 14.1 | 112 |
| Modoc | 26.8 | 15 | 23.5 | 8 |
| Mono | 9.1 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 10.3 | 38 | 10.1 | 29 |
| Napa | 14.5 | 20 | 11.2 | 16 |
| Nevada | 7.3 | 14 | 5.9 | 9 |
| Orange | 9.7 | 261 | 8.2 | 214 |
| Placer | 10 | 41 | 8.9 | 34 |
| Plumas | 0.0 | 0 | 24.3 | 9 |
| Riverside | 14.8 | 682 | 14.3 | 579 |
| Sacramento | 19.4 | 449 | 20.1 | 414 |
| San Benito | 20.3 | 16 | 11.3 | 9 |
| San Bernardino | 13.8 | 919 | 13.2 | 818 |
| San Diego | 13.5 | 308 | 13.8 | 263 |
| San Francisco | 6.7 | 49 | 7.8 | 55 |
| San Joaquin | 17.3 | 297 | 17.8 | 287 |
| San Luis Obispo | 12.2 | 46 | 15.6 | 55 |
| San Mateo | 12.7 | 40 | 14.2 | 37 |
| Santa Barbara | 17.1 | 65 | 15.7 | 62 |
| Santa Clara | 13.2 | 149 | 12.7 | 123 |
| Santa Cruz | 11.9 | 32 | 16.3 | 33 |
| Shasta | 15.6 | 71 | 15.7 | 70 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 10.0 | 10 | 9.3 | 10 |
| Solano | 17 | 93 | 17 | 85 |
| Sonoma | 12.3 | 77 | 12.6 | 76 |
| Stanislaus | 16.7 | 161 | 15.8 | 144 |
| Sutter | 12.9 | 34 | 12.5 | 27 |
| Tehama | 11.1 | 22 | 11.8 | 22 |
| Trinity | 11.5 | 9 | 7.2 | 5 |
| Tulare | 10.9 | 130 | 13.4 | 159 |
| Tuolumne | 16.3 | 13 | 15.9 | 14 |
| Ventura | 11.6 | 99 | 15.3 | 108 |
| Yolo | 17.5 | 69 | 12.2 | 50 |
| Yuba | 13.8 | 36 | 14.9 | 35 |
| **Statewide** | **15.2** | **7,651** | **15.1** | **7,070** |

Tables 12 and 13 below show the unduplicated count of expelled foster youth and the expulsion rates for foster youth by county of enrollment in the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years, respectively. Tables 12 and 13 also include the total cumulative enrollment of foster youth for reference. As seen in Table 12, in 2017–18, the statewide expulsion rate for foster youth was 0.3 percent. In Table 13, we see the statewide expulsion rate for foster youth was 0.4 percent. While the expulsion rate for foster youth increased, the total unduplicated count of foster youth who were expelled decreased by 17, going from 187 in 2017–18 to 170 in 2018–19.

#### Table 12: Expulsion of Foster Youth by County for 2017–18

| County | Cumulative Enrollment Foster Youth  (N) | Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Expelled (N) | Foster Youth Expulsion Rate  (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 1,026 | 3 | 0.3 |
| Alpine | 0 | \* | \* |
| Amador | 76 | 0 | 0 |
| Butte | 486 | 2 | 0.4 |
| Calaveras | 160 | 1 | 0.6 |
| Colusa | 67 | 0 | 0 |
| Contra Costa | 1,112 | 0 | 0 |
| Del Norte | 121 | 0 | 0 |
| El Dorado | 650 | 1 | 0.2 |
| Fresno | 2,381 | 20 | 0.8 |
| Glenn | 77 | 0 | 0 |
| Humboldt | 402 | 2 | 0.5 |
| Imperial | 436 | 2 | 0.5 |
| Inyo | 145 | 1 | 0.7 |
| Kern | 2,027 | 4 | 0.2 |
| Kings | 453 | 7 | 1.5 |
| Lake | 81 | 0 | 0 |
| Lassen | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | 17,041 | 21 | 0.1 |
| Madera | 454 | 1 | 0.2 |
| Marin | 162 | 0 | 0 |
| Mariposa | 69 | 0 | 0 |
| Mendocino | 228 | 1 | 0.4 |
| Merced | 827 | 6 | 0.7 |
| Modoc | 56 | 0 | 0 |
| Mono | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| Monterey | 368 | 0 | 0 |
| Napa | 138 | 1 | 0.7 |
| Nevada | 193 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Orange | 2,683 | 5 | 0.2 |
| Placer | 410 | 0 | 0 |
| Plumas | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | 4,618 | 28 | 0.6 |
| Sacramento | 2,313 | 6 | 0.3 |
| San Benito | 79 | 1 | 1.3 |
| San Bernardino | 6,645 | 24 | 0.4 |
| San Diego | 2,289 | 7 | 0.3 |
| San Francisco | 729 | 0 | 0 |
| San Joaquin | 1,715 | 5 | 0.3 |
| San Luis Obispo | 378 | 2 | 0.5 |
| San Mateo | 316 | 0 | 0 |
| Santa Barbara | 380 | 1 | 0.3 |
| Santa Clara | 1,125 | 1 | 0.1 |
| Santa Cruz | 270 | 3 | 1.1 |
| Shasta | 454 | 0 | 0 |
| Sierra | 2 | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Solano | 547 | 2 | 0.4 |
| Sonoma | 627 | 2 | 0.3 |
| Stanislaus | 963 | 7 | 0.7 |
| Sutter | 264 | 0 | 0 |
| Tehama | 198 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Trinity | 78 | 0 | 0 |
| Tulare | 1,197 | 11 | 0.9 |
| Tuolumne | 80 | 0 | 0 |
| Ventura | 854 | 6 | 0.7 |
| Yolo | 394 | 0 | 0 |
| Yuba | 261 | 1 | 0.4 |
| **Statewide** | **50,247** | **187** | **0.3** |

#### Table 13: Expulsion of Foster Youth by County for 2018–19

| County | Cumulative Enrollment Foster Youth  (N) | Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Expelled (N) | Foster Youth Expulsion Rate  (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 884 | 2 | 0.2 |
| Alpine | 2 | \* | \* |
| Amador | 71 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Butte | 468 | 2 | 0.4 |
| Calaveras | 165 | 1 | 0.6 |
| Colusa | 61 | 1 | 1.6 |
| Contra Costa | 976 | 3 | 0.3 |
| Del Norte | 88 | \* | \* |
| El Dorado | 492 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Fresno | 2,256 | 17 | 0.8 |
| Glenn | 67 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Humboldt | 385 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Imperial | 453 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Inyo | 99 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Kern | 1,801 | 2 | 0.1 |
| Kings | 398 | 7 | 1.8 |
| Lake | 70 | 1 | 1.4 |
| Lassen | 94 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Los Angeles | 15,697 | 16 | 0.1 |
| Madera | 371 | 1 | 0.3 |
| Marin | 148 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mariposa | 57 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mendocino | 257 | 1 | 0.4 |
| Merced | 794 | 5 | 0.6 |
| Modoc | 34 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mono | 6 | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 288 | 2 | 0.7 |
| Napa | 143 | 2 | 1.4 |
| Nevada | 152 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Orange | 2,617 | 6 | 0.2 |
| Placer | 384 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Plumas | 37 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Riverside | 4,044 | 38 | 0.9 |
| Sacramento | 2,063 | 8 | 0.4 |
| San Benito | 80 | 0 | 0.0 |
| San Bernardino | 6,197 | 20 | 0.3 |
| San Diego | 1,907 | 7 | 0.4 |
| San Francisco | 702 | 0 | 0.0 |
| San Joaquin | 1,612 | 4 | 0.2 |
| San Luis Obispo | 353 | 2 | 0.6 |
| San Mateo | 260 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 394 | 1 | 0.3 |
| Santa Clara | 965 | 1 | 0.1 |
| Santa Cruz | 202 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Shasta | 447 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Sierra | 6 | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 108 | 1 | 0.9 |
| Solano | 501 | 4 | 0.8 |
| Sonoma | 601 | 2 | 0.3 |
| Stanislaus | 911 | 3 | 0.3 |
| Sutter | 216 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tehama | 187 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Trinity | 69 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tulare | 1,186 | 7 | 0.6 |
| Tuolumne | 88 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Ventura | 705 | 2 | 0.3 |
| Yolo | 409 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Yuba | 235 | 1 | 0.4 |
| **Statewide** | **46,810** | **170** | **0.4** |

Tables 14 and 15 provide the cumulative enrollment counts, number of foster youth receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility, and the detention rates by county for foster youth in the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years, respectively. The statewide juvenile detention rate for foster youth decreased by 0.5 percentage points from 2017–18 to 2018–19, from 9.0 percent to 8.5 percent, representing over 570 fewer foster youth receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility. When youth are placed in a juvenile detention facility, they are required to change schools; the decrease in the juvenile detention rate and the decrease in the number of foster youth who were placed in a juvenile detention facility illustrates significant and continued success for the foster youth population and speaks to the coordinated efforts to decrease school changes for foster youth.

#### Table 14: Foster Youth Juvenile Detention Placements by County for 2017–18

| County | Cumulative Enrollment (N) | Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools (N) | Juvenile Detention Rate (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 1,026 | 151 | 14.7 |
| Alpine | 0 | \* | \* |
| Amador | 76 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Butte | 486 | 15 | 3.1 |
| Calaveras | 160 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Colusa | 67 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Contra Costa | 1,112 | 90 | 8.1 |
| Del Norte | 121 | 14 | 11.6 |
| El Dorado | 650 | 322 | 49.5 |
| Fresno | 2,381 | 213 | 8.9 |
| Glenn | 77 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Humboldt | 402 | 13 | 3.2 |
| Imperial | 436 | 38 | 8.7 |
| Inyo | 145 | 1 | 0.7 |
| Kern | 2,027 | 447 | 22.1 |
| Kings | 453 | 19 | 4.2 |
| Lake | 81 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Lassen | 100 | 8 | 8.0 |
| Los Angeles | 17,041 | 1,492 | 8.8 |
| Madera | 454 | 24 | 5.3 |
| Marin | 162 | 21 | 13.0 |
| Mariposa | 69 | 0 | \* |
| Mendocino | 228 | 16 | 7.0 |
| Merced | 827 | 41 | 5.0 |
| Modoc | 56 | 22 | 39.3 |
| Mono | 11 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Monterey | 368 | 45 | 12.2 |
| Napa | 138 | 12 | 8.7 |
| Nevada | 193 | 15 | 7.8 |
| Orange | 2,683 | 334 | 12.4 |
| Placer | 410 | 39 | 9.5 |
| Plumas | 12 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Riverside | 4,618 | 242 | 5.2 |
| Sacramento | 2,313 | 260 | 11.2 |
| San Benito | 79 | 1 | 1.3 |
| San Bernardino | 6,645 | 277 | 4.2 |
| San Diego | 2,289 | 324 | 14.2 |
| San Francisco | 729 | 50 | 6.9 |
| San Joaquin | 1,715 | 205 | 12.0 |
| San Luis Obispo | 378 | 31 | 8.2 |
| San Mateo | 316 | 43 | 13.6 |
| Santa Barbara | 380 | 62 | 16.3 |
| Santa Clara | 1,125 | 100 | 8.9 |
| Santa Cruz | 270 | 23 | 8.5 |
| Shasta | 454 | 17 | 3.7 |
| Sierra | 2 | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 100 | 6 | 6.0 |
| Solano | 547 | 34 | 6.2 |
| Sonoma | 627 | 58 | 9.3 |
| Stanislaus | 963 | 46 | 4.8 |
| Sutter | 264 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tehama | 198 | 26 | 13.1 |
| Trinity | 78 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tulare | 1,197 | 48 | 4.0 |
| Tuolumne | 80 | 7 | 8.8 |
| Ventura | 854 | 77 | 9.0 |
| Yolo | 394 | 19 | 4.8 |
| Yuba | 261 | 15 | 5.7 |
| **Statewide** | 50,247 | 4,540 | 9.0 |

#### Table 15: Foster Youth Juvenile Detention Placements by County for 2018–19

| County | Cumulative Enrollment(N) | Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools (N) | Juvenile Detention Rate (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 884 | 121 | 13.7 |
| Alpine | 2 | \* | \* |
| Amador | 71 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Butte | 468 | 12 | 2.6 |
| Calaveras | 165 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Colusa | 61 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Contra Costa | 976 | 76 | 7.8 |
| Del Norte | 88 | 7 | 8.0 |
| El Dorado | 492 | 241 | 49.0 |
| Fresno | 2,256 | 186 | 8.2 |
| Glenn | 67 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Humboldt | 385 | 19 | 4.9 |
| Imperial | 453 | 18 | 4.0 |
| Inyo | 99 | 1 | 1.0 |
| Kern | 1,801 | 405 | 22.5 |
| Kings | 398 | 24 | 6.0 |
| Lake | 70 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Lassen | 94 | 12 | 12.8 |
| Los Angeles | 15,697 | 1,167 | 7.4 |
| Madera | 371 | 31 | 8.4 |
| Marin | 148 | 22 | 14.9 |
| Mariposa | 57 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mendocino | 257 | 16 | 6.2 |
| Merced | 794 | 36 | 4.5 |
| Modoc | 34 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mono | 6 | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 288 | 35 | 12.2 |
| Napa | 143 | 16 | 11.2 |
| Nevada | 152 | 12 | 7.9 |
| Orange | 2,617 | 337 | 12.9 |
| Placer | 384 | 31 | 8.1 |
| Plumas | 37 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Riverside | 4,044 | 184 | 4.5 |
| Sacramento | 2,063 | 232 | 11.2 |
| San Benito | 80 | 3 | 3.8 |
| San Bernardino | 6,197 | 235 | 3.8 |
| San Diego | 1,907 | 266 | 13.9 |
| San Francisco | 702 | 89 | 12.7 |
| San Joaquin | 1,612 | 132 | 8.2 |
| San Luis Obispo | 353 | 25 | 7.1 |
| San Mateo | 260 | 31 | 11.9 |
| Santa Barbara | 394 | 39 | 9.9 |
| Santa Clara | 965 | 70 | 7.3 |
| Santa Cruz | 202 | 13 | 6.4 |
| Shasta | 447 | 37 | 8.3 |
| Sierra | 6 | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 108 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Solano | 501 | 35 | 7.0 |
| Sonoma | 601 | 59 | 9.8 |
| Stanislaus | 911 | 67 | 7.4 |
| Sutter | 216 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tehama | 187 | 26 | 13.9 |
| Trinity | 69 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tulare | 1,186 | 45 | 3.8 |
| Tuolumne | 88 | 6 | 6.8 |
| Ventura | 705 | 67 | 9.5 |
| Yolo | 409 | 18 | 4.4 |
| Yuba | 235 | 13 | 5.5 |
| **Statewide** | 46,810 | 3,964 | 8.5 |

The previous truancy data and reports collected by the CDE were collected and reported to the CDE in aggregate form. This did not allow for detailed analyses or reporting in such a way as to understand the educational experiences of foster youth and whether they were attending school on a regular basis. In order to collect more meaningful data, the CDE discontinued the collection of truancy data in 2016 and began instead collecting data on chronic absence. As such, this report does not include truancy reports for foster youth and now includes chronic absence reports.

Chronic absence is calculated by dividing the unduplicated count of students determined to be chronically absent by the total number of students who were eligible[[41]](#footnote-41) to be included in the chronic absence calculation. When a student is absent for 10 percent or more of their enrolled instructional days, the students is considered to be chronically absent, regardless of the reason for the absence.

Table 16 below compares the percentage of foster youth who were chronically absent with non-foster youth for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years. While the statewide chronic absence rates for both foster and non-foster youth increased, foster youth were chronically absent more than double the rate of non-foster youth in both school years.

Table 17 below shows the chronic absence rate for foster youth for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years by grade span: kindergarten, grades one through three, four through six, seven through eight, and nine through twelve. Each grade span saw an increase in the percent of chronically absent foster youth between school years, ranging from a three percent increase for foster youth in kindergarten to an increase of less than one percent in grades four through six.

Table 18 below shows the chronic absence rate for foster youth for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years by county and statewide. From the 2017–18 school year to the 2018–19 school year there were 34 counties with an increase in the foster youth chronic absence rate, 21 counties with a decrease, and three counties with no reportable rate for a year-to-year comparison.

#### Table 16: Chronic Absence of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| Academic Year | Foster Youth Chronic Absence (%) | Non-Foster Youth Chronic Absence (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2017–18 | 26.2 | 11.0 |
| 2018–19 | 27.7 | 12.1 |

#### Table 17: Foster Youth Chronic Absence by Grade Span for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| Academic Year | Kindergarten (%) | One–Three (%) | Four–Six (%) | Seven–Eight (%) | Nine–Twlve (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2017–18 | 21.8 | 15.7 | 15.9 | 25.7 | 42 |
| 2018–19 | 24.6 | 17.1 | 16.4 | 27.7 | 43.4 |

#### Table 18: Foster Youth Chronic Absence by County for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| County | 2017–18  Foster Youth Chronic Absence (%) | 2018–19  Foster Youth Chronic Absence (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 39 | 45.2 |
| Alpine | \* | \* |
| Amador | 29 | 14.5 |
| Butte | 30.4 | 30 |
| Calaveras | 25.5 | 26.6 |
| Colusa | 20.3 | 14.8 |
| Contra Costa | 26.5 | 30.5 |
| Del Norte | 23.9 | 26.2 |
| El Dorado | 15.6 | 19.3 |
| Fresno | 27.9 | 27.5 |
| Glenn | 26.1 | 29.5 |
| Humboldt | 27.7 | 22.7 |
| Imperial | 30.7 | 20.7 |
| Inyo | 71 | 72.1 |
| Kern | 25.3 | 22 |
| Kings | 19.9 | 21.9 |
| Lake | 28.8 | 36.4 |
| Lassen | 18.9 | 24.4 |
| Los Angeles | 25.6 | 28.9 |
| Madera | 25.6 | 26.3 |
| Marin | 26.6 | 27.5 |
| Mariposa | 37.5 | 52.3 |
| Mendocino | 31.2 | 34 |
| Merced | 23.8 | 25.5 |
| Modoc | 41.7 | 20.7 |
| Mono | 80.0 | \* |
| Monterey | 25.9 | 24.7 |
| Napa | 22 | 38.9 |
| Nevada | 46.3 | 46.9 |
| Orange | 27.7 | 27.6 |
| Placer | 18.6 | 17.4 |
| Plumas | 41.7 | 42.4 |
| Riverside | 24 | 24.2 |
| Sacramento | 33.8 | 31.5 |
| San Benito | 15.6 | 25.7 |
| San Bernardino | 21.8 | 22.9 |
| San Diego | 28.9 | 29 |
| San Francisco | 52.9 | 54 |
| San Joaquin | 26.1 | 25.3 |
| San Luis Obispo | 21.9 | 25 |
| San Mateo | 34.4 | 30.8 |
| Santa Barbara | 28.2 | 35.1 |
| Santa Clara | 40.4 | 36.7 |
| Santa Cruz | 31.3 | 31.8 |
| Shasta | 19.4 | 18.9 |
| Sierra | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 21.6 | 30.6 |
| Solano | 25.5 | 23.7 |
| Sonoma | 31 | 29.1 |
| Stanislaus | 28.7 | 25.5 |
| Sutter | 24.7 | 18.2 |
| Tehama | 21.2 | 20.5 |
| Trinity | 20 | 25.4 |
| Tulare | 17.4 | 18.8 |
| Tuolumne | 20.6 | 31.2 |
| Ventura | 29.3 | 33.1 |
| Yolo | 30.8 | 32.2 |
| Yuba | 16.1 | 22.9 |
| **Statewide** | **26.2** | **27.7** |

Tables 19 and 20 display the attendance rates by county for foster youth in 2017–18 and 2018–19, respectively. The cumulative enrollment numbers for foster youth are included for reference. Attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days the foster youth attended school by the total number of days they were expected to attend school. Table 19 shows a range in attendance rates by county from 78.3 percent in Inyo County to 94.4 percent in Yuba County in 2017–18. In 2018–19 the attendance rates ranged from 78.3 percent in Inyo County to 94.6 percent in Amador County, as seen in Table 20. The statewide attendance rate decreased from 91.9 percent in 2017–18 to 91.4 percent in 2018–19.

#### Table 19: Foster Youth Attendance by County for 2017–18

| County | Cumulative Enrollment (N) | Days Attended (N) | Days Expected to Attend (N) | Attendance Rate (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 1,026 | 111,080 | 128,585 | 86.4 |
| Alpine | 0 | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 76 | 8,371 | 9,200 | 91.0 |
| Butte | 486 | 61,919 | 68,552 | 90.3 |
| Calaveras | 160 | 19,375 | 21,023 | 92.2 |
| Colusa | 67 | 7,847 | 8,362 | 93.8 |
| Contra Costa | 1,112 | 132,032 | 144,136 | 91.6 |
| Del Norte | 121 | 16,815 | 18,175 | 92.5 |
| El Dorado | 650 | 62,846 | 67,229 | 93.5 |
| Fresno | 2,381 | 316,030 | 342,536 | 92.3 |
| Glenn | 77 | 9,768 | 10,610 | 92.1 |
| Humboldt | 402 | 55,625 | 60,776 | 91.5 |
| Imperial | 436 | 59,477 | 64,455 | 92.3 |
| Inyo | 145 | 9,007 | 11,503 | 78.3 |
| Kern | 2,027 | 269,547 | 290,946 | 92.6 |
| Kings | 453 | 64,937 | 69,566 | 93.3 |
| Lake | 81 | 8,984 | 9,851 | 91.2 |
| Lassen | 100 | 11,379 | 12,250 | 92.9 |
| Los Angeles | 17,041 | 2,371,818 | 2,573,906 | 92.1 |
| Madera | 454 | 52,566 | 56,521 | 93.0 |
| Marin | 162 | 15,161 | 16,779 | 90.4 |
| Mariposa | 69 | 6,139 | 6,865 | 89.4 |
| Mendocino | 228 | 31,617 | 34,805 | 90.8 |
| Merced | 827 | 93,252 | 100,793 | 92.5 |
| Modoc | 56 | 5,446 | 5,967 | 91.3 |
| Mono | 11 | 456 | 545 | 83.7 |
| Monterey | 368 | 47,702 | 51,427 | 92.8 |
| Napa | 138 | 16,830 | 18,080 | 93.1 |
| Nevada | 193 | 11,892 | 13,701 | 86.8 |
| Orange | 2,683 | 354,852 | 388,848 | 91.3 |
| Placer | 410 | 49,220 | 52,374 | 94.0 |
| Plumas | 12 | 1,414 | 1,662 | 85.1 |
| Riverside | 4,618 | 551,216 | 594,901 | 92.7 |
| Sacramento | 2,313 | 267,005 | 295,504 | 90.4 |
| San Benito | 79 | 7,771 | 8,338 | 93.2 |
| San Bernardino | 6,645 | 792,715 | 848,437 | 93.4 |
| San Diego | 2,289 | 303,825 | 332,968 | 91.2 |
| San Francisco | 729 | 67,048 | 82,293 | 81.5 |
| San Joaquin | 1,715 | 202,540 | 219,823 | 92.1 |
| San Luis Obispo | 378 | 49,849 | 53,873 | 92.5 |
| San Mateo | 316 | 38,779 | 43,192 | 89.8 |
| Santa Barbara | 380 | 44,573 | 49,023 | 90.9 |
| Santa Clara | 1,125 | 132,655 | 151,891 | 87.3 |
| Santa Cruz | 270 | 32,148 | 35,513 | 90.5 |
| Shasta | 454 | 53,852 | 57,320 | 93.9 |
| Sierra | 2 | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 100 | 12,138 | 12,994 | 93.4 |
| Solano | 547 | 64,230 | 70,597 | 91.0 |
| Sonoma | 627 | 71,557 | 79,762 | 89.7 |
| Stanislaus | 963 | 103,583 | 112,709 | 91.9 |
| Sutter | 264 | 25,481 | 27,335 | 93.2 |
| Tehama | 198 | 24,233 | 25,935 | 93.4 |
| Trinity | 78 | 7,662 | 8,459 | 90.6 |
| Tulare | 1,197 | 170,087 | 181,853 | 93.5 |
| Tuolumne | 80 | 8,316 | 8,927 | 93.2 |
| Ventura | 854 | 95,326 | 104,627 | 91.1 |
| Yolo | 394 | 47,991 | 52,656 | 91.1 |
| Yuba | 261 | 30,251 | 32,044 | 94.4 |
| **Statewide** | **50,247** | **7,489,342** | **8,152,194** | **91.9** |

#### Table 20: Foster Youth Attendance by County for 2018–19

| County | Cumulative Enrollment (N) | Days Attended (N) | Days Expected to Attend (N) | Attendance Rate (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 884 | 93,214 | 110,449 | 84.4 |
| Alpine | 2 | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 71 | 8,240 | 8,711 | 94.6 |
| Butte | 468 | 55,197 | 60,912 | 90.6 |
| Calaveras | 165 | 19,162 | 20,843 | 91.9 |
| Colusa | 61 | 7,187 | 7,621 | 94.3 |
| Contra Costa | 976 | 113,668 | 126,662 | 89.7 |
| Del Norte | 88 | 12,382 | 13,593 | 91.1 |
| El Dorado | 492 | 48,198 | 51,155 | 94.2 |
| Fresno | 2,256 | 308,273 | 334,115 | 92.3 |
| Glenn | 67 | 8,574 | 9,414 | 91.1 |
| Humboldt | 385 | 55,303 | 61,075 | 90.5 |
| Imperial | 453 | 66,931 | 71,437 | 93.7 |
| Inyo | 99 | 7,665 | 9,783 | 78.3 |
| Kern | 1,801 | 243,371 | 261,559 | 93.0 |
| Kings | 398 | 55,021 | 59,474 | 92.5 |
| Lake | 70 | 8,914 | 9,810 | 90.9 |
| Lassen | 94 | 11,015 | 11,765 | 93.6 |
| Los Angeles | 15,697 | 2,177,718 | 2,385,850 | 91.3 |
| Madera | 371 | 44,990 | 48,160 | 93.4 |
| Marin | 148 | 13,736 | 15,099 | 91.0 |
| Mariposa | 57 | 5,113 | 5,879 | 87.0 |
| Mendocino | 257 | 35,565 | 40,059 | 88.8 |
| Merced | 794 | 91,202 | 98,734 | 92.4 |
| Modoc | 34 | 4,770 | 5,110 | 93.3 |
| Mono | 6 | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 288 | 37,802 | 40,704 | 92.9 |
| Napa | 143 | 16,783 | 18,491 | 90.8 |
| Nevada | 152 | 10,614 | 12,160 | 87.3 |
| Orange | 2,617 | 353,270 | 388,441 | 90.9 |
| Placer | 384 | 44,086 | 47,062 | 93.7 |
| Plumas | 37 | 4,223 | 4,705 | 89.7 |
| Riverside | 4,044 | 481,945 | 519,576 | 92.8 |
| Sacramento | 2,063 | 246,666 | 272,512 | 90.5 |
| San Benito | 80 | 8,742 | 9,430 | 92.7 |
| San Bernardino | 6,197 | 746,851 | 803,649 | 92.9 |
| San Diego | 1,907 | 256,370 | 281,000 | 91.2 |
| San Francisco | 702 | 65,222 | 81,095 | 80.4 |
| San Joaquin | 1,612 | 190,448 | 206,588 | 92.2 |
| San Luis Obispo | 353 | 47,784 | 52,136 | 91.7 |
| San Mateo | 260 | 32,166 | 35,435 | 90.8 |
| Santa Barbara | 394 | 45,852 | 51,096 | 89.7 |
| Santa Clara | 965 | 116,014 | 132,738 | 87.4 |
| Santa Cruz | 202 | 25,572 | 27,881 | 91.7 |
| Shasta | 447 | 54,303 | 58,364 | 93.0 |
| Sierra | 6 | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 108 | 14,295 | 15,718 | 90.9 |
| Solano | 501 | 60,145 | 65,172 | 92.3 |
| Sonoma | 601 | 76,835 | 84,796 | 90.6 |
| Stanislaus | 911 | 94,968 | 103,303 | 91.9 |
| Sutter | 216 | 24,498 | 26,071 | 94.0 |
| Tehama | 187 | 21,749 | 23,289 | 93.4 |
| Trinity | 69 | 7,242 | 7,834 | 92.4 |
| Tulare | 1,186 | 167,978 | 179,966 | 93.3 |
| Tuolumne | 88 | 10,875 | 11,977 | 90.8 |
| Ventura | 705 | 79,470 | 89,542 | 88.8 |
| Yolo | 409 | 51,863 | 57,328 | 90.5 |
| Yuba | 235 | 26,154 | 28,065 | 93.2 |
| **Statewide** | 46,810 | 6,958,375 | 7,613,047 | 91.4 |

Table 21 contains a three-year view of the adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR)[[42]](#footnote-42) for foster and non-foster youth as well as the change in graduation rates from 2018 to 2019 (one-year change) and from 2017 to 2019 (two-year change). As seen in Table 21, the ACGR for both foster youth and non-foster youth has been increasing. What is important to note is that the ACGR for foster youth is increasing at a higher rate than for non-foster youth. The one-year change for foster youth was 2.9 percent and only 1.5 percent for non-foster youth. The two-year change for foster youth was 5.2 percent and for non-foster youth it was 1.8 percent. This indicates success in the efforts aimed at closing the achievement gap for foster youth.

Table 22 contains the 2018 and 2019 Dashboard graduation rate for foster youth and all students,[[43]](#footnote-43) which is a combined one-year, four-year, and five-year graduation rate. Table 22 shows that while the combined graduation rate for foster youth was 19 percent lower than for all students in 2019, the combined graduation rate for foster youth increased from 2018 to 2019 by 5.2 percent, whereas the combined graduation rate for all students increased by only 2.4 percent. This increase in percentage of students graduating high school again points to the success of increased supports and services schools and districts continue to provide to foster youth. It also points to a clear success of the training and supports county FYSCPs have provided to schools and districts around aligning services to support the needs of foster youth in graduating high school.

Because the state of California’s accountability model, which includes the Dashboard, is focused on schools and school districts, the Dashboard does not report outcomes by county. As such, in order to report on high school completion data by county, this report includes outcome data as reported on DataQuest, the CDE’s public reporting data system. Table 23 contains the ACGR for foster youth by county and statewide for the 2018 and 2019 graduation years. As seen in Table 22, Table 23 also shows an increase in graduation rates for foster youth from 53.1 percent in 2018 to 56 percent in 2019.

#### Table 21: Graduation Rates for Foster and Non-Foster Youth between 2017 and 2019

| Student Group | 2017 (%) | 2018 (%) | 2019 (%) | 1-Year Change 2018 to 2019 (%) | 2-Year Change in 2017 to 2019 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Foster Youth | 50.8 | 53.1 | 56.0 | 2.9 | 5.2 |
| Non-Foster Youth | 83.1 | 83.4 | 84.9 | 1.5 | 1.8 |

#### Table 22: Dashboard High School Graduation Rate of Foster Youth and All Students for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| Academic Year | Graduation Rate Foster Youth (%) | Graduation Rate All Students (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2018 | 59 | 83.5 |
| 2019 | 64.2 | 85.9 |

#### Table 23: ACGR for Foster Youth by County for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| County | 2018 Graduation Rate (%) | 2019 Graduation Rate (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 45.2 | 56.6 |
| Alpine | \* | \* |
| Amador | 81.8 | \* |
| Butte | 69.6 | 58.8 |
| Calaveras | 57.1 | 88.2 |
| Colusa | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 60.9 | 66.2 |
| Del Norte | \* | \* |
| El Dorado | 48.9 | 64 |
| Fresno | 49.8 | 48.4 |
| Glenn | \* | \* |
| Humboldt | 71.1 | 80 |
| Imperial | 58.6 | 82.8 |
| Inyo | 25.8 | 19 |
| Kern | 61.1 | 60.8 |
| Kings | 63 | 55.4 |
| Lake | 46.2 | \* |
| Lassen | \* | 69.2 |
| Los Angeles | 51 | 54.1 |
| Madera | 52.5 | 51.4 |
| Marin | 45 | 71.4 |
| Mariposa | \* | 90.9 |
| Mendocino | 58.3 | 66.7 |
| Merced | 60.3 | 70.5 |
| Modoc | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 45.5 | 63.2 |
| Napa | 80 | 52.2 |
| Nevada | 28.9 | 31.4 |
| Orange | 59.9 | 60.1 |
| Placer | 70.8 | 66.7 |
| Plumas | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 58.6 | 66.3 |
| Sacramento | 44.7 | 51.1 |
| San Benito | \* | 64.3 |
| San Bernardino | 55.7 | 57.8 |
| San Diego | 47.7 | 48.1 |
| San Francisco | 36.9 | 36.4 |
| San Joaquin | 54.7 | 56.5 |
| San Luis Obispo | 74.5 | 83.9 |
| San Mateo | 67.4 | 60 |
| Santa Barbara | 62.3 | 52.5 |
| Santa Clara | 46.1 | 52.1 |
| Santa Cruz | 54.9 | 58.1 |
| Shasta | 65 | 68.2 |
| Sierra | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 50 | \* |
| Solano | 56.6 | 54.3 |
| Sonoma | 42.9 | 50 |
| Stanislaus | 57.9 | 51.1 |
| Sutter | 75 | 42.9 |
| Tehama | 100 | 61.9 |
| Trinity | 56.3 | \* |
| Tulare | 66.4 | 60.4 |
| Tuolumne | \* | \* |
| Ventura | 53.8 | 48 |
| Yolo | 60.5 | 61 |
| Yuba | 54.2 | 47.6 |
| **Statewide** | **53.1** | **56** |

Table 24 compares the high school dropout rates for foster youth with non-foster youth for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years. While the percentage of foster youth[[44]](#footnote-44) who drop out of high school is three times the dropout rate for non-foster youth in both school years, the dropout rate for foster youth declined by 0.5 percentage points. Table 25 includes the number of youth in the four-year cohort,[[45]](#footnote-45) the number of foster youth who were considered a dropout, and the dropout rates for non-foster youth for the 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years by county.

Table 25 shows that 23 counties saw an increase in dropout rates, and 20 counties saw a decrease. Sonoma, Imperial, and Alameda counties all saw dropout rates for foster youth decrease by 10 percent or more. Santa Clara County’s dropout rate decreased by over 16 percent.

#### Table 24: High School Dropout Rates of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| Academic Year | Foster Youth (%) | Non-Foster Youth (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2017–18 | 28.4 | 9.3 |
| 2018–19 | 27.9 | 8.7 |

#### Table 25: High School Dropout Rates and Counts of Foster Youth by County for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| County | 2017–18 Cohort (N) | 2017–18 Dropout Count (N) | 2017–18 Dropout Rate (%) | 2018–19 Cohort (N) | 2018–19 Dropout Count (N) | 2018–19 Dropout Rate (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 188 | 67 | 35.6 | 175 | 45 | 25.7 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 11 | 0 | 0.0 | \* | \* | \* |
| Butte | 46 | 8 | 17.4 | 51 | 14 | 27.5 |
| Calaveras | 21 | 3 | 14.3 | 17 | 2 | 11.8 |
| Colusa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 133 | 21 | 15.8 | 148 | 28 | 18.9 |
| Del Norte | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| El Dorado | 90 | 21 | 23.3 | 89 | 23 | 25.8 |
| Fresno | 249 | 82 | 32.9 | 277 | 97 | 35.0 |
| Glenn | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Humboldt | 38 | 9 | 23.7 | 35 | 6 | 17.1 |
| Imperial | 29 | 7 | 24.1 | 29 | 4 | 13.8 |
| Inyo | 62 | 28 | 45.2 | 58 | 41 | 70.7 |
| Kern | 208 | 57 | 27.4 | 204 | 48 | 23.5 |
| Kings | 54 | 6 | 11.1 | 65 | 16 | 24.6 |
| Lake | 13 | 4 | 30.8 | \* | \* | \* |
| Lassen | \* | \* | \* | 13 | 1 | 7.7 |
| Los Angeles | 2,777 | 795 | 28.6 | 2,733 | 746 | 27.3 |
| Madera | 40 | 12 | 30.0 | 37 | 16 | 43.2 |
| Marin | 20 | 3 | 15.0 | 14 | 3 | 21.4 |
| Mariposa | \* | \* | \* | 11 | 1 | 9.1 |
| Mendocino | 24 | 5 | 20.8 | 30 | 6 | 20.0 |
| Merced | 78 | 23 | 29.5 | 78 | 22 | 28.2 |
| Modoc | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 55 | 16 | 29.1 | 38 | 8 | 21.1 |
| Napa | 15 | 3 | 20.0 | 23 | 6 | 26.1 |
| Nevada | 38 | 16 | 42.1 | 35 | 16 | 45.7 |
| Orange | 312 | 84 | 26.9 | 353 | 74 | 21.0 |
| Placer | 65 | 9 | 13.8 | 63 | 14 | 22.2 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 481 | 125 | 26.0 | 463 | 101 | 21.8 |
| Sacramento | 291 | 85 | 29.2 | 270 | 77 | 28.5 |
| San Benito | \* | \* | \* | 14 | 4 | 28.6 |
| San Bernardino | 630 | 175 | 27.8 | 652 | 198 | 30.4 |
| San Diego | 333 | 97 | 29.1 | 345 | 108 | 31.3 |
| San Francisco | 111 | 30 | 27.0 | 132 | 77 | 58.3 |
| San Joaquin | 181 | 58 | 32.0 | 193 | 59 | 30.6 |
| San Luis Obispo | 51 | 5 | 9.8 | 56 | 5 | 8.9 |
| San Mateo | 46 | 6 | 13.0 | 55 | 10 | 18.2 |
| Santa Barbara | 61 | 16 | 26.2 | 61 | 23 | 37.7 |
| Santa Clara | 178 | 76 | 42.7 | 167 | 44 | 26.3 |
| Santa Cruz | 51 | 20 | 39.2 | 31 | 10 | 32.3 |
| Shasta | 40 | 8 | 20.0 | 44 | 10 | 22.7 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 12 | 4 | 33.3 | \* | \* | \* |
| Solano | 53 | 16 | 30.2 | 46 | 18 | 39.1 |
| Sonoma | 70 | 30 | 42.9 | 90 | 27 | 30.0 |
| Stanislaus | 114 | 36 | 31.6 | 92 | 33 | 35.9 |
| Sutter | 16 | 1 | 6.3 | 14 | 7 | 50.0 |
| Tehama | 16 | 0 | 0.0 | 21 | 5 | 23.8 |
| Trinity | 16 | 2 | 12.5 | \* | \* | \* |
| Tulare | 119 | 21 | 17.6 | 106 | 28 | 26.4 |
| Tuolumne | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Ventura | 104 | 30 | 28.8 | 102 | 23 | 22.5 |
| Yolo | 43 | 13 | 30.2 | 41 | 11 | 26.8 |
| Yuba | 24 | 9 | 37.5 | 21 | 11 | 52.4 |
| **Statewide** | **7,703** | **2,188** | **28.4** | **7,647** | **2,137** | **27.9** |

In 2019, the CDE developed and published new reports on College-Going Rates (CGR) for the first time using high school completion[[46]](#footnote-46) data obtained from CALPADS and student-level postsecondary enrollment[[47]](#footnote-47) data obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse. The CGR is defined as the percentage of California public high school students who completed high school in a given year and subsequently enrolled in a postsecondary institution within 12 or 16 months of completing high school.

Table 26 contains the CGR for foster youth compared to non-foster youth who completed high school in 2017 and 2018. Because the CGR monitors student outcomes 12 months after the most recent school year, 2019 CGR data are not yet available for the purposes of this report. As was seen in Table 21, in 2017, 50.8 percent of foster youth and 83.1 percent of non-foster youth graduated from high school. This represents a difference of 32 percentage points. But the difference between the CGR for foster youth and non-foster youth enrolling in college within 12 months was much smaller, which points to successful efforts around closing the achievement gap for foster youth. In 2017, 46.8 percent of foster youth and 65.3 percent of non-foster youth were enrolled in college within 12 months of completing high school. This points to success of the concerted efforts of FYSCPs in supporting foster youth transitioning to college. Additionally, as seen in Table 26, the CGR for foster youth increased by 1.5 percent from 2017 to 2018 whereas the CGR for non-foster youth decreased by 0.8 percent.

#### Table 26: Successful Transition to Postsecondary Education in CGR of Foster and non-Foster Youth by County for 2017 and 2018

| County | 2017 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Foster Youth (%) | 2017 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Non-Foster Youth (%) | 2018 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Foster Youth (%) | 2018 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Non-Foster Youth (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 46.4 | 72.2 | 45.2 | 71 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | 56.9 | \* | 46.9 |
| Butte | 60 | 67.2 | 60 | 66.7 |
| Calaveras | \* | 50.8 | \* | 61.9 |
| Colusa | \* | 63.1 | \* | 58.3 |
| Contra Costa | 49.2 | 71.5 | 59.6 | 69.7 |
| Del Norte | \* | 40.3 | \* | 42.9 |
| El Dorado | 29.6 | 68.8 | 32.7 | 66.9 |
| Fresno | 64.8 | 71.6 | 62.1 | 69.6 |
| Glenn | \* | 51.4 | \* | 58.4 |
| Humboldt | 21.7 | 51.7 | 28.6 | 53.3 |
| Imperial | 71.4 | 73.9 | \* | 69.6 |
| Inyo | 41.7 | 25.4 | 45.5 | 25.1 |
| Kern | 34.3 | 49 | 32 | 47.9 |
| Kings | 60 | 62.7 | 66.7 | 62 |
| Lake | \* | 43.9 | \* | 42.3 |
| Lassen | \* | 52.3 | \* | 64.9 |
| Los Angeles | 43.3 | 62.5 | 45.1 | 62 |
| Madera | 46.7 | 61.2 | 69.2 | 61.2 |
| Marin | \* | 75.8 | \* | 76.3 |
| Mariposa | \* | 50.7 | \* | 54.8 |
| Mendocino | \* | 38.3 | \* | 33.3 |
| Merced | 65.7 | 62.8 | 48.5 | 60.5 |
| Modoc | \* | 48 | \* | 50.6 |
| Mono | \* | 29.9 | \* | 37.8 |
| Monterey | 78.6 | 67.6 | 43.8 | 60.8 |
| Napa | \* | 68.6 | \* | 66.7 |
| Nevada | 41.2 | 38.1 | \* | 37.4 |
| Orange | 50.8 | 75.6 | 61.4 | 75.7 |
| Placer | 53.1 | 73.9 | 57.7 | 75.1 |
| Plumas | \* | 58.9 | \* | 59 |
| Riverside | 43.5 | 56.9 | 42.8 | 56.3 |
| Sacramento | 56.6 | 64.5 | 58.2 | 65.2 |
| San Benito | \* | 59.2 | \* | 62 |
| San Bernardino | 40 | 60 | 44.7 | 58.6 |
| San Diego | 54.1 | 66.2 | 52.5 | 65.2 |
| San Francisco | 54.3 | 73.4 | 60 | 68.3 |
| San Joaquin | 56.9 | 62.7 | 50 | 60.8 |
| San Luis Obispo | 37.1 | 65.2 | 30.6 | 64.7 |
| San Mateo | 48 | 76.6 | 52.4 | 75.8 |
| Santa Barbara | 61.5 | 69.9 | 52 | 67.6 |
| Santa Clara | 60 | 75.9 | 55.9 | 76.3 |
| Santa Cruz | 55 | 67.2 | 35.3 | 66.1 |
| Shasta | 33.3 | 60.8 | 76.9 | 60.6 |
| Sierra | \* | 66.7 | \* | 53.8 |
| Siskiyou | \* | 60.5 | \* | 62.3 |
| Solano | 50 | 62.7 | 52.4 | 59.9 |
| Sonoma | 56 | 65.9 | 50 | 62.9 |
| Stanislaus | 44.2 | 59 | 46.8 | 59.4 |
| Sutter | \* | 63.7 | 54.5 | 59.7 |
| Tehama | \* | 55.7 | \* | 53.7 |
| Trinity | \* | 53.5 | \* | 49.6 |
| Tulare | 51.8 | 63.4 | 50 | 59.3 |
| Tuolumne | \* | 52.7 | \* | 60.9 |
| Ventura | 45.5 | 74.8 | 67.3 | 74.1 |
| Yolo | 42.9 | 69.7 | 46.2 | 65.6 |
| Yuba | \* | 56.7 | \* | 51.3 |
| **Statewide** | **46.8** | **65.3** | **48.3** | **64.5** |

### Part III—FYSCP Report

During the past two years, the CDE implemented the FYSCP by a strengthened team, in collaboration with the CDSS, TAP, county FYSCP coordinators, and various stakeholders. The CDE enhanced the FYSCP capacity by adding an EREC to the team. The purpose of the new position is to improve the data coordination, sharing, utilization, and reporting. The EREC works with CDSS to improve the foster youth identification in schools by matching foster youth in two data systems between the CDE and CDSS. This includes working directly with CDSS programmers, COEs, and LEAs to ensure students are identified as foster youth in a timely fashion so that the student can be provided with appropriate educational supports and services right away. The EREC also provides supports to the CDE FYSCP with monitoring and analyzing educational outcomes for foster youth. In addition, the EREC works with CDSS on creating data sharing agreements that are used to meet mandates specified by the legislation. This ongoing collaboration aims at improving the understanding of the intersection of the CDE and CDSS data systems and how the two systems can better support the complex needs of foster youth.

The CDE continued partnering with the Shasta COE and the Orange County Department of Education, which served as the FYSCP TAP during 2017–18 and 2018–19 FYs. The FYSCP TAP provides support, guidance, and leadership to all county FYSCP coordinators for the implementation of the requirements of AB 854. In addition, the CDE utilizes various communication channels to provide trainings and presentations about the FYSCP to a variety of stakeholders.

Budget Acts of 2017 and 2018 appropriated $25,775,000 and $26,474,000 for the FYSCP, respectively. The budget authorized five percent of the funds for the TAP each year. The remaining 95 percent of funds were dispersed to county FYSCPs to support local activities. Table 27 shows the FYSCP funds dispersed to COEs for 2017–18 and 2018–19.

In 2017–18, 51 out of 58 counties received the funds. The Los Angles COE received the largest amount of $5,593,436, based on 10,774 foster youth enrolled on Census Day as shown in Table 1, while Plumas COE received the smallest amount of $100,860, with 23 foster youth enrolled on Census Day, also shown in Table 1. Among those COEs that received the funds, only two counties did not spend all their allocated funds. Due to temporary staff position vacancies and unexpected resources from Title IV-E fund agreements with county child welfare agencies, Kern County left about 13 percent of the funds unspent, and San Luis Obispo nearly spent all but a little over $100, which is about 0.04 percent of its allocation. The 2017–18 funds were nearly spent with only less than 0.5 percent unspent by the time it was closed out for the fiscal year.

In 2018–19, 55 out of 58 counties received funds. Los Angeles COE continues taking the largest share of $5,225,300, based on 10,646 foster youth enrolled on Census Day, and Mono COE received the smallest amount of $95,275, based on one foster youth enrolled on Census Day as seen in Table 1. Compared to 2017–18, there is a decrease of the funds the Los Angeles COE received in 2018–19 due to the decrease of the number of foster youth in the county. This decrease mirrored the statewide data in the number of foster youth from 2017–18 to 2018–19 because of the strengthened data capacity at the CDE and CDSS, as well as at the local level, that resulted in the reduced number of duplicated foster youth.

Additionally, this table shows that almost half of the COEs had not spent their 2018–19 allocated funds which was due to a fiscal policy change allowing FYSCPs to spend their current funds over a three-year period. 2018–19 was the first year of the new three-year accounting program that allowed COEs until June 2021 to spend each and every year’s allocated funds.

#### Table 27: FYSCP Fund Allocations by County for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| County | Allocated 2017–18 FY | Expended 2017–18 FY | Allocated 2018–19 FY | Expended 2018–19 FY |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | $612,525 | $612,525 | $593,935 | $593,935 |
| Alpine | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Amador | $108,312 | $108,312 | $103,091 | $103,091 |
| Butte | $306,404 | $306,404 | $295,538 | $295,538 |
| Calaveras | $141,807 | $141,807 | $138,368 | $138,368 |
| Colusa | $113,571 | $113,571 | $117,793 | $90,952 |
| Contra Costa | $508,512 | $508,512 | $476,456 | $418,769 |
| Del Norte | $114,586 | $114,586 | $118,522 | $118,522 |
| El Dorado | $291,293 | $291,293 | $285,579 | $285,579 |
| Fresno | $817,198 | $817,198 | $889,559 | $716,790 |
| Glenn | $145,290 | $145,290 | $149,112 | $149,112 |
| Humboldt | $367,971 | $367,971 | $377,421 | $347,970 |
| Imperial | $266,378 | $266,378 | $289,765 | $289,765 |
| Inyo | $137,862 | $137,862 | $0 | $0 |
| Kern | $859,757 | $745,962 | $903,487 | $786,274 |
| Kings | $270,531 | $270,531 | $275,920 | $275,920 |
| Lake | $136,293 | $136,293 | $133,881 | $133,056 |
| Lassen | $169,581 | $169,581 | $165,629 | $165,629 |
| Los Angeles | $5,593,436 | $5,593,436 | $5,225,300 | $5,225,300 |
| Madera | $230,576 | $230,576 | $235,599 | $235,599 |
| Marin | $0 | $0 | $232,554 | $178,015 |
| Mariposa | $0 | $0 | $101,805 | $84,448 |
| Mendocino | $229,168 | $229,168 | $222,010 | $222,010 |
| Merced | $387,121 | $387,121 | $394,383 | $394,383 |
| Modoc | $109,464 | $109,464 | $112,749 | $112,749 |
| Mono | $0 | $0 | $95,275 | $72,616 |
| Monterey | $311,776 | $311,776 | $318,969 | $318,969 |
| Napa | $145,913 | $145,913 | $144,697 | $88,900 |
| Nevada | $172,142 | $172,142 | $168,301 | $168,301 |
| Orange | $894,112 | $894,112 | $934,639 | $934,639 |
| Placer | $266,770 | $266,770 | $272,190 | $268,816 |
| Plumas | $100,860 | $100,860 | $97,518 | $70,923 |
| Riverside | $1,479,863 | $1,479,863 | $1,419,407 | $1,051,699 |
| Sacramento | $771,710 | $771,710 | $735,384 | $735,384 |
| San Benito | $0 | $0 | $169,386 | $113,602 |
| San Bernardino | $1,758,215 | $1,758,215 | $1,866,354 | $1,866,354 |
| San Diego | $983,916 | $983,916 | $943,018 | $943,018 |
| San Francisco | $251,432 | $251,432 | $229,854 | $211,973 |
| San Joaquin | $572,692 | $572,692 | $583,591 | $583,591 |
| San Luis Obispo | $242,134 | $242,032 | $232,927 | $224,937 |
| San Mateo | $316,298 | $316,298 | $298,922 | $298,922 |
| Santa Barbara | $300,635 | $300,635 | $291,507 | $273,548 |
| Santa Clara | $551,902 | $551,902 | $534,736 | $534,736 |
| Santa Cruz | $221,925 | $221,925 | $216,538 | $214,592 |
| Shasta | $354,708 | $354,708 | $348,874 | $224,894 |
| Sierra | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Siskiyou | $268,821 | $268,821 | $266,572 | $45,232 |
| Solano | $250,024 | $250,024 | $248,759 | $240,025 |
| Sonoma | $0 | $0 | $477,252 | $303,894 |
| Stanislaus | $440,595 | $440,595 | $466,324 | $466,324 |
| Sutter | $197,794 | $197,794 | $200,578 | $149,599 |
| Tehama | $219,733 | $219,733 | $210,665 | $171,328 |
| Trinity | $154,102 | $154,102 | $151,700 | $151,700 |
| Tulare | $635,687 | $635,687 | $647,983 | $647,983 |
| Tuolumne | $167,020 | $167,020 | $166,815 | $166,815 |
| Ventura | $420,664 | $420,664 | $416,774 | $416,774 |
| Yolo | $174,150 | $174,150 | $191,849 | $165,911 |
| Yuba | $166,307 | $166,307 | $172,560 | $146,302 |
| **Statewide** | **$24,709,536** | **$24,595,639** | **$25,358,374** | **$23,634,075** |

Under the FYSCP, COEs play an important role to coordinate interagency support for foster youth services. Each COE established the county EAC with representatives from a wide range of local agencies and stakeholders. County EACs meet about four times a year. The agreements created to establish EAC procedures provide a foundation for formal county interagency collaboration.

Table 28 lists the number of county COEs with various stakeholders represented on the EACs in 2019, as reported by the TAP annual summary for 2018–19.[[48]](#footnote-48) As shown in Table 28, most counties included key stakeholders on their EACs, such as child welfare agency, community-based organizations, community college, court-appointed special advocate (CASA), court staff (judge or attorney), current and/or former foster youth, mental health representatives, mental health professionals, probation officers, district personnel, and special education/Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA).

#### Table 28: Number of COEs Having Various Stakeholders Represented on EACs

| Stakeholders | Number of COEs Having Representors on EACs |
| --- | --- |
| Biological Parents | 5 |
| Child Welfare Agency Representative | 55 |
| Community Based Organizations | 51 |
| Community College | 39 |
| CASA | 45 |
| Court Staff (Judge or Attorney) | 48 |
| Current and/or Former Foster Youth | 38 |
| Early Childhood | 19 |
| Foster Parent | 26 |
| FYSCP Coordinator | 54 |
| Mental Health | 37 |
| Probation | 52 |
| Regional Center | 4 |
| School District | 54 |
| Short Term Residential Treatment Facility | 17 |
| Special Education/SELPA | 35 |
| University Representative | 18 |
| Other Representatives | 45 |

In order to coordinate services across county agencies, county FYSCPs developed Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with county child welfare agencies for the purpose of drawing down Title IV-E federal dollars for eligible case management activities that support the coordination of services for foster youth. The FYSCPs also developed policies and procedures for information sharing among county agencies concerning foster youth. This shared information is used by education, child welfare, and probation agencies to track the progress of foster youth in both care and education and, when needed, quickly transfer students between districts. The county-administered FYSCPs have also developed agreements to address transportation to a child’s school of origin to promote school stability.[[49]](#footnote-49) Table 29 shows the number of counties having formal agreements, MOUs, or protocols established among county agencies specifically designed to support the FYSCP during 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years, also reported by the TAP annual summary for 2018–19.[[50]](#footnote-50)

#### Table 29: Number and Percent of Formal Agreements among County Agencies for 2017–18 and 2018–19

| MOUs/Agreements | 2017–18 (N) | 2017–18 (%) | 2018–19 (N) | 2018–19 (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Information sharing Agreements | 47 | 84 | 41 | 75 |
| Countywide ESSA Transportation Requirement Agreements | 53 | 96 | 30 | 55 |
| Title IV-E Draw Down Agreements | 45 | 82 | 33 | 60 |
| Post-Secondary | \* | \* | 12 | 22 |
| Executive Advisory Council | \* | \* | 23 | 42 |
| Co-location | \* | \* | 26 | 47 |
| Other Agreements[[51]](#footnote-51) | 18 | 33 | 23 | 42 |

\* Data was not collected in 2017–18 school year.

In addition to coordinating resources to serve foster youth, COEs support LEAs to build the capacity of serving foster youth in their schools. COE-administered FYSCPs provided trainings and LCAP consultations to LEAs with LCAP compliance to support foster youth. Table 30 shows the percentages of districts and charter schools receiving training and LCAP consultations by county FYSCPs, as reported by the TAP annual summary for 2018–19.[[52]](#footnote-52) As shown in Table 30, about 85 percent of school districts in multiple district counties and about 95 percent of single district counties received trainings. Also shown in Table 30, the majority of charter schools in a single district county received the highest percentage of LCAP consultations from the FYSCPs. These activities provided support for LEAs to establish policies and procedures to support all mandates from both state and federal governments regarding foster youth education.

#### Table 30: Percent of Districts and Charter Schools Supported by County FYSCPs

| Support | Counties with Multiple Districts School (%) | Counties with Multiple Charter Schools (%) | Counties with a Single District School District (%) | Counties with a Single District Charter School (%) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| LCAP Consultation | 47.0 | 23.2 | 60.0 | 75.0 |
| Training | 84.6 | 41.5 | 95.0 | 93.8 |

In addition to providing LCAP training and consultants, county FYSCPs support local LEAs to provide the services to foster youth in their schools through ongoing training and workshops. Table 31 shows the number of trainings provided to district staff and the number of trainees since enactment of AB 854, which established FYSCP. As Table 31 shows, the number of trainings increased by 190 percent from 2015–16 to 2018–19, while the number of trainees increased by 330 percent from the same period.

#### Table 31: Number of Trainings Provided to School Districts by County FYSCPs from 2015–16 to 2018–19

| Data Count Method | 2015–16 | 2016–17 | 2017–18 | 2018–19 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Trainings | 351 | 414 | 698 | 1,019 |
| Number of Trainees | 5,778 | 7,611 | 10,668 | 24,981 |

During the 2018–19 school year, the FYSCP began a series of pilot groups targeting specific services for foster youth. Recognizing that frequent school changes are a major barrier for foster youth to achieve learning success, as well as contributing to low graduation rates in foster youth, the FYSCP focused on providing school stability and college and career success transition support to foster youth. Many COE FYSCPs selected their pilot groups to improve school stability and support foster youth in college and career transition. Table 32 shows the COE FYSCP pilot group selections. As shown in Table 32, all but one (98 percent) of COE FYSCP selected a pilot group. Most COE FYSCPs targeted school stability and college and career successful transition in their services.

#### Table 32: Number and Percent of COE FYSCP Pilot Group Selection

| Pilot Group Focus | Counties (N) | Counties (%) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| School Stability Utilizing Local Placement Change/School Enrollment Data in Foster Focus | 19 | 35 |
| School Stability Using FYSCP Countywide ESSA Transportation Plans/Agreements to Track Youth | 10 | 18 |
| Probation Crossover Youth | 3 | 5 |
| College and Career Successful Transition: Develop an Inter-Agency Sharing Network/MOU/Partnership for Foster Youth | 10 | 18 |
| College and Career Successful Transition: Develop a Partnership with ILP to Gather and Track Data | 12 | 22 |
| **Total** | **54** | **98** |

Table 33 describes collaborative partnerships by listing the agencies partnering with the county-administered FYSCPs and their respective services. Each example was reported by a majority of counties in the FYSCP.

#### Table 33: Collaborative Agencies and Services Provided

| Collaborative Agencies | Services Provided |
| --- | --- |
| TAP | Support, guidance, and leadership to all county FYSCP coordinators for the implementation of the requirements of AB 854; technical assistance, sharing of best practices, data collection procedures, and operational databases |
| County Courts and Local Blue-Ribbon Commissions | Judicial guidance and leadership regarding the case management challenges associated with supporting the health and well-being of youth in care, which include education services |
| County Departments of Mental Health | Counseling, psychological evaluations, medication consultation, and behavior management techniques |
| County Departments of Social Services and Probation | Case management, counseling, monitoring, 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 assisting 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 and truancy intervention |
| Colleges and Universities | Tutoring and mentoring services, counseling, financial aid information, and outside evaluations of LCFF and LCAP impact on foster youth subgroup |
| 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), and funding for school clothes |
| Tribal Organizations | Leisure and 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 |

Under the LCFF, LEAs must address the state priorities in their LCAP. COEs are required to address Priority 10 Foster Youth in their LCAP by developing the goal for student achievement and allocating resources for an action plan. According to the TAP 2018–19 Summary Report,[[53]](#footnote-53) 82 percent of COE FYSCPs had input in the development of the Priority 10 LCAP goal.

Since 2018, the Dashboard released accountability measures of COEs on coordinated services for foster youth. Table 34 lists these self-evaluations by counties concerning eight foster youth coordinated services priorities for 2018–19. The majority of COE administered FYSCPs are at *Full Implementation* or *Full Implementation and Sustainability* in all eight FYSCP priorities.

#### Table 34: Number of COEs Reported of FYSCP Priority by Degree of Implementation (1–5 Scale)\*\*

| 2019 FYSCP Priority | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Establish ongoing collaboration and support policy development, including formalized information sharing agreements with child welfare, probation, local educational agencies (LEAs), the courts, and other organizations to support the proper educational placement of foster youth (e.g., school of origin versus current residence, comprehensive versus alternative school, and regular versus special education). | 1 | 2 | 13 | 17 | 24 |
| Build capacity with LEAs, probation, child welfare, and other organizations for purposes of implementing school-based support infrastructure for foster youth (e.g., provide regular professional development with the Foster Youth Liaisons to facilitate adequate transportation services for foster youth). | 0 | 0 | 11 | 24 | 22 |
| Provide information and assistance to LEAs regarding the educational needs of foster youth in order to improve educational outcomes | 0 | 1 | 3 | 22 | 31 |
| Provide direct educational services for foster youth in LEA or county-operated programs provided the school district has certified that specified services cannot be provided or funded using other sources, including, but not limited to, LCFF, federal, state or local funding. | 3 | 6 | 8 | 18 | 22 |
| Establish ongoing collaboration and support development of policies and procedures that facilitate expeditious transfer of records, transcripts, and other relevant educational information. | 0 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 31 |
| Facilitate the coordination of post-secondary opportunities for youth by engaging with systems partners, including, child welfare transition planning and independent living services, community colleges or universities, career technical education, and workforce development providers. | 0 | 2 | 12 | 22 | 21 |
| Develop strategies to prioritize the needs of foster youth in the community, use community-wide assessments that consider age group, geographical area, and identification of highest need students. | 1 | 5 | 22 | 15 | 13 |
| Engage in the process of reviewing plan deliverables and of collecting and analyzing LEA and COE level outcome data for purposes of evaluating effectiveness of support services for foster youth and whether the investment in services contributes to improved educational outcomes for foster youth. | 1 | 2 | 23 | 21 | 10 |

\*\*Degree of Implementation Rating Scale

| Scale | Degree of Implementation |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Exploration and Research Phase |
| 2 | Beginning Development |
| 3 | Initial Implementation |
| 4 | Full Implementation |
| 5 | Full Implementation and Sustainability |

### Part IV—Conclusion

Education has the potential to provide foster youth the necessary academic, vocational, and life skills that lead to successful independent living. The FYSCP is designed to increase the overall capacity of the education community in counties to expand access to services and to assist LEAs in the delivery of direct services for foster youth with the goal of improving educational outcomes.

The data shows, the FYSCP helped to:

1. Improve foster youth academic outcomes in ELA and mathematics. Particularly notable from closing the achievement gap perspective is that the increase of foster youth scoring on the CAASPP ELA assessments is larger than the state average increase. Between 2017–18 and 2018–19 school years, the percentage of foster youth scored at “Standard Met” and “Standard Exceed” improved 1.5 percentage points, from 22.1 percent to 23.6 percent, compared to the state average increase of 1.2 percentage points from 49.9 percent to 51.1 percent
2. Increase high school graduation rate. The three-year increase in foster youth graduation rate of 5.2 percentage points is much higher than the non-foster youth 1.8 percent increase from 2017 to 2019. This larger increase in graduation rate is a significant step toward closing the achievement gap between foster youth and non-foster youth
3. Increase foster youth college-going rates. Foster youth increased their college-going rate 1.5 percentage points between 2018 and 2019 compared to non-foster youth decrease of 0.8 percentage points, a 2.3 percentage point narrowing of the achievement gap
4. Improve foster youth school engagement as seen in a decrease in the number of suspension rates. The suspension rates for foster youth decreased 0.1 percentage points, compared to no change for non-foster youth
5. Coordinate services and information with LEAs and other partners to obtain necessary records to determine appropriate school placements and coordinate instruction
6. Increase collaboration and build capacity among partner agencies and systems in order to increase access to meaningful educational support for foster youth
7. Provide guidance and support to LEAs on the development of integrated policy and practice for LCAP to engage in effective program planning for foster youth under LCFF
8. Provide direct service and referrals for educational support services, vocational training, and training for independent living
9. Develop formal agreements to formalize collaboration among county agencies to optimize resources and eliminate redundant services

The FYSCPs have demonstrated substantial progress in building collaborative relationships among various agencies and systems that work with foster youth, focusing support in data sharing, transportation procedures to support school stability, learning support, and college and career transitions. The interagency collaborative relationships developed by the FYSCPs have resulted in the expanded capacity of providing comprehensive services to foster youth and the improvement in their academic outcomes.

As indicated by the data and outcomes presented in this report, the FYSCPs had a positive impact on the educational outcomes of foster youth. Additionally, there are countless success stories provided by FYSCPs regarding individual foster youth. The two stories below were provided from two different FYSCPs and are presented here to illustrate both the success and need for continuing the FYSCP of supporting the unique and complex needs of foster youth.

Christopher is a third-grade boy who experienced years of generational homelessness, was chronically absent from school, and endured multiple adverse childhood experiences. After Chris was detained by Child Welfare and placed in a resource home in a neighboring city, the Placer County FYSCP formed a supporting group of staff assisting him. Realizing that Chris had established a good relationship at his current school—especially, that the front office staff knew him well—the team made a commitment to ensuring Chris was able to stay in his school. The FYSCP coordinated the transportation by forming “a team of supporters” to take Chris to and from the same school he was attending before. Every day, a member of the team of supporters dropped Chris off at the school office, where he was greeted by a familiar staff and then went off to the playground. Since coming into foster care, Chris has had impeccable attendance, continues to enjoy going to school, and never misses spirit wear showing off his school pride. Chris thrives in school because of the stability of his learning environment while everything else in his world is changing or unknown to him. Without the strong and committed effort of the FYSCP, Chris may not have been able to stay in his school with his familiar school staff, teachers, and peers; keep strong connections; and thrive in school.

Jenny had been in foster care throughout her high school years in Monterey County before graduating high school last year. After she graduated high school, she went on to study at the University of California, Los Angeles. This would likely not have been possible without the efforts and supports the county FYSCP provided Jenny during her high school years. The county FYSCP played an important role for her school success and college transition. Specifically, an array of FYSCP staff supported her through case management, school stability, and academic support. The FYSCP provided her educational materials and made expectations clear that she was going to college. She attended college workshops and college tours organized by the FYSCP. Staff assisted her with FAFSA and financial aid applications. Her success story not only points to the powerful success and impact of the FYSCP; it continues to serve as a model for younger foster youth to follow. This year there are two foster youth in the same school who are also following Jenny’s journey by successfully completing high school and going to four-year universities.
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