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## Executive Summary

This report is required by California *Education Code (EC)* Section 42923(b). For every even-numbered 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 California’s FYSCP and student learning outcomes of foster youth. This report includes information for the 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years.

For foster youth learning outcomes, there are notable improvements during this reporting period:

* Increased high school graduation rate as seen in the two-year change.
* Increased percentage of attendance rate.
* Increased foster youth school stability rates.
* Decrease in the statewide number of foster youths in Juvenile Court Schools or Youth Authority Schools.
* Decreased percentage of chronic absences.

Based on program service activities and data details provided in the following pages, this report recommends (a) amending *EC* Section 42921(e)(2)(A) to remove the annual local educational agency waiver requirements to provide direct services to foster youth, (b) securing funding to support district foster youth educational liaison positions, and (c) continuation of the funding of the FYSCP to ensure the support infrastructure remains in place.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Amy Fowler, Education Programs Consultant, Student Achievement and Support Division, at   
916-323-5113 or [afowler@cde.ca.gov](mailto:afowler@cde.ca.gov).

You will find this report on the CDE Foster Youth Services web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/lrlegreport2024.asp>. If you need a copy of this report, please contact Amy Fowler, Education Programs Consultant, Student Achievement and Support Division, at 916-323-5113 or [afowler@cde.ca.gov](mailto:afowler@cde.ca.gov).

## Legislative Reporting Requirements

The FYSCP was established in 2016 due to the enactment of Assembly Bill (AB) 854 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015). The statute replaced the previous Foster Youth Services (FYS) Program, which the CDE had administrated since 1973.[[1]](#endnote-2) AB 854 amended California *EC* sections 42920–42926 to support local educational agencies (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 to implement school-based support for foster care students. In addition to the 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 most recently partnered with the Los Angeles COE (LACOE) to administer the FYSCP Technical Assistance Program (TAP) during the 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 school years. The FYSCP TAP provides support, guidance, and leadership to all county FYSCP coordinators for the implementation of the requirements of AB 854.

This report is submitted in accordance with the provisions of California *EC* Section 42923(b), which requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 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 be prepared with input from the providers of the FYSCP and that it shall include:

1. Recommendations regarding the effectiveness and continuation of the Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program.
2. Aggregate educational outcome data for each county in which there were at least 15 pupils in foster care who attended school in the county.
3. A discussion of the meaning and implications of educational outcome data.
4. Information about how the program has supported the development and implementation of new local educational agency and county agency policies, practices, and programs aimed at improving the educational outcomes of pupils in foster care; and
5. Information about how the program has improved the coordination of services between local educational agencies and county agencies, including the types of services provided to pupils in foster care.

The 2024 report is the fifth legislative report written specifically on the FYSCP established in 2016. The three previous reports are available on the CDE website:

* 2018 FYSCP Legislative Report <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/lrlegreport2018.asp>
* 2020 FYSCP Legislative Report <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/lrlegreport2020.asp>
* 2022 FYSCP Legislative Report

<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/lrlegreport2022.asp>

## Organization of the2024 Report for the Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program

This report comprises five parts:

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

Part II—Aggregate foster youth educational outcome data by 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, stability 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 foster youth services coordinating programs in the previous two -fiscal years (FY).

Part III—Discussion of the Meaning and Implications of the Educational Outcome Data

Part IV—FYSCP Report

1. Development and Implementation of New LEA and County Agency Policies, Practices, and Programs Aimed at Improving the Educational Outcomes of Pupils in Foster Care
2. Coordination of Services Between LEAs and County Agencies, Including the Types of Services Provided to Pupils in Foster Care

Part V—Conclusion

### Part I—Recommendations Regarding the Effectiveness and Continuation of the Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program

Based on educational outcome data (Parts II and III) and the FYSCP activities (Part IV) presented in this report, the CDE finds that the FYSCP has built an effective infrastructure in California to provide ongoing support to LEAs that serve foster youth. Therefore, the CDE strongly recommends the following:

* Amend *EC* Section 42921(e)(2)(A) to remove the annual LEA waiver requirements to provide direct services to foster youth;
* Secure funding to support district foster youth educational liaison positions; and
* Continue the funding of the FYSCP to ensure the support infrastructure remains in place.

During this reporting period between 2021 and 2023, there has been an improvement in:

* The coordination of services and information with LEAs and other partners to obtain necessary records to determine appropriate school placements and coordinate instruction.
* Increased collaboration and capacity building among partner agencies and systems to increase access to meaningful educational support for foster youth.
* Providing guidance and support to LEAs on the development of integrated policy and practice for Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) to engage in effective program planning for foster youth under Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF).
* Providing direct service and referrals for educational support services, vocational training, and training for independent living.
* The development of formal agreements to formalize collaboration among county agencies to optimize resources and eliminate redundant services.

In addition to the creation of the FYSCP, the CDE recognized the need to have Special Education support to meet the needs of our most vulnerable foster youth. As such, in 2023 the CDE created an Education Programs Consultant position dedicated to Special Education in our AB 2083 work with other agencies.

The FYSCPs provide support with transferring school records and other relevant educational information so that foster youth are available for inter-district transfers. In addition, all FYSCPs have established local interagency Executive Advisory Councils (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 child welfare agencies to leverage Title IV-E of the federal Social Security Act (42 *USC* Section 301) funds. These agreements establish procedures to promote school stability for the foster youth and support transitions to independent living. Through these agreements, protocols have been established by LEAs, child welfare agencies, county probation departments, and other organizations (Table 32) to work collaboratively to meet the educational needs of foster youth.

**As outlined in this section, the FYSCP performs a critical role in building and maintaining the infrastructure in California to support foster youth, and the CDE strongly recommends continuing the FYSCP to ensure the support infrastructure remains in place**.

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

This section includes data for each county where pupils in foster care attended school, pursuant to *EC* Section 42923(b), and outlines the methodology used to operationalize the data when having additional context may be helpful in interpreting the numbers (e.g., understanding nuances for cumulative enrollment counts). Note that this section includes a presentation of the data, and the following section (Part III) provides a discussion of the meaning and implications for the foster youth educational outcomes.

To protect student privacy, data are suppressed and indicated by an asterisk (\*) if the foster youth population is less than 11 in each county, excluding Census Day enrollment counts. The following section includes:

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, stability 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 foster youth services coordinating programs in the previous two fiscal years.
8. **The Number of Pupils in Foster Care Who Attended School in the County**

Table 1 shows the 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years’ Census Day[[2]](#endnote-3) enrollment of 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 shows the statewide cumulative enrollment[[3]](#endnote-4) for foster youth and non-foster youth for the 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years.

Table 3 shows the statewide cumulative enrollment for foster youth by grade for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years[[4]](#endnote-5).

Table 4 shows the total cumulative enrollment for foster youth by county of enrollment. Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the school year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a county. Cumulative enrollment is **not** necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is enrolled in multiple counties during the academic year, they are counted once in each county but only once in the **state’s** cumulative enrollment.

#### Table 1: Census Day Foster Youth Enrollment by County for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **County** | **2021-22**  **(N)** | **2022-23**  **(N)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 455 | 450 |
| Alpine | 2 | 0 |
| Amador | 29 | 31 |
| Butte | 211 | 229 |
| Calaveras | 57 | 59 |
| Colusa | 38 | 18 |
| Contra Costa | 482 | 435 |
| Del Norte | 65 | 81 |
| El Dorado | 127 | 102 |
| Fresno | 1,633 | 1,636 |
| Glenn | 26 | 26 |
| Humboldt | 261 | 284 |
| Imperial | 195 | 183 |
| Inyo | 47 | 42 |
| Kern | 1,337 | 1,494 |
| Kings | 215 | 235 |
| Lake | 51 | 44 |
| Lassen | 51 | 58 |
| Los Angeles | 9,993 | 9,872 |
| Madera | 218 | 194 |
| Marin | 65 | 46 |
| Mariposa | 19 | 29 |
| Mendocino | 130 | 129 |
| Merced | 382 | 390 |
| Modoc | 19 | 20 |
| Mono | 3 | 4 |
| Monterey | 103 | 100 |
| Napa | 61 | 46 |
| Nevada | 31 | 27 |
| Orange | 1,501 | 1,813 |
| Placer | 150 | 164 |
| Plumas | 13 | 16 |
| Riverside | 2,630 | 3,019 |
| Sacramento | 934 | 909 |
| San Benito | 41 | 32 |
| San Bernardino | 3,447 | 3,644 |
| San Diego | 1,129 | 1,118 |
| San Francisco | 268 | 279 |
| San Joaquin | 764 | 789 |
| San Luis Obispo | 159 | 154 |
| San Mateo | 93 | 103 |
| Santa Barbara | 321 | 265 |
| Santa Clara | 398 | 328 |
| Santa Cruz | 87 | 95 |
| Shasta | 271 | 263 |
| Sierra | 2 | 1 |
| Siskiyou | 46 | 41 |
| Solano | 235 | 206 |
| Sonoma | 258 | 289 |
| Stanislaus | 393 | 367 |
| Sutter | 119 | 103 |
| Tehama | 124 | 99 |
| Trinity | 32 | 31 |
| Tulare | 667 | 713 |
| Tuolumne | 44 | 32 |
| Ventura | 404 | 361 |
| Yolo | 140 | 134 |
| Yuba | 84 | 90 |
| **Statewide** | **31,060** | **31,722** |

#### Table 2: Statewide Cumulative Enrollment for Foster Youth and Non-Foster Youth for 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **Academic Year** | **Foster (N)** | **Non-Foster (N)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2021–22 | 43,191 | 6,021,467 |
| 2022–23 | 41,901 | 5,977,650 |

#### Table 3: Statewide Cumulative Enrollment for Foster Youth by Grade for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **Grade** | **2021-22** | **2022-23** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Kindergarten | 4,257 | 4,464 |
| First Grade | 3,475 | 3,428 |
| Second Grade | 3,333 | 3,120 |
| Third Grade | 3,187 | 3,045 |
| Fourth Grade | 2,932 | 2,903 |
| Fifth Grade | 2,905 | 2,721 |
| Sixth Grade | 2,832 | 2,692 |
| Seventh Grade | 2,829 | 2,828 |
| Eight Grade | 2,949 | 2,805 |
| Ninth Grade | 3,621 | 3,423 |
| Tenth Grade | 3,747 | 3,569 |
| Eleventh Grade | 3,571 | 3,516 |
| Twelfth Grade | 3,553 | 3,387 |
| **Total** | **43,191** | **41,901** |

#### Table 4: Foster Youth Cumulative Enrollment by County for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **County** | **2021-22**  **(N)** | **2022-23**  **(N)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 835 | 766 |
| Alpine | \* | \* |
| Amador | 44 | 60 |
| Butte | 358 | 334 |
| Calaveras | 105 | 91 |
| Colusa | 57 | 28 |
| Contra Costa | 793 | 708 |
| Del Norte | 106 | 103 |
| El Dorado | 254 | 212 |
| Fresno | 2,403 | 2,292 |
| Glenn | 50 | 48 |
| Humboldt | 339 | 362 |
| Imperial | 292 | 231 |
| Inyo | 84 | 87 |
| Kern | 2,160 | 2,137 |
| Kings | 334 | 374 |
| Lake | 73 | 72 |
| Lassen | 98 | 82 |
| Los Angeles | 14,266 | 13,418 |
| Madera | 374 | 316 |
| Marin | 110 | 105 |
| Mariposa | 50 | 56 |
| Mendocino | 196 | 215 |
| Merced | 629 | 664 |
| Modoc | 29 | 34 |
| Mono | \* | 16 |
| Monterey | 204 | 155 |
| Napa | 108 | 85 |
| Nevada | 67 | 51 |
| Orange | 2,505 | 2,699 |
| Placer | 291 | 271 |
| Plumas | 23 | 26 |
| Riverside | 4,433 | 4,588 |
| Sacramento | 1,558 | 1,463 |
| San Benito | 59 | 39 |
| San Bernardino | 5,692 | 5,632 |
| San Diego | 1,732 | 1,618 |
| San Francisco | 535 | 517 |
| San Joaquin | 1,309 | 1,266 |
| San Luis Obispo | 261 | 219 |
| San Mateo | 156 | 146 |
| Santa Barbara | 462 | 402 |
| Santa Clara | 615 | 476 |
| Santa Cruz | 150 | 157 |
| Shasta | 406 | 396 |
| Sierra | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 64 | 61 |
| Solano | 410 | 333 |
| Sonoma | 407 | 377 |
| Stanislaus | 646 | 603 |
| Sutter | 189 | 158 |
| Tehama | 186 | 171 |
| Trinity | 49 | 61 |
| Tulare | 1,001 | 1,058 |
| Tuolumne | 78 | 65 |
| Ventura | 588 | 541 |
| Yolo | 229 | 208 |
| Yuba | 171 | 167 |

1. **The Academic Achievement of the Pupils in Foster Care Who Attended School in the County**

Tables 5 and Table 6 show the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Smarter Balanced Performance Levels for foster youth in English language arts (ELA) for the 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years by county.

Tables 7 and Table 8 show the Smarter Balanced Performance Levels for foster youth in mathematics for the 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years.

#### Table 5: Foster Youth Achievement on 2021–22 CAASPP in ELA by County

| **County** | **Standard Exceeded (%)** | **Standard Met (%)** | **Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)** | **Standard Nearly Met (%)** | **Standard Not Met (%)** | **Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 7.0 | 18.0 | 25.0 | 18.0 | 57.0 | 75.0 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Butte | 5.1 | 14.1 | 19.2 | 28.2 | 52.6 | 80.8 |
| Calaveras | 4.4 | 26.1 | 30.4 | 21.7 | 47.8 | 69.6 |
| Colusa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 5.0 | 10.7 | 15.7 | 27.1 | 57.1 | 84.3 |
| Del Norte | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 24.0 | 72.0 | 96.0 |
| El Dorado | 3.2 | 12.9 | 16.1 | 19.4 | 64.5 | 83.9 |
| Fresno | 5.0 | 19.1 | 24.0 | 21.5 | 54.5 | 76.0 |
| Glenn | 0.0 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 9.1 | 54.6 | 63.6 |
| Humboldt | 4.1 | 9.2 | 13.3 | 17.4 | 69.4 | 86.7 |
| Imperial | 6.1 | 11.0 | 17.1 | 31.7 | 51.2 | 82.9 |
| Inyo | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Kern | 3.9 | 15.0 | 18.9 | 21.6 | 59.5 | 81.1 |
| Kings | 10.1 | 19.0 | 29.1 | 21.5 | 49.4 | 70.9 |
| Lake | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.5 | 61.5 | 100.0 |
| Lassen | 0.0 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 12.5 | 68.8 | 81.3 |
| Los Angeles | 5.5 | 15.8 | 21.3 | 22.6 | 56.1 | 78.7 |
| Madera | 5.9 | 8.8 | 14.7 | 17.7 | 67.7 | 85.3 |
| Marin | 5.9 | 5.9 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 76.5 | 88.2 |
| Mariposa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 2.3 | 11.6 | 14.0 | 37.2 | 48.8 | 86.1 |
| Merced | 4.3 | 13.5 | 17.8 | 28.8 | 53.4 | 82.2 |
| Modoc | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 3.0 | 15.2 | 18.2 | 33.3 | 48.5 | 81.8 |
| Napa | 0.0 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 10.5 | 68.4 | 79.0 |
| Nevada | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Orange | 6.0 | 17.0 | 23.0 | 27.7 | 49.3 | 77.0 |
| Placer | 8.3 | 18.8 | 27.1 | 16.7 | 56.3 | 72.9 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 5.9 | 15.2 | 21.1 | 23.9 | 55.1 | 78.9 |
| Sacramento | 5.7 | 14.9 | 20.6 | 17.6 | 61.8 | 79.4 |
| San Benito | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| San Bernardino | 4.7 | 14.8 | 19.5 | 21.6 | 58.9 | 80.5 |
| San Diego | 6.5 | 18.4 | 24.9 | 21.4 | 53.7 | 75.1 |
| San Francisco | 0.0 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 26.2 | 54.8 | 81.0 |
| San Joaquin | 3.7 | 12.0 | 15.7 | 25.0 | 59.3 | 84.3 |
| San Luis Obispo | 0.0 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 36.7 | 49.0 | 85.7 |
| San Mateo | 0.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 25.0 | 65.0 | 90.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 5.5 | 20.9 | 26.4 | 28.6 | 45.1 | 73.6 |
| Santa Clara | 5.5 | 12.1 | 17.6 | 31.9 | 50.6 | 82.4 |
| Santa Cruz | 0.0 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 34.5 | 55.2 | 89.7 |
| Shasta | 5.6 | 16.7 | 22.2 | 22.2 | 55.6 | 77.8 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 5.9 | 23.5 | 29.4 | 29.4 | 41.2 | 70.6 |
| Solano | 3.1 | 20.3 | 23.4 | 20.3 | 56.3 | 76.6 |
| Sonoma | 6.3 | 10.1 | 16.5 | 26.6 | 57.0 | 83.5 |
| Stanislaus | 4.2 | 11.4 | 15.6 | 16.8 | 67.7 | 84.4 |
| Sutter | 0.0 | 15.2 | 15.2 | 42.4 | 42.4 | 84.8 |
| Tehama | 3.1 | 15.6 | 18.8 | 25.0 | 56.3 | 81.3 |
| Trinity | 0.0 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 42.9 | 50.0 | 92.9 |
| Tulare | 6.9 | 16.2 | 23.1 | 24.7 | 52.2 | 76.9 |
| Tuolumne | 16.7 | 11.1 | 27.8 | 22.2 | 50.0 | 72.2 |
| Ventura | 4.8 | 17.1 | 21.9 | 19.1 | 59.1 | 78.1 |
| Yolo | 3.5 | 17.2 | 20.7 | 13.8 | 65.5 | 79.3 |
| Yuba | 6.1 | 15.2 | 21.2 | 24.2 | 54.6 | 78.8 |
| **Statewide** | **5.2** | **15.4** | **20.6** | **23.0** | **56.3** | **79.3** |

#### Table 6: Foster Youth Achievement on 2022–23 CAASPP in ELA by County

| **County** | **Standard Exceeded (%)** | **Standard Met (%)** | **Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)** | **Standard Nearly Met (%)** | **Standard Not Met (%)** | **Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 5.2 | 16.5 | 21.7 | 16.5 | 61.9 | 78.4 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 16.7 | 25.0 | 41.7 | 16.7 | 41.7 | 58.3 |
| Butte | 2.7 | 10.8 | 13.5 | 18.9 | 67.6 | 86.5 |
| Calaveras | 5.3 | 26.3 | 31.6 | 10.5 | 57.9 | 68.4 |
| Colusa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 2.5 | 16.5 | 19.0 | 12.0 | 69.0 | 81.0 |
| Del Norte | 3.2 | 6.5 | 9.7 | 25.8 | 64.5 | 90.3 |
| El Dorado | 0.0 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 45.5 | 27.3 | 72.7 |
| Fresno | 4.4 | 16.9 | 21.3 | 18.4 | 60.3 | 78.7 |
| Glenn | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Humboldt | 2.1 | 10.6 | 12.8 | 17.0 | 70.2 | 87.2 |
| Imperial | 6.3 | 8.3 | 14.6 | 33.3 | 52.1 | 85.4 |
| Inyo | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Kern | 3.9 | 15.1 | 19.0 | 17.8 | 63.2 | 81.0 |
| Kings | 5.1 | 11.5 | 16.7 | 32.1 | 51.3 | 83.3 |
| Lake | 0.0 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 26.7 | 60.0 | 86.7 |
| Lassen | 0.0 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 16.7 | 72.2 | 88.9 |
| Los Angeles | 5.2 | 15.3 | 20.5 | 21.4 | 58.1 | 79.5 |
| Madera | 6.0 | 11.9 | 17.9 | 25.4 | 56.7 | 82.1 |
| Marin | 0.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 20.0 | 73.3 | 93.3 |
| Mariposa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 4.8 | 14.3 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 61.9 | 81.0 |
| Merced | 4.5 | 11.7 | 16.2 | 21.2 | 62.6 | 83.8 |
| Modoc | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 3.1 | 9.4 | 12.5 | 31.3 | 56.3 | 87.5 |
| Napa | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 71.4 | 100.0 |
| Nevada | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Orange | 7.4 | 18.7 | 26.1 | 25.4 | 48.5 | 73.9 |
| Placer | 0.0 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 35.3 | 52.9 | 88.2 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 4.1 | 15.2 | 19.2 | 21.0 | 59.8 | 80.8 |
| Sacramento | 5.5 | 14.9 | 20.4 | 22.0 | 57.7 | 79.6 |
| San Benito | 0.0 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 18.2 | 45.5 | 63.6 |
| San Bernardino | 5.4 | 12.2 | 17.5 | 20.4 | 62.1 | 82.5 |
| San Diego | 6.0 | 14.6 | 20.5 | 21.4 | 58.0 | 79.5 |
| San Francisco | 3.3 | 14.8 | 18.0 | 31.2 | 50.8 | 82.0 |
| San Joaquin | 5.3 | 10.7 | 16.0 | 21.0 | 63.0 | 84.0 |
| San Luis Obispo | 9.6 | 11.5 | 21.2 | 25.0 | 53.9 | 78.9 |
| San Mateo | 0.0 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 63.6 | 81.8 |
| Santa Barbara | 3.5 | 13.8 | 17.2 | 21.8 | 60.9 | 82.8 |
| Santa Clara | 4.3 | 11.7 | 16.0 | 26.6 | 57.5 | 84.1 |
| Santa Cruz | 0.0 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 28.6 | 60.7 | 89.3 |
| Shasta | 6.6 | 9.9 | 16.5 | 20.9 | 62.6 | 83.5 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 0.0 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 23.1 | 46.2 | 69.2 |
| Solano | 1.7 | 15.3 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 66.1 | 83.1 |
| Sonoma | 5.7 | 23.9 | 29.6 | 26.1 | 44.3 | 70.5 |
| Stanislaus | 1.8 | 10.2 | 12.1 | 22.9 | 65.1 | 88.0 |
| Sutter | 4.0 | 24.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 44.0 | 72.0 |
| Tehama | 0.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 28.2 | 64.1 | 92.3 |
| Trinity | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Tulare | 3.5 | 16.7 | 20.2 | 23.7 | 56.1 | 79.8 |
| Tuolumne | 28.6 | 7.1 | 35.7 | 21.4 | 42.9 | 64.3 |
| Ventura | 7.6 | 13.2 | 20.8 | 26.4 | 52.8 | 79.3 |
| Yolo | 3.5 | 13.8 | 17.2 | 13.8 | 69.0 | 82.8 |
| Yuba | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 27.5 | 67.5 | 95.0 |
| **Statewide** | **4.9** | **14.6** | **19.4** | **21.5** | **59.1** | **80.6** |

#### Table 7: Foster Youth Achievement on 2021–22 CAASPP in Mathematics by County

| **County** | **Standard Exceeded (%)** | **Standard Met (%)** | **Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)** | **Standard Nearly Met (%)** | **Standard Not Met (%)** | **Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 5.2 | 6.3 | 11.5 | 15.6 | 72.9 | 88.6 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Butte | 1.4 | 6.9 | 8.2 | 15.1 | 76.7 | 91.8 |
| Calaveras | 8.3 | 12.5 | 20.8 | 16.7 | 62.5 | 79.2 |
| Colusa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 1.4 | 7.2 | 8.6 | 18.7 | 72.7 | 91.4 |
| Del Norte | 4.2 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 16.7 | 79.2 | 95.8 |
| El Dorado | 0.0 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 16.1 | 74.2 | 90.3 |
| Fresno | 3.2 | 7.9 | 11.1 | 23.6 | 65.3 | 88.9 |
| Glenn | 0.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 27.3 | 63.6 | 90.9 |
| Humboldt | 1.0 | 7.1 | 8.1 | 16.2 | 75.8 | 91.9 |
| Imperial | 3.7 | 8.6 | 12.4 | 28.4 | 59.3 | 87.7 |
| Inyo | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Kern | 1.4 | 5.7 | 7.0 | 18.6 | 74.4 | 93.0 |
| Kings | 3.8 | 8.9 | 12.7 | 25.3 | 62.0 | 87.4 |
| Lake | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 100.0 |
| Lassen | 0.0 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 62.5 | 81.3 |
| Los Angeles | 2.5 | 8.0 | 10.5 | 20.6 | 69.0 | 89.5 |
| Madera | 2.8 | 5.6 | 8.5 | 14.1 | 77.5 | 91.5 |
| Marin | 0.0 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 88.2 | 94.1 |
| Mariposa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 0.0 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 14.3 | 69.1 | 83.3 |
| Merced | 1.9 | 8.8 | 10.6 | 19.4 | 70.0 | 89.4 |
| Modoc | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 24.2 | 72.7 | 97.0 |
| Napa | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 75.0 | 100.0 |
| Nevada | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Orange | 5.2 | 10.6 | 15.8 | 22.7 | 61.5 | 84.2 |
| Placer | 2.1 | 14.6 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 66.7 | 83.3 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 1.8 | 8.8 | 10.6 | 18.5 | 70.9 | 89.4 |
| Sacramento | 3.4 | 6.7 | 10.1 | 20.2 | 69.7 | 89.9 |
| San Benito | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| San Bernardino | 2.7 | 6.3 | 9.0 | 18.2 | 72.8 | 91.1 |
| San Diego | 3.5 | 9.7 | 13.3 | 20.1 | 66.7 | 86.7 |
| San Francisco | 0.0 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 26.8 | 70.7 | 97.6 |
| San Joaquin | 2.0 | 5.8 | 7.8 | 19.7 | 72.5 | 92.2 |
| San Luis Obispo | 2.1 | 6.3 | 8.3 | 25.0 | 66.7 | 91.7 |
| San Mateo | 0.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 70.0 | 90.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 3.3 | 6.5 | 9.8 | 17.4 | 72.8 | 90.2 |
| Santa Clara | 4.4 | 5.6 | 10.0 | 14.4 | 75.6 | 90.0 |
| Santa Cruz | 0.0 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 27.6 | 65.5 | 93.1 |
| Shasta | 1.1 | 15.6 | 16.7 | 20.0 | 63.3 | 83.3 |
| Sierra | **\*** | **\*** | **\*** | **\*** | **\*** | \* |
| Siskiyou | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 70.6 | 100.0 |
| Solano | 4.8 | 3.2 | 7.9 | 22.2 | 69.8 | 92.1 |
| Sonoma | 1.2 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 20.7 | 72.0 | 92.7 |
| Stanislaus | 0.6 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 11.0 | 81.6 | 92.6 |
| Sutter | 0.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 23.5 | 73.5 | 97.1 |
| Tehama | 2.9 | 11.4 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 71.4 | 85.7 |
| Trinity | 7.1 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 21.4 | 71.4 | 92.9 |
| Tulare | 4.0 | 6.9 | 10.9 | 21.4 | 67.7 | 89.1 |
| Tuolumne | 0.0 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 22.2 | 61.1 | 83.3 |
| Ventura | 3.9 | 9.8 | 13.7 | 12.8 | 73.5 | 86.3 |
| Yolo | 3.5 | 3.5 | 6.9 | 17.2 | 75.9 | 93.1 |
| Yuba | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 27.3 | 69.7 | 97.0 |
| **Statewide** | **2.6** | **7.7** | **10.3** | **19.8** | **69.9** | **89.7** |

#### Table 8: Foster Youth Achievement on 2022–23 CAASPP in Mathematics by County

| **County** | **Standard Exceeded (%)** | **Standard Met (%)** | **Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)** | **Standard Nearly Met (%)** | **Standard Not Met (%)** | **Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 5.3 | 6.4 | 11.7 | 18.1 | 70.2 | 88.3 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 0.0 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 50.0 | 41.7 | 91.7 |
| Butte | 0.0 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 18.1 | 75.0 | 93.1 |
| Calaveras | 0.0 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 15.8 | 73.7 | 89.5 |
| Colusa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 1.9 | 5.0 | 6.9 | 12.6 | 80.5 | 93.1 |
| Del Norte | 3.2 | 6.5 | 9.7 | 12.9 | 77.4 | 90.3 |
| El Dorado | 0.0 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 39.1 | 52.2 | 91.3 |
| Fresno | 2.3 | 9.9 | 12.1 | 18.8 | 69.1 | 87.9 |
| Glenn | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Humboldt | 3.2 | 4.3 | 7.5 | 20.4 | 72.0 | 92.5 |
| Imperial | 4.2 | 12.5 | 16.7 | 12.5 | 70.8 | 83.3 |
| Inyo | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Kern | 2.5 | 5.7 | 8.2 | 15.9 | 75.9 | 91.8 |
| Kings | 1.3 | 15.4 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 66.7 | 83.3 |
| Lake | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 73.3 | 100.0 |
| Lassen | 0.0 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 83.3 | 83.3 |
| Los Angeles | 3.0 | 8.1 | 11.1 | 18.8 | 70.2 | 88.9 |
| Madera | 0.0 | 10.5 | 10.5 | 17.9 | 71.6 | 89.6 |
| Marin | 0.0 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 17.7 | 70.6 | 88.2 |
| Mariposa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 2.3 | 11.6 | 14.0 | 11.6 | 74.4 | 86.1 |
| Merced | 0.6 | 7.8 | 8.3 | 18.3 | 73.3 | 91.7 |
| Modoc | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 83.9 | 100.0 |
| Napa | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.1 | 81.0 | 100.0 |
| Nevada | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Orange | 5.5 | 11.5 | 17.0 | 22.3 | 60.6 | 83.0 |
| Placer | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 26.0 | 70.0 | 96.0 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 1.9 | 7.0 | 8.9 | 19.0 | 72.1 | 91.1 |
| Sacramento | 3.5 | 6.3 | 9.8 | 19.9 | 70.3 | 90.2 |
| San Benito | 0.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 18.2 | 72.7 | 90.9 |
| San Bernardino | 2.9 | 6.7 | 9.6 | 18.1 | 72.3 | 90.4 |
| San Diego | 2.9 | 6.6 | 9.5 | 21.0 | 69.5 | 90.5 |
| San Francisco | 3.3 | 4.9 | 8.2 | 21.3 | 70.5 | 91.8 |
| San Joaquin | 2.9 | 6.4 | 9.3 | 17.0 | 73.7 | 90.7 |
| San Luis Obispo | 7.8 | 9.8 | 17.7 | 21.6 | 60.8 | 82.4 |
| San Mateo | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 9.5 | 85.7 | 95.2 |
| Santa Barbara | 2.3 | 9.1 | 11.4 | 18.2 | 70.5 | 88.6 |
| Santa Clara | 1.1 | 11.8 | 12.9 | 11.8 | 75.3 | 87.1 |
| Santa Cruz | 0.0 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 3.5 | 86.2 | 89.7 |
| Shasta | 1.1 | 10.9 | 12.0 | 14.1 | 73.9 | 88.0 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 0.0 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 15.4 | 76.9 | 92.3 |
| Solano | 1.6 | 4.9 | 6.6 | 14.8 | 78.7 | 93.4 |
| Sonoma | 1.2 | 4.7 | 5.8 | 25.6 | 68.6 | 94.2 |
| Stanislaus | 1.2 | 6.1 | 7.4 | 20.3 | 72.4 | 92.6 |
| Sutter | 4.2 | 12.5 | 16.7 | 29.2 | 54.2 | 83.3 |
| Tehama | 0.0 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 28.2 | 69.2 | 97.4 |
| Trinity | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Tulare | 3.5 | 9.2 | 12.7 | 17.5 | 69.9 | 87.3 |
| Tuolumne | 21.4 | 7.1 | 28.6 | 14.3 | 57.1 | 71.4 |
| Ventura | 2.8 | 7.6 | 10.4 | 16.0 | 73.6 | 89.6 |
| Yolo | 3.3 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 10.0 | 86.7 | 96.7 |
| Yuba | 0.0 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 18.0 | 79.5 | 97.4 |
| **Statewide** | **2.8** | **7.7** | **10.5** | **18.5** | **71.0** | **89.5** |

1. **The Number of Pupils in Foster Care Who Were Suspended or Expelled**

Table 9 includes the statewide suspension rates[[5]](#endnote-6) between foster youth and non-foster youth for the 2021–22 and 2022–23 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.

Table 10 includes the suspension rates for foster youth by grade span for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years.

Table 11 shows the Suspension rate of foster youth who were suspended one or more times during the 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years by county. Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the school year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a county. Cumulative enrollment is **not** necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is suspended in multiple counties during the academic year, they are counted once at each county but only once at the state level.

#### Table 9: Suspension of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **Academic Year** | **Foster Youth (%)** | **Non-Foster Youth (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2021-22 | 12.6 | 3.1 |
| 2022-23 | 13.9 | 3.5 |

#### Table 10: Suspension of Foster Youth by Grade Span for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **Academic Year** | **Kindergarten–Third**  **(%)** | **Fourth–Sixth**  **(%)** | **Seventh–Eighth**  **(%)** | **Ninth–Twelfth**  **(%)** | **All Grades**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2021-22 | 3.5 | 10.9 | 23.4 | 18.4 | 12.6 |
| 2022-23 | 4.3 | 12.0 | 26.8 | 19.4 | 13.9 |

#### Table 11: Suspension of Foster Youth by County for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **County** | **2021-22**  **Cumulative Enrollment**  **Foster Youth (N)** | **2021-22**  **Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Suspended One or More Times (N)** | **2022-23**  **Cumulative Enrollment**  **Foster Youth (N)** | **2022-23**  **Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Suspended One or More Times (N)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 835 | 86 | 766 | 78 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 44 | 8 | 60 | 9 |
| Butte | 358 | 61 | 334 | 52 |
| Calaveras | 105 | 11 | 91 | 10 |
| Colusa | 57 | 12 | 28 | 5 |
| Contra Costa | 793 | 123 | 708 | 110 |
| Del Norte | 106 | 20 | 103 | 21 |
| El Dorado | 254 | 13 | 212 | 13 |
| Fresno | 2,403 | 360 | 2,292 | 476 |
| Glenn | 50 | 7 | 48 | 6 |
| Humboldt | 339 | 45 | 362 | 65 |
| Imperial | 292 | 32 | 231 | 31 |
| Inyo | 84 | 3 | 87 | 2 |
| Kern | 2,160 | 332 | 2,137 | 345 |
| Kings | 334 | 35 | 374 | 46 |
| Lake | 73 | 10 | 72 | 9 |
| Lassen | 98 | 14 | 82 | 13 |
| Los Angeles | 14,266 | 1,169 | 13,418 | 1,209 |
| Madera | 374 | 41 | 316 | 47 |
| Marin | 110 | 18 | 105 | 15 |
| Mariposa | 50 | 5 | 56 | 9 |
| Mendocino | 196 | 33 | 215 | 41 |
| Merced | 629 | 84 | 664 | 90 |
| Modoc | 29 | 3 | 34 | 6 |
| Mono | \* | \* | 16 | 0 |
| Monterey | 204 | 16 | 155 | 16 |
| Napa | 108 | 14 | 85 | 13 |
| Nevada | 67 | 3 | 51 | 3 |
| Orange | 2,505 | 199 | 2,699 | 240 |
| Placer | 291 | 20 | 271 | 24 |
| Plumas | 23 | 3 | 26 | 7 |
| Riverside | 4,433 | 542 | 4,588 | 627 |
| Sacramento | 1,558 | 277 | 1,463 | 253 |
| San Benito | 59 | 13 | 39 | 5 |
| San Bernardino | 5,692 | 716 | 5,632 | 828 |
| San Diego | 1,732 | 187 | 1,618 | 212 |
| San Francisco | 535 | 34 | 517 | 43 |
| San Joaquin | 1,309 | 248 | 1,266 | 230 |
| San Luis Obispo | 261 | 37 | 219 | 34 |
| San Mateo | 156 | 20 | 146 | 15 |
| Santa Barbara | 462 | 67 | 402 | 62 |
| Santa Clara | 615 | 68 | 476 | 57 |
| Santa Cruz | 150 | 14 | 157 | 20 |
| Shasta | 406 | 77 | 396 | 73 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 64 | 9 | 61 | 5 |
| Solano | 410 | 66 | 333 | 56 |
| Sonoma | 407 | 56 | 377 | 54 |
| Stanislaus | 646 | 105 | 603 | 88 |
| Sutter | 189 | 27 | 158 | 15 |
| Tehama | 186 | 21 | 171 | 22 |
| Trinity | 49 | 3 | 61 | 2 |
| Tulare | 1,001 | 102 | 1,058 | 126 |
| Tuolumne | 78 | 9 | 65 | 7 |
| Ventura | 588 | 85 | 541 | 82 |
| Yolo | 229 | 48 | 208 | 36 |
| Yuba | 171 | 26 | 167 | 22 |
| **Statewide** | **43,191** | **5,457** | **41,901** | **5,816** |

Table 12 includes the statewide expulsion rates[[6]](#endnote-7) between foster youth and non-foster youth for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years.

Table 13 shows the expulsion of foster youth by County for 2021–22 and 2022–23 and includes the total cumulative enrollment of foster youth for reference. Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the school year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a county. Cumulative enrollment is not necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is expelled in multiple counties during the academic year, they are counted once at each county but only once at the state level.

#### Table 12: Expulsion of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **Academic Year** | **Foster Youth (%)** | **Non-Foster Youth (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2021-22 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| 2022-23 | 0.3 | 0.1 |

#### Table 13: Expulsion of Foster Youth by County for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **County** | **2021-22**  **Cumulative Enrollment Foster Youth (N)** | **2021-22**  **Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Expelled (N)** | **2022-23**  **Cumulative Enrollment Foster Youth (N)** | **2022-23**  **Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Expelled (N)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 835 | 5 | 766 | 2 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 44 | 0 | 60 | 1 |
| Butte | 358 | 5 | 334 | 7 |
| Calaveras | 105 | 0 | 91 | 0 |
| Colusa | 57 | 0 | 28 | 2 |
| Contra Costa | 793 | 2 | 708 | 1 |
| Del Norte | 106 | 1 | 103 | 0 |
| El Dorado | 254 | 0 | 212 | 2 |
| Fresno | 2,403 | 13 | 2,292 | 10 |
| Glenn | 50 | 0 | 48 | 0 |
| Humboldt | 339 | 0 | 362 | 1 |
| Imperial | 292 | 0 | 231 | 2 |
| Inyo | 84 | 0 | 87 | 0 |
| Kern | 2,160 | 6 | 2,137 | 2 |
| Kings | 334 | 7 | 374 | 10 |
| Lake | 73 | 1 | 72 | 0 |
| Lassen | 98 | 1 | 82 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | 14,266 | 17 | 13,418 | 12 |
| Madera | 374 | 5 | 316 | 2 |
| Marin | 110 | 0 | 105 | 0 |
| Mariposa | 50 | 0 | 56 | 0 |
| Mendocino | 196 | 0 | 215 | 1 |
| Merced | 629 | 4 | 664 | 10 |
| Modoc | 29 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Mono | \* | \* | 16 | 0 |
| Monterey | 204 | 1 | 155 | 1 |
| Napa | 108 | 1 | 85 | 0 |
| Nevada | 67 | 0 | 51 | 0 |
| Orange | 2,505 | 2 | 2,699 | 2 |
| Placer | 291 | 1 | 271 | 1 |
| Plumas | 23 | 0 | 26 | 0 |
| Riverside | 4,433 | 20 | 4,588 | 17 |
| Sacramento | 1,558 | 4 | 1,463 | 5 |
| San Benito | 59 | 1 | 39 | 1 |
| San Bernardino | 5,692 | 24 | 5,632 | 13 |
| San Diego | 1,732 | 2 | 1,618 | 3 |
| San Francisco | 535 | 0 | 517 | 0 |
| San Joaquin | 1,309 | 5 | 1,266 | 8 |
| San Luis Obispo | 261 | 3 | 219 | 1 |
| San Mateo | 156 | 0 | 146 | 0 |
| Santa Barbara | 462 | 0 | 402 | 0 |
| Santa Clara | 615 | 2 | 476 | 1 |
| Santa Cruz | 150 | 1 | 157 | 0 |
| Shasta | 406 | 1 | 396 | 1 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 64 | 0 | 61 | 1 |
| Solano | 410 | 2 | 333 | 2 |
| Sonoma | 407 | 1 | 377 | 1 |
| Stanislaus | 646 | 1 | 603 | 3 |
| Sutter | 189 | 1 | 158 | 1 |
| Tehama | 186 | 0 | 171 | 1 |
| Trinity | 49 | 0 | 61 | 0 |
| Tulare | 1,001 | 5 | 1,058 | 4 |
| Tuolumne | 78 | 0 | 65 | 0 |
| Ventura | 588 | 1 | 541 | 2 |
| Yolo | 229 | 2 | 208 | 0 |
| Yuba | 171 | 3 | 167 | 1 |
| **Statewide** | **43,191** | **152** | **41,901** | **134** |

1. **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**

Tables 14 and 15 provide the number and percent of foster youth enrolled in juvenile court schools or youth authority schools by county in the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years, respectively.[[7]](#endnote-8) Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the school year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a county. Cumulative enrollment is not necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is enrolled in a juvenile court school or youth authority school in multiple counties during the academic year, they are counted once at each county but only once at the state level, regardless of the number of juvenile court schools or youth authority schools they attended.

#### Table 14: Number and percent of Foster Youth enrolled in Juvenile Court Schools and Youth Authority Schools for 2021–22

| **County** | **Cumulative Enrollment**  **(N)** | **Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth in Juvenile Court Schools or Youth Authority Schools**  **(N)** | **Percent of Foster Youth Enrolled in Juvenile Court Schools or Youth Authority Schools**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 835 | 94 | 11.3 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 44 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Butte | 358 | 1 | 0.3 |
| Calaveras | 105 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Colusa | 57 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Contra Costa | 793 | 20 | 2.5 |
| Del Norte | 106 | 5 | 4.7 |
| El Dorado | 254 | 107 | 42.1 |
| Fresno | 2,403 | 121 | 5.0 |
| Glenn | 50 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Humboldt | 339 | 8 | 2.4 |
| Imperial | 292 | 16 | 5.5 |
| Inyo | 84 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Kern | 2,160 | 528 | 24.4 |
| Kings | 334 | 13 | 3.9 |
| Lake | 73 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Lassen | 98 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Los Angeles | 14,266 | 417 | 2.9 |
| Madera | 374 | 13 | 3.5 |
| Marin | 110 | 13 | 11.8 |
| Mariposa | 50 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mendocino | 196 | 6 | 3.1 |
| Merced | 629 | 11 | 1.7 |
| Modoc | 29 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 204 | 17 | 8.3 |
| Napa | 108 | 12 | 11.1 |
| Nevada | 67 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Orange | 2,505 | 185 | 7.4 |
| Placer | 291 | 19 | 6.5 |
| Plumas | 23 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Riverside | 4,433 | 107 | 2.4 |
| Sacramento | 1,558 | 142 | 9.1 |
| San Benito | 59 | 1 | 1.7 |
| San Bernardino | 5,692 | 130 | 2.3 |
| San Diego | 1,732 | 149 | 8.6 |
| San Francisco | 535 | 30 | 5.6 |
| San Joaquin | 1,309 | 99 | 7.6 |
| San Luis Obispo | 261 | 14 | 5.4 |
| San Mateo | 156 | 8 | 5.1 |
| Santa Barbara | 462 | 9 | 1.9 |
| Santa Clara | 615 | 39 | 6.3 |
| Santa Cruz | 150 | 15 | 10.0 |
| Shasta | 406 | 12 | 3.0 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 64 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Solano | 410 | 15 | 3.7 |
| Sonoma | 407 | 26 | 6.4 |
| Stanislaus | 646 | 31 | 4.8 |
| Sutter | 189 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tehama | 186 | 10 | 5.4 |
| Trinity | 49 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tulare | 1,001 | 30 | 3.0 |
| Tuolumne | 78 | 12 | 15.4 |
| Ventura | 588 | 30 | 5.1 |
| Yolo | 229 | 8 | 3.5 |
| Yuba | 171 | 10 | 5.8 |
| **Statewide** | **43,191** | **2,243** | **5.2** |

#### Table 15: Number and percent of Foster Youth enrolled in Juvenile Court Schools and Youth Authority Schools for 2022–23

| **County** | **Cumulative Enrollment**  **(N)** | **Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth in Juvenile Court Schools or Youth Authority Schools**  **(N)** | **Percent of Foster Youth Enrolled in Juvenile Court Schools or Youth Authority Schools**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 766 | 77 | 10.1 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 60 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Butte | 334 | 5 | 1.5 |
| Calaveras | 91 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Colusa | 28 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Contra Costa | 708 | 21 | 3.0 |
| Del Norte | 103 | 3 | 2.9 |
| El Dorado | 212 | 85 | 40.1 |
| Fresno | 2,292 | 122 | 5.3 |
| Glenn | 48 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Humboldt | 362 | 13 | 3.6 |
| Imperial | 231 | 4 | 1.7 |
| Inyo | 87 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Kern | 2,137 | 495 | 23.2 |
| Kings | 374 | 10 | 2.7 |
| Lake | 72 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Lassen | 82 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Los Angeles | 13,418 | 436 | 3.2 |
| Madera | 316 | 10 | 3.2 |
| Marin | 105 | 10 | 9.5 |
| Mariposa | 56 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mendocino | 215 | 9 | 4.2 |
| Merced | 664 | 18 | 2.7 |
| Modoc | 34 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mono | 16 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Monterey | 155 | 19 | 12.3 |
| Napa | 85 | 12 | 14.1 |
| Nevada | 51 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Orange | 2,699 | 196 | 7.3 |
| Placer | 271 | 13 | 4.8 |
| Plumas | 26 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Riverside | 4,588 | 119 | 2.6 |
| Sacramento | 1,463 | 135 | 9.2 |
| San Benito | 39 | 3 | 7.7 |
| San Bernardino | 5,632 | 91 | 1.6 |
| San Diego | 1,618 | 142 | 8.8 |
| San Francisco | 517 | 11 | 2.1 |
| San Joaquin | 1,266 | 94 | 7.4 |
| San Luis Obispo | 219 | 9 | 4.1 |
| San Mateo | 146 | 4 | 2.7 |
| Santa Barbara | 402 | 13 | 3.2 |
| Santa Clara | 476 | 28 | 5.9 |
| Santa Cruz | 157 | 14 | 8.9 |
| Shasta | 396 | 27 | 6.8 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 61 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Solano | 333 | 15 | 4.5 |
| Sonoma | 377 | 27 | 7.2 |
| Stanislaus | 603 | 27 | 4.5 |
| Sutter | 158 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tehama | 171 | 15 | 8.8 |
| Trinity | 61 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tulare | 1,058 | 41 | 3.9 |
| Tuolumne | 65 | 4 | 6.2 |
| Ventura | 541 | 21 | 3.9 |
| Yolo | 208 | 5 | 2.4 |
| Yuba | 167 | 13 | 7.8 |
| **Statewide** | **41,901** | **2166** | **5.2** |

1. **The Chronic Absence Rates, Attendance Rates, Stability Rates, Graduation Rates, and Dropout Rates for Pupils in Foster Care**

Table 16 compares the statewide percentage of foster youth who were chronically absent[[8]](#endnote-9) with non-foster youth for the 2021–22 and 2022-23 school years.

Table 17 shows the chronic absence rate for foster youth for the 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years by grade span: kindergarten, grades one through three, four through six, seven through eight, nine through twelve, and all grades.

Table 18 below shows the chronic absence rate for foster youth for the 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years by county and statewide.

#### Table 16: Chronic Absence of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **Academic Year** | **Foster Youth Chronic Absence (%)** | **Non-Foster Youth Chronic Absence (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2021-22 | 46.5 | 29.9 |
| 2022-23 | 39.2 | 24.8 |

#### Table 17: Foster Youth Chronic Absence by Grade Span for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **Academic Year** | **Kindergarten**  **(%)** | **First–Third**  **(%)** | **Fourth–Sixth**  **(%)** | **Seventh–Eighth**  **(%)** | **Ninth–Twelfth**  **(%)** | **All Grades**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2021-22 | 49.7 | 39.6 | 38.7 | 46.2 | 55.5 | 46.5 |
| 2022-23 | 40.8 | 30.8 | 28.7 | 40.2 | 50.7 | 39.2 |

#### Table 18: Foster Youth Chronic Absence by County for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **County** | **2021-22**  **Foster Youth**  **Chronic Absence**  **(%)** | **2022-23**  **Foster Youth**  **Chronic Absence**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 61.0 | 59.8 |
| Alpine | \* | \* |
| Amador | 50.0 | 44.6 |
| Butte | 50.9 | 39.7 |
| Calaveras | 48.4 | 43.7 |
| Colusa | 48.0 | 30.8 |
| Contra Costa | 48.6 | 45.2 |
| Del Norte | 65.0 | 54.5 |
| El Dorado | 25.4 | 21.3 |
| Fresno | 47.9 | 35.5 |
| Glenn | 44.4 | 26.1 |
| Humboldt | 55.6 | 54.9 |
| Imperial | 45.2 | 29.8 |
| Inyo | 68.1 | 79.7 |
| Kern | 50.0 | 34.8 |
| Kings | 48.8 | 34.6 |
| Lake | 50.7 | 37.1 |
| Lassen | 46.2 | 38.5 |
| Los Angeles | 44.7 | 38.7 |
| Madera | 49.3 | 30.0 |
| Marin | 51.9 | 45.7 |
| Mariposa | 46.7 | 51.1 |
| Mendocino | 56.1 | 50.2 |
| Merced | 45.2 | 32.0 |
| Modoc | 53.8 | 36.4 |
| Mono | \* | 75.0 |
| Monterey | 49.7 | 37.0 |
| Napa | 47.9 | 35.5 |
| Nevada | 59.6 | 55.8 |
| Orange | 42.1 | 39.0 |
| Placer | 44.9 | 33.7 |
| Plumas | 77.3 | 80.0 |
| Riverside | 44.1 | 40.6 |
| Sacramento | 49.4 | 44.0 |
| San Benito | 57.9 | 28.9 |
| San Bernardino | 40.5 | 35.4 |
| San Diego | 47.0 | 39.7 |
| San Francisco | 71.5 | 66.7 |
| San Joaquin | 49.7 | 39.3 |
| San Luis Obispo | 51.4 | 41.0 |
| San Mateo | 47.3 | 48.6 |
| Santa Barbara | 45.8 | 41.1 |
| Santa Clara | 55.4 | 48.0 |
| Santa Cruz | 51.1 | 40.1 |
| Shasta | 44.6 | 29.1 |
| Sierra | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 51.7 | 49.2 |
| Solano | 46.0 | 41.5 |
| Sonoma | 56.2 | 41.1 |
| Stanislaus | 44.7 | 32.0 |
| Sutter | 26.4 | 29.9 |
| Tehama | 47.0 | 32.2 |
| Trinity | 55.6 | 64.2 |
| Tulare | 38.3 | 30.1 |
| Tuolumne | 42.3 | 25.9 |
| Ventura | 51.3 | 44.6 |
| Yolo | 58.3 | 44.5 |
| Yuba | 44.3 | 38.9 |
| **Statewide** | **46.5** | **39.2** |

Tables 19 and Table 20 display the attendance rates by county for foster youth in 2021–22 and 2022–23, 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: Foster Youth Attendance by County for 2021-22

| **County** | **Cumulative Enrollment**  **(N)** | **Days Attended**  **(N)** | **Days Expected to Attend**  **(N)** | **Attendance Rate**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 835 | 84,686.9 | 110,924.0 | 76.3 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 44 | 5,740.0 | 6,496.0 | 88.4 |
| Butte | 358 | 40,906.7 | 51,751.0 | 79.0 |
| Calaveras | 105 | 11,654.2 | 13,417.0 | 86.9 |
| Colusa | 57 | 6,357.2 | 7,379.0 | 86.2 |
| Contra Costa | 793 | 85,095.4 | 102,425.0 | 83.1 |
| Del Norte | 106 | 12,720.4 | 16,308.0 | 78.0 |
| El Dorado | 254 | 22,995.0 | 26,067.0 | 88.2 |
| Fresno | 2,403 | 283,427.9 | 358,726.0 | 79.0 |
| Glenn | 50 | 5,359.1 | 6,607.0 | 81.1 |
| Humboldt | 339 | 42,623.6 | 56,122.0 | 75.9 |
| Imperial | 292 | 38,636.1 | 44,639.0 | 86.6 |
| Inyo | 84 | 5,864.4 | 8,193.0 | 71.6 |
| Kern | 2,160 | 267,508.1 | 318,509.0 | 84.0 |
| Kings | 334 | 36,682.9 | 50,282.0 | 73.0 |
| Lake | 73 | 8,595.1 | 11,337.0 | 75.8 |
| Lassen | 98 | 10,424.7 | 13,203.0 | 79.0 |
| Los Angeles | 14,266 | 1,838,195.2 | 2,207,256.7 | 83.3 |
| Madera | 374 | 40,634.1 | 49,339.0 | 82.4 |
| Marin | 110 | 10,893.5 | 12,954.0 | 84.1 |
| Mariposa | 50 | 3,214.6 | 5,552.0 | 57.9 |
| Mendocino | 196 | 23,031.9 | 29,530.0 | 78.0 |
| Merced | 629 | 71,385.8 | 84,304.0 | 84.7 |
| Modoc | 29 | 3,412.9 | 4,124.0 | 82.8 |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 204 | 22,889.5 | 27,356.0 | 83.7 |
| Napa | 108 | 12,449.2 | 14,264.0 | 87.3 |
| Nevada | 67 | 4,586.6 | 5,953.0 | 77.0 |
| Orange | 2,505 | 331,665.7 | 386,057.0 | 85.9 |
| Placer | 291 | 34,138.4 | 39,301.0 | 86.9 |
| Plumas | 23 | 2,217.0 | 3,020.0 | 73.4 |
| Riverside | 4,433 | 514,800.3 | 616,337.0 | 83.5 |
| Sacramento | 1,558 | 157,841.2 | 203,826.0 | 77.4 |
| San Benito | 59 | 6,430.7 | 7,918.0 | 81.2 |
| San Bernardino | 5,692 | 645,855.1 | 780,464.0 | 82.8 |
| San Diego | 1,732 | 207,744.2 | 260,838.0 | 79.6 |
| San Francisco | 535 | 51,077.0 | 71,188.0 | 71.7 |
| San Joaquin | 1,309 | 141,325.5 | 177,176.0 | 79.8 |
| San Luis Obispo | 261 | 31,066.4 | 40,385.0 | 76.9 |
| San Mateo | 156 | 18,705.0 | 23,097.0 | 81.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 462 | 58,676.8 | 69,164.0 | 84.8 |
| Santa Clara | 615 | 67,441.1 | 88,042.0 | 76.6 |
| Santa Cruz | 150 | 17,603.2 | 20,781.0 | 84.7 |
| Shasta | 406 | 49,121.7 | 58,391.0 | 84.1 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 64 | 7,475.9 | 10,171.0 | 73.5 |
| Solano | 410 | 45,234.4 | 53,368.0 | 84.8 |
| Sonoma | 407 | 45,045.9 | 57,123.0 | 78.9 |
| Stanislaus | 646 | 64,643.1 | 79,422.0 | 81.4 |
| Sutter | 189 | 19,855.2 | 22,702.0 | 87.5 |
| Tehama | 186 | 20,399.4 | 24,980.0 | 81.7 |
| Trinity | 49 | 4,825.0 | 6,231.0 | 77.4 |
| Tulare | 1,001 | 133,065.3 | 157,634.0 | 84.4 |
| Tuolumne | 78 | 9,277.8 | 10,663.0 | 87.0 |
| Ventura | 588 | 63,437.1 | 80,638.0 | 78.7 |
| Yolo | 229 | 24,275.6 | 30,184.0 | 80.4 |
| Yuba | 171 | 17,440.2 | 21,337.0 | 81.7 |
| **Statewide** | **43,191** | **5,812,926.5** | **7,074,915.7** | **82.2** |

#### Table 20: Foster Youth Attendance by County for 2022-23

| **County** | **Cumulative Enrollment**  **(N)** | **Days Attended**  **(N)** | **Days Expected to Attend**  **(N)** | **Attendance Rate**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 766 | 77,417.8 | 99,947.0 | 77.5 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 60 | 7,402.8 | 8,466.0 | 87.4 |
| Butte | 334 | 38,593.6 | 48,812.0 | 79.1 |
| Calaveras | 91 | 11,668.2 | 13,059.0 | 89.3 |
| Colusa | 28 | 3,719.0 | 4,342.0 | 85.7 |
| Contra Costa | 708 | 77,722.8 | 91,617.0 | 84.8 |
| Del Norte | 103 | 13,171.2 | 15,932.0 | 82.7 |
| El Dorado | 212 | 20,022.8 | 22,726.0 | 88.1 |
| Fresno | 2,292 | 299,921.1 | 352,012.0 | 85.2 |
| Glenn | 48 | 5,760.2 | 6,693.0 | 86.1 |
| Humboldt | 362 | 45,970.4 | 57,669.0 | 79.7 |
| Imperial | 231 | 32,669.6 | 35,665.0 | 91.6 |
| Inyo | 87 | 6,376.4 | 8,663.0 | 73.6 |
| Kern | 2,137 | 285,670.3 | 324,720.0 | 88.0 |
| Kings | 374 | 44,770.4 | 56,185.0 | 79.7 |
| Lake | 72 | 8,244.0 | 9,988.0 | 82.5 |
| Lassen | 82 | 10,223.8 | 12,488.0 | 81.9 |
| Los Angeles | 13,418 | 1,768,510.1 | 2,074,492.8 | 85.3 |
| Madera | 316 | 37,914.5 | 42,491.0 | 89.2 |
| Marin | 105 | 9,958.7 | 11,634.0 | 85.6 |
| Mariposa | 56 | 5,153.7 | 6,865.0 | 75.1 |
| Mendocino | 215 | 28,892.3 | 34,121.0 | 84.7 |
| Merced | 664 | 84,945.8 | 95,834.0 | 88.6 |
| Modoc | 34 | 4,631.5 | 5,070.0 | 91.4 |
| Mono | 16 | 1,246.0 | 1,508.0 | 82.6 |
| Monterey | 155 | 17,965.3 | 20,789.0 | 86.4 |
| Napa | 85 | 9,851.5 | 11,002.0 | 89.5 |
| Nevada | 51 | 3,698.5 | 5,053.0 | 73.2 |
| Orange | 2,699 | 363,033.6 | 423,807.0 | 85.7 |
| Placer | 271 | 33,312.4 | 37,889.0 | 87.9 |
| Plumas | 26 | 2,432.0 | 3,420.0 | 71.1 |
| Riverside | 4,588 | 558,175.1 | 649,706.0 | 85.9 |
| Sacramento | 1,463 | 154,847.8 | 195,587.0 | 79.2 |
| San Benito | 39 | 5,278.5 | 5,759.0 | 91.7 |
| San Bernardino | 5,632 | 655,059.7 | 777,751.0 | 84.2 |
| San Diego | 1,618 | 195,441.1 | 241,068.0 | 81.1 |
| San Francisco | 517 | 51,688.0 | 69,486.0 | 74.4 |
| San Joaquin | 1,266 | 141,302.7 | 173,395.0 | 81.5 |
| San Luis Obispo | 219 | 28,468.3 | 34,110.0 | 83.5 |
| San Mateo | 146 | 17,918.5 | 21,734.0 | 82.4 |
| Santa Barbara | 402 | 51,921.6 | 60,511.0 | 85.8 |
| Santa Clara | 476 | 51,348.1 | 67,443.0 | 76.1 |
| Santa Cruz | 157 | 16,513.5 | 19,116.0 | 86.4 |
| Shasta | 396 | 50,197.9 | 57,050.0 | 88.0 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 61 | 7,628.3 | 9,102.0 | 83.8 |
| Solano | 333 | 36,894.4 | 41,806.0 | 88.3 |
| Sonoma | 377 | 44,465.7 | 54,528.0 | 81.5 |
| Stanislaus | 603 | 59,532.1 | 69,073.0 | 86.2 |
| Sutter | 158 | 18,154.5 | 21,368.0 | 85.0 |
| Tehama | 171 | 20,212.8 | 23,107.0 | 87.5 |
| Trinity | 61 | 4,667.7 | 7,133.0 | 65.4 |
| Tulare | 1,058 | 143,884.8 | 166,309.0 | 86.5 |
| Tuolumne | 65 | 8,445.8 | 9,151.0 | 92.3 |
| Ventura | 541 | 58,235.7 | 73,182.0 | 79.6 |
| Yolo | 208 | 24,950.6 | 29,828.0 | 83.6 |
| Yuba | 167 | 18,640.1 | 22,151.0 | 84.2 |
| **Statewide** | **41,901** | **5,808,928.3** | **6,877,810.8** | **84.5** |

Table 21 includes the statewide school stability rate[[9]](#endnote-10) for foster and non-foster youth for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years.

Table 22 shows the school stability rate of foster youth by county for 2021-22 and 2022–23 school years.

#### Table 21: School Stability Rate of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **Academic Year** | **Foster Youth (%)** | **Non-Foster Youth (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2021-22 | 65.0 | 90.0 |
| 2022-23 | 66.3 | 91.3 |

#### Table 22: School Stability Rate of Foster Youth by County for 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **County** | **2021-22**  **Stability Rate**  **(%)** | **2022-23**  **Stability Rate**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 51.7 | 51.7 |
| Alpine | \* | \* |
| Amador | 68.2 | 65 |
| Butte | 52.5 | 57.8 |
| Calaveras | 50.5 | 60.4 |
| Colusa | 50.9 | 78.6 |
| Contra Costa | 51.6 | 51.8 |
| Del Norte | 66.0 | 72.8 |
| El Dorado | 37.8 | 38.7 |
| Fresno | 60.2 | 61.0 |
| Glenn | 50.0 | 54.2 |
| Humboldt | 74.3 | 70.2 |
| Imperial | 63.4 | 70.1 |
| Inyo | 27.4 | 24.1 |
| Kern | 52.8 | 56.1 |
| Kings | 64.1 | 61.1 |
| Lake | 65.8 | 51.4 |
| Lassen | 53.1 | 69.5 |
| Los Angeles | 64.4 | 65.5 |
| Madera | 53.7 | 58.5 |
| Marin | 62.7 | 44.8 |
| Mariposa | 38.0 | 55.4 |
| Mendocino | 59.7 | 66 |
| Merced | 46.7 | 53.8 |
| Modoc | 69.0 | 61.8 |
| Mono | \* | 43.8 |
| Monterey | 50.5 | 50.3 |
| Napa | 60.2 | 52.9 |
| Nevada | 32.8 | 41.2 |
| Orange | 66.5 | 69.3 |
| Placer | 56.4 | 61.6 |
| Plumas | 47.8 | 26.9 |
| Riverside | 52.6 | 55.9 |
| Sacramento | 47.6 | 49.6 |
| San Benito | 54.2 | 66.7 |
| San Bernardino | 48.9 | 50.4 |
| San Diego | 60.1 | 60.0 |
| San Francisco | 57.2 | 57.1 |
| San Joaquin | 50.6 | 54.1 |
| San Luis Obispo | 65.1 | 68.9 |
| San Mateo | 67.9 | 65.8 |
| Santa Barbara | 64.1 | 62.9 |
| Santa Clara | 59.3 | 58.5 |
| Santa Cruz | 54.0 | 46.5 |
| Shasta | 53.9 | 55.8 |
| Sierra | \* | 66.7 |
| Siskiyou | 65.6 | 54.1 |
| Solano | 49.0 | 53.8 |
| Sonoma | 64.1 | 66.0 |
| Stanislaus | 45.0 | 46.6 |
| Sutter | 46.0 | 56.1 |
| Tehama | 44.6 | 52.6 |
| Trinity | 53.1 | 47.5 |
| Tulare | 69.6 | 66.4 |
| Tuolumne | 55.1 | 64.6 |
| Ventura | 57.8 | 58.8 |
| Yolo | 50.7 | 63.5 |
| Yuba | 52.0 | 44.3 |
| **Statewide** | **65.0** | **66.3** |

Table 23 contains a three-year view of the adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR)[[10]](#endnote-11) for foster and non-foster youth as well as the change in graduation rates between 2021 and 2023.

#### Table 23: Four Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate for Foster and Non-Foster Youth between 2021 and 2023

| **Student Group** | **2021**  **(%)** | **2022**  **(%)** | **2023**  **(%)** | **1-Year Change 2023 to 2022**  **(%)** | **2-Year Change in 2023 to 2021**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Foster Youth | 55.7 | 61.4 | 61.2 | -0.2 | 5.5 |
| Non-Foster Youth | 83.9 | 87.3 | 86.5 | -0.8 | 2.6 |

Table 24 contains the 2022 and 2023 Dashboard graduation rate for foster youth and all students,[[11]](#endnote-12) which is a combined one-year, four-year, and five-year graduation rate.

#### Table 24: Dashboard High School Graduation Rate of Foster Youth and All Students for 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **Academic Year** | **Graduation Rate Foster Youth**  **(%)** | **Graduation Rate All Students**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2022 | 64.1 | 87.4 |
| 2023 | 63.2 | 86.4 |

Table 25 shows the ACGR for foster youth by county in 2021–22 compared to 2022–23.

#### Table 25: Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate for Foster Youth by County for 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **County** | **2021-22 Graduation Rate**  **(%)** | **2022-23 Graduation Rate**  **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 49.2 | 54.9 |
| Alpine | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | \* |
| Butte | 61.0 | 61.9 |
| Calaveras | 80.0 | 75.0 |
| Colusa | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 63.6 | 61.3 |
| Del Norte | \* | 75.0 |
| El Dorado | 58.8 | 59.1 |
| Fresno | 53.4 | 55.4 |
| Glenn | \* | \* |
| Humboldt | 76.3 | 65.5 |
| Imperial | 77.8 | 62.5 |
| Inyo | 17.2 | 35.0 |
| Kern | 63.3 | 56.3 |
| Kings | 46.7 | 65.1 |
| Lake | \* | \* |
| Lassen | 81.8 | \* |
| Los Angeles | 61.1 | 61.3 |
| Madera | 53.5 | 61.8 |
| Marin | 78.6 | 66.7 |
| Mariposa | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 58.1 | 66.7 |
| Merced | 59.3 | 75.4 |
| Modoc | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 74.4 | 55.2 |
| Napa | 75.0 | 50.0 |
| Nevada | 36.8 | 5.9 |
| Orange | 69.4 | 73.5 |
| Placer | 77.5 | 66.7 |
| Plumas | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 72.1 | 71.0 |
| Sacramento | 56.0 | 57.6 |
| San Benito | \* | \* |
| San Bernardino | 60.2 | 61.5 |
| San Diego | 55.2 | 49.8 |
| San Francisco | 61.1 | 48.4 |
| San Joaquin | 57.9 | 57.7 |
| San Luis Obispo | 75.7 | 71.0 |
| San Mateo | 80.8 | 80.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 70.2 | 73.6 |
| Santa Clara | 43.5 | 56.0 |
| Santa Cruz | 80.8 | 55.6 |
| Shasta | 82.5 | 67.3 |
| Sierra | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | \* | \* |
| Solano | 64.6 | 61.1 |
| Sonoma | 53.8 | 58.5 |
| Stanislaus | 60.9 | 57.1 |
| Sutter | 64.3 | 50.0 |
| Tehama | 75.0 | 52.4 |
| Trinity | 27.3 | 33.3 |
| Tulare | 64.6 | 59.1 |
| Tuolumne | \* | \* |
| Ventura | 48.7 | 58.7 |
| Yolo | 78.6 | 77.8 |
| Yuba | 55.0 | 68.0 |
| **Statewide** | **61.4** | **61.2** |

Table 26 compares the high school dropout rates of foster and non-foster youth for 2021–22 and 2022–23.

Table 27 includes the number of youth in the four-year cohort,[[12]](#endnote-13) the number of foster youth who were considered a dropout, and the dropout rates for foster youth for the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years by county.

#### Table 26: High School Dropout Rates of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2021–22 and 2022–23

| **Academic Year** | **Foster Youth (%)** | **Non-Foster Youth (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2021-22 | 22.2% | 7.7% |
| 2022-23 | 24.4% | 8.1% |

#### Table 27: High School Dropout Rates and Counts of Foster Youth by County for 2021-22 and 2022–23 (included counts, although not required)

| **County** | **2021-22 Cohort  (N)** | **2021-22  Dropout Count (N)** | **2021-22  Dropout Rate (%)** | **2022-23 Cohort  (N)** | **2022-23  Dropout Count (N)** | **2022-23  Dropout Rate (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 130 | 40 | 30.8 | 122 | 38 | 31.1 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Butte | 41 | 11 | 26.8 | 42 | 12 | 28.6 |
| Calaveras | 15 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 16.7 |
| Colusa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 107 | 25 | 23.4 | 93 | 28 | 30.1 |
| Del Norte | \* | \* | \* | 12 | 1 | 8.3 |
| El Dorado | 51 | 15 | 29.4 | 44 | 12 | 27.3 |
| Fresno | 236 | 72 | 30.5 | 289 | 70 | 24.2 |
| Glenn | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Humboldt | 38 | 3 | 7.9 | 29 | 8 | 27.6 |
| Imperial | 36 | 3 | 8.3 | 32 | 11 | 34.4 |
| Inyo | 29 | 12 | 41.4 | 20 | 5 | 25 |
| Kern | 199 | 55 | 27.6 | 208 | 53 | 25.5 |
| Kings | 60 | 15 | 25 | 63 | 9 | 14.3 |
| Lake | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Lassen | 11 | 1 | 9.1 | \* | \* | \* |
| Los Angeles | 1642 | 331 | 20.2 | 1613 | 364 | 22.6 |
| Madera | 43 | 16 | 37.2 | 34 | 10 | 29.4 |
| Marin | 14 | 2 | 14.3 | 21 | 5 | 23.8 |
| Mariposa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 31 | 9 | 29 | 30 | 6 | 20 |
| Merced | 54 | 19 | 35.2 | 61 | 13 | 21.3 |
| Modoc | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 43 | 9 | 20.9 | 29 | 8 | 27.6 |
| Napa | 24 | 3 | 12.5 | 18 | 6 | 33.3 |
| Nevada | 19 | 7 | 36.8 | 17 | 8 | 47.1 |
| Orange | 268 | 41 | 15.3 | 313 | 53 | 16.9 |
| Placer | 40 | 4 | 10 | 33 | 7 | 21.2 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 401 | 78 | 19.5 | 389 | 75 | 19.3 |
| Sacramento | 225 | 51 | 22.7 | 203 | 43 | 21.2 |
| San Benito | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| San Bernardino | 573 | 145 | 25.3 | 584 | 155 | 26.5 |
| San Diego | 232 | 52 | 22.4 | 221 | 67 | 30.3 |
| San Francisco | 90 | 22 | 24.4 | 91 | 33 | 36.3 |
| San Joaquin | 152 | 37 | 24.3 | 130 | 35 | 26.9 |
| San Luis Obispo | 37 | 7 | 18.9 | 31 | 7 | 22.6 |
| San Mateo | 26 | 3 | 11.5 | 20 | 2 | 10 |
| Santa Barbara | 47 | 11 | 23.4 | 53 | 9 | 17 |
| Santa Clara | 92 | 26 | 28.3 | 100 | 25 | 25 |
| Santa Cruz | 26 | 2 | 7.7 | 27 | 11 | 40.7 |
| Shasta | 40 | 4 | 10 | 49 | 11 | 22.4 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Solano | 48 | 8 | 16.7 | 36 | 12 | 33.3 |
| Sonoma | 65 | 18 | 27.7 | 65 | 21 | 32.3 |
| Stanislaus | 69 | 14 | 20.3 | 77 | 24 | 31.2 |
| Sutter | 14 | 1 | 7.1 | 14 | 4 | 28.6 |
| Tehama | 16 | 4 | 25 | 21 | 5 | 23.8 |
| Trinity | 11 | 2 | 18.2 | 12 | 5 | 41.7 |
| Tulare | 113 | 19 | 16.8 | 110 | 29 | 26.4 |
| Tuolumne | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Ventura | 78 | 20 | 25.6 | 75 | 19 | 25.3 |
| Yolo | 28 | 4 | 14.3 | 27 | 6 | 22.2 |
| Yuba | 20 | 6 | 30 | 25 | 6 | 24 |
| **Statewide** | **5,595** | **1,241** | **22.2** | **5,564** | **1,355** | **24.4** |

1. **The Number of Pupils in Foster Care Who Successfully Transition to Postsecondary Education: Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) or California Dream Act Application (CADAA) Completion Rates and College-Going Rates**

Table 28 and Table 29 compare the number and percentage of pupils in foster care who successfully completed a FAFSA or CADAA while in Grade 12 in 2021-22 and 2022-23. Data sourced from CALPADS and obtained from the California Student Aid Commission. .[[13]](#endnote-14)

#### Table 28: Number and Percentage of Pupils in Foster Care who Successfully Complete a Free Application for Federal Student Aid or California Dream Act Application while in Grade 12 in 2021-22

| **County** | **2021-22 Grade 12 Foster Youth FAFSA/CADAA Completers (N)** | **2021-22 Grade 12 Foster Youth Enrolled by County (N)** | **2021-22 Foster Youth FAFSA/CADAA Completion Rate (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 20 | 98 | 20.41 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | \* | \* |
| Butte | 6 | 21 | 28.57 |
| Calaveras | \* | \* | \* |
| Colusa | \* | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 30 | 87 | 34.48 |
| Del Norte | \* | \* | \* |
| El Dorado | 3 | 31 | 9.68 |
| Fresno | 84 | 158 | 53.16 |
| Glenn | \* | \* | \* |
| Humboldt | 7 | 24 | 29.17 |
| Imperial | 9 | 18 | 50.00 |
| Inyo | \* | \* | \* |
| Kern | 51 | 166 | 30.72 |
| Kings | 7 | 22 | 31.82 |
| Lake | \* | \* | \* |
| Lassen | \* | \* | \* |
| Los Angeles | 515 | 1075 | 47.91 |
| Madera | 9 | 19 | 47.37 |
| Marin | \* | \* | \* |
| Mariposa | \* | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 2 | 14 | 14.29 |
| Merced | 10 | 34 | 29.41 |
| Modoc | \* | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 7 | 22 | 31.82 |
| Napa | 2 | 12 | 16.67 |
| Nevada | \* | \* | \* |
| Orange | 69 | 146 | 47.26 |
| Placer | 7 | 15 | 46.67 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 151 | 268 | 56.34 |
| Sacramento | 53 | 144 | 36.81 |
| San Benito | \* | \* | \* |
| San Bernardino | 115 | 333 | 34.53 |
| San Diego | 43 | 134 | 32.09 |
| San Francisco | 17 | 43 | 39.53 |
| San Joaquin | 37 | 114 | 32.46 |
| San Luis Obispo | 15 | 32 | 46.88 |
| San Mateo | 8 | 18 | 44.44 |
| Santa Barbara | 10 | 21 | 47.62 |
| Santa Clara | 14 | 78 | 17.95 |
| Santa Cruz | 4 | 22 | 18.18 |
| Shasta | 17 | 28 | 60.71 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | \* | \* | \* |
| Solano | 8 | 34 | 23.53 |
| Sonoma | 6 | 32 | 18.75 |
| Stanislaus | 16 | 59 | 27.12 |
| Sutter | 3 | 13 | 23.08 |
| Tehama | 6 | 13 | 46.15 |
| Trinity | \* | \* | \* |
| Tulare | 29 | 67 | 43.28 |
| Tuolumne | \* | \* | \* |
| Ventura | 20 | 56 | 35.71 |
| Yolo | 4 | 15 | 26.67 |
| Yuba | \* | \* | \* |
| **Statewide** | **1462** | **3344** | **43.72** |

#### Table 29: Number and Percentage of Pupils in Foster Care who Successfully Complete a Free Application for Federal Student Aid or California Dream Act Application while in Grade 12 in 2022–23

| **County** | **2022-23 Grade 12 Foster Youth FAFSA/CADAA Completers (N)** | **2022-23 Grade 12 Foster Youth Enrolled by County (N)** | **2022-23 Foster Youth FAFSA/CADAA Completion Rate (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 30 | 86 | 34.88 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | \* | \* |
| Butte | 9 | 26 | 34.62 |
| Calaveras | \* | \* | \* |
| Colusa | \* | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 18 | 65 | 27.69 |
| Del Norte | \* | \* | \* |
| El Dorado | 7 | 28 | 25.00 |
| Fresno | 96 | 166 | 57.83 |
| Glenn | \* | \* | \* |
| Humboldt | 4 | 21 | 19.05 |
| Imperial | \* | \* | \* |
| Inyo | \* | \* | \* |
| Kern | 51 | 148 | 34.46 |
| Kings | 17 | 30 | 56.67 |
| Lake | \* | \* | \* |
| Lassen | \* | \* | \* |
| Los Angeles | 533 | 990 | 53.84 |
| Madera | 14 | 24 | 58.33 |
| Marin | 6 | 17 | 35.29 |
| Mariposa | \* | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 5 | 17 | 29.41 |
| Merced | 26 | 48 | 54.17 |
| Modoc | \* | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | \* | \* | \* |
| Napa | 4 | 14 | 28.57 |
| Nevada | \* | \* | \* |
| Orange | 97 | 161 | 60.25 |
| Placer | 5 | 16 | 31.25 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 145 | 235 | 61.70 |
| Sacramento | 51 | 150 | 34.00 |
| San Benito | \* | \* | \* |
| San Bernardino | 143 | 330 | 43.33 |
| San Diego | 46 | 108 | 42.59 |
| San Francisco | 24 | 43 | 55.81 |
| San Joaquin | 31 | 99 | 31.31 |
| San Luis Obispo | 8 | 15 | 53.33 |
| San Mateo | 4 | 14 | 28.57 |
| Santa Barbara | 13 | 32 | 40.63 |
| Santa Clara | 18 | 74 | 24.32 |
| Santa Cruz | 3 | 15 | 20.00 |
| Shasta | 6 | 21 | 28.57 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | \* | \* | \* |
| Solano | 7 | 27 | 25.93 |
| Sonoma | 8 | 38 | 21.05 |
| Stanislaus | 20 | 65 | 30.77 |
| Sutter | \* | \* | \* |
| Tehama | \* | \* | \* |
| Trinity | 1 | 13 | 7.69 |
| Tulare | 33 | 65 | 50.77 |
| Tuolumne | \* | \* | \* |
| Ventura | 25 | 50 | 50.00 |
| Yolo | 7 | 15 | 46.67 |
| Yuba | \* | \* | \* |
| **Statewide** | **1572** | **3199** | **49.14** |

In 2019, the CDE developed and published new reports on College-Going Rates (CGR) for the first time using high school completion[[14]](#endnote-15) data obtained from CALPADS and student-level postsecondary enrollment[[15]](#endnote-16) data obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). 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 to 16 months of completing high school.

It is important to note that with the implementation of the Cradle-to-Career Data System, data and outcomes from the CDE, California Community Colleges, California State Universities, and the Universities of California will provide information on students and whether they successfully transition to post-secondary education.

Table 30 compares the CGR for foster youth compared to non-foster youth who completed high school in 2019, 2020, and 2021.

#### Table 30: Successful Transition to Postsecondary Education in College-Going Rates of Foster and non-Foster Youth by County for 2019, 2020, 2021

| **County** | **2019 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Foster Youth (%)** | **2019 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Non-Foster Youth (%)** | **2020 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Foster Youth (%)** | **2020 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Non-Foster Youth (%)** | **2021 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Foster Youth (%)** | **2021 High School Completers Enrolled in College: Non-Foster Youth (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 45.3 | 71.8 | 54.8 | 68.5 | 30.9 | 69.4 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | 50.0 | \* | 52.7 | \* | 53.1 |
| Butte | 63.0 | 65.2 | 53.8 | 59.0 | 45.0 | 59.2 |
| Calaveras | 46.2 | 56.5 | \* | 52.1 | 16.7 | 50.4 |
| Colusa | \* | 53.8 | \* | 51.2 | \* | 53.1 |
| Contra Costa | 58.2 | 68.3 | 42.9 | 68.6 | 43.2 | 69.8 |
| Del Norte | \* | 43.2 | \* | 31.4 | \* | 34.9 |
| El Dorado | 40.4 | 68.3 | 34.2 | 65.3 | 23.3 | 63.9 |
| Fresno | 68.4 | 67.4 | 60.0 | 63.9 | 59.3 | 60.8 |
| Glenn | \* | 56.9 | \* | 48.3 | \* | 56.1 |
| Humboldt | 38.5 | 55.7 | 18.2 | 45.7 | 33.3 | 50.9 |
| Imperial | 80.0 | 68.0 | 83.3 | 67.7 | \* | 71.7 |
| Inyo | 45.5 | 27.0 | 11.1 | 24.2 | 20.0 | 23.9 |
| Kern | 45.2 | 49.7 | 34.7 | 47.2 | 23.8 | 44.4 |
| Kings | 56.5 | 60.9 | 37.5 | 58.4 | 39.1 | 55.0 |
| Lake | \* | 44.3 | \* | 42.5 | \* | 41.1 |
| Lassen | \* | 49.4 | \* | 49.8 | \* | 50.4 |
| Los Angeles | 49.7 | 64.1 | 43.9 | 62.0 | 45.9 | 62.0 |
| Madera | \* | 56.5 | 40.0 | 54.4 | 30.8 | 51.9 |
| Marin | \* | 78.5 | \* | 77.4 | \* | 78.3 |
| Mariposa | \* | 53.4 | \* | 50.8 | \* | 47.3 |
| Mendocino | 23.1 | 39.3 | 16.7 | 45.1 | \* | 42.1 |
| Merced | 58.1 | 61.0 | 50.0 | 58.8 | 50.0 | 51.4 |
| Modoc | \* | 51.8 | \* | 46.8 | \* | 50.0 |
| Mono | \* | 33.9 | \* | 31.0 | \* | 36.1 |
| Monterey | 58.8 | 62.4 | 44.4 | 65.8 | 60.0 | 62.3 |
| Napa | \* | 71.8 | \* | 71.9 | \* | 69.1 |
| Nevada | 61.1 | 38.5 | \* | 39.7 | 41.7 | 36.7 |
| Orange | 59.1 | 76.8 | 57.2 | 73.8 | 59.0 | 73.9 |
| Placer | 62.5 | 75.9 | 53.8 | 72.6 | 47.6 | 71.1 |
| Plumas | \* | 52.8 | \* | 45.1 | \* | 56.9 |
| Riverside | 51.4 | 56.4 | 40.8 | 53.5 | 42.2 | 52.4 |
| Sacramento | 49.2 | 65.3 | 40.7 | 62.9 | 44.5 | 61.4 |
| San Benito | \* | 61.9 | \* | 62.9 | \* | 63.0 |
| San Bernardino | 48.3 | 59.0 | 37.5 | 54.0 | 40.4 | 53.1 |
| San Diego | 52.2 | 64.5 | 48.6 | 63.9 | 38.9 | 63.5 |
| San Francisco | 49.0 | 64.3 | 35.4 | 62.9 | 30.6 | 66.5 |
| San Joaquin | 46.8 | 58.9 | 39.2 | 54.7 | 20 | 56.2 |
| San Luis Obispo | 46.2 | 63.6 | 15.8 | 64.4 | 29.4 | 62.3 |
| San Mateo | 60.0 | 75.5 | 50.0 | 75.5 | 75.0 | 76.3 |
| Santa Barbara | 47.1 | 66.4 | 43.8 | 67.2 | 57.7 | 67.2 |
| Santa Clara | 63.8 | 76.5 | 73.3 | 77.4 | 49.0 | 77.6 |
| Santa Cruz | \* | 60.8 | 30.8 | 66.9 | 38.5 | 65.8 |
| Shasta | 60.0 | 61.0 | 31.6 | 53.8 | 55.6 | 52.2 |
| Sierra | \* | 39.1 | \* | 57.1 | \* | 64.5 |
| Siskiyou | \* | 57.3 | \* | 46.2 | \* | 47.6 |
| Solano | 31.6 | 59.3 | 31.8 | 57.6 | 50.0 | 55.0 |
| Sonoma | 71.4 | 64.0 | 37.9 | 62.5 | 48.5 | 60.7 |
| Stanislaus | 50.0 | 60.6 | 33.3 | 59.4 | 45.6 | 55.2 |
| Sutter | \* | 58.3 | \* | 57.1 | \* | 54.3 |
| Tehama | \* | 52.5 | \* | 47.3 | 40.0 | 43.2 |
| Trinity | \* | 43.8 | \* | 42.3 | \* | 39.3 |
| Tulare | 58.8 | 60.2 | 72.7 | 58.2 | 60.0 | 54.5 |
| Tuolumne | \* | 62.8 | \* | 50.8 | \* | 50.1 |
| Ventura | 54.3 | 75.3 | 55.9 | 73.4 | 58.5 | 72.6 |
| Yolo | 40.0 | 64.2 | 66.7 | 63.6 | 50.0 | 63.3 |
| Yuba | \* | 53.1 | \* | 48.4 | 54.5 | 47.3 |
| **Statewide** | **51.9** | **64.9** | **44.3** | **62.8** | **44.4** | **62.3** |

1. **The Amount of Funds Allocated and Expended by each FYSCP in the Previous Two Fiscal Years**

The CDE partnered with LACOE, which served as the FYSCP TAP during the 2021-22 and 2022–23 FYs. The FYSCP TAP provides support, guidance, and leadership to all county FYSCP coordinators for the implementation of the requirements of AB 854 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015) as well as new legislation that impacts the education of youth in care. In addition, the CDE utilizes various communication channels to provide multiple training and presentations about the FYSCP to a variety of stakeholders.

The Budget Acts of 2019 and 2020 appropriated $28,200,000 and $27,337,000 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 31 shows the FYSCP funds dispersed to COEs for 2021-22 and 2022-23.

In 2021–22, 57 out of 58 counties received the funds. LACOE received the largest amount of $5,274,433.17, based on 31,060 foster youth enrolled on Census Day as shown in Table 1, while Sierra COE received the smallest amount of $88,788.39 with 2 foster youth enrolled on Census Day, also shown in Table 1. Each COE that received the funds fully spent their allocation.

In 2022–23, 58 out of 58 counties received funds. LACOE continued taking the largest share of $5,989,374.97, based on 9,872 foster youth enrolled on Census Day, and Sierra COE received the smallest amount of $90,380.20, based on one foster youth enrolled on Census Day as seen in Table 1. The FYSCP grant is awarded on a three-year cycle with final expenditure reports due to the CDE by July 31, 2024, for the remaining $2,258,104.11 remaining in the 2022-23 expenditures\*\*

#### Table 31: Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program Fund Allocations by County for 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **County** | **Allocated**  **2021-22 FY** | **Expended 2021-22 FY** | **Allocated 2022-23 FY** | **\*\*Expenditures Based on 3rd Report 2022-23 FY** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | $426,378.85 | $426,378.85 | $452,188.07 | $452,188.07 |
| Alpine | $0.00 | $0.00 | $90,380.19 | $77,601.79 |
| Amador | $99,340.21 | $99,340.21 | $104,889.64 | $104,889.64 |
| Butte | $295,742.42 | $295,742.42 | $288,526.54 | $288,526.54 |
| Calaveras | $134,171.82 | $134,171.82 | $141,394.60 | $140,894.46 |
| Colusa | $122,660.74 | $122,660.74 | $131,184.26 | $131,184.00 |
| Contra Costa | $446,523.24 | $446,523.24 | $469,921.82 | $469,921.82 |
| Del Norte | $122,362.36 | $122,362.36 | $124,235.54 | $85,766.35 |
| El Dorado | $259,169.84 | $259,169.84 | $257,154.13 | $235,187.80 |
| Fresno | $1,010,679.50 | $1,010,679.50 | $1,188,591.52 | $1,055,973.69 |
| Glenn | $150,717.14 | $150,717.14 | $153,346.48 | $153,346.48 |
| Humboldt | $404,489.79 | $404,489.79 | $448,443.82 | $448,443.82 |
| Imperial | $297,000.06 | $297,000.06 | $301,386.50 | $301,386.50 |
| Inyo | $145,562.06 | $145,562.06 | $150,326.17 | $105,093.39 |
| Kern | $954,136.37 | $954,136.37 | $1,127,513.63 | $1,060,207.86 |
| Kings | $279,435.06 | $279,435.06 | $294,437.79 | $276,495.07 |
| Lake | $143,163.92 | $143,163.92 | $152,475.71 | $148,066.67 |
| Lassen | $175,057.35 | $175,057.35 | $181,086.57 | $73,372.93 |
| Los Angeles | $5,487,987.11 | $5,487,987.11 | $5,989,374.97 | $5,436,126.38 |
| Madera | $248,500.89 | $248,500.89 | $263,677.38 | $263,677.48 |
| Marin | $237,884.94 | $237,884.94 | $238,678.99 | $235,544.95 |
| Mariposa | $101,738.35 | $101,738.35 | $99,515.77 | $99,515.77 |
| Mendocino | $234,410.42 | $234,410.42 | $237,845.53 | $224,634.93 |
| Merced | $398,919.21 | $398,919.21 | $430,488.61 | $426,982.27 |
| Modoc | $109,291.57 | $109,291.57 | $113,821.20 | $113,821.20 |
| Mono | $96,402.02 | $96,402.02 | $98,070.31 | $81,273.64 |
| Monterey | $310,425.94 | $310,425.94 | $309,168.68 | $309,168.68 |
| Napa | $144,183.60 | $144,183.60 | $150,696.86 | $150,696.86 |
| Nevada | $165,045.57 | $165,045.57 | $163,186.13 | $163,186.13 |
| Orange | $1,079,568.43 | $1,079,568.43 | $1,087,433.50 | $1,087,433.50 |
| Placer | $273,977.90 | $273,977.90 | $276,666.73 | $272,023.65 |
| Plumas | $96,942.07 | $96,942.07 | $96,291.45 | $81,506.96 |
| Riverside | $1,535,936.57 | $1,535,936.57 | $1,656,229.57 | $1,181,336.98 |
| Sacramento | $671,291.35 | $671,291.35 | $677,056.87 | $677,056.87 |
| San Benito | $172,598.79 | $169,266.73 | $182,328.04 | $147,379.38 |
| San Bernardino | $1,982,345.95 | $1,982,345.95 | $2,170,025.70 | $2,051,025.82 |
| San Diego | $938,131.09 | $938,131.09 | $990,350.73 | $984,179.55 |
| San Francisco | $215,889.88 | $215,889.88 | $233,324.97 | $231,559.23 |
| San Joaquin | $586,336.73 | $589,336.73 | $592,853.90 | $515,453.34 |
| San Luis Obispo | $246,042.33 | $246,042.33 | $239,124.30 | $235,886.54 |
| San Mateo | $292,260.48 | $292,260.48 | $296,642.10 | $260,775.49 |
| Santa Barbara | $351,915.64 | $351,915.64 | $397,708.04 | $241,606.57 |
| Santa Clara | $512,406.15 | $512,406.15 | $516,691.89 | $481,164.39 |
| Santa Cruz | $200,896.86 | $200,896.86 | $207,585.20 | $207,585.20 |
| Shasta | $367,441.29 | $367,441.29 | $407,139.69 | $374,233.36 |
| Sierra | $88,788.39 | $88,788.39 | $90,380.20 | $61,483.51 |
| Siskiyou | $272,954.52 | $272,954.52 | $285,152.99 | $275,352.79 |
| Solano | $247,722.89 | $247,722.89 | $251,354.80 | $228,202.90 |
| Sonoma | $495,555.03 | $277,990.56 | $506,907.01 | $426,929.76 |
| Stanislaus | $460,009.54 | $460,009.54 | $472,163.44 | $472,163.44 |
| Sutter | $219,541.94 | $219,541.94 | $231,934.28 | $218,379.28 |
| Tehama | $229,553.72 | $229,553.72 | $241,236.54 | $238,333.63 |
| Trinity | $156,412.26 | $156,412.26 | $163,723.52 | $138,675.51 |
| Tulare | $734,708.29 | $734,708.29 | $747,618.79 | $733,607.40 |
| Tuolumne | $181,711.73 | $181,711.73 | $184,477.58 | $184,477.59 |
| Ventura | $423,920.29 | $423,920.29 | $435,158.40 | $435,157.73 |
| Yolo | $210,372.30 | $210,372.30 | $192,075.61 | $192,075.61 |
| Yuba | $165,287.24 | $165,287.24 | $163,056.75 | $138,374.74 |
| **Statewide Total** | **$26,411,900.00** | **$26,194,003.47** | **$28,144,700.00** | **$25,886,595.89** |

### Part III—Discussion of the Meaning and Implications of the Educational Outcome Data

**Foster Youth Enrollment**

The enrollment of foster youth by grade is relatively evenly distributed in both school years. In 2021-22, the lowest percent of the total statewide enrollment of foster youth was approximately 6.5 percent in grade seven, with 2,829 youth enrolled. In 2021-22, the highest percent of the total statewide enrollment of foster youth was approximately 9.9 percent in kindergarten, with 4,257 youth enrolled.

As shown, three of the 58 counties in California had fewer than 11 foster youth attend school in their county in the 2021–22 school year: Alpine, Mono, and Sierra counties. Los Angeles County had the highest number of foster youths enrolled in both the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years, representing 29.3 percent and 28.7 percent of all foster youth enrolled in the state, respectively. From the 2021–22 to 2022–23 school years, the total number of foster youths enrolled declined by 1,803.

**Suspension and Expulsion**

Suspension rates remain significantly higher for foster youth than non- foster youth with foster youth experiencing 12.6 percent and non-foster youth experiencing 3.1 percent in the 2021-22 school year. Both foster youth and non-foster youth experienced a rise in suspension rates in the 2022-23 school year. Foster youth suspension rates increased by more than three times than that of non-foster students. Foster students increased from 12.6 percent to 13.9 percent, and non-foster students increased by .4 percent from 3.1 percent to 3.5 percent in the 2022-23 school year.

Expulsion rates remained stagnant for non-foster youth across both the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years at .1 percent for both years. Foster youth students experienced a decrease from .4 percent in the 2021-22 school year down to .3 percent for the 2022-23 school year.

**Foster Youth enrolled in a Juvenile Court School or Youth Authority School**

The statewide number of foster youths enrolled in a Juvenile Court School or Youth Authority School for foster youth remained stationary from 2021–22 to 2022–23, at 5.2 percent representing 2,243 foster youth in 2021-22 and 2,166 foster youth in 2022-23 receiving instruction in a juvenile court school or youth authority school facility. The decrease in the number of foster youths in a Juvenile Court School or Youth Authority School in 2022-23 is relative to the decrease in overall foster youth enrollment statewide.

**Chronic Absence Rates, Attendance Rates, and School Stability Rates**

Foster youth chronic absence rates decreased 7.3 percentage points from 46.5 percent in 2021-22 to 39.2 percent in 2022-23. Additionally, foster youth attendance rates increased from 82.2 percent to 84.5 percent, representing a 2.3 percent increase.

Foster youth and non-foster youth experienced an equivalent increase of 1.3 percentage points in stability rates between 2021–22 and 2022–23 (Table 21). An equivalent increase in stability rates among foster youth and non-foster youth suggests that efforts to narrow the gap in the disparities between foster youth and non-foster youth students that contribute to school stability may be what has affected change. Program plans developed based on county needs assessment by the FYSCP may be benefiting the cultural impact of schools creating an increase in stability for non-foster students as well. While this measure appears to be showing improvement, there is more work to do in evaluating the underlying mechanisms influencing the shift, especially given the impacts of school closures, increased rates of teacher turnover, and school staff shortages.

**High School Completion and Graduation Rates**

The Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR) for both foster youth and non-foster youth has increased from 2021 to 2023 (Table 23). Note that the ACGR for foster youth increased at a higher rate than for non-foster youth in 2022. The two-year change for foster youth was 5.5 percent and only 2.6 percent for non-foster youth.

Twelve counties saw an increase in dropout rates (Table 27), and three counties saw a decrease. Inyo, Kings, and Merced counties all saw dropout rates for foster youth decrease by 10 percent or more. Santa Cruz saw the highest dropout rate increase at 33 percent over the previous year.

**FAFSA/CADAA Completion Rate and College-Going Rates**

The percentage of pupils in foster care who successfully completed a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) or California Dream Act Application (CADAA) increased from 43.72 in 2021-22 to 49.14 in 2022-23, which is a 5.42 percentage point increase. Noting that these data are sourced through a formal data sharing agreement between the CDE and the California Student Aid Commission, which represents a shift from the optional self-reported data provided to the CDE in the 2022 FYSCP Legislative Report.

The College-Going Rate (CGR) for foster youth decreased from 51.9 percent in 2019 to 44.4 percent in 2021, representing a 7.5 percentage point decrease. It is important to note that the CGR in this report includes years where foster youth graduated prior to and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Non-foster youth experienced a decline in CGR as well, from 64.9 percent in 2019 to 62. 3 in 2021, though it represents a smaller decrease.

### Part IV—Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program Report Development and Implementation of New Local Educational Agency and County Agency Policies, Practices, and Programs Aimed at Improving the Educational Outcomes of Pupils in Foster Care

An ongoing collaboration between the CDE and the CDSS improves the understanding of the intersection of the two data systems and how the agencies can better support the complex needs of foster youth. The FYSCP provides a crucial link between the state-level data-sharing partnership and the on-the-ground implementation of policies, practices, and programs. In collaboration with the CDE’s Foster Youth Data Liaison, the FYSCP has 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. Additionally, FYSCP coordinators and the Foster Youth Data Liaison have worked with CDSS to improve foster youth identification in schools by matching foster youth in the two data systems to ensure students were identified as foster youth in a timely fashion so that the students would be provided with appropriate educational supports and services.

The Foster Youth Data Liaison also supported the CDE FYSCP team with monitoring and analyzing educational outcomes for foster youth. This included working to develop two new CDE data reports—Stability Rate and Absence by Reason reports—that provide the public and the entities that serve students in foster care with additional information to better understand these students’ complex experiences and needs in school. Descriptions of the new reports follow:

* **Stability Rate:** This report captures the number and percentage of students enrolled during an academic year who complete a “full year” of learning in one school without any gaps in enrollment. While this measure reports the school stability outcomes for all students, the stability rate for students in foster care is significantly lower than the statewide rate for all students and lower than any other student group in the state. These data serve to inform important conversations and policy decisions around the social-emotional and academic needs of students in schools and can be viewed for the foster youth at the school, district, county, and state aggregation levels.
* **Absence by Reason:** This report was developed to complement and add context to the existing chronic absenteeism measure, which the CDE has published for several years. Chronic absence is a binary measure that captures the number and percentage of students who miss 10 percent or more of their expected days to attend in a school year. And while foster youth have the highest chronic absence rates of any student group in the state, the amount of school missed is not captured in the Chronic Absence rate reports. The Absence by Reason report includes the average number of days students are absent from school and the percentage of total absences broken down by the reported reason for the absences. This report has revealed that students in foster care miss more school than other students, and the reasons they miss school more frequently are out-of-school suspensions, incomplete independent study, and unexcused absences.

1. **Coordination of Services Between Local Educational Agencies and County Agencies, Including the Types of Services Provided to Pupils in Foster Care**

Under the FYSCP, COEs play an important role in coordinating interagency support for foster youth services. Each COE established the county Executive Advisory Council (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 32 lists the number of COEs with various stakeholders represented on the EACs in the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school as reported by the TAP annual summary for 2020–21.[[16]](#endnote-17) As shown in Table 31, 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). The data shows no significant increases or decreases in the 2021–22 or 2022–23 school years in most EAC stakeholder group involvement. Participation by biological parents doubled from two to four, foster parents decreased by four, as did the representation of mental health professionals. We also saw a decrease by seven early childhood representatives, and a decrease of 5 in court appointed representatives.

#### Table 32: Number of County Offices of Education Having Various Stakeholders Represented on Executive Advisory Councils

| **Stakeholders** | **2021-22 Number of COEs Having Representors on EACs** | **2022-23 Number of COEs Having Representors on EACs** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Biological Parents | 2 | 4 |
| Child Welfare Agency Representative | 55 | 57 |
| COE Other Departments/Admin | 41 | 39 |
| Community Based Organizations | 47 | 46 |
| Community College | 42 | 40 |
| Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) | 43 | 45 |
| Court Staff (Judge or Attorney) | 30 | 25 |
| Current and/or Former Foster Youth | 28 | 26 |
| Early Childhood | 25 | 18 |
| Foster Family Agency | 31 | 29 |
| Foster Parent | 20 | 16 |
| FYSCP Coordinator (required member) | 57 | 58 |
| Independent Living Program (ILP) | 41 | 39 |
| Mental Health | 42 | 38 |
| Probation | 49 | 43 |
| Regional Center | 9 | 7 |
| School District | 56 | 56 |
| Short Term Residential Treatment Facility (STRTP) | 23 | 20 |
| Special Education/SELPA | 34 | 30 |
| Tribal Representative | 9 | 9 |
| University Representative | 17 | 15 |
| Other Representatives | 32 | 10 |

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.[[17]](#endnote-18) Table 33 shows the number of counties having formal agreements, MOUs, or protocols established among county agencies specifically designed to support the FYSCP during 2021–22 and 2022–23 school years, also reported by the TAP annual summary for 2021–22 and 2022–23.[[18]](#endnote-19)

#### Table 33: Number and Percent of Formal Agreements among County Agencies for 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **MOUs/Agreements** | **2021-22 (N)** | **2021-22 (%)** | **2022-23 (N)** | **2022-23 (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Information sharing Agreements | 51 | 91 | 48 | 84 |
| Countywide ESSA Transportation Requirement Agreements | 43 | 77 | 41 | 72 |
| Title IV-E Draw Down Agreements | 39 | 70 | 42 | 74 |
| Post-Secondary | 15 | 27 | 14 | 25 |
| Executive Advisory Council | 27 | 48 | 25 | 44 |
| Co-location | 29 | 52 | 29 | 51 |
| Other Agreements[[19]](#footnote-2) | 35 | 63 | 30 | 53 |

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 training and LCAP consultations to LEAs with LCAP compliance to support foster youth. Table 33 shows the percentages of districts and charter schools receiving training and LCAP consultations by county FYSCPs, as reported by the TAP annual summary for 2021-23.[[20]](#endnote-20) As shown in Table 34, 479 LEAs received support around LCAP consultation in 2021-22, and 560 LEAs did in 2022-23. These activities provided support for LEAs to ensure that foster youth are included in LCAP services and supports.

#### Table 34: Number of LEAs Supported by County Foster Youth Services Coordinating Programs in Local Control and Accountability Plan Consultation in 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **Year** | **Number of LEAs Receiving Support** |
| --- | --- |
| 2021–22 | 479 |
| 2022–23 | 560 |

Further, in a review of Learning Continuity and Attendance Plans, the CDE FYSCP team found examples of LEAs providing the following services and programs for foster youth:

* Prioritized foster youth for access to tutoring before other students.
* Conducted interviews to understand their needs.
* Provided transportation support for delivering meals, delivering homework, conducting wellness checks, and technology support.
* Provided social-emotional support through weekly check-ins or mentoring.
* Identified an improved collaboration with school districts, child welfare, probation, courts, and community-based organizations.
* Created individualized learning plans for foster youth to ensure foster youth are receiving targeted intervention.
* Provided post-secondary educational opportunities to visit colleges, gain FAFSA assistance, and attend job and career fairs.
* Established wellness centers at various schools and district sites to provide a warm and welcoming environment for foster youth to engage in mental health services.

Table 35 displays the number of LEAs that attended FYSCP trainings or meetings in 2021-22 and 2022-23. The number of LEAs attending FYSCP trainings or meetings increased from 15,481 in 2021-22 to 16,258 in 2022-23. 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 35: Number of Local Educational Agencies that Attended Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program Trainings or Meetings in 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **Year** | **Number of LEAs Attending FYSCP Trainings or Meetings** |
| --- | --- |
| 2021-22 | 15,481 |
| 2022-23 | 16,258 |

Since the enactment of AB 854 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015) established the FYSCP, county FYSCPs support local LEAs to provide services to foster youth in their schools through ongoing training and workshops in support of the LEAs LCAP planning and development. Table 36 shows the number of trainings provided to district staff by county FYSCPs. As Table 36 shows, the number of trainings in 2021-22 was 611 and in 2022-23 was 728, demonstrating an increase in trainings by FYSCPs of 117 trainings.

#### Table 36: Number of Trainings Provided to School Districts by County Foster Youth Services Coordinating Programs in 2021-22 and 2022-23

| **Service Year** | **Number of Trainings** |
| --- | --- |
| 2021-22 | 611 |
| 2022-23 | 728 |

Table 37 describes collaborative partnerships by listing the agencies partnering with the county-administered FYSCPs and their respective services. Each example was reported by most counties in the FYSCP.

#### Table 37: 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 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015); 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 assistance 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 |
| LEAs | 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 group |
| 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 |

### Part IV—Conclusion

High-quality educational supports and services provide foster youth with the necessary academic, vocational, and life skills to lead successful and independent lives. 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 FYSCPs have demonstrated substantial progress in building collaborative relationships among various agencies and systems that work with foster youth, focusing support on 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.

The data show that the FYSCP helped to:

1. Increase the school stability rate by 1.3 percentage points.
2. Increase foster youth FAFSA/CADAA completion rates from 2020-21 to 2021-22 by Update Numbers.
3. Coordinate services and information with LEAs and other partners to obtain necessary records to determine appropriate school placements and coordinate instruction.
4. Increase collaboration and build capacity among partner agencies and systems to increase access to meaningful educational support for foster youth.
5. 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.
6. Provide direct service and referrals for educational support services, vocational training, and training for independent living.
7. Develop formal agreements to formalize collaboration among county agencies to optimize resources and eliminate redundant services.

## Recommendations

In summary, the CDE has three key recommendations given the information and reflections in this report.

First, we must recognize the traumatic effects that foster placement has on the developing mind of a child. Foster youth endure disproportionate complex and or developmental trauma when compared to non-foster students. Including, but not limited to: (1) the abuse, neglect, or abandonment which brought them into the child welfare system; (2) being removed from their families; and (3) repeated home and/or school placement changes. The CDE acknowledges that the time a foster child or youth spends in a school setting can offer a stabilizing force for the child or youth. The FYSCP is currently piloting Dr. Bruce Perry’s Nuerosequential model of education (NME); a classroom-based approach to help educators understand student behavior and performance. NME aims to support school staff and children to learn more about brain development and the impact of developmental trauma on a child’s ability to function in a classroom setting. This model is based on the Nuerosequential model of therapeutics (NMT) currently being piloted by the Department of Social Services. By maintaining the same foundational trauma informed practices in our respective agencies, foster students will be met with trauma informed practices cohesively. With the intended goal of mitigating the trauma our most vulnerable population endures and improving educational outcomes as a result.

Second, the CDE advocates securing funding to support the district foster youth educational liaisons that are mandated through *EC* Section 48853.5. Among other duties, these liaisons must (1) ensure and facilitate the proper educational placement, enrollment in school, and checkout from school of foster children; and (2) assist foster children when transferring from one school to another school or from one school district to another school district by ensuring the proper transfer of credits, records, and grades. Currently, there is no specific funding for these mandated positions, and providing this funding would further support the work they do.

Finally, it is essential to continue funding the FYSCP to support the services that remain in place. As indicated by the data presented in this report, the FYSCPs positively impact the educational outcomes of foster youth, and there is still a great need to support these students in schools. FYSCPs have worked vigorously to engage and empower foster youth in the educational rights they are afforded in the promotion of their success. Although progress has been made on several fronts, opportunities remain to advance the work being done to close the opportunity gap between youth in foster care and other student groups. Future reports will continue to build on efforts by sharing new legislation, data, and interventions aimed at improving the educational outcomes of our foster youth in California.
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