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Overview of CalYOUTH Study (2012-present)

Evaluation of the impact of CA Fostering Connections to Success Act (AB 12) on outcomes for foster youth (PI: Mark Courtney)

CalYOUTH Study includes:

1. **Longitudinal survey of young people in CA foster care**
   - Representative sample of youth age 16.75-17.75 in Dec. 2012 in child welfare-supervised foster care for 6+ months
   - 3 survey waves completed:
     - Wave 1 in 2013 (n=727) 95% response rate
     - Wave 2 in 2015 (n=611) 84% response rate
     - Wave 3 in 2017 (n=616) 84% response rate

2. **Analysis of state administrative data**
   - Child welfare data (CWS/CMS)
     - 113k youths in foster care from Jan 2006-Dec 2017 age 16+
     - Link to other administrative data (e.g., public benefits, college)

3. **Periodic surveys of caseworkers serving young people in foster care**
   - Two completed thus far (2013 & 2015)
Today’s CalYOUTH Presentation

Part 1
Impact of AB-12 on foster youths’ postsecondary enrollment and persistence

Part 2
Roles of Campus-Support Programs and Chafee grants on postsecondary persistence

Disclaimer: The findings reported herein were performed with the permission of CDSS. The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are solely those of the authors and should not be considered as representing the policy of the collaborating agency or any agency of the California government.
Part I: Impact of AB12
2008 federal Fostering Connections Act gave states the option to extend the age limit of foster care up to 21

CA was an early adopter (AB 12 implemented in 2012)

Currently 28 States and Washington D.C. have approved extended foster care laws

Youth’s access to services potentially impact their college enrollment (e.g., housing)

BUT...little research has evaluated the impact of extended foster care on college outcomes¹

¹ Courtney & Hook, 2017; Okpych & Courtney, 2019
Research Questions

1. Are foster youth in care after AB12 more likely than youth before AB12 to (1) enroll, (2) persist, and (3) complete more semesters?

2. Does spending more time in foster care after age 18 increase the likelihood that foster youth (1) enroll, (2) persist, and (3) complete more semesters?
Sample

- Samples came from administrative data
- Youth we’re interested in: 76,000 youths in care after 17th birthday who turned 18 between Jan. 1, 2006 and Dec. 31, 2013
- Who’s in this analysis: of the 76k youths, a sample of **21,964 youths** were selected (stratified random sample)

- We AB12 impact separately for...
  - Youth in child-welfare supervised foster care (n=17,122)
  - Youth in probation-supervised foster care (n=4,842)

- When analyzing persistence and # of completed semesters, we included just youth who enrolled in college by age 21 (n=**8,580**)

Sample
Data Sources

• **National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) records**
  - Enrollment and graduation records of 3,600+ postsecondary institutions (99% of all U.S. institutions)

• **California’s CWS/CMS data system**
  - AB12 eligible; youth’s history of foster care & maltreatment; basic demographic info

• **Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)**
  - Information about college the youth attended

• **U.S. Census Bureau’s Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data**
  - County-level housing affordability & young adult unemployment rates

• **CalYOUTH search of CSPs**
  - Contacted CA colleges to get info. on campus support programs
Outcomes by Age 21

- Enrolled? (y/n)
- Persisted? (y/n)
- Semesters completed? (#)
Eligible for AB12?
• No = youth turned 18 before Jan 1, 2012
• Yes = youth turned 18 on or after Jan 1, 2012

Time in care after age 18
• # of months the youth stayed in foster care after their 18th birthday up to their 21st birthday
• Youths were able to stay in care up to age 19 before the implementation of AB12 (if completing high school)
Analyses We Conducted

• **Regression analyses**\(^1\) used to estimate how much AB12 is expected to impact probability of the three outcomes

• Regression analyses...
  ✓ Enables us to account for potential confounders (i.e., things that could distort our estimate of AB12)
  ✓ The AB12 impact estimate are statistically adjusted
  ✓ This yields more accurate estimates of AB12 impact

• We also ran more rigorous type of regression analyses\(^2\) that provide an alternative method to answering our questions

\(^1\)Linear probability models (LPMs)
\(^2\)Instrumental variable (IV) models
Factors We Controlled for in our Regression Analyses

Youth characteristics (CWS/CMS)
- **Demographics**: Race/ethnicity and gender
- **Behavioral health problems**: mental health and substance use
- **Ever incarcerated**
- **Foster care history**: Age of first entry, primary placement type before age 18, placement change rate, total number of episodes before age 18, types of substantiated maltreatment

County characteristics (PUMS)
- **Housing affordability** (spend >30% of income on rent or mortgage)
- County-level young adult (age 16–24) **unemployment rate**

Postsecondary education institution characteristics
- **Selectivity** (4-year, 2-year, etc.) (IPEDS)
- Full-time student **retention rate** (IPEDS)
- Existence of a **campus support program** for foster youth (CY collected)
## Results:
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CW-supervised youths</th>
<th>Probation-only youths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Months in care after age 18</td>
<td>n=17,122</td>
<td>n=4,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-AB12</td>
<td>5.1 months</td>
<td>2.1 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-AB12</td>
<td>18.6 months</td>
<td>7.2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled by age 21</td>
<td>n=17,122</td>
<td>n=4,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-AB12</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-AB12</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persisted first two semesters</td>
<td>n=7,297</td>
<td>n=1,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-AB12</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-AB12</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of semesters persisted</td>
<td>n=7,089*</td>
<td>n=1,252*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-AB12</td>
<td>2.5 semesters</td>
<td>1.7 semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-AB12</td>
<td>2.5 semesters</td>
<td>1.7 semesters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stat. significant difference (p<.05)
Statistically significant (p<.05) impacts were only found for youth in child-welfare-supervised foster care:

**Results: Regression Analyses**

- College enrollment rates were 3.9% greater for youth in care after AB12 than for youth in care before AB12.

- For each additional year a youth spends in extended care, the probability of enrollment increases by about 4 percentage points.

Statistically significant (p<.05) impacts were not found for:

- Persistence or number of semesters completed
- Any of the postsecondary outcomes for probation-supervised youth
Limitations

- Over 1,100 youths in sample had enrolled in postsecondary education, but NSC record was blocked

- Limited range of individual-level control variables for the regression analyses (e.g., no measures of prior academic history and performance)

- Small sample sizes, especially probation-only youths

- Analysis based on data from the first two years of implementation of AB12
Take-Home Points So Far...

• AB12 increases the likelihood that youth in CW-supervised foster care enroll in postsecondary education by their 21st birthday

• However, we did not find evidence that AB12 increases rates of persistence or the number of semesters completed by age 21

• What about Chafee grants and CSPs?
Part 2: CSPs and Chafee Grants
Background

- **Chafee Grants (aka, Education & Training Vouchers)**
  - Foster youth receives up to $5k/year toward postsecondary expenses
  - Up to age 26, max 5 years
  - Federally funded since 2001 (~ $42M per year)
  - CA supplemented federal funding with state funding (AB 2506 in 2016 and AB 1811 in 2018)

- **Campus-Support Programs for Foster Youth (CSPs)**
  - Many services: logistical, advising, skill-building, advocacy, financial (sometimes)
  - First program established in late 1990s in CA
  - Currently 200+ programs nationwide
  - CA laws (SB 1023 in 2014 & SB 12 in 2017) fund network of CSP development/support in community college districts
    - Cooperating Agencies Foster Youth Educational Support (CAFYES)

- CSPs and Chafee grants are promising levers to boost persistence, because specifically targeted to postsecondary education
- But they haven’t been rigorously evaluated
Research Questions

1. Does receiving a Chafee Grant increase the likelihood of persisting?

2. Does participating in a CSP increase likelihood of persisting?
Sample

- Sample comes from youth participating in the CalYOUTH interviews (longitudinal study)
  - Interested in just youth who had enrolled in college

NSC data obtained in Jan. 2019

- 457 youths had an NSC record
- But, 56 youth were not included because:
  - 30 youths had blocked record (no data provided on them)
  - 12 youths first enrolled after CalYOUTH Wave 3 (no info. on Chafee Grant/CSP)
  - 14 youths didn’t complete a HS credential (likely taking adult basic ed. courses)
- This leaves 401 youths in the analysis
Data Sources

**NSC data** obtained Jan. 2019
- Outcome: college persistence (first 2 semesters)

**CalYOUTH Interviews**
- CSP involvement & Chafee grant receipt (W2 & W3)
- Diverse sets of background variables (W1)

**CA Child Welfare Administrative Data (CWS/CMS)**
- Foster care history, substantiated maltreatment history

**CalYOUTH Caseworker Survey**
- County-level engagement with postsecondary ed. institutions

**IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Ed. Data System)**
- Several institution-level characteristics

**CalYOUTH Search for CSPs**
- CSPs in CA colleges & years in operation
Main Predictors and Outcome

CSP involvement (Y/N)

- W2 & W3 interviews
- Youth asked if they participated in a CSP specifically for foster youth?
- 2 versions: youth self-report & verification of CSP

Chafee grant receipt (Y/N)

- W2 & W3 interviews
- Youth asked if they received ETV or Chafee grant?

Persistence
Persisted through their first two semesters (or equivalent) in postsecondary ed.
Analyses We Conducted

- Used a type of **regression analysis** for binary outcomes (logistic regression)
  - Allows us to account for potential confounders
  - Estimates the impacts of Chafee grant & CSP participation are statistically adjusted based on confounders in the model

Results are reported as **odds ratios (ORs)**

- Less than 1.0: Decreases odds of persistence
- 1.0: No impact
- Greater than 1.0: Increases odds of persistence

- Also investigated whether Chafee Grants and CSP have differing effects on persistence in 2-yr vs. 4-yr institutions
Control variables (FYI)

- **Demographic characteristics:** Gender, Race/ethnicity, Sexual orientation, Age at Wave 1 interview.
- **Educational background:** Reading proficiency, High school grades, Special education, Grade repetition, Expulsion, Educational aspirations, How prepared youth felt to continue education, Amount of educational preparation services youth received, Number of remedial college courses youth had to take.
- **Foster care history:** Ever in congregate care, Ever in kinship care, Age entered foster care, Placement change rate, Binary variables for substantiated maltreatment (sexual abuse, physical abuse, neglect, emotional abuse, other maltreatment).
- **Risk factors:** Ever arrested, Had a living child, Mood disorder, Anxiety disorder, Externalizing behavior disorder, ADHD, Alcohol/substance use disorder.
- **Protective factors:** Total number of emotional supports, Total number of tangible supports, Total number of advice/guidance supports, Ever worked for pay.
- **EFC and IL planning:** Youth’s role in TILP development, Amount of information received about EFC, Amount of conflicting information received about EFC, Has a person to go to for correct information about EFC, Youth’s score on EFC knowledge quiz, Ever in foster care past age 18.
- **County-level factors:** County size/urbanicity, Average availability of postsecondary education services/trainings, Average helpfulness of postsecondary education services/trainings, Average collaboration with postsecondary education institutions.
- **Institution-level factors:** Type/selectivity, Retention rate in first year, Percentage of students enrolled part-time, Percentage of students receiving Pell Grant, Expenditures on instruction per full-time student, Expenditures on academics per full-time student, Expenditures on student support services per full-time student.
- **Other controls:** Age at time of NSC data draw, Early vs. Late enrollee in CalYOUTH interview gap, Indicator if their college attended had a CSP program (from CalYOUTH search).
Results: Enrollment and CSPs

Type of institution

- Of youths in 2yr colleges, nearly all in CA public colleges
- About 5% in CA public 4yr colleges
- About 6% enrolled in other 4yr colleges

CSPs identified from CalYOUTH Search
- CSPs located on 122 campuses in CA
- 29 out of 31 public 4yr colleges (94% of these schools)
- 89 out of 114 public 2yr colleges (78%)
## Results:
Chafee grants, CSPs, and Persistence
(n=401)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received ETV</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in CSP</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in CSP (adjusted)</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persisted</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results: Roles of Chafee Grants & CSPs on Persistence

## Logistic Regression Results

(n = 401, weighted, control variables not shown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No controls</th>
<th>With controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p-value)</td>
<td>(p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Chafee grant</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&lt;.001)</td>
<td>(&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in CSP</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.056)</td>
<td>(.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in CSP (adjusted)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.085)</td>
<td>(.016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Take-Home Points

• Results suggest these Chafee grants & CSPs increase expected odds of persistence
  • Observed effects are robust after accounting for many possible confounders

• These early findings are promising
  • Thus far, extended care has not shown to move impact persistence
  • Substantial public & private investment appear to be having impact, at least in the short run

• Supplemental analyses (not shown) suggest benefits of these programs is not limited to youth in just one type of institution (e.g., 4-year colleges)
  • Important, because 85% + youth in sample enrolled in two-year college

• Appropriate degree of caution is warranted. This study is a first look at impacts. More, and more rigorous, studies needed
Limitations

• Analysis of observational data. \textbf{Not} a randomized controlled trial study or other evaluation design
  • Possibility for unmeasured confounding, which would bias estimates

• Specific dates not available for Chafee grants/CSP involvement
  • Possibility that some youth persisted then received Chafee grant/CSP
  • Sensitivity analyses conducted to check for this (not enough time to present, but no indication found)

• Missing NSC data due to blocked records
Where to Find CalYOUTH Reports

Findings from first part of presentation (AB12 impact) available on CalYOUTH’s webpage:

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

Memo from CalYOUTH: Early findings on the impact of extended foster care on foster youths’ postsecondary education enrollment and persistence.

Also check out the Co-Investment Partnership website for all-things CalYOUTH:

http://co-invest.org/resources/california-youth-transitions-adulthood/
CalYouth in the Loop

- **Outreach strategy** testing surveys and other communications methods

- Collects feedback / reactions to the CalYOUTH Transitions to Adulthood Study

- **Objective:** Build a feedback loop between TAY from foster care and researchers / stakeholders / service providers
How did we collect feedback?

www.CalYouthInTheLoop.org

Speak Up!

The latest wave of results has just been published. Learn how youth across California have been impacted by extended foster care. Add your voice and ideas to make an impact!
What we learned

• Peer-to-peer outreach strategies and intermediary relationships were more effective.

• Male respondents remain elusive – we asked why

• Most youth indicated they always or almost always have reliable forms of communication like a phone or internet service

• Youth prefer texting and hearing directly from a social worker as a form of communication.
From the list below, what are your preferred ways of communicating with services or programs related to foster care?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texting</td>
<td>67.80% 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media networks like snapchat or instagram</td>
<td>28.81% 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail</td>
<td>61.02% 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving letters or pamphlets through the mail</td>
<td>16.95% 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving phone calls</td>
<td>35.59% 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From my friends who are enrolled in or use relevant foster care programs</td>
<td>20.34% 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In person from social workers or other service providers</td>
<td>37.29% 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1.69% 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Respondents: 59
Q3 How did you hear about this survey?

- Youth Perspective...
- Guardian Scholar or...
- THP/THP+ Organization
- Youth Advocacy Organization
- Other current or former...
- Other (please specify)
Responses by Gender

Q13 Gender

- Female: 71%
- Male: 25%
- I identify as a different...: 4%
Male feedback

- They don’t think that their feedback matters: 24%
- They don’t have the time to provide feedback: 0%
- They are not interested in providing feedback: 33%
- They feel uncomfortable providing feedback: 14%
- They do not know enough information to provide feedback: 10%
- Other (please specify): 19%
Male feedback

As a male, we are taught to not talk about our personal lives and "man up." For me, I want to make a difference by responding and answering questions. I love talking about my story and encourage current or former foster youth students to become someone in life.
Did respondents think feedback was important?

Q12 How important is it to you to be able to provide feedback through surveys and studies about the policies and programs that affect youth ages 18-21 who are transitioning to adulthood from foster care?

- 1% Not so important, I don’t think our feedback makes a difference for the better.
- 23% Somewhat important, feedback can make a difference, but not much.
- 76% Very important, I think feedback makes a difference for the better.
Have you been able to achieve, or make progress on, your educational goals?

- **Yes**: 87.5%
- **No**: 6.25%
- **Somewhat**: 6.25%

Progress on educational goals of youth who **did not opt** into extended foster care.
Has extended foster care helped you achieve, or make progress on, your educational goals?

- Answered: 59    Skipped: 1

- Yes: 72.88%
- No: 8.47%
- Somewhat: 18.64%

Progress on educational goals of youth who opted into extended foster care.
Since you didn’t know about the Chafee scholarship, what would have been the best way for you to learn about this scholarship program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would have liked to receive a brochure through the mail</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a high school counselor</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through my social worker</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a foster parent or group home staff person</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a college counselor</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a social media post or ad</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to learn about things through conversations with friends</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

• For youth in the room, what feedback do you want to give about campus-support programs to better support persistence?

• For anyone, what has been your experience with Chafee grants? Have you encountered any difficulties? What improvements could be made?

• What things are working with AB12? What are some changes that could be made to help support persistence?