California Department of Education

Report to the Governor, the Legislature, and the Legislative Analyst's Office:

Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program Report for 2018

Prepared by the:

Improvement and Accountability Division
Instruction and Management Branch

September 2019

Description: This report is an update of the Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program (FYSCP) for school years 2016–17 and 2017–18. The report includes: (1) recommendations regarding the effectiveness and continuation of the FYSCP; (2) foster student data by county; (3) FYSCP Report; and (4) conclusion.

Authority: California *Education Code* Section 42923(b)

Recipient: The Governor, the Legislature, and the Legislative Analyst's Office

Due Date: July 1 of each even-numbered year per California *Education Code* Section 42923(b)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report is prepared pursuant to California *Education Code* (*EC*) Section 42923(b). The California Department of Education (CDE) has long considered the needs of California pupils in foster care to be a high priority. Pupils in foster care represent one of the most vulnerable and academically at-risk subgroups enrolled in California schools. The instability in home and school placements often negatively impact students learning achievement.

In 1981, the Legislature recognized that a high percentage of foster youth were achieving significantly below grade level, were being retained at least one year at the same grade level, or were dropping out of school. In response, the Legislature declared that the instruction, counseling, tutoring, and provision of related services for foster youth would be a state priority.

In fall 2013, California implemented a historic shift in how it funds its public schools through the adoption of the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). This new funding system significantly increases funding for high-needs students and provides greater flexibility to local educational agencies (LEAs) in how to meet the needs of these students. In March 2017, the California State Board of Education (SBE) and CDE launched the new California accountability system, the California School Dashboard (Dashboard). For the first, time foster youth were uniquely identified as a high-needs student subgroup on the Dashboard. The Dashboard provides parents, educators, and members of the public annual information about the performance of districts, schools, and student groups, including foster youth. LEAs are now required to identify in their Local Control and Accountability Plans (LCAPs) how resources, including LCFF supplemental and concentration grant funds, will be leveraged to best serve students in foster care.

Recognizing the need to align the existing county structure of support for foster youth to a system focused at the LEA level, the Legislature enacted Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015 (Assembly Bill [AB] 854) which amended California *EC* sections 42921–42927, establishing the Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program (FYSCP). This legislation further defines the approach for county agencies and LEAs to collaboratively meet the educational needs of foster youth. To support this realignment, the Budget Act of 2015 (Senate Bill [SB] 97 Line Item 6100-119-0001) increased the foster youth allocation by an additional $10 million for a total of $25.4 million. The goal of the increased appropriation was to provide integrated educational services to pupils in foster care. The Budget Act of 2018, AB 840, allocated $26.5 million for the FYSCP.

The purposes of the FYSCP are 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.

This report recommends the continuation of the FYSCP. Since these county-administered programs were developed, foster youth educational outcomes have improved, new policies and programs have been developed and implemented at the LEA and county level, and the program has dramatically improved the coordination of foster youth services among county agencies. The development of Executive Advisory Councils (EACs) and formal interagency agreements allow for coordination of foster youth services and the implementation of new policies and practices that have braided resources and eliminated redundant services among county agencies. The county FYSCPs also supported the development of school district and charter school transportation plans as required by Section 6312(c)(5) of Title 20 of the *United States Code,* of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

If you have any questions regarding this report or would like a copy of this report, please contact Jane Liang, Education Programs Consultant, Improvement and Accountability Division, by phone at 916-319-0259 or by email at jliang@cde.ca.gov. This report will be posted on the CDE Foster Youth Services web page at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/.

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

Introduction

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

To support LEAs to better serve foster youth, AB 854 was signed into law on October 9, 2015, and it became effective on January 1, 2016. It amended California *EC* sections 42921–42927 and established the FYSCP. The FYSCP shifts the responsibilities of providing direct educational services for students in foster care from county offices of education (COEs) to LEAs. COEs are now responsible for establishing ongoing collaboration among child welfare agencies, county probation departments, and other organizations for purposes of implementing school-based support for students in foster care. In addition to coordination of services, the administered COE FYSCPs are to build the capacity of LEAs to improve foster youth educational outcomes.

The CDE has administered the FYSCP since 2016. As allowed under AB 854, the CDE has partnered with the Shasta COE and the Orange County Department of Education to create the FYSCP Technical Assistance Program (TAP). The FYSCP TAP provides support, guidance, and leadership to all county FYSCP coordinators for the implementation of the requirements of AB 854.

Program History and Purpose

The foster youth service program was established in 1973 as a pilot project in a handful of school districts and expanded to COEs in 1998, with a focus on providing supplemental education services for foster youth living in group homes. The eligible population later expanded to include foster youth in foster homes and those transitioning from juvenile detention facilities.

In 1981, the Legislature recognized that a high percentage of foster youth were achieving significantly below grade level, being retained at least one year at the same grade level, and dropping out of school. In response, the Legislature mandated that the instruction, counseling, tutoring, and provision of related services for foster youth be a

state priority and provided ongoing funding for the pilot project.[1] By 2006, the foster youth service program expanded to all counties. The Budget Act of 2006–07 provided $18.3 million for FYSCPs. This amount included an additional $8.2 million to expand services to foster youth beyond those residing in licensed children's institutions of group homes, including those in juvenile detention facilities.

In 2013, the Governor and the Legislature changed the landscape of education for students in foster care at the district and county levels with the passage of LCFF. The LCFF made a historic shift in how California funds its public schools. This new funding mechanism significantly increases funding for high-needs students, including foster youth, and provides greater flexibility to LEAs in how to meet the needs of these students. Through their LCAPS, LEAs identify how resources, including LCFF supplemental and concentration grant funds, will be leveraged to best serve each high-needs student subgroup. The LCFF unduplicated pupil count is used to allocate funds to avoid over-allocation of funds when a student satisfies more than one category of high need. Unduplicated pupil categories are: English learners, students who meet income or categorical eligibility requirements for free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program, and foster youth. To monitor the LCFF data, LEAs are able to identify students in foster care through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data (CALPADS) System as a result of a data sharing agreement with the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

To track the progress of student educational outcomes in California, the SBE and CDE launched the new California accountability system, the California School Dashboard, in 2017.[2] The Dashboard allows educational outcomes to be identified across student groups for each LEA and school. Foster youth are identified as a separate student subgroup on the Dashboard. Parents, educators, and the public are able to track the progress of schools through the annual reports to verify the performance of districts, schools, and student groups, including foster youth. Now that foster youth is a designated high-needs subgroup, LEAs must specify in their LCAP how resources will be leveraged to best serve this population. Using the Dashboard reports, LEAs are able to develop local plans, which include allocation of supplemental and target funds for unduplicated pupils. The LCAP process allows LEAs and community members to provide services which meets the needs of their students. For foster youth, this means that schools are able to provide direct services, such as tutoring, but also services that promote school stability, such as a foster youth liaison or transportation to the student's school of origin if this is in the best interest of the youth.

---

[1] Webber, Shirley. 2015. AB 854 Foster Youth Services/LCFF Alignment. https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/BTB_23_4H_1.pdf (accessed March 6, 2019).

[2] California Department of Education. 2018. California School Dashboard. https://www.caschooldashboard.org/.

Since this major change, the Legislature, CDE, and SBE have been providing guidance to improve foster youth services and build capacity for LEAs to best serve foster youth in school districts and charter schools. The CDE and SBE made foster youth coordinating service a state priority, Priority 10.[3] This means that COEs must address their coordination of foster youth services in LCAPs, including working with the county child welfare agency to share information, responding to the needs of the juvenile court system, and transferring health and education records. To monitor Priority 10, the Dashboard uses a local accountability indicator. The COE develops this indicator by preparing an annual report about the coordinating services for students in foster care in eight specific areas. The COE reports that they either met or did not meet their goals. The data are used as part of their annual report to CDE concerning their program.

Two issues surfaced after the implementation of LCFF. First, the LCFF definition of "foster youth" in *EC* Section 42238.01(b) expanded the definition of foster youth that had been used by the foster youth services program, which was established in 1981. The LCFF definition included all foster youth with an open dependency case, regardless of the living arrangement in which they have been placed by the state. This new definition also included two more groups in foster youth: children in relative placements and in family maintenance. This expansion increased the numbers of foster youth eligible for educational services in the state by threefold. Prior to LCFF alignment, approximately 20,000 students were eligible for foster youth services. The second issue was that now LEAs were able to develop plans based on the local needs. Any school district or charter school was able to address the needs of the students attending their schools. The impact on foster youth education was that LEAs could address local foster youth needs so that the students could be provided school stability and have access to educational support services. These two were the motivation for AB 854 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015).

Recognizing the need to align the existing county structure of support for foster youth to one focused at the LEA level, the Legislature enacted Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015, (AB 854) which amended California *EC* sections 42921–42927, establishing the FYSCP and further defining the approach for county agencies and LEAs to collaboratively meet the educational needs of foster youth. The legislation also aligned the definition of foster youth to include the LCFF definition. After the adoption of AB 854, approximately 60,000 students were eligible for services. To support this realignment, the Budget Act of 2015 (SB 97 Line Item 6100-119-0001) allocated an additional $10 million, for a total of $25.4 million, to provide more integrated educational services to pupils in foster care. In 2018, SB 420 allocated $26.5 million for the FYSCP. The FYSCP went beyond the definition of foster youth in LCFF and also included youth in juvenile detention centers.

---

[3] California Department of Education. 2015. State Priority Related Resources. https://www.cde.ca.gov/fg/aa/lc/statepriorityresources.asp.

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

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

Foster care is a temporary service provided by states for children who cannot live with their family because either their parents cannot care for them or they are mistreated and/or neglected and require oversight by the county welfare agency. In the U.S. in 2017, approximately 691,000 children were placed out of home, and on a given day (September 30, 2017), 443,000 children were placed out of their homes in licensed foster family homes, non-family group home, or residential treatment settings.[4] Also reported by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in California, about 80,000 children were placed in foster care in 2017, and around 52,000 children were placed outside their homes on September 30, 2017.[5]

It is widely known, long before foster youth were identified as a unique student group in the California school accountability system, that the learning achievement of foster youth is much lower than their peers with permanent homes.[6] Students in foster care face many obstacles in achieving learning success. According to a study published in 2012, there are four major factors underlying the poor educational outcomes of foster youth:[7]

---

[4] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau. 2018. *Trends in Foster Care and Adoption—FY 2017*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/trends-in-foster-care-and-adoption (accessed January 23, 2019).

[5] Pecora, Peter J. 2012. Maximizing Educational Achievement of Youth in Foster Care and Alumni: Factors Associated with Success. Children and Youth Services Review 34 (2012): 1121–1129.

[6] Barrat Vanessa X., & BethAnn Berliner. 2013. *The Invisible Achievement Gap, Part I: Education Outcomes of Students in Foster Care in California's Public Schools*. San Francisco: WestEd. https://www.wested.org/resources/the-invisible-achievement-gap-education-outcomes-of-students-in-foster-care-in-californias-public-schools-part-1/ (accessed September 17, 2019).
Clemens, E. V. & M. Tis. 2016. *Colorado Study of Students in Foster Care: Needs Assessment Data 2008 to 2014.* Greeley, CO: University of Northern Colorado. Retrieved from: www.unco.edu/cebs/foster-care-research/ (accessed September 17, 2019).

[7] See Note 5.

1. Enrollment problems and educational instability lower test scores and complicate a child's journey through the education system.

2. Placement changes in foster care frequently lower school stability and a child's education performance.

3. Educational challenges can result in a child being held back a grade, resulting in stigma from being older than many children in their grade.

4. Various genetic, environmental, parent-child interaction, community, and other factors, not the least of which might be child abuse or neglect, contribute to the higher rates of certain emotional and behavioral disorders of children in care that can interfere with learning.

Foster youth commonly experience multiple placements in foster homes and licensed children's institutions. Youth in foster care change placements on an average of one to two times a year. Though the average stay in foster care is 13.4 months, approximately 27 percent of children in care stay for more than two years. Many foster care youth are unable to remain in their schools of origin when it is clearly in their best interest to do so.[8]

According to the most recent National Workgroup on Foster Care and Education report,[9] 65 percent of foster youth experienced more than one living placement while in foster care. Due to high mobility, many foster youth change schools many times in their kindergarten through grade twelve education. In the same report, more than 34 percent foster youth age of seventeen and eighteen experienced five or more school changes. In California, 75 percent of foster youth changed school in first year and 49 percent in second year, compared to 21 percent of non-foster youth transfer rate.[10] Research found this low school stability negatively associated to foster youth students' educational attainment. A study based on Colorado state data reveals that if the average number of school changes increased by one, the odds of drop out of high

---

[8] Child Welfare Information Gateway. 2019. *Foster Care Statistics 2017*. https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/factsheets/foster/.

[9] National Workgroup on Foster Care and Education. 2018. Fostering Success in Education: National Factsheet on the Educational Outcomes of Children in Foster Care. http://www.fostercareandeducation.org/OurWork/NationalWorkingGroup.aspx (accessed February 8, 2019).

[10] Center for Social Services Research & Institute for Evidence-Based Change. 2013. Foster Youth Stability: A Study of California Foster Youths' School and Residential Changes in Relation to Educational Outcomes. http://www.iebcnow.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/pub_foster_youth_stability_2013.pdf (Accessed February 8, 2019).

school is 39 percent greater.[11] The California data shows foster youth who experienced a school transfer were 22 percent less likely to score *Proficient* on the California Standard Test (CST) than those who did not experience a transfer.[12]

Foster youth often experience high placement rate and high school transfer rates. A study reveals that foster youth have a mean of 7.35 placement changes and 8.26 school transfers over the average of 6.6 years spent in foster care. This same study also concludes that there is a significant correlation between school changes and negative behaviors.[13] The Institute for Higher Education Policy estimates that a change in placement occurs about once every six months and, due to this movement, foster youth lose an average of four to six months of educational attainment.[14] The educational impact of every school change is significant. Foster youth must adjust to different curricula, different expectations, new friends, and new teachers. They must withstand disruptions in education services, including special education support, counseling, enrichment programs, and extracurricular opportunities.

Data on educational outcomes has, for many years, shown an inverse relationship between children placed in foster care and educational outcomes. A study by the John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities that focused on the academic achievement of students in foster care living in San Mateo County, California, revealed that students who had contact with the child welfare system were more than twice as likely to not be *Proficient* in their English and Math CST scores. By grade eleven, only 1 in 5 foster youth scored *Proficient* on English and only 1 in 20 *Proficient* on math.[15] In addition, 48 percent of high school students who had contact with the child welfare system passed the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) for English Language Arts (ELA) and 50 percent passed the CAHSEE for Math compared to a 74 percent ELA pass rate and a 75 percent Math pass rate experienced by their peers not in foster care. This study also noted that students in foster care were earning approximately 50 percent fewer University of California/California State University

---

[11] Clemens, Elysia V., Trent L. Lalonde, Alison Phillips Sheesley. 2016. The Relationship Between School Mobility and Students in Foster Care Earning a High School Credential. *Children and Youth Services Review 68* (2016): 193–201.

[12] See Note 9.

[13] Sullivan, M., L. Jones, & S. Mathiesen, "School Change, Academic Progress, and Behavior Problems in a Sample of Foster Youth." *Children and Youth Services Review* 32 (2010): 164–170.

[14] T. R. Wolanin, *Higher Education Opportunities for Foster Youth: A Primer for Policy Makers.* The Institute for Higher Education Policy, December 2005, 29 http://www.ihep.org/Publications/publications–detail.cfm?id=58 (accessed December 20, 2011).

[15] Frerer, K., Sosenko, L., Pellegrin, N., Zakharenkov, A., Horowitz, J., & Patton, M. (2011). *Ready to Succeed: An exploration of secondary and postsecondary educational outcomes for foster children in California.* (Four County Study.)

College admissions-required high school credits (A–G) than their peers who had no history with the child welfare system.[16]

A large percentage of children and youth placed in foster care experience physical and emotional trauma as a result of abuse, neglect, separation from family, and impermanence.[17] Although youth are placed in foster care for their safety, foster youth often do not find the security and stability they need through the foster care system. Most children who enter foster care have been exposed to many conditions that have undermined their chances for healthy development.[18] The detrimental effects of environmental, social, biological, and psychological risk factors such as abuse and neglect, exposure to illicit drugs, and poverty have significantly undermined the well-being of foster youth mental health. Therefore, students in foster care face more challenges in achieving learning success than their peers not in foster care.[19]

The Legislature recognized that a high percentage of foster youth were working substantially below grade level, were being retained at least one year at the same grade level, and were dropping out of school. Studies conducted in connection with legislation to support the education of students in foster care show that 83 percent of foster youth students are held back by the third grade, 75 percent of all foster youth students are working below grade level, and 46 percent become high school dropouts.[20] These data are confirmed by a report of the California Legislative Analyst's Office.[21] The report also revealed that by third grade, approximately 80 percent of students in foster care have had to repeat a grade in school.

---

[16] S. Castechini, *Educational outcomes in court-dependent youth in San Mateo County. Issue Brief: Court Dependent Youth* (Stanford, CA: John W. Gardner Center for Youth and Their Communities, 2009). http://gardnercenter.stanford.edu/resources/publications/JGC_IB_CourtDependentYouth2009.pdf (Accessed September 6, 2012).

[17] Romano, Elisa, Lyzon Babchishin, Robyn Marquis, and Sabrina Frechette. 2015. Childhood Maltreatment and Educational Outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 16* (4) 418–437. doi: 10.1177/1524838014537908.

[18] Reibschleger, Joanne, Angelique Day & Amy Damashek. 2015. Foster Care Youth Share Stories of Trauma Before, During, and After Placement: Youth Voices for Building Trauma-Informed Systems of Care. Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 24 (4). doi: 10.1080/10926771.2015.1009603.

[19] See Note 6

[20] An overview of AB 490 (Steinberg, *Helping Foster Children Make the Grade)* developed by the California Youth Connection, Children's Advocacy Institute, and Children's Law Center of Los Angeles (2004), appears at the end of this report in Appendix D. The complete law can be viewed at the Official California Legislative Information website at http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/ (accessed October 1, 2016).

[21] California Legislative Analyst's Office (2009). *Education of Foster Youth in California Report.*

In a study conducted by the California Attorney General entitled *In School and On Track*[22] in the 2015–16 school year, the chronic absence rate for students in foster care was almost 9 percent—about 2 percentage points greater than the rate for students not in foster care. These same foster youth had chronic absence rates of 14 percent in 2013–14 and 12 percent in 2012–13, double the rates of students not in foster care in the same years. In addition, this report indicates that students in foster care were more likely to be suspended than peers not in foster care.

Monitoring these trends is supported by the data reporting elements of *EC* Section 49085(c), which requires the SSPI to provide outcome data on educational outcomes for pupils in foster care at school and district levels. Specifically, this includes the number of pupils and their academic achievement, incidence of suspension and expulsion, and truancy rates, attendance rates, and dropout rates, to the extent allowable by federal law.

For the 2018 Report to the Governor and Legislature as required by *EC* Section 49085(c), the CDE is able to provide, for the first time, the comprehensive educational data on the academic achievement and other educational metrics of students in foster care due to the improvement of its dynamic data system. The data reported here are obtained from two data sources:

1. The publicly available DataQuest,[23] which provides aggregated data annually about California students, teachers, and schools, including foster youth.

2. California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data,[24] which tracks an array of students' performance indicators over years.

Organization of the 2018 Report for the Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program

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

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

---

[22] Kamala Harris, California Attorney General, In School and On Track, Attorney General 2015 Report on California's Elementary School Truancy and Absenteeism Crisis (Accessed 2016).

[23] California Department of Education. 2019. *DataQuest*. https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/.

[24] California Department of Education. 2019. *California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System*. https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/cl/.

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

- Part III—FYSCP report; and

- Part IV—Conclusion.

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

Based on the FYSCP activities described below in establishing procedures, agreements, and data tools to support foster youth and the data report in the following pages showing improvement of foster youth in academic and social emotional learning indicators, the CDE believes the FYSCP is effective and strongly recommends the continuation of the FYSCP.

As a result of AB 854, the FYSCP restructured the previous foster youth service model by shifting the responsibilities of the COEs from direct educational service provider for foster youth to one of capacity builder for LEAs.

During the 2016–17 and 2017–18 FYs, the FYSCP has been effective in providing guidance for COEs to establish policies and procedures that ensure that LEAs place foster youth in schools in a timely manner and in an appropriate educational placement in accordance with state and federal laws. The COE FYSCPs oversee the transfer of school records and other relevant educational information so that they are available for inter-district transfer. All county FYSCPs have established local interagency EACs that coordinate and leverage resources for LEAs, child welfare agencies, and county probation offices to support foster youth education. All counties are developing countywide transportation plans, data sharing agreements, and agreements with the child welfare agencies to leverage Title IV-E of the federal Social Security Act (42 *U.S.C.* Section 301) funds. These agreements establish procedures to promote school stability for foster youth and provide support for transitions to independent living. Prior to 2016, essentially none of these interagency agreements had been established. Through these agreements, protocols have been established by LEAs, child welfare agencies, county probation departments, and other organizations, such as those listed in Table 25, to work collaboratively to meet the educational needs of foster youth.

The FYSCP also effectively provided support in the development of the complex data tools developed by and for COEs. For example, the Stuart Foundation awarded the Sacramento COE a grant to develop a real-time data system called Foster Focus. This data system combines foster youth data from the Child Welfare Services Case Management System, CALPADS, and school district student information systems and allows for manual editing of data. This tool gathers data to track the educational progress of 90 percent of California foster youth. Any county agency using Foster Focus can get a complete real-time picture about a child's school history, including grades and attendance. This data system helps in identifying and tracking academic, behavioral, and social emotional progress as well as supporting foster youth. The Los Angeles COE created a similar system, the Educational Passport System, which compiles county data

from Los Angeles Child and Family Services, Probation, and other Los Angeles county school districts. The FYSCP has allowed all counties to benefit from these proven data tools.

Part II—Aggregate Educational Outcome Data by County

This section includes aggregated educational data for the following indicators listed below for each county that had at least 15 students in foster care who attended school in the county. To protect student privacy, data are suppressed and indicated by an asterisk if the foster student population is 10 or fewer in a given county.

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

Tables 1 and 2 below show the 2016–17 and 2017–18 cumulative enrollment[25] of matched[26] students in foster care who attended school by county. The cumulative enrollment by grade level for the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school year are included in Appendixes A and B. The county enrollment is collected by counties through CALPADS where the foster student was enrolled during the academic year. This may or may not be the same as the County of Jurisdiction, which has legal jurisdiction over the foster student. Foster student for enrollment counts are unduplicated at each reporting level (i.e., state, county, district, and school). For example, students in foster care are counted once for each county in which they had one or more enrollments during the academic year but only counted once at the state level. As shown in Tables 1 and 2, three of the 58 counties in California had fewer than 10 foster youth attending school in

---

[25] Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the academic year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a school or district. Source: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/fsabd.asp.

[26] Each week, the CDSS extracts from the Child Welfare System/Case Management System the youth who meet the LCFF definition of a foster youth, along with extracting specified demographic information, and provides the data to the CDE. The CDE matches the youth information received from the CDSS with student enrollment data maintained in CALPADS. To ensure an accurate match, the CDE requires a youth to be matched based on name, date of birth, and one school of enrollment over the past three years. Source: https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/cl/edoutcome1415fostyouth.asp

their county in the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years: Alpine, Mono, and Sierra counties.

Table 1: 2016–17 Foster Student Enrollment by County

County	Total
Alameda	1,257
Alpine	*
Amador	96
Butte	523
Calaveras	165
Colusa	51
Contra Costa	1,259
Del Norte	108
El Dorado	643
Fresno	2,333
Glenn	68
Humboldt	319
Imperial	391
Inyo	132
Kern	2,009
Kings	474
Lake	86
Lassen	113
Los Angeles	20,138
Madera	493
Marin	185
Mariposa	64

County	Total
Mendocino	254
Merced	862
Modoc	67
Mono	*
Monterey	376
Napa	161
Nevada	236
Orange	2,776
Placer	370
Plumas	57
Riverside	5,235
Sacramento	2,514
San Benito	91
San Bernardino	7,036
San Diego	2,516
San Francisco	770
San Joaquin	1,731
San Luis Obispo	419
San Mateo	362
Santa Barbara	435
Santa Clara	1,192
Santa Cruz	297
Shasta	502
Sierra	*

County	Total
Siskiyou	102
Solano	561
Sonoma	646
Stanislaus	1,043
Sutter	217
Tehama	219
Trinity	102
Tulare	1,212
Tuolumne	73
Ventura	942
Yolo	326
Yuba	276
Statewide	**55,282**

Table 2: 2017–18 Foster Student Enrollment by County

County	Total
Alameda	1,026
Alpine	*
Amador	76
Butte	486
Calaveras	160
Colusa	67
Contra Costa	1,112
Del Norte	121

County	Total
El Dorado	650
Fresno	2,381
Glenn	77
Humboldt	402
Imperial	436
Inyo	145
Kern	2,027
Kings	453
Lake	81
Lassen	100
Los Angeles	17,041
Madera	454
Marin	162
Mariposa	69
Mendocino	228
Merced	827
Modoc	56
Mono	11
Monterey	368
Napa	138
Nevada	193
Orange	2,683
Placer	410
Plumas	12

County	Total
Riverside	4,618
Sacramento	2,313
San Benito	79
San Bernardino	6,645
San Diego	2,289
San Francisco	729
San Joaquin	1,715
San Luis Obispo	378
San Mateo	316
Santa Barbara	380
Santa Clara	1,125
Santa Cruz	270
Shasta	454
Sierra	*
Siskiyou	100
Solano	547
Sonoma	627
Stanislaus	963
Sutter	264
Tehama	198
Trinity	78
Tulare	1,197
Tuolumne	80
Ventura	854

County	Total
Yolo	394
Yuba	261
Statewide	**50,247**

The California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) is the state testing system used to measure the academic achievement of students. The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments are part of the state testing system, and they test students' knowledge and skills in, among other subjects, English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics.[27] Students in grades three through eight and grade eleven take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for ELA and mathematics.[28] Test scores on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments fall into one of four performance levels: standard exceeded, standard met, standard nearly met, and standard not met.[29]

Tables 3 and 4 show the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments Performance Levels for students in foster care in ELA for 2016–17 and 2017–18 school year, respectively. For ELA, in 2016–17 the statewide average for students in foster care who met or exceeded the state standard was 21.2 percent, as shown in Table 3. In 2017–18, the students in foster care who met or exceeded the state standard was 22.1 percent (Table 4), which shows an increase of 0.9 percentage points.

Tables 5 and 6 show the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments Performance Levels for students in foster care in mathematics for the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years. For the 2016–17 school year mathematics assessments, the state students in foster care who met or exceeded the state standard was 13.0 percent, as shown in Table 5. For 2017–18, the statewide percent of students in foster care who met or exceeded the state standard was 13.7, which shows an increase of 0.7 percentage points.

---

[27] California Department of Education. 2019. California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress Report. https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ai/cefcaaspp.asp.

[28] California Department of Equation. 2019. 2019–20 *California Assessment System.* https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ai/documents/calassesssystem.pdf.

[29] California Department of Education. 2019. Reporting Achievement Level Descriptors. https://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/ca/sbachievedescript.asp.

Table 3: 2016–17 Academic Achievement Levels for ELA

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
Alameda	5.2	13.6	18.8	21.0	60.2	81.2
Alpine	*	*	*	*	*	*
Amador	10.8	27.0	37.8	21.6	40.5	62.2
Butte	2.1	13.4	15.5	25.8	58.8	84.5
Calaveras	0.0	26.5	26.5	32.7	40.8	73.5
Colusa	9.5	9.5	19.0	23.8	57.1	81.0
Contra Costa	4.4	15.2	19.5	25.5	54.9	80.5
Del Norte	3.8	15.1	18.9	22.6	58.5	81.1
El Dorado	7.2	24.0	31.2	23.2	45.6	68.8
Fresno	5.0	16.5	21.5	23.0	55.5	78.5
Glenn	0.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	60.0	90.0
Humboldt	0.6	16.5	17.1	27.8	55.1	82.9
Imperial	5.8	19.7	25.5	26.3	48.2	74.5
Inyo	*	*	*	*	*	*
Kern	3.6	15.3	18.8	21.6	59.6	81.2
Kings	5.5	12.0	17.5	27.3	55.2	82.5
Lake	5.0	15.0	20.0	15.0	65.0	80.0
Lassen	11.1	11.1	22.2	16.7	61.1	77.8
Los Angeles	4.4	16.6	21.0	22.9	56.0	79.0
Madera	4.7	16.7	21.3	29.3	49.3	78.7

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
Marin	4.3	19.1	23.4	17.0	59.6	76.6
Mariposa	6.3	25.0	31.3	18.8	50.0	68.8
Mendocino	2.2	11.0	13.2	26.4	60.4	86.8
Merced	3.9	17.6	21.5	23.2	55.3	78.5
Modoc	0.0	13.0	13.0	30.4	56.5	87.0
Mono	*	*	*	*	*	*
Monterey	4.7	13.3	18.0	23.4	58.6	82.0
Napa	6.3	28.1	34.4	23.4	42.2	65.6
Nevada	2.7	10.8	13.5	32.4	54.1	86.5
Orange	6.2	17.9	24.1	22.1	53.7	75.9
Placer	7.7	21.2	28.8	26.9	44.2	71.2
Plumas	0.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	40.0	70.0
Riverside	5.0	16.8	21.8	24.1	54.1	78.2
Sacramento	3.7	14.6	18.3	25.3	56.4	81.7
San Benito	6.3	12.5	18.8	28.1	53.1	81.3
San Bernardino	4.8	15.7	20.5	22.6	56.9	79.5
San Diego	7.9	16.6	24.5	24.9	50.6	75.5
San Francisco	3.4	8.9	12.3	23.5	64.2	87.7
San Joaquin	3.6	14.5	18.2	21.0	60.8	81.8

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
San Luis Obispo	9.0	24.5	33.5	29.0	37.4	66.5
San Mateo	8.4	19.6	28.0	20.6	51.4	72.0
Santa Barbara	2.7	16.8	19.5	20.1	60.4	80.5
Santa Clara	5.9	15.1	21.0	24.6	54.4	79.0
Santa Cruz	4.5	20.7	25.2	24.3	50.5	74.8
Shasta	4.7	19.9	24.6	26.2	49.2	75.4
Sierra	*	*	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	4.7	20.9	25.6	34.9	39.5	74.4
Solano	4.1	17.8	21.8	21.3	56.9	78.2
Sonoma	5.3	17.0	22.3	24.3	53.4	77.7
Stanislaus	4.8	13.3	18.2	23.3	58.5	81.8
Sutter	1.4	17.1	18.6	31.4	50.0	81.4
Tehama	6.6	26.3	32.9	21.1	46.1	67.1
Trinity	6.5	19.4	25.8	19.4	54.8	74.2
Tulare	3.7	15.4	19.1	24.1	56.8	80.9
Tuolumne	4.8	14.3	19.0	42.9	38.1	81.0
Ventura	4.2	18.8	23.0	23.6	53.3	77.0
Yolo	10.0	13.0	23.0	23.0	54.0	77.0
Yuba	5.3	22.3	27.7	18.1	54.3	72.3
Statewide	**4.8**	**16.4**	**21.2**	**23.4**	**55.4**	**78.8**

Table 4: 2017–18 Academic Achievement Levels for ELA

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
Alameda	8.8	15.9	24.7	17.7	57.6	75.3
Alpine	*	*	*	*	*	*
Amador	4.8	19.0	23.8	47.6	28.6	76.2
Butte	3.7	18.7	22.5	25.1	52.4	77.5
Calaveras	2.0	18.0	20.0	30.0	50.0	80.0
Colusa	0.0	19.4	19.4	25.8	54.8	80.6
Contra Costa	3.8	18.5	22.3	23.3	54.5	77.8
Del Norte	8.5	14.9	23.4	17.0	59.6	76.6
El Dorado	4.8	21.8	26.6	29.0	44.4	73.4
Fresno	8.1	16.9	25.0	21.2	53.8	75.0
Glenn	5.3	10.5	15.8	36.8	47.4	84.2
Humboldt	5.7	14.6	20.4	28.0	51.6	79.6
Imperial	4.2	13.7	17.9	31.0	51.2	82.1
Inyo	9.1	18.2	27.3	18.2	54.5	72.7
Kern	5.0	14.3	19.3	24.3	56.5	80.7
Kings	4.4	19.1	23.5	27.3	49.2	76.5
Lake	9.5	9.5	19.0	14.3	66.7	81.0
Lassen	2.9	8.8	11.8	20.6	67.6	88.2
Los Angeles	5.5	16.4	21.9	22.9	55.1	78.1
Madera	4.3	13.7	18.0	22.3	59.7	82.0

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
Marin	8.0	30.0	38.0	16.0	46.0	62.0
Mariposa	0.0	41.7	41.7	8.3	50.0	58.3
Mendocino	3.0	17.0	20.0	17.0	63.0	80.0
Merced	4.7	13.3	18.0	24.1	57.9	82.0
Modoc	0.0	9.1	9.1	36.4	54.5	90.9
Mono	*	*	*	*	*	*
Monterey	7.0	10.9	18.0	18.8	63.3	82.0
Napa	7.3	25.5	32.7	25.5	41.8	67.3
Nevada	5.9	20.6	26.5	35.3	38.2	73.5
Orange	6.1	19.4	25.6	20.8	53.6	74.4
Placer	10.4	21.7	32.2	21.7	46.1	67.8
Plumas	0.0	17.6	17.6	35.3	47.1	82.4
Riverside	6.2	17.0	23.1	23.1	53.8	76.9
Sacramento	3.7	13.5	17.2	24.4	58.4	82.8
San Benito	4.5	18.2	22.7	27.3	50.0	77.3
San Bernardino	5.4	16.6	21.9	22.0	56.0	78.1
San Diego	6.9	17.1	24.0	25.7	50.4	76.0
San Francisco	5.6	13.1	18.8	20.0	61.3	81.3
San Joaquin	4.3	12.5	16.8	24.2	58.9	83.2
San Luis Obispo	3.8	26.2	30.0	32.3	37.7	70.0

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
San Mateo	6.3	18.8	25.0	27.1	47.9	75.0
Santa Barbara	3.5	15.7	19.1	22.6	58.3	80.9
Santa Clara	5.1	17.6	22.7	23.8	53.5	77.3
Santa Cruz	6.1	17.1	23.2	22.0	54.9	76.8
Shasta	5.0	14.5	19.6	29.1	51.4	80.4
Sierra	*	*	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	11.8	5.9	17.6	26.5	55.9	82.4
Solano	4.6	19.4	24.0	21.9	54.1	76.0
Sonoma	8.0	17.1	25.1	30.5	44.4	74.9
Stanislaus	5.1	16.2	21.3	19.1	59.6	78.7
Sutter	4.1	16.4	20.5	30.1	49.3	79.5
Tehama	6.4	15.4	21.8	19.2	59.0	78.2
Trinity	6.7	20.0	26.7	20.0	53.3	73.3
Tulare	4.1	17.3	21.4	29.7	48.9	78.6
Tuolumne	0.0	14.3	14.3	28.6	57.1	85.7
Ventura	3.5	18.4	21.9	26.1	51.9	78.1
Yolo	6.2	15.9	22.1	22.1	55.8	77.9
Yuba	3.5	18.6	22.1	22.1	55.8	77.9
Statewide	**5.5**	**16.6**	**22.1**	**23.4**	**54.6**	**77.9**

Table 5: 2016–17 Academic Achievement Levels for Mathematics

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
Alameda	4.6	7.0	11.6	21.4	67.0	88.4
Alpine	*	*	*	*	*	*
Amador	5.6	11.1	16.7	33.3	50.0	83.3
Butte	1.0	9.3	10.3	27.8	61.9	89.7
Calaveras	2.0	16.0	18.0	28.0	54.0	82.0
Colusa	0.0	10.0	10.0	45.0	45.0	90.0
Contra Costa	2.3	8.2	10.5	21.4	68.1	89.5
Del Norte	3.8	5.7	9.4	30.2	60.4	90.6
El Dorado	3.2	14.5	17.7	29.8	52.4	82.3
Fresno	4.1	10.8	14.9	22.9	62.3	85.1
Glenn	0.0	9.5	9.5	14.3	76.2	90.5
Humboldt	3.1	11.9	15.0	19.4	65.6	85.0
Imperial	5.0	12.9	17.9	30.0	52.1	82.1
Inyo	*	*	*	*	*	*
Kern	2.2	8.4	10.6	20.4	68.9	89.4
Kings	4.4	7.7	12.2	21.0	66.9	87.8
Lake	0.0	13.6	13.6	18.2	68.2	86.4
Lassen	6.1	18.2	24.2	12.1	63.6	75.8
Los Angeles	3.3	9.7	13.0	22.6	64.4	87.0
Madera	1.3	12.7	14.0	26.7	59.3	86.0

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
Marin	7.3	4.9	12.2	22.0	65.9	87.8
Mariposa	0.0	6.3	6.3	37.5	56.3	93.8
Mendocino	4.5	4.5	9.0	24.7	66.3	91.0
Merced	1.4	11.3	12.8	23.0	64.2	87.2
Modoc	0.0	11.5	11.5	19.2	69.2	88.5
Mono	*	*			*	*
Monterey	4.0	6.4	10.4	21.6	68.0	89.6
Napa	6.3	7.8	14.1	34.4	51.6	85.9
Nevada	2.8	5.6	8.3	22.2	69.4	91.7
Orange	3.9	10.7	14.6	25.5	59.9	85.4
Placer	5.0	9.9	14.9	28.7	56.4	85.1
Plumas	0.0	15.8	15.8	36.8	47.4	84.2
Riverside	3.0	9.9	12.9	25.4	61.7	87.1
Sacramento	3.5	10.2	13.8	23.2	63.0	86.2
San Benito	6.3	6.3	12.5	18.8	68.8	87.5
San Bernardino	2.0	9.2	11.2	22.1	66.7	88.8
San Diego	4.7	10.5	15.3	26.8	57.9	84.7
San Francisco	3.5	7.6	11.0	22.1	66.9	89.0
San Joaquin	2.3	8.8	11.1	20.2	68.8	88.9
San Luis Obispo	5.2	16.9	22.1	31.2	46.8	77.9

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
San Mateo	2.7	15.3	18.0	29.7	52.3	82.0
Santa Barbara	2.1	10.3	12.3	18.5	69.2	87.7
Santa Clara	3.6	12.7	16.3	21.2	62.4	83.7
Santa Cruz	4.5	9.1	13.6	20.9	65.5	86.4
Shasta	4.6	11.9	16.5	24.7	58.8	83.5
Sierra	*	*	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	9.1	11.4	20.5	27.3	52.3	79.5
Solano	1.5	6.7	8.2	20.5	71.3	91.8
Sonoma	2.5	10.0	12.4	22.9	64.7	87.6
Stanislaus	3.3	5.7	9.1	18.1	72.8	90.9
Sutter	0.0	11.6	11.6	39.1	49.3	88.4
Tehama	5.3	7.9	13.2	28.9	57.9	86.8
Trinity	13.3	16.7	30.0	13.3	56.7	70.0
Tulare	3.0	10.1	13.1	24.2	62.8	86.9
Tuolumne	0.0	38.1	38.1	14.3	47.6	61.9
Ventura	2.7	8.8	11.6	24.1	64.3	88.4
Yolo	4.0	10.1	14.1	21.2	64.6	85.9
Yuba	2.1	11.6	13.7	28.4	57.9	86.3
Statewide	**3.2**	**9.8**	**13.0**	**23.3**	**63.7**	**87.0**

Table 6: 2017–18 Academic Achievement Levels for Mathematics

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
Alameda	5.4	6.9	12.3	23.6	64.1	87.7
Alpine	*	*	*	*	*	*
Amador	4.5	0.0	4.5	31.8	63.6	95.5
Butte	1.1	10.8	11.9	29.7	58.4	88.1
Calaveras	0.0	14.3	14.3	18.4	67.3	85.7
Colusa	3.2	6.5	9.7	38.7	51.6	90.3
Contra Costa	2.2	7.4	9.7	20.6	69.7	90.3
Del Norte	4.2	6.3	10.4	29.2	60.4	89.6
El Dorado	3.1	20.5	23.6	21.3	55.1	76.4
Fresno	5.7	10.9	16.6	23.5	59.9	83.4
Glenn	0.0	10.5	10.5	42.1	47.4	89.5
Humboldt	3.2	9.6	12.7	24.8	62.4	87.3
Imperial	3.0	10.1	13.0	27.8	59.2	87.0
Inyo	0.0	16.7	16.7	25.0	58.3	83.3
Kern	2.6	9.0	11.6	20.5	67.9	88.4
Kings	3.8	12.6	16.5	25.3	58.2	83.5
Lake	4.8	4.8	9.5	19.0	71.4	90.5
Lassen	2.9	5.9	8.8	29.4	61.8	91.2
Los Angeles	3.8	10.1	13.8	21.9	64.3	86.2

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
Madera	2.8	9.2	12.1	22.7	65.2	87.9
Marin	10.2	8.2	18.4	24.5	57.1	81.6
Mariposa	0.0	9.1	9.1	27.3	63.6	90.9
Mendocino	1.0	6.0	7.0	23.0	70.0	93.0
Merced	2.5	5.4	7.9	22.0	70.0	92.1
Modoc	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.4	63.6	100.0
Mono	*	*	*	*	*	*
Monterey	4.0	9.5	13.5	20.6	65.9	86.5
Napa	7.4	13.0	20.4	31.5	48.1	79.6
Nevada	5.9	11.8	17.6	17.6	64.7	82.4
Orange	4.9	12.9	17.8	23.9	58.3	82.2
Placer	6.0	11.2	17.2	25.0	57.8	82.8
Plumas	0.0	5.9	5.9	23.5	70.6	94.1
Riverside	3.4	10.3	13.7	23.2	63.1	86.3
Sacramento	2.7	8.5	11.2	22.3	66.5	88.8
San Benito	4.5	13.6	18.2	9.1	72.7	81.8
San Bernardino	3.5	9.2	12.7	21.1	66.2	87.3
San Diego	3.4	12.2	15.6	23.9	60.5	84.4
San Francisco	3.3	10.5	13.7	21.6	64.7	86.3
San Joaquin	2.8	8.1	10.9	20.9	68.2	89.1

County	Foster Students Standard Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Met or Exceeded (%)	Foster Students Standard Nearly Met (%)	Foster Students Standard Not Met (%)	Foster Students Combined Standard Not Met or Nearly Met (%)
San Luis Obispo	5.5	16.4	21.9	26.6	51.6	78.1
San Mateo	8.6	11.8	20.4	23.7	55.9	79.6
Santa Barbara	1.8	10.8	12.6	19.8	67.6	87.4
Santa Clara	4.0	12.1	16.1	23.4	60.5	83.9
Santa Cruz	2.5	8.9	11.4	24.1	64.6	88.6
Shasta	3.9	10.6	14.4	23.9	61.7	85.6
Sierra	*	*	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	11.8	5.9	17.6	26.5	55.9	82.4
Solano	2.6	5.2	7.7	24.7	67.5	92.3
Sonoma	3.8	16.8	20.5	27.6	51.9	79.5
Stanislaus	3.8	9.3	13.1	17.9	69.0	86.9
Sutter	5.5	16.4	21.9	28.8	49.3	78.1
Tehama	2.6	11.5	14.1	30.8	55.1	85.9
Trinity	0.0	13.3	13.3	33.3	53.3	86.7
Tulare	3.0	9.8	12.8	25.0	62.2	87.2
Tuolumne	4.8	0.0	4.8	28.6	66.7	95.2
Ventura	2.5	11.0	13.5	22.1	64.4	86.5
Yolo	3.6	9.8	13.4	24.1	62.5	86.6
Yuba	0.0	16.3	16.3	26.7	57.0	83.7
Statewide	**3.6**	**10.1**	**13.7**	**22.6**	**63.6**	**86.3**

Tables 7 and 8 represent the numbers of students suspended and the suspension rates by county for students in foster care in the 2016–17 and 2017–18 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.

As shown in Table 7, for the 2016–17 school year, the unduplicated count of students suspended was 8,337. In 2017–18, the unduplicated count of students suspended was 7,651. Additionally, the suspension rates for students in foster care vary by county, and this range decreased over this two-year period. In 2016–17, the rate ranged from 3.8 percent of students in foster care suspended in Inyo and Sierra counties to 43.3 percent of students in foster care in Modoc County (Table 7). In 2017–18, the lowest suspension rate was observed in Plumas County (no suspensions) and the highest in Modoc (26.8 percent). The range across counties decreased from a range of 39.5 percentage points in 2016–17 to 26.8 percentage points in 2017–18. This shows a measurable benefit in part due to the FYSCP, which provided comprehensive communication, coaching, and training among the county-administered FYSCPs. Counties with a reduced suspension rate were able to share best practices statewide to help counties with the most suspensions and reduce the number of suspensions statewide.

Table 7: 2016–17 Suspension Data

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Suspended	Foster Students Suspension Rate (%)
Alameda	1,257	203	16.1
Alpine	*	*	*
Amador	96	15	15.6
Butte	523	99	18.9
Calaveras	165	23	13.9
Colusa	51	6	11.8

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Suspended	Foster Students Suspension Rate (%)
Contra Costa	1,259	226	18.0
Del Norte	108	21	19.4
El Dorado	643	45	7.0
Fresno	2,333	515	22.1
Glenn	68	15	22.1
Humboldt	319	55	17.2
Imperial	391	39	10.0
Inyo	132	5	3.8
Kern	2,009	306	15.2
Kings	474	73	15.4
Lake	86	14	16.3
Lassen	113	23	20.4
Los Angeles	20,138	2,133	10.6
Madera	493	88	17.8
Marin	185	26	14.1
Mariposa	64	12	18.8
Mendocino	254	47	18.5
Merced	862	131	15.2
Modoc	67	29	43.3

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Suspended	Foster Students Suspension Rate (%)
Mono	*	*	*
Monterey	376	39	10.4
Napa	161	18	11.2
Nevada	236	9	3.8
Orange	2,776	250	9.0
Placer	370	43	11.6
Plumas	57	3	5.3
Riverside	5,235	780	14.9
Sacramento	2,514	495	19.7
San Benito	91	14	15.4
San Bernardino	7,036	959	13.6
San Diego	2,516	314	12.5
San Francisco	770	77	10.0
San Joaquin	1,731	313	18.1
San Luis Obispo	419	55	13.1
San Mateo	362	44	12.2
Santa Barbara	435	75	17.2
Santa Clara	1,192	169	14.2
Santa Cruz	297	20	6.7
Shasta	502	69	13.7
Sierra	*	*	*

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Suspended	Foster Students Suspension Rate (%)
Siskiyou	102	10	9.8
Solano	561	103	18.4
Sonoma	646	90	13.9
Stanislaus	1,043	188	18.0
Sutter	217	29	13.4
Tehama	219	18	8.2
Trinity	102	5	4.9
Tulare	1,212	138	11.4
Tuolumne	73	11	15.1
Ventura	942	148	15.7
Yolo	326	58	17.8
Yuba	276	36	13.0
Statewide	**55,282**	**8,337**	**15.1**

Table 8: 2017–18 Suspension Data

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Suspended	Foster Students Suspension Rate (%)
Alameda	1,026	136	13.3
Alpine	*	*	*
Amador	76	11	14.5
Butte	486	80	16.5

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Suspended	Foster Students Suspension Rate (%)
Calaveras	160	18	11.3
Colusa	67	7	10.4
Contra Costa	1,112	177	15.9
Del Norte	12	12	9.9
El Dorado	650	53	8.2
Fresno	2,381	472	19.8
Glenn	77	11	14.3
Humboldt	402	74	18.4
Imperial	436	42	9.6
Inyo	145	2	1.4
Kern	2,027	291	14.4
Kings	453	82	18.1
Lake	81	10	12.3
Lassen	100	16	16.0
Los Angeles	17,041	1,926	11.3
Madera	454	84	18.5
Marin	162	29	17.9
Mariposa	69	21	30.4
Mendocino	228	56	24.6
Merced	827	121	14.6
Modoc	56	15	26.8

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Suspended	Foster Students Suspension Rate (%)
Mono	11	1	9.1
Monterey	368	38	10.3
Napa	138	20	14.5
Nevada	193	14	7.3
Orange	2683	261	9.7
Placer	410	41	10.0
Plumas	12	0	0.0
Riverside	4,618	682	14.8
Sacramento	2,313	449	19.4
San Benito	79	16	20.3
San Bernardino	6,645	919	13.8
San Diego	2,289	308	13.5
San Francisco	729	49	6.7
San Joaquin	1,715	297	17.3
San Luis Obispo	378	46	12.2
San Mateo	316	40	12.7
Santa Barbara	380	65	17.1
Santa Clara	1,125	149	13.2
Santa Cruz	270	32	11.9
Shasta	454	71	15.6
Sierra	*	*	*

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Suspended	Foster Students Suspension Rate (%)
Siskiyou	100	10	10.0
Solano	547	93	17.0
Sonoma	627	77	12.3
Stanislaus	963	161	16.7
Sutter	264	34	12.9
Tehama	198	22	11.1
Trinity	78	9	11.5
Tulare	1,197	130	10.9
Tuolumne	80	13	16.3
Ventura	854	99	11.6
Yolo	394	69	17.5
Yuba	261	36	13.8
Statewide	**50,247**	**7,651**	**15.2**

Tables 9 and 10 show the number of expelled students and the expulsion rates for students in foster care by county in the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years. In 2016–17, the state expulsion rate for students in foster care was 0.4 percent (Table 9). For 2017–18, the state expulsion rate for students in foster care was 0.3 percent (Table 10). As shown in Tables 9 and 10, the expulsion rate for students in foster care decreased 0.1 percent from 2016–17 to 2017–18, which demonstrates success.

Table 9: 2016–17 Expulsion Data

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Expelled	Foster Students Expulsion Rate (%)
Alameda	1,257	3	0.2
Alpine	*	*	*
Amador	96	0	0.0
Butte	523	5	1.0
Calaveras	165	0	0.0
Colusa	51	0	0.0
Contra Costa	1,259	4	0.3
Del Norte	108	0	0.0
El Dorado	643	0	0.0
Fresno	2,333	30	1.3
Glenn	68	0	0.0
Humboldt	319	0	0.0
Imperial	391	1	0.3
Inyo	132	0	0.0
Kern	2,009	2	0.1
Kings	474	7	1.5
Lake	86	3	3.5
Lassen	113	0	0.0
Los Angeles	20,138	35	0.2
Madera	493	2	0.4

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Expelled	Foster Students Expulsion Rate (%)
Marin	185	0	0.0
Mariposa	64	0	0.0
Mendocino	254	2	0.8
Merced	862	6	0.7
Modoc	67	0	0.0
Mono	*	*	*
Monterey	376	1	0.3
Napa	161	0	0.0
Nevada	236	0	0.0
Orange	2,776	3	0.1
Placer	370	1	0.3
Plumas	57	0	0.0
Riverside	5,235	39	0.7
Sacramento	2,514	9	0.4
San Benito	91	0	0.0
San Bernardino	7,036	25	0.4
San Diego	2,516	3	0.1
San Francisco	770	0	0.0
San Joaquin	1,731	6	0.3
San Luis Obispo	419	6	1.4
San Mateo	362	0	0.0

County	Foster Students Cumulative Enrollment	Foster Students Unduplicated Counts of Students Expelled	Foster Students Expulsion Rate (%)
Santa Barbara	435	0	0.0
Santa Clara	1,192	0	0.0
Santa Cruz	297	1	0.3
Shasta	502	0	0.0
Sierra	*	*	*
Siskiyou	102	1	1.0
Solano	561	3	0.5
Sonoma	646	4	0.6
Stanislaus	1,043	6	0.6
Sutter	217	5	2.3
Tehama	219	0	0.0
Trinity	102	0	0.0
Tulare	1,212	6	0.5
Tuolumne	73	0	0.0
Ventura	942	0	0.0
Yolo	326	0	0.0
Yuba	276	2	0.7
Statewide	**55,282**	**220**	**0.4**

Table 10: 2017–18 Foster Student Expulsion Data

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Unduplicated Counts of Students Expelled	Expulsion Rate (%)
Alameda	1,026	3	0.3
Alpine	*	*	*
Amador	76	0	0.0
Butte	486	2	0.4
Calaveras	160	1	0.6
Colusa	67	0	0.0
Contra Costa	1,112	0	0.0
Del Norte	121	0	0.0
El Dorado	650	1	0.2
Fresno	2,381	20	0.8
Glenn	77	0	0.0
Humboldt	402	2	0.5
Imperial	436	2	0.5
Inyo	145	1	0.7
Kern	2,027	4	0.2
Kings	453	7	1.5
Lake	81	0	0.0
Lassen	100	0	0.0
Los Angeles	17,041	21	0.1
Madera	454	1	0.2
Marin	162	0	0.0

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Unduplicated Counts of Students Expelled	Expulsion Rate (%)
Mariposa	69	0	0.0
Mendocino	228	1	0.4
Merced	827	6	0.7
Modoc	56	0	0.0
Mono	11	0	0.0
Monterey	368	0	0.0
Napa	138	1	0.7
Nevada	193	1	0.5
Orange	2,683	5	0.2
Placer	410	0	0.0
Plumas	12	0	0.0
Riverside	4,618	28	0.6
Sacramento	2,313	6	0.3
San Benito	79	1	1.3
San Bernardino	6,645	24	0.4
San Diego	2,289	7	0.3
San Francisco	729	0	0.0
San Joaquin	1,715	5	0.3
San Luis Obispo	378	2	0.5
San Mateo	316	0	0.0
Santa Barbara	380	1	0.3
Santa Clara	1,125	1	0.1

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Unduplicated Counts of Students Expelled	Expulsion Rate (%)
Santa Cruz	270	3	1.1
Shasta	454	0	0.0
Sierra	2	0	0.0
Siskiyou	100	0	0.0
Solano	547	2	0.4
Sonoma	627	2	0.3
Stanislaus	963	7	0.7
Sutter	264	0	0.0
Tehama	198	1	0.5
Trinity	78	0	0.0
Tulare	1,197	11	0.9
Tuolumne	80	0	0.0
Ventura	854	6	0.7
Yolo	394	0	0.0
Yuba	261	1	0.4
Statewide	**50,247**	**187**	**0.3**

Tables 11 and 12 provide the number of students receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility and the detention rates by county for foster in the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years. The juvenile detention rate for foster decreased by 0.7 percentage points from 2016–17 to 2017–18, from 9.7 percent in 2016–17 to 9.0 percent in 2017–18, representing over 800 fewer students receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility. This shows significant success for the foster student population.

Table 11: 2016–17 Foster Students Juvenile Detention Facility Placements

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Unduplicated Count of Students in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools	Juvenile Detention Rate
Alameda	1,257	189	15.0
Alpine	*	*	*
Amador	96	0	0.0
Butte	523	12	2.3
Calaveras	165	0	0.0
Colusa	51	0	0.0
Contra Costa	1,259	100	7.9
Del Norte	108	11	10.2
El Dorado	643	298	46.3
Fresno	2,333	219	9.4
Glenn	68	5	7.4
Humboldt	319	29	9.1
Imperial	391	49	12.5
Inyo	132	0	0.0
Kern	2,009	526	26.2
Kings	474	21	4.4
Lake	86	0	0.0
Lassen	113	11	9.7
Los Angeles	20,138	1,834	9.1
Madera	493	23	4.7

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Unduplicated Count of Students in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools	Juvenile Detention Rate
Marin	185	26	14.1
Mariposa	64	0	0.0
Mendocino	254	22	8.7
Merced	862	41	4.8
Modoc	67	46	68.7
Mono	*	*	*
Monterey	376	55	14.6
Napa	161	23	14.3
Nevada	236	25	10.6
Orange	2,776	359	12.9
Placer	370	42	11.4
Plumas	57	0	0.0
Riverside	5,235	308	5.9
Sacramento	2,514	273	10.9
San Benito	91	1	1.1
San Bernardino	7,036	336	4.8
San Diego	2,516	332	13.2
San Francisco	770	95	12.3
San Joaquin	1,731	247	14.3
San Luis Obispo	419	44	10.5
San Mateo	362	34	9.4

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Unduplicated Count of Students in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools	Juvenile Detention Rate
Santa Barbara	435	63	14.5
Santa Clara	1,192	80	6.7
Santa Cruz	297	33	11.1
Shasta	502	35	7.0
Sierra	*	*	*
Siskiyou	102	8	7.8
Solano	561	44	7.8
Sonoma	646	93	14.4
Stanislaus	1,043	61	5.8
Sutter	217	0	0.0
Tehama	219	18	8.2
Trinity	102	0	0.0
Tulare	1,212	68	5.6
Tuolumne	73	3	4.1
Ventura	942	105	11.1
Yolo	326	23	7.1
Yuba	276	20	7.2
Statewide	**55,282**	**5,385**	**9.7**

Table 12: 2017–18 Foster Students Juvenile Hall Placements

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Unduplicated Count of Students in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools	Juvenile Detention Rate
Alameda	1,026	151	14.7
Alpine	*	*	*
Amador	76	0	0.0
Butte	486	15	3.1
Calaveras	160	0	0.0
Colusa	67	0	0.0
Contra Costa	1,112	90	8.1
Del Norte	121	14	11.6
El Dorado	650	322	49.5
Fresno	2,381	213	8.9
Glenn	77	0	0.0
Humboldt	402	13	3.2
Imperial	436	38	8.7
Inyo	145	1	0.7
Kern	2,027	447	22.1
Kings	453	19	4.2
Lake	81	0	0.0
Lassen	100	8	8.0
Los Angeles	17,041	1,492	8.8
Madera	454	24	5.3

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Unduplicated Count of Students in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools	Juvenile Detention Rate
Marin	162	21	13.0
Mariposa	69	0	*
Mendocino	228	16	7.0
Merced	827	41	5.0
Modoc	56	22	39.3
Mono	11	0	0.0
Monterey	368	45	12.2
Napa	138	12	8.7
Nevada	193	15	7.8
Orange	2,683	334	12.4
Placer	410	39	9.5
Plumas	12	0	0.0
Riverside	4,618	242	5.2
Sacramento	2,313	260	11.2
San Benito	79	1	1.3
San Bernardino	6,645	277	4.2
San Diego	2,289	324	14.2
San Francisco	729	50	6.9
San Joaquin	1,715	205	12.0
San Luis Obispo	378	31	8.2
San Mateo	316	43	13.6

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Unduplicated Count of Students in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools	Juvenile Detention Rate
Santa Barbara	380	62	16.3
Santa Clara	1,125	100	8.9
Santa Cruz	270	23	8.5
Shasta	454	17	3.7
Sierra	*	*	*
Siskiyou	100	6	6.0
Solano	547	34	6.2
Sonoma	627	58	9.3
Stanislaus	963	46	4.8
Sutter	264	0	0.0
Tehama	198	26	13.1
Trinity	78	0	0.0
Tulare	1,197	48	4.0
Tuolumne	80	7	8.8
Ventura	854	77	9.0
Yolo	394	19	4.8
Yuba	261	15	5.7
Statewide	**50,247**	**4,540**	**9.0**

Chronic Absence is calculated by dividing the unduplicated count of students determined to be chronically absent (Chronic Absenteeism Count) by the Chronic Absenteeism Eligible Enrollment at a selected entity for a selected population. When a student is absent for 10 percent or more of their enrolled instructional school days, the student is considered chronically absent. Tables 13 and 14 show the chronic

absenteeism count and rate by county for students in foster care in the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years. These tables show an increase of 0.5 percentage points in chronic absenteeism for foster, from 25.7 percent in 2016–17 to 26.2 percent in 2017–18.

Table 13: 2016–17 Foster Students Chronic Absenteeism

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Eligible Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Count	Chronic Absenteeism Rate (%)
Alameda	1,257	1,085	409	37.7
Alpine	*	*	*	*
Amador	96	87	16	18.4
Butte	523	486	163	33.5
Calaveras	165	144	34	23.6
Colusa	51	46	6	13.0
Contra Costa	1,259	1,114	312	28.0
Del Norte	108	104	29	27.9
El Dorado	643	540	86	15.9
Fresno	2,333	2,121	623	29.4
Glenn	68	61	14	23.0
Humboldt	319	304	97	31.9
Imperial	391	354	73	20.6
Inyo	132	96	66	68.8
Kern	2,009	1,836	466	25.4
Kings	474	452	108	23.9
Lake	86	72	21	29.2
Lassen	113	97	27	27.8
Los Angeles	20,138	18,885	4,922	26.1

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Eligible Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Count	Chronic Absenteeism Rate (%)
Madera	493	422	115	27.3
Marin	185	123	44	35.8
Mariposa	64	50	16	32.0
Mendocino	254	245	64	26.1
Merced	862	725	157	21.7
Modoc	67	49	10	20.4
Mono	*	*	*	*
Monterey	376	339	74	21.8
Napa	161	144	25	17.4
Nevada	236	121	53	43.8
Orange	2,776	2,520	701	27.8
Placer	370	316	83	26.3
Plumas	57	49	15	30.6
Riverside	5,235	4,666	1,127	24.2
Sacramento	2,514	2,193	642	29.3
San Benito	91	75	11	14.7
San Bernardino	7,036	6,132	1,381	22.5
San Diego	2,516	2,327	514	22.1
San Francisco	770	629	87	13.8
San Joaquin	1,731	1,525	364	23.9

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Eligible Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Count	Chronic Absenteeism Rate (%)
San Luis Obispo	419	390	76	19.5
San Mateo	362	328	120	36.6
Santa Barbara	435	389	110	28.3
Santa Clara	1,192	1,060	390	36.8
Santa Cruz	297	280	115	41.1
Shasta	502	420	81	19.3
Sierra	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	102	97	21	21.6
Solano	561	490	114	23.3
Sonoma	646	515	194	37.7
Stanislaus	1,043	829	231	27.9
Sutter	217	176	40	22.7
Tehama	219	194	40	20.6
Trinity	102	80	20	25.0
Tulare	1,212	1,116	216	19.4
Tuolumne	73	65	16	24.6
Ventura	942	813	223	27.4
Yolo	326	297	93	31.3
Yuba	276	234	50	21.4
Statewide	**55,282**	**53,290**	**13,692**	**25.7**

Table 14: 2017–18 Foster Students Chronic Absenteeism

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Eligible Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Count	Chronic Absenteeism Rate (%)
Alameda	1,026	885	345	39.0
Alpine	*	*	*	*
Amador	76	62	18	29.0
Butte	486	447	136	30.4
Calaveras	160	145	37	25.5
Colusa	67	59	12	20.3
Contra Costa	1,112	969	257	26.5
Del Norte	121	113	27	23.9
El Dorado	650	507	79	15.6
Fresno	2,381	2,185	609	27.9
Glenn	77	69	18	26.1
Humboldt	402	383	106	27.7
Imperial	436	411	126	30.7
Inyo	145	107	76	71.0
Kern	2,027	1,873	473	25.3
Kings	453	438	87	19.9
Lake	81	73	21	28.8
Lassen	100	90	17	18.9
Los Angeles	17,041	16,000	4,101	25.6
Madera	454	399	102	25.6

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Eligible Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Count	Chronic Absenteeism Rate (%)
Marin	162	109	29	26.6
Mariposa	69	56	21	37.5
Mendocino	228	215	67	31.2
Merced	827	694	165	23.8
Modoc	56	48	20	41.7
Mono	11	5	4	80.0
Monterey	368	343	89	25.9
Napa	138	127	28	22.0
Nevada	193	108	50	46.3
Orange	2,683	2,431	674	27.7
Placer	410	355	66	18.6
Plumas	12	12	5	41.7
Riverside	4,618	4,072	978	24.0
Sacramento	2,313	1,992	673	33.8
San Benito	79	64	10	15.6
San Bernardino	6,645	5,754	1,255	21.8
San Diego	2,289	2,108	609	28.9
San Francisco	729	584	309	52.9
San Joaquin	1,715	1,466	382	26.1
San Luis Obispo	378	342	75	21.9

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Eligible Enrollment	Chronic Absenteeism Count	Chronic Absenteeism Rate (%)
San Mateo	316	282	97	34.4
Santa Barbara	380	326	92	28.2
Santa Clara	1,125	1,004	406	40.4
Santa Cruz	270	240	75	31.3
Shasta	454	391	76	19.4
Sierra	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	100	88	19	21.6
Solano	547	487	124	25.5
Sonoma	627	525	163	31.0
Stanislaus	963	787	226	28.7
Sutter	264	198	49	24.7
Tehama	198	179	38	21.2
Trinity	78	65	13	20.0
Tulare	1,197	1,118	195	17.4
Tuolumne	80	63	13	20.6
Ventura	854	717	210	29.3
Yolo	394	351	108	30.8
Yuba	261	230	37	16.1
Statewide	**50,247**	**48,448**	**12,705**	**26.2**

Tables 15 and 16 display the attendance rates by county for students in foster care in the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years. The Attendance Rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days the students attended school by the total number of days students were expected to attend school. For the 2016–17 school year, the state

attendance rate for students in foster care was 92.1 percent. In 2017–18, students in foster care attendance rate was 91.9 percent. This is a decrease of 0.2 percent in the attendance rate for students in foster care.

Table 15: 2016–17 Foster Students Attendance

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Days Attended	Days Expected to Attend	Attendance Rate (%)
Alameda	1,257	134,821	153,110	88.1
Alpine	*	*	*	*
Amador	96	12,271	13,112	93.6
Butte	523	66,958	73,976	90.5
Calaveras	165	19,290	20,741	93.0
Colusa	51	6,525	6,929	94.2
Contra Costa	1,259	153,483	168,808	90.9
Del Norte	108	15,766	17,233	91.5
El Dorado	643	68,940	73,385	93.9
Fresno	2,333	299,721	328,014	91.4
Glenn	68	8,842	9,661	91.5
Humboldt	319	43,419	48,430	89.7
Imperial	391	53,696	56,845	94.5
Inyo	132	9,101	11,289	80.6
Kern	2,009	267,298	288,803	92.6
Kings	474	65,388	70,411	92.9
Lake	86	9,186	10,081	91.1
Lassen	113	12,968	14,195	91.4

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Days Attended	Days Expected to Attend	Attendance Rate (%)
Los Angeles	20,138	2,824,137	3,063,253	92.2
Madera	493	55,781	60,099	92.8
Marin	185	16,489	18,472	89.3
Mariposa	64	6,226	6,749	92.2
Mendocino	254	35,838	39,066	91.7
Merced	862	96,701	103,568	93.4
Modoc	67	6,330	6,860	92.3
Mono	*	*	*	*
Monterey	376	47,005	50,617	92.9
Napa	161	21,507	22,995	93.5
Nevada	236	13,162	14,952	88.0
Orange	2,776	367,147	400,118	91.8
Placer	370	43,140	46,831	92.1
Plumas	57	6,939	7,837	88.5
Riverside	5,235	642,247	691,250	92.9
Sacramento	2,514	297,031	325,684	91.2
San Benito	91	9,531	10,121	94.2
San Bernardino	7,036	826,049	886,150	93.2
San Diego	2,516	348,590	374,775	93.0
San Francisco	770	87,022	90,844	95.8
San Joaquin	1,731	209,749	225,905	92.8

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Days Attended	Days Expected to Attend	Attendance Rate (%)
San Luis Obispo	419	57,355	61,599	93.1
San Mateo	362	44,050	49,128	89.7
Santa Barbara	435	52,976	58,109	91.2
Santa Clara	1,192	145,399	165,674	87.8
Santa Cruz	297	36,878	42,030	87.7
Shasta	502	59,602	63,726	93.5
Sierra	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	102	13,290	14,351	92.6
Solano	561	65,583	70,882	92.5
Sonoma	646	69,035	78,968	87.4
Stanislaus	1,043	103,128	112,190	91.9
Sutter	217	21,908	23,666	92.6
Tehama	219	28,308	30,171	93.8
Trinity	102	9,314	10,381	89.7
Tulare	1,212	169,794	182,051	93.3
Tuolumne	73	8,650	9,502	91.0
Ventura	942	113,277	124,492	91.0
Yolo	326	39,982	44,063	90.7
Yuba	276	30,381	32,532	93.4
Statewide	**55,282**	**8,278,513**	**8,986,129**	**92.1**

Table 16: 2017–18 Students in Foster Care Attendance

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Days Attended	Days Expected to Attend	Attendance Rate (%)
Alameda	1,026	111,080	128,585	86.4
Alpine	*	*	*	*
Amador	76	8,371	9,200	91.0
Butte	486	61,919	68,552	90.3
Calaveras	160	19,375	21,023	92.2
Colusa	67	7,847	8,362	93.8
Contra Costa	1,112	132,032	144,136	91.6
Del Norte	121	16,815	18,175	92.5
El Dorado	650	62,846	67,229	93.5
Fresno	2,381	316,030	342,536	92.3
Glenn	77	9,768	10,610	92.1
Humboldt	402	55,625	60,776	91.5
Imperial	436	59,477	64,455	92.3
Inyo	145	9,007	11,503	78.3
Kern	2,027	269,547	290,946	92.6
Kings	453	64,937	69,566	93.3
Lake	81	8,984	9,851	91.2
Lassen	100	11,379	12,250	92.9
Los Angeles	17,041	2,371,818	2,573,906	92.1
Madera	454	52,566	56,521	93.0
Marin	162	15,161	16,779	90.4

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Days Attended	Days Expected to Attend	Attendance Rate (%)
Mariposa	69	6,139	6,865	89.4
Mendocino	228	31,617	34,805	90.8
Merced	827	93,252	100,793	92.5
Modoc	56	5,446	5,967	91.3
Mono	11	456	545	83.7
Monterey	368	47,702	51,427	92.8
Napa	138	16,830	18,080	93.1
Nevada	193	11,892	13,701	86.8
Orange	2,683	354,852	388,848	91.3
Placer	410	49,220	52,374	94.0
Plumas	12	1,414	1,662	85.1
Riverside	4,618	551,216	594,901	92.7
Sacramento	2,313	267,005	295,504	90.4
San Benito	79	7,771	8,338	93.2
San Bernardino	6,645	792,715	848,437	93.4
San Diego	2,289	303,825	332,968	91.2
San Francisco	729	67,048	82,293	81.5
San Joaquin	1,715	202,540	219,823	92.1
San Luis Obispo	378	49,849	53,873	92.5
San Mateo	316	38,779	43,192	89.8
Santa Barbara	380	44,573	49,023	90.9

County	Cumulative Enrollment	Days Attended	Days Expected to Attend	Attendance Rate (%)
Santa Clara	1,125	132,655	151,891	87.3
Santa Cruz	270	32,148	35,513	90.5
Shasta	454	53,852	57,320	93.9
Sierra	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	100	12,138	12,994	93.4
Solano	547	64,230	70,597	91.0
Sonoma	627	71,557	79,762	89.7
Stanislaus	963	103,583	112,709	91.9
Sutter	264	25,481	27,335	93.2
Tehama	198	24,233	25,935	93.4
Trinity	78	7,662	8,459	90.6
Tulare	1,197	170,087	181,853	93.5
Tuolumne	80	8,316	8,927	93.2
Ventura	854	95,326	104,627	91.1
Yolo	394	47,991	52,656	91.1
Yuba	261	30,251	32,044	94.4
Statewide	**50,247**	**7,489,342**	**8,152,194**	**91.9**

Tables 17 and 18 represent the four-year cohort dropout counts and rates by county for students in foster care in the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years. Students enter into the four-year cohort in the year they enter grade nine for the first time and are included in the dropout counts four years later if they: (1) do not graduate with a regular high school diploma, (2) do not otherwise complete high school, or (3) are not still enrolled as a "fifth year senior." For the 2016–17 school year, the state dropout rate for students in foster care was 28.8 percent. In 2017–18, the state dropout rate for students in foster care was 28.4 percent. This is a decrease in the statewide foster student dropout rate of 0.4 percentage points.

Table 17: 2016–17 Foster Youth Dropout Counts and Rates

County	Cohort Students	Dropouts	Dropout Rate (%)
Alameda	214	76	35.5
Alpine	*	*	*
Amador	*	*	*
Butte	43	14	32.6
Calaveras	11	1	9.1
Colusa	*	*	*
Contra Costa	133	27	20.3
Del Norte	*	*	*
El Dorado	121	23	19.0
Fresno	222	78	35.1
Glenn	*	*	*
Humboldt	36	7	19.4
Imperial	24	3	12.5
Inyo	45	24	53.3
Kern	197	55	27.9
Kings	40	11	27.5
Lake	11	4	36.4
Lassen	17	3	17.6
Los Angeles	2,557	764	29.9
Madera	36	12	33.3
Marin	19	7	36.8
Mariposa	*	*	*

County	Cohort Students	Dropouts	Dropout Rate (%)
Mendocino	26	4	15.4
Merced	68	13	19.1
Modoc	*	*	*
Mono	*	*	*
Monterey	40	13	32.5
Napa	17	4	23.5
Nevada	40	18	45.0
Orange	291	77	26.5
Placer	52	6	11.5
Plumas	*	*	*
Riverside	474	154	32.5
Sacramento	323	98	30.3
San Benito	*	*	*
San Bernardino	598	191	31.9
San Diego	279	70	25.1
San Francisco	116	26	22.4
San Joaquin	167	54	32.3
San Luis Obispo	64	8	12.5
San Mateo	63	10	15.9
Santa Barbara	51	16	31.4
Santa Clara	165	38	23.0
Santa Cruz	37	5	13.5
Shasta	37	5	13.5

County	Cohort Students	Dropouts	Dropout Rate (%)
Sierra	*	*	*
Siskiyou	11	2	18.2
Solano	43	13	30.2
Sonoma	86	31	36.0
Stanislaus	105	21	20.0
Sutter	11	3	27.3
Tehama	15	1	6.7
Trinity	*	*	*
Tulare	96	15	15.6
Tuolumne	*	*	*
Ventura	108	37	34.3
Yolo	30	6	20.0
Yuba	15	6	40.0
Statewide	**7,222**	**2,080**	**28.8**

Table 18: 2017–18 Foster Students Dropout Counts and Rates

County	Cohort Students	Dropouts	Dropout Rate (%)
Alameda	188	67	35.6
Alpine	*	*	*
Amador	11	0	0.0
Butte	46	8	17.4
Calaveras	21	3	14.3
Colusa	*	*	*

County	Cohort Students	Dropouts	Dropout Rate (%)
Contra Costa	133	21	15.8
Del Norte	*	*	*
El Dorado	90	21	23.3
Fresno	249	82	32.9
Glenn	*	*	*
Humboldt	38	9	23.7
Imperial	29	7	24.1
Inyo	62	28	45.2
Kern	208	57	27.4
Kings	54	6	11.1
Lake	13	4	30.8
Lassen	*	*	*
Los Angeles	2,777	795	28.6
Madera	40	12	30.0
Marin	20	3	15.0
Mariposa	*	*	*
Mendocino	24	5	20.8
Merced	78	23	29.5
Modoc	*	*	*
Mono	*	*	*
Monterey	55	16	29.1
Napa	15	3	20.0

County	Cohort Students	Dropouts	Dropout Rate (%)
Nevada	38	16	42.1
Orange	312	84	26.9
Placer	65	9	13.8
Plumas	*	*	*
Riverside	481	125	26.0
Sacramento	291	85	29.2
San Benito	*	*	*
San Bernardino	630	175	27.8
San Diego	333	97	29.1
San Francisco	111	30	27.0
San Joaquin	181	58	32.0
San Luis Obispo	51	5	9.8
San Mateo	46	6	13.0
Santa Barbara	61	16	26.2
Santa Clara	178	76	42.7
Santa Cruz	51	20	39.2
Shasta	40	8	20.0
Sierra	*	*	*
Siskiyou	12	4	33.3
Solano	53	16	30.2
Sonoma	70	30	42.9
Stanislaus	114	36	31.6

County	Cohort Students	Dropouts	Dropout Rate (%)
Sutter	16	1	6.3
Tehama	16	0	0.0
Trinity	16	2	12.5
Tulare	119	21	17.6
Tuolumne	*	*	*
Ventura	104	30	28.8
Yolo	43	13	30.2
Yuba	24	9	37.5
Statewide	**7,703**	**2,188**	**28.4**

At this time, data is not available to show the number of pupils in foster care who transitioned to postsecondary for the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years. However, the CDE, in partnership with the California Community Colleges Chancellors Office and the California State University Office of the Chancellor, plans to develop data collection tools to measure successful transitions to postsecondary college and career technical education opportunities in the future.

Part III—FYSCP Report

In both the 2016–17 and 2017–18 FYs, the allocated funds were nearly expended. When funds were not completely expended, the reasons included temporary staff position vacancies and unexpected resources from Title IV-E funds agreements with county child welfare agencies, which increased funds available to certain county FYSCPs.

Table 19: FYSCP Funds

County	Allocated 2016–17 FY	Expended 2016–17 FY	Allocated 2017–18 FY	Expended 2017–18 FY
Alameda	$436,612	$436,628	$612,525	$612,525
Alpine	$0	$0	$0	$0

County	Allocated 2016–17 FY	Expended 2016–17 FY	Allocated 2017–18 FY	Expended 2017–18 FY
Amador	$106,889	$106,889	$108,312	$108,312
Butte	$265,737	$265,737	$306,404	$306,404
Calaveras	$137,180	$137,180	$141,807	$132,726
Colusa	$110,993	$110,993	$113,571	$113,571
Contra Costa	$437,283	$437,283	$508,512	$508,512
Del Norte	$103,028	$103,028	$114,586	$114,586
El Dorado	$276,897	$276,897	$291,293	$291,293
Fresno	$722,446	$722,446	$817,198	$817,198
Glenn	$143,548	$143,548	$145,290	$145,290
Humboldt	$325,199	$325,199	$367,971	$367,971
Imperial	$253,142	$253,142	$266,378	$266,378
Inyo	$135,664	$135,664	$137,862	$135,402
Kern	$844,023	$647,409	$859,757	$745,962
Kings	$261,795	$261,795	$270,531	$270,531
Lake	$134,153	$134,153	$136,293	$136,293
Lassen	$161,336	$161,336	$169,581	$169,581
Los Angeles	$5,308,025	$5,308,025	$5,593,436	$5,593,436
Madera	$214,636	$214,636	$230,576	$230,576
Marin	$227,199	$227,199	$0	$0
Mariposa	$94,803	$94,803	$0	$0
Mendocino	$203,968	$203,968	$229,168	$229,168
Merced	$355,696	$355,696	$387,121	$387,121

County	Allocated 2016–17 FY	Expended 2016–17 FY	Allocated 2017–18 FY	Expended 2017–18 FY
Modoc	$111,919	$111,919	$109,464	$109,464
Mono	$104,956	$89,232	$0	$0
Monterey	$298,947	$298,947	$311,776	$311,776
Napa	$142,801	$142,801	$145,913	$145,913
Nevada	$177,706	$177,706	$172,142	$172,142
Orange	$807,986	$807,986	$894,112	$894,112
Placer	$251,463	$251,463	$266,770	$266,770
Plumas	$94,970	$94,970	$100,860	$100,860
Riverside	$1,390,989	$1,390,989	$1,479,863	$1,479,863
Sacramento	$705,795	$705,795	$771,710	$771,710
San Benito	$161,753	$139,571	$0	$0
San Bernardino	$1,664,077	$1,664,077	$1,758,215	$1,758,215
San Diego	$883,233	$883,233	$983,916	$983,916
San Francisco	$230,437	$230,437	$251,432	$248,336
San Joaquin	$540,362	$540,362	$572,692	$572,692
San Luis Obispo	$222,103	$222,103	$242,134	$242,134
San Mateo	$292,319	$292,319	$316,298	$316,298
Santa Barbara	$296,776	$296,776	$300,635	$300,635
Santa Clara	$499,777	$499,777	$551,902	$551,902
Santa Cruz	$200,530	$200,530	$221,925	$221,925
Shasta	$328,404	$328,404	$354,708	$354,708

County	Allocated 2016–17 FY	Expended 2016–17 FY	Allocated 2017–18 FY	Expended 2017–18 FY
Sierra	$75,000	$75,000	$0	$0
Siskiyou	$253,369	$253,369	$268,821	$268,821
Solano	$241,250	$241,250	$250,024	$250,024
Sonoma	$442,092	$141,200	$0	$0
Stanislaus	$413,008	$413,008	$440,595	$440,595
Sutter	$185,335	$185,335	$197,794	$197,794
Tehama	$214,706	$203,902	$219,733	$219,733
Trinity	$143,294	$143,294	$154,102	$154,102
Tulare	$599,456	$553,815	$635,687	$635,687
Tuolumne	$160,914	$160,914	$167,020	$167,020
Ventura	$395,398	$395,397	$420,664	$420,664
Yolo	$163,280	$163,280	$174,150	$174,150
Yuba	$155,391	$154,922	$166,307	$166,307
Statewide	**$24,110,048**	**$23,517,738**	**$24,709,536**	**$23,871,450**

Through the FYSCP, COEs were able to improve interagency support for foster youth. This collaboration provided strong support for LEAs to establish policies and procedures to support all of the mandates from both state and federal governments concerning foster youth education. The FYSCPs developed Memoranda 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 students who are in foster care. 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.[30] Table 20 shows the increase in formal agreements, MOUs, or protocols established among county agencies specifically designed to support the FYSCP since 2016.

Table 20: Number of Formal Agreements Among County Agencies

Activities	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18
Information Sharing Agreements	44	46	47
Countywide Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Transportation Requirement Agreements	29	44	53
Title IV-E Draw Down Agreements	26	42	45
*Other Agreements	7	8	18

*The category "Other" includes agreements to support data tools development to provide schools, social workers, and probation officers by supplying real time data about foster youth education. They also included MOUs with probation departments and tribal courts to support the coordination of services for foster youth.

Table 21 shows how FYSCP coordinators have increased their engagement in committees formed to support foster youth needs, which directly lead to improved educational outcomes.[31] These local committees, supported by the FYSCPs include Child Welfare committees, Probation committees, and College and Career committees. Through these committee meetings, procedures concerning child welfare, probation, court-led topics, postsecondary opportunities, independent living, and human trafficking were developed. From 2016 to 2018, there was an increase in formal committee membership and leadership as the result of the establishment of the FYSCP. The number of trainings was very high in 2016–17, in part due to the development of new procedures to address the requirements of ESSA school stability and transportation procedures.

---

[30] CDSS All County Letter 16-91 https://www.cdss.ca.gov/lettersnotices/EntRes/getinfo/acl/2016/16-91.pdf.

[31] FYSCP County Office of Education reports for 2015–16, 2016–17, and 2017–18, submitted annually to the CDE. Not available online.

Table 21: Active Involvement in Committees by FYSCP Coordinator

Activities	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18
Child Welfare Committees	199	221	274
Probation Committees	79	93	67
College and Career Committees	2	2	136
Trainings provided to Partner Agencies	582	705	410
Total	**862**	**1,021**	**887**

The FYSCPs established county EACs, which meet about five times a year. The agreements created to establish EAC procedures provide a foundation for formal county interagency collaboration. Table 22 lists the county stakeholders represented on the EACs in 2018.[32]

Table 22: Executive Advisory Membership

Stakeholders	Number Represented on EACs
FYSCP Coordinator	54
Child Welfare Agency Representative	54
Probation Department Representative	51
Mental Health Representative	34
Regional Center Representative	4
Court Staff (Judge or Attorney)	25
School District Representative	53
Community College Representative	45
University Representative	18

---

[32] Ibid.

Stakeholders	Number Represented on EACs
Foster Youth Representative	43
Biological Parent Representative	3
Foster Parent Representative	27
Short-Term Residential Treatment Facility Representative	17
Court-Appointed Special Advocate Representative	37
Community Based Organization Representative	35
Other Representatives	45

Table 23 shows the number of school districts that worked with the FYSCP over the past three years. Table 23 shows that the number of school districts serviced by the FYSCP increased by 8 percent from 2016–17 to 2017–18. Table 24 shows the number of trainings provided to district staff and the number of trainees. Table 24 shows that the number of trainings increased by 85 percent from 2015 to 2018.

Table 23: School Districts Working with FYSCP

Data Count Method	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18
Number of School Districts	896	896	968
Number of Unduplicated Districts that Participated in a Meeting or Training	573	590	773

Table 24: Trainings Provided to School Districts

Data Count Method	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18
Number of Trainings	351	414	698
Number of Trainees	5,778	7,611	10,668

Table 25 describes collaborative partnerships by listing the agencies partnering with the county-administered FYSCPs and their respective services. Each example was reported by a majority of counties in the FYSCP.

Table 25: Collaborative Agencies and Services Provided

Collaborative Agencies	Services Provided
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, behavior management techniques, and assistance in completing health and education records
County Departments of Social Services and Probation	Case management, counseling, monitoring, appropriate behavioral reinforcement, 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 funding for eyeglasses
County Probation Departments	Monitoring and reinforcement of appropriate behavior, meetings with family and school personnel, and information regarding placement changes for foster youth
Local Educational Agencies	Educational assessment to determine appropriate special education services and school placement, assistance through the School Attendance Review Board, tutoring services, and school attendance monitoring and truancy intervention
Colleges and Universities	Tutoring and mentoring services, counseling, financial aid information, and outside evaluations of FYSCPs

Collaborative Agencies	Services Provided
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
Other Foster Youth Service Countywide Programs	Technical assistance, sharing of best practices, data collection procedures, and operational databases

In 2018, the Dashboard released accountability measures of COEs on coordinated services for foster youth. Table 26 lists these self-evaluations by counties concerning eight foster youth coordinated services priorities. Over 50 percent of COE-administered FYSCPs are at *Full Implementation* or *Full Implementation and Sustainability* in all eight FYCSP priorities.

Table 26: COEs Report of FYSCP Priorities

Number of County Offices of Education by Degree of Implementation (1–5 Scale)

Foster Youth Coordinated Service Program Priorities	Exploration and Research Phase (1)	Beginning Development (2)	Initial Implementation (3)	Full Implementation (4)	Full Implementation and Sustainability (5)
Establish ongoing collaboration and support policy development, including formalized information sharing agreements with child welfare, probation, local educational agencies (LEAs), the courts, and other organizations to support the proper educational placement of foster youth (e.g., school of origin versus current residence, comprehensive versus alternative school, and regular versus special education).	0	2	12	22	22

Foster Youth Coordinated Service Program Priorities	Exploration and Research Phase (1)	Beginning Development (2)	Initial Implementation (3)	Full Implementation (4)	Full Implementation and Sustainability (5)
Build capacity with LEAs, probation, child welfare, and other organizations for purposes of implementing school-based support infrastructure for foster youth (e.g., provide regular professional development with the Foster Youth Liaisons to facilitate adequate transportation services for foster youth).	0	4	11	21	22
Provide information and assistance to LEAs regarding the educational needs of foster youth in order to improve educational outcomes	0	1	7	19	31

Foster Youth Coordinated Service Program Priorities	Exploration and Research Phase (1)	Beginning Development (2)	Initial Implementation (3)	Full Implementation (4)	Full Implementation and Sustainability (5)
Provide direct educational services for foster youth in LEA or county-operated programs provided the school district has certified that specified services cannot be provided or funded using other sources, including, but not limited to, Local Control Funding Formula, federal, state, or local funding.	3	4	9	20	22
Establish ongoing collaboration and support development of policies and procedures that facilitate expeditious transfer of records, transcripts, and other relevant educational information.	0	1	7	23	27

Foster Youth Coordinated Service Program Priorities	Exploration and Research Phase (1)	Beginning Development (2)	Initial Implementation (3)	Full Implementation (4)	Full Implementation and Sustainability (5)
Facilitate the coordination of post-secondary opportunities for youth by engaging with systems partners, including child welfare transition planning and independent living services, community colleges or universities, career technical education, and workforce development providers.	0	7	9	25	17
Develop strategies to prioritize the needs of foster youth in the community; use community-wide assessments that consider age group, geographical area, and identification of highest need students.	1	10	15	18	14

Foster Youth Coordinated Service Program Priorities	Exploration and Research Phase (1)	Beginning Development (2)	Initial Implementation (3)	Full Implementation (4)	Full Implementation and Sustainability (5)
Engage in the process of reviewing plan deliverables and of collecting and analyzing LEA- and COE-level outcome data for purposes of evaluating effectiveness of support services for foster youth and whether the investment in services contributes to improved educational outcomes for foster youth.	1	10	18	20	9

Part IV—Conclusion

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

The data show the FYSCP helped to:

1. Improve foster youth academic outcomes in ELA and mathematics.

2. Improve foster youth school engagement, as seen in a decrease in the number of suspensions and expulsions, juvenile hall placements, and dropout rates.

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 in order to increase access to meaningful educational support for foster youth.

5. Provide guidance and support concerning the development of integrated policy and practice for LEAs to engage in effective program planning for foster youth.

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.

The FYSCPs have demonstrated substantial progress in building collaborative relationships among various agencies and systems that work with foster youth, focusing support in data sharing and transportation procedure to support school stability. Interagency agreements and MOUs have been used with increased frequency to formalize and document agreements between partner agencies. The collaborative relationships developed by the FYSCPs have resulted in gains in comprehensive services being provided to foster youth and improvement in academic outcomes.

Appendix A: Table 1: 2016–17 Matched Foster Students by County and Grade

County	KN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	UE	9	10	11	12	US	Total
Alameda	86	86	68	72	72	62	65	65	74	0	99	138	179	189	2	1,257
Alpine	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Amador	7	8	7	7	12	7	6	7	6	0	8	7	9	5	0	96
Butte	47	47	43	35	43	36	33	35	37	0	39	52	43	32	1	523
Calaveras	12	17	15	10	15	8	6	8	14	0	20	14	16	10	0	165
Colusa	5	4	4	6	7	6	5	3	0	0	2	7	2	0	0	51
Contra Costa	82	90	84	72	77	93	66	110	89	0	115	136	128	114	3	1,259
Del Norte	13	10	8	8	12	7	9	9	6	0	9	4	7	6	0	108
El Dorado	34	21	26	15	18	28	15	27	24	0	88	96	110	139	2	643
Fresno	205	199	171	167	158	133	131	139	150	0	217	219	240	201	3	2,333
Glenn	9	10	6	7	2	5	4	6	3	0	3	6	4	2	1	68
Humboldt	33	25	25	25	33	25	10	22	21	0	18	27	26	29	0	319
Imperial	45	31	37	28	27	25	32	22	25	0	43	31	24	21	0	391
Inyo	4	3	2	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	28	18	25	46	0	132

County	KN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	UE	9	10	11	12	US	Total
Kern	218	182	150	149	124	131	113	141	132	0	154	167	172	176	0	2,009
Kings	31	46	39	32	33	42	37	29	28	0	49	42	40	26	0	474
Lake	10	5	11	7	7	5	5	6	3	0	1	9	12	5	0	86
Lassen	6	9	7	8	3	7	6	7	6	0	12	13	14	15	0	113
Los Angeles	2,058	1,676	1,514	1,511	1,449	1,366	1,248	1,196	1,249	1	1,730	1,725	1,732	1,671	12	20,138
Madera	48	37	39	33	25	29	30	31	31	0	56	38	56	40	0	493
Marin	14	7	9	13	14	14	14	14	13	0	19	19	19	16	0	185
Mariposa	4	4	1	3	0	5	1	4	3	0	6	13	12	8	0	64
Mendocino	26	27	17	18	17	15	21	17	13	0	21	27	16	19	0	254
Merced	86	76	63	57	72	65	52	56	67	0	81	71	64	51	1	862
Modoc	1	3	1	2	2	3	4	3	7	0	8	13	17	3	0	67
Mono	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Monterey	34	29	29	22	17	22	24	18	32	0	29	40	47	32	1	376
Napa	16	7	7	8	10	11	12	19	9	0	8	20	17	16	1	161
Nevada	8	8	12	5	5	6	3	6	17	0	27	22	45	72	0	236
Orange	258	212	211	190	207	194	179	176	180	3	217	258	267	216	8	2,776

County	KN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	UE	9	10	11	12	US	Total
Placer	25	26	21	25	18	17	13	13	26	0	33	40	52	60	1	370
Plumas	4	3	4	6	4	6	5	9	1	0	2	7	4	2	0	57
Riverside	484	486	435	401	406	388	334	336	311	0	398	426	450	372	8	5,235
Sacramento	225	175	154	155	161	160	158	130	157	10	222	218	269	302	18	2,514
San Benito	8	3	2	4	10	8	9	8	9	0	10	11	4	5	0	91
San Bernardino	692	621	593	527	474	459	431	439	435	0	583	610	647	525	0	7,036
San Diego	271	210	192	185	147	157	135	123	130	0	202	209	251	301	3	2,516
San Francisco	38	32	46	41	39	31	38	41	46	0	80	101	139	98	0	770
San Joaquin	122	144	117	114	124	106	116	124	140	1	136	165	158	162	2	1,731
San Luis Obispo	35	33	35	31	25	21	17	21	34	0	35	40	44	46	2	419
San Mateo	33	24	20	17	34	16	20	16	26	0	34	45	34	42	1	362
Santa Barbara	33	26	24	30	20	24	23	24	35	0	52	47	51	46	0	435
Santa Clara	79	77	79	78	83	69	47	69	75	0	95	96	164	177	4	1,192

County	KN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	UE	9	10	11	12	US	Total
Santa Cruz	14	14	23	16	21	8	27	17	23	0	30	25	42	36	1	297
Shasta	60	38	26	49	41	33	33	34	26	0	37	56	41	28	0	502
Sierra	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	8	7	7	10	11	11	6	6	6	0	12	3	10	5	0	102
Solano	47	45	36	54	36	34	36	37	43	0	42	56	51	40	4	561
Sonoma	45	43	40	27	39	46	35	43	48	0	65	76	72	62	5	646
Stanislaus	85	81	65	74	80	66	60	63	72	0	92	100	109	95	1	1,043
Sutter	20	22	22	24	17	14	13	15	17	0	13	15	15	10	0	217
Tehama	23	21	22	26	15	16	12	13	15	0	11	19	16	10	0	219
Trinity	3	1	2	3	2	3	4	3	7	0	15	17	24	18	0	102
Tulare	109	115	80	106	85	92	86	81	84	0	98	93	99	83	1	1,212
Tuolumne	9	10	5	5	7	6	2	2	2	0	10	5	8	2	0	73
Ventura	63	59	62	47	56	62	56	64	58	0	95	84	133	102	1	942
Yolo	44	28	22	18	25	22	14	18	22	0	24	33	34	22	0	326
Yuba	38	22	22	23	20	19	18	21	18	0	15	19	22	18	1	276
Statewide	**5,389**	**4,692**	**4,219**	**4,108**	**3.997**	**3,780**	**3,450**	**3,422**	**3,472**	**13**	**5,548**	**4,544**	**4,818**	**4,876**	**80**	**55,282**

87

* To protect student privacy, data are suppressed if the foster student population is 10 or less in a given county.

KN: Kindergarten

UE: Ungraded Elementary Student

US: Ungraded Secondary Student

Appendix B: Table 2: 2017–18 Matched Foster Students by County and Grade

County	KN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	UE	9	10	11	12	US	Total
Alameda	69	70	63	57	55	54	48	54	68	0	79	102	130	173	4	1,026
Alpine	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Amador	10	4	5	3	5	7	6	3	7	0	6	9	5	6	0	76
Butte	48	29	48	32	33	36	40	35	29	0	37	44	39	35	1	486
Calaveras	13	9	14	13	11	14	7	6	14	0	15	21	10	13	0	160
Colusa	6	9	6	6	6	7	8	5	4	0	3	3	3	1	0	67
Contra Costa	79	66	69	71	70	70	83	76	91	0	101	109	121	101	5	1,112
Del Norte	12	10	7	9	4	13	6	9	10	0	14	11	6	10	0	121
El Dorado	37	29	17	26	18	13	22	16	29	0	75	114	132	121	1	650
Fresno	207	179	181	156	162	162	142	168	146	0	224	225	234	188	7	2,381
Glenn	15	8	12	6	6	2	6	3	4	0	4	5	2	4	0	77
Humboldt	46	37	37	36	29	38	36	19	25	0	27	22	28	22	0	402
Imperial	45	45	39	34	31	29	30	31	29	0	44	27	30	22	0	436
Inyo	2	4	4	2	1	1	1	2	1	0	23	24	35	44	1	145
Kern	198	170	161	139	139	132	142	119	151	0	146	167	181	181	1	2,027

County	KN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	UE	9	10	11	12	US	Total
Kings	27	32	34	35	29	30	33	39	28	0	45	57	38	26	0	453
Lake	9	5	8	8	4	6	8	5	5	0	6	5	7	5	0	81
Lassen	9	6	6	10	5	3	7	7	5	0	9	13	13	7	0	100
Los Angeles	1,632	1,410	1,329	1,239	1,173	1,137	1,097	1,077	1,008	0	1,647	1,429	1,393	1,449	21	17,041
Madera	52	35	36	31	29	19	25	24	36	0	38	53	44	32	0	454
Marin	10	11	6	7	15	20	17	13	13	0	8	17	16	9	0	162
Mariposa	6	4	3	3	2	1	4	0	5	0	9	8	16	8	0	69
Mendocino	20	12	18	23	19	15	13	23	19	0	17	18	22	9	0	228
Merced	74	72	53	55	57	63	72	52	63	0	66	76	69	55	0	827
Modoc	3	3	5	2	2	2	4	4	5	0	8	4	6	8	0	56
Mono	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	11
Monterey	34	27	29	27	26	18	24	29	16	0	29	30	34	44	1	368
Napa	7	14	12	8	9	13	10	11	15	0	3	12	12	11	1	138
Nevada	10	6	5	6	2	6	6	3	17	0	20	24	23	64	1	193
Orange	220	216	210	189	176	178	172	166	184	3	240	251	244	221	13	2,683
Placer	47	44	26	23	21	14	14	20	22	0	41	38	56	43	1	410
Plumas	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	12

County	KN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	UE	9	10	11	12	US	Total
Riverside	424	403	398	360	333	360	315	309	297	0	348	335	390	338	8	4,618
Sacramento	167	209	137	123	138	137	149	143	152	3	201	228	233	282	11	2,313
San Benito	3	7	5	3	5	8	7	7	6	0	7	8	9	4	0	79
San Bernardino	633	561	564	542	436	437	443	481	421	0	548	512	556	502	9	6,645
San Diego	218	179	151	143	157	116	132	135	130	0	171	220	219	306	12	2,289
San Francisco	39	47	34	34	39	38	30	34	41	0	92	91	90	119	1	729
San Joaquin	125	117	131	111	98	119	127	118	113	0	162	151	190	152	1	1,715
San Luis Obispo	32	37	29	24	26	24	15	20	24	0	37	23	41	44	2	378
San Mateo	22	32	29	15	9	24	14	22	14	0	31	41	39	24	0	316
Santa Barbara	21	29	18	20	24	16	17	19	22	0	54	48	41	51	0	380
Santa Clara	69	77	63	73	70	69	70	68	63	0	94	117	125	165	2	1,125
Santa Cruz	17	13	14	14	10	14	10	25	22	0	29	34	33	35	0	270
Shasta	47	52	34	21	38	35	29	42	35	0	22	37	36	26	0	454
Sierra	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Siskiyou	15	7	8	7	9	6	11	6	5	0	7	6	7	6	0	100

County	KN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	UE	9	10	11	12	US	Total
Solano	50	51	42	28	42	39	38	33	42	0	44	48	52	37	1	547
Sonoma	39	42	43	48	42	50	40	47	51	0	53	69	56	43	4	627
Stanislaus	72	66	67	62	70	73	63	59	74	0	73	91	83	110	0	963
Sutter	26	35	25	24	18	26	17	16	19	0	15	18	12	13	0	264
Tehama	19	13	16	17	19	9	19	17	11	0	14	17	17	10	0	198
Trinity	2	3	3	3	2	3	1	6	1	0	15	16	11	12	0	78
Tulare	123	99	120	67	101	70	89	74	86	0	104	102	82	78	2	1,197
Tuolumne	12	7	8	4	3	5	4	4	6	0	6	10	7	4	0	80
Ventura	46	40	55	42	36	55	58	54	61	0	97	113	93	102	2	854
Yolo	37	39	43	19	24	32	25	19	20	0	31	35	32	38	0	394
Yuba	34	30	23	28	19	18	12	15	17	0	21	17	14	13	0	261
Statewide	**4,650**	**4,232**	**3,993**	**3,606**	**3,460**	**3,432**	**3,370**	**3,278**	**3,177**	**6**	**4,169**	**4,096**	**4,152**	**4,523**	**103**	**50,247**

* To protect student privacy, data are suppressed if the foster student population is 10 or less in a given county.

KN: Kindergarten

UE: Ungraded Elementary Student

US: Ungraded Secondary Student