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## Executive Summary

This report is required by California *Education Code (EC)* Section 42923(b). For every even-numbered year, the California Department of Education (CDE) provides a report to the Governor, the Legislature, and the Legislative Analyst's Office with the activities of California’s Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program (FYSCP) and student learning outcomes of foster youth. This report includes information for the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years.

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

* Increased high school graduation rate as seen in the two-year change; particularly, the 2.6 percentage points of increase are much larger than the 0.5 percentage point increase of non-foster youth, which shows a significant step toward narrowing the opportunity gap.
* Increased foster youth school stability rates by six percentage points, thus narrowing the opportunity gap.
* Increased foster youth Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA)/California Dream Act Application (CADAA) completion rates from 2019–20 to 2020–21 by 4.4 percentage points.
* Decrease in the statewide juvenile detention rate for foster youth by 2.4 percentage points from 2019–20 to 2020–21, representing more than 1,100 fewer foster youth receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility.

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

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Deborah Avalos, Education Programs Consultant, Student Achievement and Support Division, at
916-323-5113 or DAvalos@cde.ca.gov.

You will find this report on the CDE Foster Youth Services web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/pf/fy/lrlegreport2022.asp>. If you need a copy of this report, please contact Deborah Avalos, Education Programs Consultant, Student Achievement and Support Division, at 916-323-5113 or DAvalos@cde.ca.gov.

## Legislative Reporting Requirements

The Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program (FYSCP) was established in 2016 due to the enactment of Assembly Bill (AB) 854 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015). The statute replaced the previous Foster Youth Services (FYS) Program, which the California Department of Education (CDE) had administrated since 1973.[[1]](#endnote-1) AB 854 amended California *Education Code* (*EC*) sections 42920–42926 to support local educational agencies (LEAs) to better serve foster youth. The FYSCP shifts the responsibilities of providing direct educational services for students in foster care from county offices of education (COEs) to LEAs. COEs are now responsible for establishing ongoing collaboration among child welfare agencies, county probation departments, and other organizations to implement school-based supports for foster care students. In addition to the coordination of services, the administered COE FYSCPs are focused on building the capacity of LEAs to improve foster youth educational outcomes.

The CDE has administered the FYSCP since it replaced the FYS Program. Under AB 854, the CDE most recently partnered with the Los Angeles COE (LACOE) to administer the FYSCP Technical Assistance Program (TAP) during the 2019–20, 2020–21, and 2021–22 school years. The FYSCP TAP provides support, guidance, and leadership to all county FYSCP coordinators for the implementation of the requirements of AB 854.

This report is submitted in accordance with the provisions of California *EC* Section 42923(b), which requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide a report to the Governor and the Legislature about the FYSCP in even-numbered years. *EC* Section 42923(b) further stipulates that the report be prepared with input from the providers of the FYSCP and that it shall include:

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

The 2022 report is the third legislative report written specifically on the FYSCP established in 2016. The two previous reports are available on the CDE website:

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

## COVID-19 Considerations

Please note that, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the data presented in this report will vary from the 2018 and 2020 FYSCP Legislative Reports. AB 130[[2]](#endnote-2) (Chapter 44, Statutes of 2021) suspended the reporting of state indicators on the 2021 California School Dashboard (Dashboard). However, the statute requires that available data that would have been included in the Dashboard are reported on the CDE website if they are determined to be valid and reliable. The CDE has determined that the absenteeism data are not valid and reliable for the 2019–20 academic year; therefore, the CDE has not processed these data, and they are unavailable for public release. Due to changes under AB 130 and the suspension of the Dashboard state indicators, the following will not be included in this report:

* Foster youth academic achievement measured through the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) Math and English Language Arts
* Foster youth attendance rates[[3]](#endnote-3)

Foster youth suspension and expulsion numbers and rates will be provided; however, due to COVID-19, the numbers do not reflect a complete academic year. The CDE recommends caution when comparing data across academic years.

## Organization of the2022 Report for the Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program

This report comprises five parts:

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

Part II—Aggregate foster youth educational outcome data by county

1. The number of pupils in foster care who attended school in the county
2. The number of pupils in foster care who were suspended or expelled
3. The number of pupils in foster care who were placed in a juvenile hall, camp, ranch, or other county-operated juvenile detention facilities because of an incident of juvenile delinquency
4. The school stability rates, graduation rates, FAFSA/CADAA completion rates, and dropout rates for pupils in foster care
5. The amount of funds allocated and expended by each FYSCP in the previous two Fiscal Years

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

Part IV—FYSCP Report

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

Part V—Conclusion

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

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

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

During this reporting period between 2019 and 2021, there has been an improvement in school stability for foster youth, with an increase of six percentage points in the school stability rates for foster youth (Table 11). When compared to the 0.2 percentage point increase for non-foster youth students over the same time period, the narrowing of the gap suggests that FYSCP efforts targeted toward increasing foster youth school stability may be having an impact.

In addition, the statewide juvenile detention rate for foster youth decreased by 2.4 percentage points from 2019–20 to 2020–21, moving from 7.8 percent to 5.4 percent, representing more than 1,100 fewer foster youth receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility (Tables 9 and 10). When youth are placed in a juvenile detention facility, they are required to change schools. The decrease in the juvenile detention rate and the decrease in the number of foster youth who were placed in a juvenile detention facility illustrates significant and continued success for the foster youth population and speaks to the coordinated efforts to decrease school changes for foster youth.

There has also been improvement in graduation rates for foster youth compared to non-foster youth. The graduation rate for foster youth increased by 2.6 percentage points over two years (Table 13), which is much larger than the 0.5 percentage point increase in graduation rates of non-foster youth over the same period. Although the opportunity gap in graduation rates between foster youth and non-foster youth remains large, the increases in the past two years are significant steps toward closing this opportunity gap. These increases are largely due to the effectiveness of established FYSCPs, which provide services to high school foster youth around planning for a successful transition to college and engaging foster youth in staying in school.

In addition to the creation of the FYSCP, the CDE recognized the need to have timely and accurate data for monitoring and accountability in order to support the needs of foster youth. As such, in 2019 the CDE created an Education Research and Evaluation Consultant Foster Youth Data Liaison position to support and improve the foster match process between the CDE and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) as well as increase the data literacy of FYSCPs and to develop and implement data-informed policies, practices, and programs. With the Foster Youth Data Liaison as a dedicated data specialist at the CDE and improved data sharing between the CDE and CDSS, the FYSCP has the ability to ensure that LEAs place foster youth in schools in a timely manner and in an appropriate educational placement in accordance with state and federal laws. The FYSCP focused on enrolling foster youth in a timely fashion or keeping foster youth in their school of origin by sharing information and providing transportation if necessary; supporting foster youth emotionally and academically with counseling, mentoring, and tutoring; and assisting foster youth with college and career transition with college fairs, application supports, and the FAFSA/CADAA completion.

The FYSCPs provide support with transferring school records and other relevant educational information so that foster youth are available for inter-district transfers. In addition, all FYSCPs have established local interagency Executive Advisory Councils (EACs) that coordinate and leverage resources for LEAs, child welfare agencies, and county probation offices to support foster youth education. All counties are developing countywide transportation plans, data-sharing agreements, and agreements with child welfare agencies to leverage Title IV-E of the federal Social Security Act (42 *USC* Section 301) funds. These agreements establish procedures to promote school stability for foster youth and support transitions to independent living. Through these agreements, protocols have been established by LEAs, child welfare agencies, county probation departments, and other organizations (Table 20) to work collaboratively to meet the educational needs of foster youth.

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

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

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

To protect student privacy, data are suppressed and indicated by an asterisk (\*) if the foster youth population is less than 11 in a given county, excluding enrollment counts:

1. The number of pupils in foster care who attended school in the county
2. The number of pupils in foster care who were suspended or expelled
3. The number of pupils in foster care who were placed in a juvenile hall, camp, ranch, or other county-operated juvenile detention facilities because of an incident of juvenile delinquency
4. The school stability rates, graduation rates, FAFSA/CADAA completion rates, and dropout rates for pupils in foster care
5. The amount of funds allocated and expended by each FYSCP in the previous two fiscal years
6. **The Number of Pupils in Foster Care Who Attended School in the County**

Table 1 shows the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years’ Census Day[[4]](#endnote-4) enrollment of matched foster youth who were enrolled in school by county. Census Day enrollment numbers are used to determine funding allocations. Because Census Day enrollment numbers are calculated at a point in time, these numbers are smaller than the enrollment numbers that are collected throughout the entirety of the school year.

Table 2 shows the cumulative enrollment[[5]](#endnote-5) of matched[[6]](#endnote-6) foster youth by grade level for the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years.

Table 3 shows the total cumulative enrollment for foster youth by county of enrollment. Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the school year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a county. Cumulative enrollment is **not** necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is enrolled in multiple counties during the academic year, they are counted once at each county but only once in the state’s cumulative enrollment.

#### Table 1: Census Day Foster Youth Enrollment by County for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **County** | **2019–20(N)** | **2020–21(N)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alpine | 2 | 0 |
| Alameda | 449 | 474 |
| Amador | 24 | 23 |
| Butte | 268 | 266 |
| Calaveras | 87 | 54 |
| Colusa | 34 | 30 |
| Contra Costa | 558 | 512 |
| Del Norte | 54 | 71 |
| El Dorado | 188 | 162 |
| Fresno | 1,504 | 1,487 |
| Glenn | 32 | 33 |
| Humboldt | 317 | 242 |
| Imperial | 307 | 227 |
| Inyo | 56 | 50 |
| Kern | 1,200 | 1,167 |
| Kings | 245 | 232 |
| Lake | 42 | 45 |
| Lassen | 46 | 56 |
| Los Angeles | 10,289 | 10,200 |
| Madera | 228 | 223 |
| Marin | 89 | 76 |
| Mariposa | 28 | 28 |
| Mendocino | 200 | 152 |
| Merced | 441 | 384 |
| Modoc | 16 | 16 |
| Mono | 2 | 3 |
| Monterey | 154 | 144 |
| Napa | 83 | 61 |
| Nevada | 61 | 49 |
| Orange | 1,745 | 1,709 |
| Placer | 168 | 179 |
| Plumas | 19 | 18 |
| Riverside | 2,536 | 2,719 |
| Sacramento | 1,169 | 1,051 |
| San Benito | 41 | 39 |
| San Bernardino | 3,629 | 3,506 |
| San Diego | 1,137 | 1,203 |
| San Francisco | 306 | 266 |
| San Joaquin | 961 | 858 |
| San Luis Obispo | 218 | 204 |
| San Mateo | 133 | 120 |
| Santa Barbara | 263 | 286 |
| Santa Clara | 518 | 467 |
| Santa Cruz | 120 | 96 |
| Shasta | 272 | 250 |
| Sierra | 2 | 1 |
| Siskiyou | 68 | 52 |
| Solano | 287 | 264 |
| Sonoma | 368 | 308 |
| Stanislaus | 488 | 442 |
| Sutter | 99 | 121 |
| Tehama | 116 | 128 |
| Trinity | 33 | 32 |
| Tulare | 793 | 765 |
| Tuolumne | 55 | 54 |
| Ventura | 434 | 450 |
| Yolo | 206 | 199 |
| Yuba | 152 | 105 |
| **Statewide** | **33,340** | **32,359** |

#### Table 2: Statewide Cumulative Enrollment for Foster Youth by Grade for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **Grade** | **2019–20(N)** | **2020–21(N)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Kindergarten | 4,190 | 3,882 |
| First Grade | 3,579 | 3,523 |
| Second Grade | 3,392 | 3,363 |
| Third Grade | 3,425 | 3,138 |
| Fourth Grade | 3,145 | 3,114 |
| Fifth Grade | 2,927 | 2,942 |
| Sixth Grade | 2,948 | 2,787 |
| Seventh Grade | 3,021 | 2,927 |
| Eight Grade | 3,181 | 3,093 |
| Ninth Grade | 3,912 | 3,811 |
| Tenth Grade | 3,955 | 3,817 |
| Eleventh Grade | 3,886 | 3,706 |
| Twelfth Grade | 3,746 | 3,663 |
| **Total** | **45,307** | **43,766** |

#### Table 3: Foster Youth Cumulative Enrollment by County for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **County** | **2019–20(N)** | **2020–21(N)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 803 | 836 |
| Alpine | \* | \* |
| Amador | 47 | 43 |
| Butte | 407 | 387 |
| Calaveras | 116 | 98 |
| Colusa | 61 | 50 |
| Contra Costa | 863 | 768 |
| Del Norte | 75 | 94 |
| El Dorado | 394 | 348 |
| Fresno | 2,225 | 2,384 |
| Glenn | 50 | 54 |
| Humboldt | 405 | 332 |
| Imperial | 411 | 317 |
| Inyo | 124 | 95 |
| Kern | 1,864 | 1,817 |
| Kings | 381 | 370 |
| Lake | 67 | 107 |
| Lassen | 87 | 104 |
| Los Angeles | 14,911 | 14,049 |
| Madera | 409 | 372 |
| Marin | 130 | 118 |
| Mariposa | 55 | 51 |
| Mendocino | 268 | 216 |
| Merced | 722 | 600 |
| Modoc | 27 | 36 |
| Mono | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 255 | 223 |
| Napa | 136 | 100 |
| Nevada | 122 | 91 |
| Orange | 2,622 | 2,501 |
| Placer | 332 | 329 |
| Plumas | 34 | 33 |
| Riverside | 4,109 | 4,128 |
| Sacramento | 1,789 | 1,683 |
| San Benito | 61 | 72 |
| San Bernardino | 5,877 | 5,381 |
| San Diego | 1,835 | 1,825 |
| San Francisco | 551 | 518 |
| San Joaquin | 1,537 | 1,312 |
| San Luis Obispo | 300 | 272 |
| San Mateo | 214 | 176 |
| Santa Barbara | 399 | 487 |
| Santa Clara | 808 | 697 |
| Santa Cruz | 182 | 146 |
| Shasta | 411 | 418 |
| Sierra | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 87 | 64 |
| Solano | 459 | 395 |
| Sonoma | 531 | 431 |
| Stanislaus | 920 | 718 |
| Sutter | 186 | 189 |
| Tehama | 202 | 190 |
| Trinity | 72 | 66 |
| Tulare | 1,114 | 1,079 |
| Tuolumne | 86 | 94 |
| Ventura | 718 | 667 |
| Yolo | 357 | 295 |
| Yuba | 226 | 173 |

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

Table 4 includes the statewide suspension rates[[7]](#endnote-7) between foster youth and non-foster youth for the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years. The total count of students suspended was calculated using both in-school and out-of-school suspensions. If a student is suspended multiple times, the student is counted only once, providing an unduplicated count of students suspended. Suspensions are calculated by dividing the unduplicated count of students suspended by the cumulative enrollment at the selected entity.

Table 5 includes the suspension rates for foster youth by grade span for the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years.

Table 6 shows the cumulative enrollment of foster youth and the unduplicated count of foster youth who were suspended one or more times during the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years by county. Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the school year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a county. Cumulative enrollment is **not** necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is suspended in multiple counties during the academic year, they are counted once at each county but only once at the state level.

#### Table 4: Suspension of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **Academic Year** | **Foster Youth (%)** | **Non-Foster Youth (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2019–20  | 11.9 | 2.4 |
| 2020–21 | 1.2 | 0.2 |

#### Table 5: Suspension of Foster Youth by Grade Span for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **Academic Year** | **Kindergarten–Third(%)** |  **Fourth–Sixth(%)** | **Seventh–Eighth(%)** | **Ninth–Twelfth(%)** | **All Grades (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019–20  | 3.8 | 8.4 | 19.5 | 18.7 | **11.9** |
| 2020–21 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.9 | **1.2** |

#### Table 6: Suspension of Foster Youth by County for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **County** | **2019–20 Cumulative Enrollment Foster Youth (N)** | **2019–20 Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Suspended One or More Times(N)** | **2020–21 Cumulative Enrollment Foster Youth (N)** | **2020–21 Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Suspended One or More Times(N)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statewide | 45,307 | 5,411 | 43,766 | 519 |
| Alameda | 803 | 73 | 836 | 0 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 47 | 3 | 43 | 1 |
| Butte | 407 | 86 | 387 | 11 |
| Calaveras | 116 | 14 | 98 | 3 |
| Colusa | 61 | 11 | 50 | 6 |
| Contra Costa | 863 | 126 | 768 | 2 |
| Del Norte | 75 | 15 | 94 | 1 |
| El Dorado | 394 | 32 | 348 | 9 |
| Fresno | 2,225 | 368 | 2,384 | 32 |
| Glenn | 50 | 7 | 54 | 3 |
| Humboldt | 405 | 57 | 332 | 6 |
| Imperial | 411 | 36 | 317 | 0 |
| Inyo | 124 | 6 | 95 | 2 |
| Kern | 1,864 | 263 | 1,817 | 15 |
| Kings | 381 | 47 | 370 | 11 |
| Lake | 67 | 10 | 107 | 1 |
| Lassen | 87 | 15 | 104 | 18 |
| Los Angeles | 14,911 | 1,386 | 14,049 | 107 |
| Madera | 409 | 45 | 372 | 2 |
| Marin | 130 | 13 | 118 | 4 |
| Mariposa | 55 | 12 | 51 | 0 |
| Mendocino | 268 | 45 | 216 | 3 |
| Merced | 722 | 66 | 600 | 5 |
| Modoc | 27 | 6 | 36 | 3 |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 255 | 15 | 223 | 1 |
| Napa | 136 | 8 | 100 | 0 |
| Nevada | 122 | 4 | 91 | 1 |
| Orange | 2,622 | 181 | 2,501 | 18 |
| Placer | 332 | 21 | 329 | 9 |
| Plumas | 34 | 5 | 33 | 1 |
| Riverside | 4,109 | 429 | 4,128 | 10 |
| Sacramento | 1,789 | 253 | 1,683 | 9 |
| San Benito | 61 | 9 | 72 | 1 |
| San Bernardino | 5,877 | 636 | 5,381 | 20 |
| San Diego | 1,835 | 174 | 1,825 | 35 |
| San Francisco | 551 | 32 | 518 | 1 |
| San Joaquin | 1,537 | 250 | 1,312 | 42 |
| San Luis Obispo | 300 | 23 | 272 | 4 |
| San Mateo | 214 | 29 | 176 | 3 |
| Santa Barbara | 399 | 43 | 487 | 4 |
| Santa Clara | 808 | 74 | 697 | 1 |
| Santa Cruz | 182 | 18 | 146 | 0 |
| Shasta | 411 | 35 | 418 | 36 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 87 | 7 | 64 | 4 |
| Solano | 459 | 56 | 395 | 0 |
| Sonoma | 531 | 69 | 431 | 4 |
| Stanislaus | 920 | 113 | 718 | 15 |
| Sutter | 186 | 17 | 189 | 3 |
| Tehama | 202 | 15 | 190 | 16 |
| Trinity | 72 | 1 | 66 | 6 |
| Tulare | 1,114 | 120 | 1,079 | 8 |
| Tuolumne | 86 | 8 | 94 | 11 |
| Ventura | 718 | 69 | 667 | 7 |
| Yolo | 357 | 46 | 295 | 2 |
| Yuba | 226 | 24 | 173 | 2 |

Table 7 includes the statewide expulsion rates[[8]](#endnote-8) between foster youth and non-foster youth for the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years.

Table 8 shows the unduplicated count of expelled foster youth by county of enrollment in the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years. Table 8 also includes the total cumulative enrollment of foster youth for reference. Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the school year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a county. Cumulative enrollment is **not** necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is expelled in multiple counties during the academic year, they are counted once at each county but only once at the state level.

#### Table 7: Expulsion of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **Academic Year** | **Foster Youth (%)** | **Non-Foster Youth (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2019–20  | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| 2020–21 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

#### Table 8: Expulsion of Foster Youth by County for 2019–20 and for 2020–21

| **County** | **2019–20 Cumulative Enrollment Foster Youth (N)** | **2019–20 Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Expelled(N)** | **2020–21 Cumulative Enrollment Foster Youth (N)** | **2020–21 Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth Expelled(N)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statewide | 45,307 | 95 | 43,766 | 9 |
| Alameda | 803 | 1 | 836 | 0 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | 47 | 0 | 43 | 0 |
| Butte | 407 | 3 | 387 | 0 |
| Calaveras | 116 | 1 | 98 | 0 |
| Colusa | 61 | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| Contra Costa | 863 | 2 | 768 | 0 |
| Del Norte | 75 | 0 | 94 | 0 |
| El Dorado | 394 | 1 | 348 | 0 |
| Fresno | 2,225 | 10 | 2,384 | 3 |
| Glenn | 50 | 1 | 54 | 0 |
| Humboldt | 405 | 0 | 332 | 0 |
| Imperial | 411 | 0 | 317 | 0 |
| Inyo | 124 | 0 | 95 | 0 |
| Kern | 1,864 | 2 | 1,817 | 0 |
| Kings | 381 | 4 | 370 | 1 |
| Lake | 67 | 0 | 107 | 0 |
| Lassen | 87 | 2 | 104 | 0 |
| Los Angeles | 14,911 | 14 | 14,049 | 1 |
| Madera | 409 | 3 | 372 | 0 |
| Marin | 130 | 0 | 118 | 0 |
| Mariposa | 55 | 1 | 51 | 0 |
| Mendocino | 268 | 0 | 216 | 0 |
| Merced | 722 | 4 | 600 | 0 |
| Modoc | 27 | 0 | 36 | 0 |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 255 | 0 | 223 | 0 |
| Napa | 136 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| Nevada | 122 | 0 | 91 | 0 |
| Orange | 2,622 | 1 | 2,501 | 0 |
| Placer | 332 | 0 | 329 | 0 |
| Plumas | 34 | 0 | 33 | 0 |
| Riverside | 4,109 | 8 | 4,128 | 2 |
| Sacramento | 1,789 | 2 | 1,683 | 0 |
| San Benito | 61 | 0 | 72 | 0 |
| San Bernardino | 5,877 | 10 | 5,381 | 0 |
| San Diego | 1,835 | 1 | 1,825 | 0 |
| San Francisco | 551 | 0 | 518 | 0 |
| San Joaquin | 1,537 | 8 | 1,312 | 0 |
| San Luis Obispo | 300 | 0 | 272 | 0 |
| San Mateo | 214 | 0 | 176 | 0 |
| Santa Barbara | 399 | 1 | 487 | 0 |
| Santa Clara | 808 | 0 | 697 | 0 |
| Santa Cruz | 182 | 0 | 146 | 0 |
| Shasta | 411 | 0 | 418 | 1 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 87 | 1 | 64 | 1 |
| Solano | 459 | 1 | 395 | 0 |
| Sonoma | 531 | 3 | 431 | 0 |
| Stanislaus | 920 | 3 | 718 | 0 |
| Sutter | 186 | 0 | 189 | 0 |
| Tehama | 202 | 0 | 190 | 0 |
| Trinity | 72 | 0 | 66 | 0 |
| Tulare | 1,114 | 3 | 1,079 | 0 |
| Tuolumne | 86 | 0 | 94 | 0 |
| Ventura | 718 | 3 | 667 | 0 |
| Yolo | 357 | 0 | 295 | 0 |
| Yuba | 226 | 0 | 173 | 0 |

1. **The Number of Pupils in Foster Care Who Were Placed in a Juvenile Hall, Camp, Ranch, or Other County-operated Juvenile Detention Facility Because of an Incident of Juvenile Delinquency**

Tables 9 and 10 provide the cumulative foster youth enrollment counts, unduplicated count of foster youth in juvenile hall or youth authority schools, and the detention rates[[9]](#endnote-9) by county for foster youth in the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years, respectively. Cumulative enrollment consists of the total number of unduplicated primary and short-term enrollments within the school year (July 1 to June 30), regardless of whether the student is enrolled multiple times within a county. Cumulative enrollment is **not** necessarily additive from one reporting level to the next. For example, if a student is enrolled in a juvenile hall or youth authority school in multiple counties during the academic year, they are counted once at each county but only once at the state level, regardless of the number of juvenile hall or youth authority schools they attended.

#### Table 9: Foster Youth Juvenile Detention Placements by County for 2019–20

| **County** | **Cumulative Enrollment(N)** | **Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools(N)** | **Juvenile Detention Rate(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statewide | 45,307 | 3,540 | 7.8 |
| Alameda | 803 | 123 | 15.3 |
| Alpine | 2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Amador | 47 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Butte | 407 | 17 | 4.2 |
| Calaveras | 116 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Colusa | 61 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Contra Costa | 863 | 53 | 6.1 |
| Del Norte | 75 | 9 | 12.0 |
| El Dorado | 394 | 182 | 46.2 |
| Fresno | 2,225 | 155 | 7.0 |
| Glenn | 50 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Humboldt | 405 | 14 | 3.5 |
| Imperial | 411 | 17 | 4.1 |
| Inyo | 124 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Kern | 1,864 | 444 | 23.8 |
| Kings | 381 | 16 | 4.2 |
| Lake | 67 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Lassen | 87 | 2 | 2.3 |
| Los Angeles | 14,911 | 1,000 | 6.7 |
| Madera | 409 | 32 | 7.8 |
| Marin | 130 | 10 | 7.7 |
| Mariposa | 55 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mendocino | 268 | 14 | 5.2 |
| Merced | 722 | 28 | 3.9 |
| Modoc | 27 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mono | 7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Monterey | 255 | 22 | 8.6 |
| Napa | 136 | 14 | 10.3 |
| Nevada | 122 | 12 | 9.8 |
| Orange | 2,622 | 338 | 12.9 |
| Placer | 332 | 26 | 7.8 |
| Plumas | 34 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Riverside | 4,109 | 161 | 3.9 |
| Sacramento | 1,789 | 188 | 10.5 |
| San Benito | 61 | 2 | 3.3 |
| San Bernardino | 5,877 | 191 | 3.3 |
| San Diego | 1,835 | 244 | 13.3 |
| San Francisco | 551 | 75 | 13.6 |
| San Joaquin | 1,537 | 123 | 8.0 |
| San Luis Obispo | 300 | 9 | 3.0 |
| San Mateo | 214 | 35 | 16.4 |
| Santa Barbara | 399 | 17 | 4.3 |
| Santa Clara | 808 | 61 | 7.6 |
| Santa Cruz | 182 | 10 | 5.5 |
| Shasta | 411 | 34 | 8.3 |
| Sierra | 6 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Siskiyou | 87 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Solano | 459 | 43 | 9.4 |
| Sonoma | 531 | 47 | 8.9 |
| Stanislaus | 920 | 51 | 5.5 |
| Sutter | 186 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tehama | 202 | 22 | 10.9 |
| Trinity | 72 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tulare | 1,114 | 27 | 2.4 |
| Tuolumne | 86 | 7 | 8.1 |
| Ventura | 718 | 41 | 5.7 |
| Yolo | 357 | 12 | 3.4 |
| Yuba | 226 | 15 | 6.6 |

#### Table 10: Foster Youth Juvenile Detention Placements by County for 2020–21

| **County** | **Cumulative Enrollment(N)** | **Unduplicated Count of Foster Youth in Juvenile Hall or Youth Authority Schools(N)** | **Juvenile Detention Rate(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statewide | 43,766 | 2,379 | 5.4 |
| Alameda | 836 | 73 | 8.7 |
| Alpine | 2 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Amador | 43 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Butte | 387 | 7 | 1.8 |
| Calaveras | 98 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Colusa | 50 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Contra Costa | 768 | 21 | 2.7 |
| Del Norte | 94 | 7 | 7.5 |
| El Dorado | 348 | 157 | 45.1 |
| Fresno | 2,384 | 114 | 4.8 |
| Glenn | 54 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Humboldt | 332 | 7 | 2.1 |
| Imperial | 317 | 6 | 1.9 |
| Inyo | 95 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Kern | 1,817 | 340 | 18.7 |
| Kings | 370 | 17 | 4.6 |
| Lake | 107 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Lassen | 104 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Los Angeles | 14,049 | 664 | 4.7 |
| Madera | 372 | 12 | 3.2 |
| Marin | 118 | 8 | 6.8 |
| Mariposa | 51 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mendocino | 216 | 9 | 4.2 |
| Merced | 600 | 18 | 3.0 |
| Modoc | 36 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mono | 4 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Monterey | 223 | 17 | 7.6 |
| Napa | 100 | 4 | 4.0 |
| Nevada | 91 | 7 | 7.7 |
| Orange | 2,501 | 168 | 6.7 |
| Placer | 329 | 32 | 9.7 |
| Plumas | 33 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Riverside | 4,128 | 110 | 2.7 |
| Sacramento | 1,683 | 149 | 8.9 |
| San Benito | 72 | 4 | 5.6 |
| San Bernardino | 5,381 | 132 | 2.5 |
| San Diego | 1,825 | 208 | 11.4 |
| San Francisco | 518 | 36 | 7.0 |
| San Joaquin | 1,312 | 87 | 6.6 |
| San Luis Obispo | 272 | 7 | 2.6 |
| San Mateo | 176 | 13 | 7.4 |
| Santa Barbara | 487 | 25 | 5.1 |
| Santa Clara | 697 | 31 | 4.5 |
| Santa Cruz | 146 | 11 | 7.5 |
| Shasta | 418 | 25 | 6.0 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 64 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Solano | 395 | 30 | 7.6 |
| Sonoma | 431 | 22 | 5.1 |
| Stanislaus | 718 | 36 | 5.0 |
| Sutter | 189 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tehama | 190 | 8 | 4.2 |
| Trinity | 66 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Tulare | 1079 | 11 | 1.0 |
| Tuolumne | 94 | 9 | 9.6 |
| Ventura | 667 | 30 | 4.5 |
| Yolo | 295 | 6 | 2.0 |
| Yuba | 173 | 11 | 6.4 |

1. **The School Stability Rates, Graduation Rates, FAFSA/CADAA Completion Rates, and Dropout Rates for Pupils in Foster Care**

Table 11 includes the school stability rate[[10]](#endnote-10) for foster and non-foster youth for the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years.

Table 12 shows the school stability rate of foster youth by county for the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years.

#### Table 11: School Stability Rate of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **Academic Year** | **Foster Youth (%)** | **Non-Foster Youth (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2019–20 | 65.8 | 92.2 |
| 2020–21 | 71.8 | 92.4 |

#### Table : School Stability Rate of Foster Youth by County for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **County** | **2019–20(%)** | **2020–21(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 51.4 | 67.5 |
| Alpine | \* | \* |
| Amador | 53.2 | 65.1 |
| Butte | 54.3 | 57.9 |
| Calaveras | 62.1 | 49.0 |
| Colusa | 42.6 | 48.0 |
| Contra Costa | 56.7 | 67.8 |
| Del Norte | 62.7 | 80.9 |
| El Dorado | 34.6 | 32.3 |
| Fresno | 60.7 | 66.2 |
| Glenn | 56.0 | 53.7 |
| Humboldt | 76.0 | 77.7 |
| Imperial | 76.3 | 78.5 |
| Inyo | 30.6 | 44.2 |
| Kern | 57.2 | 58.8 |
| Kings | 62.8 | 56.1 |
| Lake | 55.2 | 67.3 |
| Lassen | 36.8 | 48.5 |
| Los Angeles | 62.5 | 72.1 |
| Madera | 52.7 | 60.2 |
| Marin | 55.4 | 54.7 |
| Mariposa | 36.4 | 35.3 |
| Mendocino | 68.7 | 71.5 |
| Merced | 52.9 | 59.0 |
| Modoc | 59.3 | 47.2 |
| Mono | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 56.1 | 60.4 |
| Napa | 58.2 | 74.0 |
| Nevada | 38.5 | 44.0 |
| Orange | 65.6 | 70.1 |
| Placer | 50.9 | 47.3 |
| Plumas | 44.1 | 33.3 |
| Riverside | 52.3 | 59.1 |
| Sacramento | 53.9 | 60.1 |
| San Benito | 51.7 | 52.8 |
| San Bernardino | 49.9 | 58.5 |
| San Diego | 57.8 | 64.3 |
| San Francisco | 46.4 | 64.3 |
| San Joaquin | 53.5 | 58.6 |
| San Luis Obispo | 72.0 | 70.2 |
| San Mateo | 59.8 | 75.0 |
| Santa Barbara | 63.2 | 65.5 |
| Santa Clara | 60.0 | 70.5 |
| Santa Cruz | 57.1 | 67.1 |
| Shasta | 62.0 | 57.1 |
| Sierra | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | 70.1 | 65.6 |
| Solano | 57.1 | 66.8 |
| Sonoma | 68.1 | 72.6 |
| Stanislaus | 43.8 | 50.2 |
| Sutter | 54.5 | 51.4 |
| Tehama | 52.7 | 50.3 |
| Trinity | 38.0 | 36.4 |
| Tulare | 72.1 | 74.3 |
| Tuolumne | 66.3 | 55.3 |
| Ventura | 58.6 | 60.1 |
| Yolo | 60.3 | 72.5 |
| Yuba | 48.2 | 47.4 |
| **Statewide** | **65.8** | **71.8** |

Table 13 contains a three-year view of the adjusted cohort graduation rate (ACGR)[[11]](#endnote-11) for foster and non-foster youth as well as the change in graduation rates from 2020 to 2021 (one-year change) and from 2019 to 2021 (two-year change).

#### Table 13: Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate for Foster and Non-Foster Youth between 2019 and 2021

| **Student Group** | **2019(%)** | **2020(%)** | **2021(%)** | **1-Year Change 2020 to 2021(%)** | **2-Year Change in 2019 to 2021(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Foster Youth | 53.1 | 58.0 | 55.7 | -2.3 | 2.6 |
| Non-Foster Youth | 83.4 | 84.7 | 83.9 | -0.8 | 0.5 |

Table 14 shows the ACGR for foster youth by county in 2019–20 compared to 2020–21. As shown in Table 14, the foster youth graduation rate declined in 2020–21 statewide compared to 2019–20.

#### Table : Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate for Foster Youth by County for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **County** | **2019–20 Graduation Rate(%)** | **2020–21 Graduation Rate(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Statewide | 58 | 55.7 |
| Alameda | 45.3 | 49.6 |
| Alpine | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | \* |
| Butte | 69.5 | 59.0 |
| Calaveras | 71.4 | 66.7 |
| Colusa | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 59.0 | 48.3 |
| Del Norte | \* | 46.7 |
| El Dorado | 66.3 | 70.2 |
| Fresno | 55.9 | 48.5 |
| Glenn | 58.3 | \* |
| Humboldt | 67.6 | 70 |
| Imperial | 73.3 | 69 |
| Inyo | 38.7 | 33.3 |
| Kern | 61.7 | 53.5 |
| Kings | 47.8 | 58.3 |
| Lake | 50 | \* |
| Lassen | 68.8 | \* |
| Los Angeles | 56.9 | 52.1 |
| Madera | 52 | 58.3 |
| Marin | 66.7 | \* |
| Mariposa | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 51.2 | 54.2 |
| Merced | 71.6 | 66.2 |
| Modoc | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 68.1 | 56.1 |
| Napa | 63.2 | 83.3 |
| Nevada | 27 | 33.3 |
| Orange | 62.7 | 68.1 |
| Placer | 65.7 | 72.7 |
| Plumas | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 71.5 | 64.1 |
| Sacramento | 53.6 | 49 |
| San Benito | \* | 63.6 |
| San Bernardino | 54.6 | 56.6 |
| San Diego | 49.6 | 49.2 |
| San Francisco | 53.2 | 55.4 |
| San Joaquin | 60.3 | 47.9 |
| San Luis Obispo | 77.3 | 65.2 |
| San Mateo | 58.8 | 62.5 |
| Santa Barbara | 70.3 | 68.1 |
| Santa Clara | 51.4 | 46.3 |
| Santa Cruz | 56.5 | 68.6 |
| Shasta | 73.2 | 78.1 |
| Sierra | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | \* | \* |
| Solano | 55.7 | 63.8 |
| Sonoma | 55.6 | 59.2 |
| Stanislaus | 61.3 | 65.3 |
| Sutter | 73.3 | \* |
| Tehama | 69.6 | 63.3 |
| Trinity | 40 | 42.9 |
| Tulare | 60.6 | 53.2 |
| Tuolumne | 68.8 | \* |
| Ventura | 50.4 | 54.7 |
| Yolo | 68.6 | 83.3 |
| Yuba | 53.6 | 50 |

Table 15 compares the high school dropout rates for foster youth with non-foster youth for the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years.

Table 16 includes the number of youth in the four-year cohort,[[12]](#endnote-12) the number of foster youth who were considered a dropout, and the dropout rates for non-foster youth for the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years by county.

#### Table 15: High School Dropout Rates of Foster and Non-Foster Youth for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **Academic Year** | **Foster Youth (%)** | **Non-Foster Youth (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2019–20 | 24.6 | 8.6 |
| 2020–21 | 25.9 | 9.2 |

#### Table 16: High School Dropout Rates and Counts of Foster Youth by County for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **County** | **2019–20 Cohort(N)** | **2019–20 Dropout Count(N)** | **2019–20 Dropout Rate(%)** | **2020–21 Cohort(N)** | **2020–21 Dropout Count(N)** | **2020–21 Dropout Rate(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda | 161 | 45 | 28 | 137 | 35 | 25.5 |
| Alpine | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Amador | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Butte | 59 | 12 | 20.3 | 39 | 9 | 23.1 |
| Calaveras | 21 | 1 | 4.8 | 15 | 1 | 6.7 |
| Colusa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Contra Costa | 156 | 36 | 23.1 | 120 | 30 | 25 |
| Del Norte | \* | \* | \* | 15 | 6 | 40 |
| El Dorado | 80 | 20 | 25 | 47 | 13 | 27.7 |
| Fresno | 304 | 82 | 27 | 270 | 86 | 31.9 |
| Glenn | 12 | 4 | 33 | \* | \* | \* |
| Humboldt | 34 | 6 | 17.6 | 40 | 8 | 20 |
| Imperial | 45 | 9 | 20 | 29 | 7 | 24.1 |
| Inyo | 62 | 23 | 37.1 | 36 | 13 | 36.1 |
| Kern | 235 | 54 | 23 | 187 | 62 | 33.2 |
| Kings | 69 | 15 | 21.7 | 48 | 6 | 12.5 |
| Lake | 14 | 5 | 35.7 | \* | \* | \* |
| Lassen | 16 | 3 | 18.8 | \* | \* | \* |
| Los Angeles | 2,684 | 597 | 22.2 | 1,839 | 506 | 27.5 |
| Madera | 50 | 16 | 32 | 36 | 11 | 30.6 |
| Marin | 21 | 5 | 23.8 | \* | \* | \* |
| Mariposa | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mendocino | 41 | 13 | 31.7 | 24 | 5 | 20.8 |
| Merced | 74 | 19 | 25.7 | 65 | 18 | 27.7 |
| Modoc | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Mono | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Monterey | 47 | 8 | 17 | 41 | 14 | 34.1 |
| Napa | 19 | 7 | 36.8 | 12 | 2 | 16.7 |
| Nevada | 37 | 17 | 36.8 | 18 | 8 | 44.4 |
| Orange | 381 | 86 | 22.6 | 317 | 58 | 18.3 |
| Placer | 67 | 20 | 29.9 | 44 | 9 | 20.5 |
| Plumas | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Riverside | 526 | 103 | 19.6 | 373 | 87 | 23.3 |
| Sacramento | 304 | 79 | 26 | 243 | 63 | 25.9 |
| San Benito | \* | \* | \* | 11 | 2 | 18.2 |
| San Bernardino | 743 | 217 | 29.2 | 579 | 155 | 26.8 |
| San Diego | 377 | 113 | 30 | 240 | 59 | 24.6 |
| San Francisco | 124 | 36 | 29 | 92 | 25 | 27.2 |
| San Joaquin | 189 | 47 | 24.9 | 142 | 47 | 33.1 |
| San Luis Obispo | 44 | 5 | 11.4 | 46 | 4 | 8.7 |
| San Mateo | 51 | 15 | 29.4 | 32 | 5 | 15.6 |
| Santa Barbara | 64 | 11 | 17.2 | 47 | 9 | 19.1 |
| Santa Clara | 173 | 41 | 23.7 | 121 | 26 | 21.5 |
| Santa Cruz | 46 | 17 | 37 | 35 | 9 | 25.7 |
| Shasta | 41 | 8 | 19.5 | 32 | 5 | 15.6 |
| Sierra | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Siskiyou | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Solano | 61 | 23 | 37.7 | 47 | 15 | 31.9 |
| Sonoma | 99 | 37 | 37.4 | 76 | 19 | 25 |
| Stanislaus | 111 | 35 | 31.5 | 98 | 24 | 24.5 |
| Sutter | 15 | 1 | 6.7 | \* | \* | \* |
| Tehama | 23 | 5 | 21.7 | 30 | 4 | 13.3 |
| Trinity | 15 | 3 | 20 | 14 | 5 | 35.7 |
| Tulare | 142 | 38 | 26.8 | 126 | 39 | 31 |
| Tuolumne | 16 | 2 | 12.5 | \* | \* | \* |
| Ventura | 133 | 29 | 21.8 | 86 | 20 | 23.3 |
| Yolo | 35 | 6 | 17.1 | 36 | 3 | 8.3 |
| Yuba | 28 | 8 | 28.6 | 28 | 7 | 25 |

In 2019, the CDE developed and published new reports on College-Going Rates (CGR) for the first time using high school completion[[13]](#endnote-13) data obtained from CALPADS and student-level postsecondary enrollment[[14]](#endnote-14) data obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The CGR is defined as the percentage of California public high school students who completed high school in a given year and subsequently enrolled in a postsecondary institution within 12 to 16 months of completing high school.

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

Table 17 compares the foster youth FAFSA/CADAA completion rate for seniors in 2019 and 2020 as reported by the TAP annual summary.[[15]](#endnote-15)

#### Table : Number and Percentage of Pupils in Foster Care who Successfully Complete a Free Application for Federal Student Aid or California Dream Act Application while in Grade Twelve in 2019 and 2020

| **Year** | **Completed**  | **Total** | **Completion Rate** **(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2019 | 1,289 | 2,861 | 45 |
| 2020 | 1,595 | 3,227 | 49.4 |

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

The CDE partnered with LACOE, which served as the FYSCP TAP during the 2019–20 and 2020–21 FYs. The FYSCP TAP provides support, guidance, and leadership to all county FYSCP coordinators for the implementation of the requirements of AB 854 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015) as well as new legislation that impacts the education of youth in care. In addition, the CDE utilizes various communication channels to provide trainings and presentations about the FYSCP to a variety of stakeholders.

The Budget Acts of 2019 and 2020 appropriated $28,200,000 and $27,337,000 for the FYSCP, respectively. The budget authorized five percent of the funds for the TAP each year. The remaining 95 percent of funds were dispersed to county FYSCPs to support local activities. Table 18 shows the FYSCP funds dispersed to COEs for 2019–20 and 2020–21.

In 2019–20, 57 out of 58 counties received the funds. LACOE received the largest amount of $5,398,701.48, based on 10,289 foster youth enrolled on Census Day as shown in Table 1, while Sierra COE received the smallest amount of $90,282.80, with 2 foster youth enrolled on Census Day, also shown in Table 1. Among those COEs that received the funds, only two counties did not spend their full allocations. Due to continual staff turnover and the pandemic not allowing for regular meetings with county agencies, Plumas and Sierra counties were not able to expend any of their allocations in 2020–21.

In 2020–21, 57 out of 58 counties received funds. LACOE continued taking the largest share of $5,398,701.48, based on 10,200 foster youth enrolled on Census Day, and Sierra COE received the smallest amount of $88,942.83, based on one foster youth enrolled on Census Day, as seen in Table 1. Among those COEs that received the funds, only 10 counties did not spend all of their allocated funds.

#### Table 18: Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program Fund Allocations by County for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **County** | **Allocated 2019–20 FY** | **Expended 2019–20 FY** | **Allocated 2020–21 FY** | **Expended 2020–21 FY** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alameda  | $404,388.88  | $404,388.88  | $400,951.72  | $400,951.72  |
| Alpine | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Amador  | $109,314.77  | $109,314.77  | $98,982.66  | $96,806.88  |
| Butte  | $309,930.24  | $309,930.24  | $288,514.17  | $288,514.00  |
| Calaveras  | $145,153.52  | $145,153.52  | $147,278.25  | $115,196.91  |
| Colusa  | $122,043.27  | $122,043.27  | $123,091.39  | $123,091.39  |
| Contra Costa  | $485,048.17  | $485,048.00  | $453,432.62  | $452,771.49  |
| Del Norte  | $112,939.91  | $112,939.91  | $112,673.33  | $107,871.07  |
| El Dorado  | $274,749.71  | $274,749.71  | $265,492.19  | $265,492.19  |
| Fresno  | $944,572.35  | $944,572.35  | $974,986.89  | $974,953.78  |
| Glenn  | $151,249.45  | $151,249.45  | $148,238.92  | $148,238.92  |
| Humboldt  | $399,730.96  | $399,730.96  | $428,146.68  | $428,146.68  |
| Imperial  | $317,056.48  | $317,056.48  | $325,857.22  | $325,857.22  |
| Inyo  | $141,404.35  | $141,404.35  | $146,161.34  | $126,114.93  |
| Kern | $913,508.16  | $902,854.27  | $934,893.37  | $604,348.67  |
| Kings  | $269,436.03  | $269,436.03  | $278,017.99  | $278,017.99  |
| Lake  | $143,216.92  | $143,216.92  | $139,772.36  | $139,772.36  |
| Lassen | $164,266.54  | $164,196.55  | $167,658.03  | $161,236.18  |
| Los Angeles | $5,398,701.48  | $5,398,701.48  | $5,274,433.17  | $5,224,791.35  |
| Madera  | $232,526.44  | $ 232,526.44  | $244,199.70  | $156,521.57  |
| Marin  | $240,804.57  | $240,804.57  | $239,401.80  | $239,401.80  |
| Mariposa  | $99,798.79  | $99,798.79  | $100,808.08  | $100,808.08  |
| Mendocino | $229,848.11  | $229,848.11  | $250,966.92  | $250,966.92  |
| Merced  | $405,171.13  | $403,913.77  | $412,156.41  | $301,948.11  |
| Modoc | $111,003.31  | $111,003.31  | $108,361.93  | $108,361.93  |
| Mono  | $94,978.78  | $94,978.78  | $95,457.89  | $87,530.71  |
| Monterey  | $307,497.51  | $307,497.51  | $308,611.64  | $308,611.64  |
| Napa  | $141,239.80  | $141,239.80  | $151,967.88  | $151,967.88  |
| Nevada  | $168,633.40  | $168,633.40  | $167,988.30  | $167,988.30  |
| Orange  | $999,486.05  | $999,486.05  | $1,054,218.73  | $1,054,218.73  |
| Placer  | $275,367.40  | $274,953.17  | $262,423.78  | $262,240.21  |
| Plumas  | $96,173.65  | $89,235.61  | $96,700.88  | $0 |
| Riverside  | $1,350,919.26  | $1,350,919.00  | $1,385,941.36  | $1,294,584.83  |
| Sacramento  | $732,094.14  | $732,094.14  | $699,234.00  | $644,421.22  |
| San Benito | $171,228.22  | $171,228.22  | $171,891.30  | $6,067.10  |
| San Bernardino  | $1,939,837.00  | $1,939,837.00  | $1,952,170.52  | $1,952,170.52  |
| San Diego  | $888,668.85  | $886,221.09  | $876,762.15  | $867,907.22  |
| San Francisco  | $236,194.56  | $234,663.13  | $228,587.68  | $227,793.38  |
| San Joaquin  | $603,113.19  | $603,113.19  | $613,109.15  | $613,109.15  |
| San Luis Obispo  | $247,191.55  | $247,191.55  | $246,151.20  | $246,151.20  |
| San Mateo  | $308,692.38  | $308,692.38  | $292,513.11  | $271,883.49  |
| Santa Barbara  | $305,479.86  | $280,438.71  | $331,837.81  | $315,808.72  |
| Santa Clara  | $537,486.17  | $537,226.06  | $518,961.46  | $500,890.17  |
| Santa Cruz  | $211,557.87  | $211,557.87  | $207,943.40  | $183,418.42  |
| Shasta  | $360,679.69  | $357,679.30  | $368,520.31  | $365,108.00  |
| Sierra  | $90,282.80  | $90,282.80  | $88,942.83  | $0 |
| Siskiyou  | $269,144.99  | $242,230.49  | $275,423.75  | $179,365.51  |
| Solano  | $253,783.60  | $253,783.60  | $249,754.08  | $245,851.86  |
| Sonoma  | $507,700.36  | $357,519.37  | $510,969.07  | $325,478.51  |
| Stanislaus  | $479,856.07  | $479,856.07  | $466,636.79  | $466,636.79  |
| Sutter  | $210,816.14  | $210,816.14  | $204,875.00  | $204,875.00  |
| Tehama  | $222,473.81  | $222,473.81  | $225,663.16  | $225,663.16  |
| Trinity  | $153,679.71  | $153,679.71  | $155,210.34  | $100,837.05  |
| Tulare | $725,702.24  | $725,702.24  | $724,009.07  | $629,593.89  |
| Tuolumne  | $168,509.37  | $168,509.37  | $178,280.28  | $178,280.28  |
| Ventura  | $390,506.03  | $390,506.03  | $403,359.58  | $377,014.46  |
| Yolo  | $222,352.24  | $222,352.24  | $207,643.28  | $207,643.28  |
| Yuba | $172,959.77  | $172,959.77  | $183,912.78  | $183,908.98  |
| **Statewide Total** | $25,970,150.00 | $ 25,741,439.73  | $25,970,149.70 | $24,267,201.80 |

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

**Foster Youth Enrollment**

The enrollment of foster youth by grade is relatively evenly distributed in both school years. In 2020–21, the lowest percent of the total statewide enrollment of foster youth was approximately 6.4 percent in grade six, with 2,787 youth enrolled. In 2020–21, the highest percent of the total statewide enrollment of foster youth was approximately 8.9 percent in kindergarten, with 3,882 youth enrolled.

As shown, three of the 58 counties in California had fewer than 11 foster youth attend school in their county in the 2020–21 school year: Alpine, Mono, and Sierra counties. Los Angeles County had the highest number of foster youth enrolled in both the 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years, representing 33 percent and 32 percent of all foster youth enrolled in the state, respectively. From the 2019–20 to 2020–21 school years, the total number of foster youth enrolled declined by 1,541.

**Suspension and Expulsion**

Foster youth suspension and expulsion numbers and rates have been provided; however, due to COVID-19, the numbers do not reflect a complete academic year. The CDE recommends caution when comparing data across academic years.

**Juvenile Detention Rates**

The statewide juvenile detention rate for foster youth decreased by 2.4 percentage points from 2019–20 to 2020–21, from 7.8 percent down to 5.4 percent, representing more than 1,100 fewer foster youth receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility. When youth are placed in a juvenile detention facility, they are required to change schools; the decrease in the juvenile detention rate and the decrease in the number of foster youth who were placed in a juvenile detention facility illustrates significant and continued success for the foster youth population and speaks to the coordinated efforts to decrease school changes for foster youth.

**Stability Rates**

There was an increase of six percentage points in foster youth stability rates between 2019–20 and 2020–21 (Table 11) compared to the 0.2 percentage point increase for non-foster students over the same time period. Thus, while the stability rate for students in foster care in 2020-2021 was more than 14 percentage points lower than the stability rate for non-foster care students, the narrowing of the gap suggests that FYSCP efforts targeted toward increasing foster youth school stability may be having an impact. However, while this measure appears to be showing improvement, there is more work to do in evaluating the underlying mechanisms influencing the shift, especially given the impacts of school closures and distance learning.

**High School Completion and Graduation Rates**

The ACGR for both foster youth and non-foster youth has decreased from 2020 to 2021 (Table 13). However, when comparing 2019 to 2021, the rates for both foster youth and non-foster youth have increased. What is important to note is that the ACGR for foster youth is increasing at a higher rate than for non-foster youth. The two-year change for foster youth was 2.6 percent and only 0.5 percent for non-foster youth.

Twenty-two counties saw an increase in dropout rates (Table 16), and 29 counties saw a decrease. Mendocino, Santa Cruz, and Sonoma counties all saw dropout rates for foster youth decrease by 10 percent or more. Napa County’s dropout rate decreased by more than 20 percent.

**FAFSA/CADAA Completion Rate**

The reported completion rate has increased from 45 percent to 49.4 percent between the one-year span of 2019 and 2020 (Table 17). It is important to note that in 2019–20, the self-reported data provided to the CDE by the FYSCPs was optional. Thirty-seven of the 57 counties provided data, and in those 37 counties, 45 percent was the reported completion rate. In 2020, all 57 counties reported data, and there was a 49.4 percent completion rate.

### Part IV—Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program Report

#### Development and Implementation of New Local Educational Agency and County Agency Policies, Practices, and Programs Aimed at Improving the Educational Outcomes of Pupils in Foster Care

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

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

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

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

Table 19 lists the number of county COEs with various stakeholders represented on the EACs in 2019 as reported by the TAP annual summary for 2019–20.[[16]](#endnote-16) As shown in Table 19, most counties included key stakeholders on their EACs, such as child welfare agency, community-based organizations, community college, court-appointed special advocate (CASA), court staff (judge or attorney), current and/or former foster youth, mental health representatives, mental health professionals, probation officers, district personnel, and special education/Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA). There were increases in tribal representative participation in the EAC reported during the 2020–21 school year, likely due to the passage of AB 1962 (Chapter 748, Statutes of 2018), which added youth under the jurisdiction of a tribal court to the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) definition of foster youth.

The data show that there were significant increases (indicated by an asterisk [\*] in Table 19) from 2019–20 to 2020–21 in the following EAC stakeholder group involvement: COE Other Departments/Administrative staff, Foster Family Agencies, and Independent Living Programs. During the 2019–20 school year, these three stakeholder groups were not listed as potential groups for FYSCPs to select when completing their reporting on this question; however, some county FYSCPs included them in the “write-in” section. Subsequently, these stakeholder groups were added in the 2020–21 school year as options to select when responding to this question, and the increase may have been due to this change.

#### Table 19: Number of County Offices of Education Having Various Stakeholders Represented on Executive Advisory Councils

| **Stakeholders** | **2019–20 Number of COEs Having Representors on EACs** | **2020–21 Number of COEs Having Representors on EACs** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Biological Parents | 4 | 5 |
| Child Welfare Agency Representative | 56 | 57 |
| COE Other Departments/Admin\* | 5 | 40 |
| Community-Based Organizations | 48 | 50 |
| Community College | 45 | 43 |
| CASA | 45 | 44 |
| Court Staff (Judge or Attorney) | 26 | 26 |
| Current and/or Former Foster Youth | 35 | 33 |
| Early Childhood | 22 | 24 |
| Foster Family Agency\* | 4 | 33 |
| Foster Parent | 28 | 23 |
| FYSCP Coordinator | 57 | 55 |
| Independent Living Program\* | 5 | 41 |
| Mental Health | 42 | 41 |
| Probation | 54 | 51 |
| Regional Center | 7 | 9 |
| School District | 57 | 55 |
| Short Term Residential Treatment Facility | 18 | 17 |
| Special Education/SELPA | 39 | 37 |
| Tribal Representative | 3 | 10 |
| University Representative | 17 | 20 |
| Other Representatives | 18 | 11 |

In order to coordinate services across county agencies, county FYSCPs developed Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with county child welfare agencies for the purpose of drawing down Title IV-E federal dollars for eligible case management activities that support the coordination of services for foster youth. The FYSCPs also developed policies and procedures for information sharing among county agencies concerning foster youth. This shared information is used by education, child welfare, and probation agencies to track the progress of foster youth in both care and education and, when needed, quickly transfer students between districts. The county-administered FYSCPs have also developed agreements to address transportation to a child’s school of origin to promote school stability.[[17]](#endnote-17) Table 20 shows the number of counties having formal agreements, MOUs, or protocols established among county agencies specifically designed to support the FYSCP during 2019–20 and 2020–21 school years, also reported by the TAP annual summary for 2020–21.[[18]](#endnote-18)

#### Table 20: Number and Percent of Formal Agreements among County Agencies for 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **MOUs/Agreements** | **2019–20(N)** | **2019–20(%)** | **2020–21(N)** | **2020–21(%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Information sharing Agreements | 46 | 81 | 44 | 77 |
| Countywide ESSA Transportation Requirement Agreements | 39 | 68 | 36 | 63 |
| Title IV-E Draw Down Agreements | 38 | 67 | 37 | 65 |
| Post-Secondary | 10 | 18 | 10 | 18 |
| Executive Advisory Council | 26 | 46 | 24 | 42 |
| Co-location | 31 | 54 | 31 | 54 |
| Other Agreements[[19]](#endnote-19) | 17 | 30 | 0 | 0 |

In addition to coordinating resources to serve foster youth, COEs support LEAs to build the capacity of serving foster youth in their schools. COE-administered FYSCPs provided trainings and LCAP consultations to LEAs with LCAP compliance to support foster youth. Table 21 shows the percentages of districts and charter schools receiving training and LCAP consultations by county FYSCPs, as reported by the TAP annual summary for 2019–20.[[20]](#endnote-20) As shown in Table 21, 482 LEAs received support around LCAP consultation in 2019–20, and 417 LEAs did in 2020–21. These activities provided support for LEAs to ensure that foster youth are included in LCAP services and supports.

#### Table 21: Number of LEAs Supported by County Foster Youth Services Coordinating Programs in Local Control and Accountability Plan Consultation in 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **Year** | **Number of LEAs Receiving Support**  |
| --- | --- |
| 2019–20  | 482 |
| 2020–21  | 417 |

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

* Prioritized foster youth for access to tutoring before other students.
* Conducted Foster Youth Interviews to understand their needs.
* Provided transportation support for delivering meals, delivering homework, conducting wellness checks, and technology support.
* Provided social-emotional support through weekly check-ins or mentoring.
* Identified an improved collaboration with school districts, child welfare, probation, courts, and community-based organizations during the pandemic.
* Created individualized learning plans for each foster youth to ensure foster youth are receiving targeted intervention.

Table 22 displays the number of LEAs that attended FYSCP trainings or meetings in 2019–20 and 2020–21. The number of LEAs attending FYSCP trainings or meetings increased from 834 in 2019–20 to 986 in 2020–21. These activities provided support for LEAs to establish policies and procedures to support all mandates from both state and federal governments regarding foster youth education.

#### Table : Number of Local Educational Agencies that Attended Foster Youth Services Coordinating Program Trainings or Meetings in 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **Year**  | **Number of LEAs Attending FYSCP Trainings or Meetings**  |
| --- | --- |
| 2019–20 | 834 |
| 2020–21 | 986 |

In addition to providing LCAP training and consultants, county FYSCPs support local LEAs to provide services to foster youth in their schools through ongoing training and workshops. Table 23 shows the number of trainings provided to district staff and the number of trainees since the enactment of AB 854 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015), which established FYSCP. As Table 23 shows, the number of trainings provided to school districts by county FYSCPs in 2019–20 and 2020–21 was 2,281 with a total of 54,882 trainees.

#### Table : Number of Trainings Provided to School Districts by County Foster Youth Services Coordinating Programs in 2019–20 and 2020–21

| **Number of Trainings** | **Number of Trainees** |
| --- | --- |
| 2,281 | 54,882 |

Table 24 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 : Collaborative Agencies and Services Provided

| **Collaborative Agencies** | **Services Provided** |
| --- | --- |
| TAP | Support, guidance, and leadership to all county FYSCP coordinators for the implementation of the requirements of AB 854 (Chapter 781, Statutes of 2015); technical assistance, sharing of best practices, data collection procedures, and operational databases |
| County Courts and Local Blue-Ribbon Commissions | Judicial guidance and leadership regarding the case management challenges associated with supporting the health and well-being of youth in care, which include education services |
| County Departments of Mental Health | Counseling, psychological evaluations, medication consultation, and behavior management techniques |
| County Departments of Social Services and Probation | Case management, counseling, monitoring, and assistance in completing health and education records |
| County Departments of Employment and Human Services | Employment training and assistance |
| County Public Health Departments | Health and education records, provision of public health services at schools, workshops for foster youth and group home staff, and assistance for eyeglasses |
| County Probation Departments | Monitoring and reinforcement of appropriate behavior, meetings with family and school personnel, and information regarding placement changes for foster youth |
| LEAs | Educational assessment to determine appropriate special education services and school placement, assistance through the School Attendance Review Board, tutoring services, and school attendance monitoring and truancy intervention |
| Colleges and Universities | Tutoring and mentoring services, counseling, financial aid information, and outside evaluations of LCFF and LCAP impact on foster youth group |
| Family Resource Centers and other Community-Based Organizations | Case management, training for group home providers, employment services (work experience, job skills, career assessments, and Regional Occupation Program credits), and funding for school clothes |
| Tribal Organizations | Leisure and recreational activities, family therapy, development of social skills, problem-solving, team building, and cultural awareness |
| Independent Living Skills Programs | Career development services, life skills classes, transition and emancipation services, and vocational education |
| Churches and Private-Sector Organizations | Funding for extracurricular activities, toys, gift certificates for basic needs, and mentoring |
| Caregivers | Address the needs of foster youth in their care |

### Part IV—Conclusion

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

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

The data show that the FYSCP helped to:

1. Increase the school stability rate. There was an increase of six percentage points in foster youth stability rates between the 2019–20 and 2020–21 FYs. This large increase in the rate is a significant step toward closing the opportunity gap between foster and non-foster youth.
2. Decrease the statewide juvenile detention rate for foster youth by 2.4 percentage points from 2019–20 to 2020–21, representing more than 1,100 fewer foster youth receiving instruction in a juvenile detention facility. This illustrates significant and continued success for the foster youth population and speaks to the coordinated efforts to decrease school changes for foster youth.
3. Increase the high school graduation rate. The two-year increase in the foster youth graduation rate of 2.6 percentage points is much higher than the non-foster youth 0.5 percent increase from 2018 to 2020. This larger increase in graduation rate is a significant step toward closing the opportunity gap between foster youth and non-foster youth.
4. Increase foster youth FAFSA/CADAA completion rates from 2019–20 to 2020–21 by 4.4 percentage points.
5. Coordinate services and information with LEAs and other partners to obtain necessary records to determine appropriate school placements and coordinate instruction.
6. Increase collaboration and build capacity among partner agencies and systems in order to increase access to meaningful educational support for foster youth.
7. Provide guidance and support to LEAs on the development of integrated policy and practice for LCAP to engage in effective program planning for foster youth under LCFF.
8. Provide direct service and referrals for educational support services, vocational training, and training for independent living.
9. Develop formal agreements to formalize collaboration among county agencies to optimize resources and eliminate redundant services.

## Recommendations

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

First, the CDE recommends that *EC* Section 42921(e)(2)(A) be amended to remove the requirement that FYSCPs obtain annual direct service waivers from LEAs in order to provide tutoring, mentoring, and counseling to foster youth. LEAs may be in need of additional FYSCP support in providing direct services to the foster youth they serve; however, they may be reluctant to sign a waiver stating they are unable to provide those services themselves. Removing the annual direct service waiver requirement will allow FYSCPs to provide more expansive services to foster youth, which will further the mission of improving educational outcomes.

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

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