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My Purpose Today

• Share selected findings of the CalYOUTH Study
  – Wave 2 Youth Survey
  – Second Child Welfare Worker Survey

• Engage in discussion about the implications of findings for practice and policy

• Let you know about CalYOUTH in the Loop
CalYOUTH Study Funders and Partners

- **Support** the research
- **Provide** guidance and feedback
- **Host** CalYOUTH Study section with results on website (co-invest.org—Resources)
- **Promote** via presentations and media outreach

- California Child Welfare Co-Investment Partnership
- California Department of Social Services
- County Welfare Directors Association of California
- The Judicial Council of California
- Casey Family Programs
- Conrad N. Hilton Foundation
- Stuart Foundation
- Walter S. Johnson Foundation
- Zellerbach Family Foundation

*Annie E. Casey and William T Grant Foundations (Funders, not in Co-invest Partnership)*
Fostering Futures: A Forum on the CalYOUTH Study Findings

CalYOUTH study Brief with Key Findings from the Second Wave of Youth Surveys at age 19

Chapin Hall and the California Child Welfare Co-Investment Partnership (2016)

Fostering Futures Panels and Panel Videos

Fostering Futures Study Overview
CalYOUTH in the Loop

• A Fund for Shared Insights Project
• “Closing the loop” between this research study and foster youth
• Invites youth to share their thoughts and opinions on extended foster care to inform policy and practice

Share with current or former transition-age foster youth!

LEARN MORE AT: calyouthintheloop.org

IF YOU WANT TO HELP: contact lgranillo@iecommm.org
Speak Up on issues that matter to you

Participate in our survey and learn about the results of the CalYOUTH Study. Researchers asked 19-year-olds how foster care has affected their transition to adulthood in areas like health, relationships, education and employment. Click on the options below to see the results and provide your own feedback to improve extended foster care in California!
Youth Perspective Recruiter

- Reach out to youth ages 18-24, and collect responses to a short survey
- Advocate the importance of including youth voice and perspectives.
- Connect with the CalYOUTH in the Loop coordinator on a weekly basis to discuss any challenges or successes in collecting surveys.

Compensation
Youth would be paid an initial stipend of $100.00 for participation in a 30 minute phone orientation and making a commitment to collecting at least 5 surveys.

After that, you would receive $5.00 for each complete survey that you collect.

Note: survey respondents will also be eligible for a monthly raffle worth $100.
Overview of the CalYOUTH Study

Evaluation of the impact of California Fostering Connections to Success Act (AB 12) on outcomes for foster youth

CalYOUTH Study includes:

- Longitudinal study of young people in CA foster care making the transition to adulthood
- Periodic surveys of caseworkers serving young people in CA foster care
- Analysis of government program administrative data
Purpose of the Longitudinal Youth Study

Obtain information about a broad range of life experiences & young adult outcomes
- Foster care placement
- Service utilization & preparation
- Perceptions of extended care
- Education and employment
- Health and development
- Social support
- Delinquency
- Pregnancy and children
Youth Surveys: Data Collection and Response Rate

• **Wave 1 Survey Period (age 17)**
  – April 2013 to October 2013
  – 51 counties included in final sample
  – Youth eligible for study \( n = 763 \)
  – Completed interviews \( n = 727 \)  (response rate = 95.3%)

• **Wave 2 Survey Period (age 19)**
  – March 2015 to December 2015
  – Youth eligible for study \( n = 724 \)
  – Completed interviews \( n = 611 \)  (response rate = 84.1%)
Purpose of Child Welfare Worker Study

Obtain perceptions of service delivery context
- County level availability of and need for services
- Coordination of services with other service systems
- Attitudes of caseworker, county court personnel, and youth toward extended care
Caseworker Surveys: Data Collection and Response Rate

- **First Caseworker Survey**
  - Sample of caseworkers across the state serving older foster care youth

- **Second Caseworker Survey**
  - Caseworkers serving young people in the longitudinal Youth Survey who were still in care as of June 1, 2015
  - Survey Period: July 2015 to October 2015
  - **Part A**: questions about service context in their county
    - 295/306 of eligible caseworkers completed surveys (96.4%)
  - **Part B**: questions about specific youth on their caseload
    - 493/516 surveys completed about youth on their caseloads (95.5%)
## Demographic Characteristics (n=611)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years old</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed race</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language spoken at home</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Foster Care Status

Care Status at Wave 2 (n=611)
- In care (never left since Wave 1): 64%
- In care (exited and reentered after Wave 1): 23%
- Not in care: 13%

Age at Discharge (n=134)
- 17 or younger: 51%
- 18: 27%
- 19: 22%

In care (never left since Wave 1)
In care (exited and reentered after Wave 1)
Not in care
How Youth Left Care \((n=134)\)

- Exited to legal permanency: 34%
- Left care by own request: 7%
- Runaway, and discharged while away: 9%
- Incarceration in jail or prison, and discharged from there: 10%
- No longer meeting the requirements to stay in care after age 18: 35%
- Other: 5%
Experience with Foster Care Professionals

- About two-thirds of youth met with social worker at least once a month.
- On average, youth had 14 phone calls with social worker per year.
- On average, youth had 2 face-to-face visits or phone calls with attorney per year.
- About 58% ever attended court proceedings about extended foster care

Satisfaction with information received from attorney (n=477)

- 46% Very satisfied
- 29% Somewhat satisfied
- 8% A little satisfied
- 8% Not at all satisfied
- 9% no open court case
How is it Going at Home? Housing, Homelessness, and Housing Supports
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## Where Are Youth Living?

**Youth In-Care** ($n = 477$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SILP</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THP+FC</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of a relative</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster home with an unrelated foster parent</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of a nonrelated family member</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, treatment or rehab facility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group care</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Where Are Youth Living?

### Youth Out-of-Care ($n = 134$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In home of another relative(s)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own place (apartment, house, etc.)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home of birth parent(s)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home of spouse/partner</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home of friend(s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own room in a motel, hotel or SRO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail or other correctional facility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home of former foster parent(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group home or treatment center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, treatment or rehab facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Are Youth in SILP’s, THP-Plus and THP+FC Faring Financially?

- Most youth reported paying less than $600 a month in rent however, differences between youth in THP+FC and SILP were present.
How Satisfied Are Youth In Their Living Situations?

- Nearly nine-in-ten youth indicated that they felt safe in their neighborhood.
How Many Youth Have Experienced Homelessness?

Homelessness since last interview (In-Care):
- Never Homeless: 86%
- Ever Homeless: 14%

Homelessness since last interview (Out-of-Care):
- Never Homeless: 66%
- Ever Homeless: 34%
Summary

• Youth in-care and out-of-care are living in different settings
  – The majority of youth in-care are living in SILPS or THP-Plus FC
  – The majority of youth out-of-care are living in the home of a birth parent, in the home of another relative, or in their own place

• The vast majority of youth are living with others

• Youth were more likely to feel “not prepared” in the area of housing than in any other area (not shown)

• Youth out-of-care are more likely than youth in-care to experience an episode of homelessness or couch-surfing
Connected or Not? Youth’s Connections to Education and Employment
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Nearly three-quarters of youth reported being enrolled and/or employed (72%)
Education Status and Enrollment

- 71% of youth had a high school diploma or equivalency certificate
- 54% of youth were currently enrolled
- Among those enrolled, 60% were in college

Type of School Enrolled in (n=317)

- High school: 47%
- GED/Continuation/Adult basic ed.: 13%
- Vocational School: 11%
- 2yr college: 9%
- 4yr college: 20%
Care Status Differences in Educational Attainment

- HS diploma, GED, or equiv.**
  - In care at W2 (n=477): 74%
  - Not in care at W2 (n=134): 59%

- Vocational certificate*
  - In care at W2 (n=477): 17%
  - Not in care at W2 (n=134): 7%

* p<.05   **p<.01
Care Status Differences in Current Enrollment

Not in care at W2 (n=134)
- Not enrolled: 71%
- High school: 13%
- GED/continuation/adult ed/other: 5%
- Vocational School: 4%
- 2yr/4yr college: 7%

In care at W2 (n=477)
- Not enrolled: 40%
- High school: 37%
- GED/continuation/adult ed/other: 6%
- Vocational School: 4%
- 2yr/4yr college: 13%

Differences in enrollment status significant at p<.001
Funding for Education

- Among youth currently enrolled in school, 62% use scholarship, grant, stipend, student loan, voucher, or other type of aid to pay for educational expenses.

- Among youth with a high school credential, 29% ever received an education and training voucher (ETV)
  - 37% reported not knowing what an ETV is.
## College Finances and Involvement ($n=268$)$^1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paying for College (can choose more than one)</strong></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETV grant</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other scholarships, fellowships, or grants</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student loans</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own earnings from employment or savings</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money from a relative, friend, other people</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money from another source</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Involvement in campus support for F.Y.</strong></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Involvement in other college activities</strong></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO/EOP student support services</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with professors outside class</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Includes both youth who were enrolled in college at W2, and youth who were enrolled since W1.
Care Status Differences in Funding for Education

Among youth currently enrolled, using scholarships or other financial aid to pay for education***

- In care at W2: 66%
- Not in care at W2: 33%

Among youth with HS credential, ever received an ETV*

- In care at W2: 32%
- Not in care at W2: 16%

* p<.05    ***p<.001
# Care Status Differences in College Finances and Involvement ($n=268$)$^1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paying for College (can choose more than one)</th>
<th>Not in Care at W2 (n=39)</th>
<th>In Care at W2 (n=223)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money from a relative, friend, other people</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money from another source</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in campus support for F.Y.</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in study groups</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Includes both youth who were enrolled in college at W2, and youth who were enrolled since W1.
## College Preparation Assistance and Educational Aspirations (n=611)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of help with college planning</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No help</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a little help</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some help, but not enough</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough help</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough help</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in going to college</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### If you could go as far as you wanted in school, how far would you go?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrete Outcome</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma, GED, or less</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn a two-year degree</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn a four-year degree</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn more than a four-year degree</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Care Status Differences in College Preparation Assistance ($n=611$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of help with college planning</th>
<th>Not in Care at W2 ($n=134$)</th>
<th>In Care at W2 ($n=477$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No help</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a little help</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some help, but not enough</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough help</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than enough help</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested in going to college</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences in assistance with college preparation significant at $p<.001$
Employment

- 76% of youth reported ever having a job
- 33% were currently employed
- Among youth not in school, 40% were currently employed
- Average hourly wage: $10.21
- Among all unemployed youth, most want a job (89%)
Assets

- About 60% of youth ($n=373$) reported that they had a checking, savings, or a money market account.
- Of those with an account, average balance in all accounts is $1,526 (median= $600)
- 30% of youth said they own a vehicle
Economic Hardship and Food Insecurity in Past 12 Months

- **Economic Hardship**
  - All Youth: 52%
  - Out-of-Care Youth: 61%
  - In-Care Youth: 49%

- **Food Insecurity**
  - All Youth: 29%
  - Out-of-Care Youth: 37%
  - In-Care Youth: 27%
## Receipt of Public Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>All Youth</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently receiving food stamps/CalFresh</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently receiving WIC (<em>n =98</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently receiving any public housing assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently receiving TANF/CalWorks</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes only mothers.*
Summary

- Almost three-quarters of youth are enrolled in school or are currently working.

- Some youth experienced economic hardships or food insecurity.

- Receipt of need-based public benefits was generally low, although many mothers were receiving WIC benefits.

- Out-of-care youth were less likely than in-care youth to have finished a secondary credential and to be enrolled in school, but more likely to experience economic hardship/food insecurity.
It’s More than Just Survival: Youth’s Health and Well-Being
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Youth’s Health and Well-Being

- Social Support
- Crime & Criminal Justice
- Health
Social Support
Overall Relationships

Amount & Size of Social Support (%)
\( (n=611) \)

- **Emotional:**
  - Mean: 4.6 people
  - Median: 3 people
- **Tangible:**
  - Mean: 3.0 people
  - Median: 2 people
- **Advice/Guidance:**
  - Mean: 3.3 people
  - Median: 2 people

- **Enough people:** 58%
- **Too few people:** 53%
- **No one to count on:** 65%
Individuals Nominated as Social Supports

**Number of Nominated Support (%)**

- None: 36%
- 1: 27%
- 2: 28%
- 3 individuals: 26%

**Relationship to Nominated Support (%)**

- Family: 39%
- Romantic Partner/Friends: 38%
- Professionals: 13%
- Substitute Caregiver: 7%
- Other: 3%

About 77%: Family + Peer groups
Summary: Social Support

- Majority of youth had someone they could turn to, and youth were in regular contact with their supports.

- **Families** and **peers** consisted of most supports. Youth still in care were more likely to nominate caseworkers, and youth who left care were more likely to nominate grandparents.

- Strain was generally **uncommon** in relationships with individuals youth identified as supports (not shown).
Criminal Behavior

Criminal Behavior (%) (since last interview)  (n= 607)

- Damaged property: 16%
- Sold marijuana/other drugs: 11%
- Stole something worth <$50: 10%
- Took part in a fight: 10%
- Belonged to a named gang: 10%
- Stole something worth > $50: 10%
- Hurt someone in a fight: 10%
- Became injured in a fight: 10%
- Bought, sold or held stolen property: 10%
- Entered a house to steal something: 10%
- Used a weapon to get something: 10%
- Used a weapon in a fight: 10%
- Own a handgun: 10%
- Used someone else's credit card: 10%
Criminal Justice Involvement (%)

- Arrested: 25% (25% Not in Care, 12% In Care)
- Convicted of a crime: 20% (20% Not in Care, 5% In Care)
- Incarcerated: 23% (23% Not in Care, 10% In Care)

(n = 607)
# Victimization & Perpetration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the past 12 months</th>
<th>Not In Care (%)</th>
<th>In Care (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victimization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw someone being shot or stabbed</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone pulled a gun on respondent *</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone pulled a knife on respondent</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone beat youth and stole something from them *</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perpetration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent pulled a knife/gun on someone</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent shot or stabbed someone *</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference between youth in care and youth not in care
• Most youth reported “never” engaging in criminal behaviors.

• Criminal justice system involvement was lower for youth still in care than those who left care.

• Overall victimization and perpetration of violence was rare. Youth in care were less likely than those who left care to report some experiences (someone pulled a gun on youth, someone beat youth and stole something from them, youth shot or stabbed someone).
Health
Health Status

General Health Rating

- Excellent
- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

General health rating - CalYOUTH

General health rating - Add Health
• **Hospitalized for any reason since last interview:** 31%

1 Mental health hospitalization was “since last interview”
Summary: Health

- The majority of youth rated their health as being “good,” “very good,” or “excellent.”

- About 1/3 screened positive for a mental health or substance use disorder.

- Most youth reported having a medical exam within the past year, and about one-quarter reported using behavioral health services.
Pregnancy, Parenting, and Romantic Relationships
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Pregnancy History (Females)

Ever been pregnant

- 51% Yes
- 49% No

Ever given birth

- 74% Yes
- 26% No

Since the last interview...
- 33% of females had become pregnant
- 21% of females gave birth

Among females who got pregnant since last interview...
- 33% wanted to get pregnant
- 37% did not want to get pregnant
- 24% were not seen by a doctor or nurse during their first trimester
History of Impregnating Females (Males)

- **Ever gotten a female pregnant**
  - Yes: 21%
  - No: 79%

- **Ever fathered a child**
  - Yes: 8%
  - No: 92%

- Since the last interview…
  - 13% of males had gotten a female pregnant
  - 7% of males fathered a child that was born

- Among males who impregnated females since last interview…
  - 29% did want to father a child
  - 37% did not want to father a child
## Children and Parenting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents (n =121)</th>
<th>Males (n=22; 9.5%)</th>
<th>Females (n=99; 27.2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of living children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent lives with all children ***</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one child is a dependent of the court</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Romantic Relationships

Currently in a romantic relationship
- Yes: 51%
- No: 49%

Relationship with current partner
- Steady basis: 89%
- Not on a steady basis: 11%

Lives with partner
- Yes: 42%
- No: 58%
Relationship Quality

• About 9 in 10 youth in a romantic relationship “agree” or “strongly agree” that...
  – Their partner listens
  – Their partner expresses love and affection
  – Their partner is encouraging
  – They trust their partner to be faithful
  – They are satisfied with their sex life

• Most youth did not report experiencing criticism or manipulation in their relationship
Summary

• Females were more likely to have gotten pregnant than males were to have gotten a partner pregnant

• Females were more likely than males to be a parent, and if they were a parent, to be living with their children

• Few children were involved with the child welfare system

• Over half of youth were in romantic relationships, and most of these relationships had a high level of commitment and satisfaction
Youths’ Preparedness for Adulthood: Connecting Child Welfare Services for Young Adults to Other Systems
Youth’s Perception of Preparedness to Achieve Goals

[Bar chart showing the percentage of youth preparedness in various areas such as Sexual health, Parenting, Substance abuse, Family planning, Relationship skills, Independent living skills, Physical health, Mental/Behavioral health, Employment, Education, Financial literacy.]

- Not prepared
- Somewhat prepared
- Prepared
- Very prepared
Youth’s Satisfaction with Life Skills Preparation, Support Services, or Training

Average Satisfaction

1=Very dissatisfied   2=Dissatisfied   3=Satisfied   4=Very Satisfied
Housing Options

Caseworkers’ Perceptions of Availability of Housing Options
\( (N = 292) \)

- None: 2%
- Few: 43%
- Some: 39%
- A wide range: 17%

Caseworkers’ Perceptions of Appropriateness of Housing Options
\( (N = 292) \)

- Very Approp.: 23%
- Somewhat approx.: 48%
- Slightly approp.: 24%
- Mostly not Approp.: 5%
Caseworkers’ Satisfaction with Collaboration with Other Systems

1 Completely dissatisfied
2
3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4
5 Completely satisfied
Supportiveness of Court Personnel

- **County Judges** (n = 290):
  - Very unsupportive: 6%
  - Unsupportive: 9%
  - Indifferent: 39%
  - Supportive: 42%
  - Very supportive: 5%

- **Youth's Attorney** (n = 289):
  - Very unsupportive: 7%
  - Unsupportive: 11%
  - Indifferent: 32%
  - Supportive: 47%
  - Very supportive: 4%

- **County Counsel** (n = 287):
  - Very unsupportive: 5%
  - Unsupportive: 16%
  - Indifferent: 41%
  - Supportive: 36%
  - Very supportive: 2%

- **CASA** (n = 265):
  - Very unsupportive: 5%
  - Unsupportive: 10%
  - Indifferent: 35%
  - Supportive: 49%
  - Very supportive: 1%
Summary

• Youths’ perceptions of preparedness differs from caseworkers’ perceptions

• Youth are least prepared in education and employment, while these two areas are the service types that are the most widely provided

• Youth reported being the least satisfied with the preparation they received in the areas of education, housing, and financial literacy

• Caseworkers are mostly dissatisfied with collaboration with other systems around substance abuse, mental health, and employment
Next Steps

• Analysis of the relationship between extended care and the young adults’ outcomes using youth and worker survey data
  – Through what mechanisms (e.g., living arrangements; services; relationships with adults) does extended care influence outcomes?

• Analysis of other risk and protective factors associated with the young adults’ outcomes using youth and worker survey data

• Analysis of selective outcomes (employment, postsecondary education, need-based government assistance) and predictors of outcomes using administrative data on the population of transition-age youth in care pre- and post-AB12