



FOSTER YOUTH DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Houston, Texas Project Profile¹

July 2008

Submitted to:

Casey Family Programs
1300 Dexter Avenue North, Floor 3
Seattle, WA 98109-3542

Submitted by:

The Institute for Educational Leadership
4455 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 310
Washington, DC 20008

¹ Please see the main report <http://www.casey.org/doleval> or <http://www.iel.org/programs/casey.html> for more information.

Houston, Texas Project Profile

State Grantee:

Texas Workforce Commission (TWC)

Local Awardee and Project Name:

Harris County Protective Services for Youth and Adults; Houston Alumni and Youth Center

Foster Youth Demonstration Project

Houston, TX

Background

On October 1, 2004, the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) received notification that it would be awarded \$400,000 in funds from the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) for the Foster Youth Demonstration Project. On April 1, 2005, TWC selected Harris County Protective Services for Children and Adults (HCPSCA), encompassing the city of Houston, as the local site provider for this demonstration project. HCPSCA is the current provider of state-supported Preparation for Adult Living (PAL) services for a 13-county region. PAL is the primary support service program for young people transitioning out of the state foster care and group home system. The first-year grant period for Harris County was from April 15, 2005 to June 30, 2006. On June 15, 2006, DOL approved a second year of funding of \$400,000 for the grant and extended the grant period to July 31, 2007. For the first year, the state provided its matching funds from a combination of TANF and Chafee funds. The second year match came solely from TANF funds administered by TWC.

The site is located at the Houston Alumni and Youth Center (HAY) on 2103 North Main St. in Houston, Texas. The location is close to downtown Houston and is accessible by public transportation. The program serves the entire Houston area (Harris County) and in 2008 will begin providing services in five additional counties surrounding Harris County. These counties are part of the service region for HCPSCA and the Gulf Coast Workforce development board, or "WorkSource."

Program Design

The goals of this project are:

1. To address critical developmental barriers to the under-served population of youth from foster care
2. To address employment and training needs
3. To provide easy access to appropriate services through a comprehensive “one-stop shopping” service system

These services are provided through the establishment of a comprehensive Houston Alumni and Youth Transition Center (HAY Center) in inner-city Houston.

This project realizes the vision of one of the principals from HCPSCA. For the agency, the DOL grant occurred at an opportune time. Staff from Harris County had already visited similar centers in San Antonio and Dallas to glean ideas for the Center design. To develop the grant application, TWC staff consulted with several individuals and organizations, including the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services-Child Protective Services (TDFPS-CPS), Casey Family Programs (San Antonio office), alumni of foster care, and Harris County juvenile, educational, housing, and child welfare agencies. Other potential partners also assisted with the planning.

The Houston project model and design, a one-stop service center that offers services to youth in care, both in house and from co-located partners, remain close to the description in the original proposal. Based on conversations with those interviewed, the current operation of the Center remains focused on building a youth-friendly but business-like atmosphere, which encourages peer support.

Program Implementation (including highlights of practices and challenges)

The basic program model has remained consistent with the original vision of a comprehensive one-stop approach to serving transitioning youth. The project has seen changes in the partnerships, however, and the delivery of program services has been continually fine-tuned to meet the needs of the youth served. The HAY Center provides a wide range of services. The

project managers there maintain an atmosphere that encourages the participation of individual service providers.

On arrival at the Center, all youth complete an initial survey and consult with a youth worker, who helps the young person identify his or her greatest needs. The Center uses the Ansell-Casey Life Skills Assessment, the “Discovery” Career Interest/Job Readiness Inventory, and the Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE) for educational assessment. All youth have a service plan that is developed by their youth worker in consultation with the youth and other HAY Center staff. This plan sets goals for the participant and outlines the services and activities that are needed for the young person to meet these goals. The project primarily provides the following services at the HAY Center:

- Case management services and financial support through the PAL Program
- Educational support, such as tutoring, assistance in obtaining high school diplomas or GEDs, college preparation and information, and mentoring
- Vocational services, such as pre-vocational classes, vocational training, job placements, apprenticeships, and other related services
- Life skills classes
- Housing assistance, including information and direct referrals to available apartments

The HAY Center continues to enroll new youth into the program, and staff has observed that many nonparticipants drop in. At any given point, staff indicates that they may serve double the number of youth who actually are enrolled. Some of the drop-ins are not youth from foster care, and many of the youth are referred by “word-of-mouth,” including peer-to-peer and sibling referrals.

In spite of the increase in the numbers of youth served, HAY continues to conduct targeted outreach activities to ensure that the eligible population of youth from foster care is aware of their services. These activities and products have included developing brochures, a DVD, and posters that will go out to shelters. The HAY Center staff is extracting 20-second public service announcements from the DVD. The HAY Center also launched a Web site during the last year. The organization is using a more focused, strategic approach to outreach, including hosting receptions for group homes and working with Youth Advocacy, Inc.

Many of the youth at the HAY Center have few if any meaningful connections with adults in their lives, and they begin to think of the Center as part of their “family.” Many of the youth have lost touch with their families of origin, many are coming out of residential facilities, and still others have experienced failed adoptions. The Center uses a variety of strategies, including Circles of Support (COS’s), to help these youth reconnect or forge new connections with significant adults.

The COS concept is well-regarded in social work. It is a youth-driven process based on the Family Group Decision Making model (FGDM) and is offered to youth beginning at age 16. Basically, a COS begins with a facilitated meeting with the participants a youth identifies as the “caring adults” who make up his or her support system. COS participants can include a youth’s foster care providers, teachers, relatives, church members, mentors, etc. These participants come together to review the young person’s transition plan, including strengths, hopes and dreams, goals, and needs in the areas of education, employment, health/mental health, housing, and all PAL life skills training components. Each caring adult participant identifies a personal way to help support the youth in executing his or her transition plan and in attaining short- and long-term goals toward self-sufficiency. The COS then signs the transition plan to seal these agreements. Staff also assists youth to re-establish relationships with siblings.

In addition, staff has pursued a variety of mentorship possibilities including connections with alumni from foster care, churches, and other community groups. Recruiting and retaining official mentors who meet the TDFPS guidelines (including background checks, minimum time commitment, and at least a one-year duration) is difficult. As a result, staff is “thinking outside the box” and creating a new project called a “life line.” In this project, adult mentors, typically professionals, make a commitment to be available by telephone and e-mail for youth.

Program Progress and Continuing Issues

The staff and youth work closely as a team and meet once a month to address challenges, issues and concerns, and to make suggestions for improvements. The youth have weighed in on everything from helping to create and enforce the rules for behavior at the Center to establishing staff-facilitated “Ladies Nights” and “Boys Nights” as opportunities for sharing needs and concerns and for socializing. A separate youth leadership board is also now in place to advise the Center. To help get it off the ground, staff took a group of youth to the PAL Youth

Center (PYC) in San Antonio to tour the facility and to get ideas from PYC youth board members there about their recruitment, roles, and activities.

There has been little staff turnover this year, creating a climate of stability and consistency that youth find important. Several youth in the focus group noted this. Staff members are finding that their roles are changing and they are doing more case management than they expected. As one staff person noted, "The youth often experience detours on the road, and our job is to get them back on track." There is a continued focus on staff training and development, both through in-house trainings and through support for staff to attend training opportunities sponsored by the county or state. Training has focused on the need to align services with the unique needs of this population.

In addition, trainings have been scheduled to respond to staff needs. For example, when staff communicated a need for enhanced skills and strategies for crisis management and handling youth with extreme behavior issues, training modules were developed to address these issues. These training efforts appear to translate to a satisfied base of "consumers." Youth repeatedly commented on the quality of the staff, and as one youth noted, "If you come here and act responsibly, the staff will treat you responsibly."

In response to the significant health, mental health, and substance abuse needs of the youth, the Center increased its community partnerships in these arenas, and it now has a larger menu of providers for the youth. In addition to making referrals for services, Center staff has invited many of the clinicians to come to the Center on a regular basis and conduct workshops. Marketed as "tools" for youth instead of the traditional therapy, these workshops help youth with anger management and other behavioral challenges.

The Blueprint for Success program was developed to prepare youth for the work place. Since its implementation, changes and refinements have been made, particularly to address the issue of poor attendance by the youth. A change made in the last year was to provide incentives for youth to actively participate in the program. It is treated as a job, and youth are paid minimum wage to attend. The youth fill out time sheets and must arrive on time. Failure to do so can result in their being fired from the program. Also, field trips to businesses have been added to the curriculum.

Job placements have come primarily from the job developer who is part of the HAY Center staff. WorkSource, the local One-Stop Career Center, has provided assistance to the youth in finding jobs. The job developer works closely with the youth and the employer to resolve issues. Helping youth find jobs is less of an issue than the youth keeping the job.

Recruitment and youth participation at the HAY Center were adversely impacted by DOL's decision not to continue funding the project and by the need to reduce building costs. As they looked at options for relocating the program, staff prepared to temporarily wind down their operations. As a result, many youth stopped coming to the Center. With the prospect of secure funding, staff has taken steps to conduct outreach to attract youth back. Mass mailings to youth provide regular information on the offerings at the Center. An open house attracted some 150 attendees and monthly HAY Days bring youth in for recreational activities. In addition, for the third year, TWC will increase the eligibility age to 25, thereby expanding the pool of participants.

The project has been impacted to some degree by the large influx of individuals who relocated to Houston, many temporarily, as a result of Hurricane Katrina. A year later, some of these resettled individuals and families have left Houston, creating a few more opportunities for housing as they leave vacated apartments behind. Several of those interviewed noted an increase in the crime rate during the second year, which many are attributing to the "Katrina effect." In particular, drug-related offenses are on the rise.

HAY staff during our Year Two visit noted an increase in youth presenting with significant substance abuse and mental health challenges. These youth are coming out of care with a higher level of complex or multisystem and needs than previous participants. As a result, the youth are not close to being either job- or college-ready. Several of those interviewed said that it takes at least 6–9 months of work for a young person to be ready for job placement and success, and the project has had to adjust accordingly.

Another consequence of serving challenging youth is that the center experienced some thefts, including theft from a food truck, and violent altercations between participants. This resulted in the addition of security staff to the project, an unforeseen circumstance and added expense.

Program Data

Houston enrolled by far the most youth of any site; its 358 youth served accounted for one-third of youth served by all five sites combined. (See Table 1.) Of these youth, four in five were 17 or older at program entry, with one in five under 17. Fifty-four percent were black, 23 percent were white, and approximately 16 percent were Hispanic. Just over half were female. Over 27 percent of participants were in high school at entry; about 24 percent were high school dropouts, 30 percent were high school graduates but not enrolled in postsecondary education, and 19 percent were in postsecondary school. Regarding housing at entry, 51 percent of all participants were living independently, 27 percent lived in stable housing, and about 22 percent were living in temporary housing or were homeless. Just 14 percent of youth were reported to be parents at entry, with about half of parenting youth acting as custodial parents.

Houston's participation data reflect that Houston has continued to enroll youth; 30 percent of youth have been in the program 1–3 quarters, while 40 percent have been in the program 4–6 quarters; and 30 percent have been in the program for longer than 7 quarters.

Most Houston youth received job preparation service, health services, and income support services. Over three-quarters of youth received job prep services, 62 percent received health services, and 55 percent received income services.

Overall, 46 percent of youth in Houston achieved a positive outcome. Nearly one-third of youth attained an employment outcome or a GED or diploma, and nearly one in five entered postsecondary schooling.

Table 1. Youth Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes

Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes	Category	Houston	Total for All Sites
Age	Under 17	20.5%	19.0%
	17 & older	79.5%	81.0%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	23.0%	9.5%
	Black	54.1%	71.3%
	Hispanic	15.7%	14.4%
	Other	7.3%	4.8%
Gender	Male	47.5%	41.6%
	Female	52.5%	58.4%
School status at entry	In high school	27.2%	42.3%
	In postsecondary	18.8%	8.6%

Characteristics, Services, and Outcomes	Category	Houston	Total for All Sites
	Dropout	23.8%	22.9%
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	30.3%	26.2%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	26.8%	51.9%
	Independent living	51.4%	29.0%
	Temporary/Homeless	21.8%	19.2%
Foster care at entry		26.3%	56.3%
Adjudicated/Incarcerated		25.7%	21.9%
Parental status	Not a parent	85.8%	80.6%
	Non-custodial	7.0%	5.9%
	Custodial	7.3%	13.5%
Received public assistance and not in foster care		14.8%	7.1%
Quarters in program	1–3	30.0%	22.3%
	4–6	40.1%	31.9%
	7–9	30.0%	45.8%
Services and Participation: Received the Following			
Job prep		77.1%	76.3%
College prep		8.1%	31.3%
GED/Basic Education		17.6%	20.2%
Life skills		11.5%	41.1%
Parenting		0.3%	6.8%
Health		61.5%	34.8%
Income support		54.5%	33.0%
Substance abuse		2.0%	4.1%
Other		31.8%	45.9%
Attained the Following Outcomes			
GED or diploma		27.9%	23.0%
Postsecondary		19.3%	16.8%
Employment		31.8%	35.0%
Any positive outcome		46.4%	44.8%
Number of youth		358	1058

Note: Variable definitions can be found in Table 2 of the main report.

Collaborations and Partnerships

A hallmark of this project has been the number of partners recruited. During the first year, memoranda of understanding (MOUs) were signed with nearly 30 agencies and organizations. A few of these organizations have been solid partners, but most have provided only limited

support. The HAY Center does have an MOU with Juvenile Probation, in which probation officers meet youth on site and have access to office space in the building.

Other partners include Catholic Charities, Children's Legal Services of Houston, School House (ETC), and Houston Area Young Lawyers. The Better Business Bureau is doing financial management training for the youth, and the National Council of Jewish Women funded a life skills conference for younger youth. Representatives from the Army come to the Center to recruit on a regular basis now, which has resulted in a couple of HAY youth enlisting in the armed services. The Harris County Health Clinic, located very close to the HAY Center, is another partner serving the participating youth.

Several of the partnerships from the first year, specifically an apartment-finding organization and the Gulf Coast Trades Center, were discontinued the second year because they did not work out well. One of the staff interviewed commented that they would have liked to have seen greater community involvement. One partnership that was being finalized at the time of our last interviews was with the Job Corps.

One of the key partners envisioned under the project was the local WorkSource agency, the One-Stop Career Center operator for the Gulf Coast area. Texas passed legislation during the first year of this project, referred to as Senate Bill 6 (SB 6), a comprehensive adult and child protective service reform bill. One of the provisions of this bill required collaboration between TWC and the Department of Family Protective Services (DFPS). TWC designated both current and former foster youth as a priority population for all workforce services. A number of steps were taken to implement this requirement through TWC and DFPS. All regional DFPS offices throughout the state, along with local workforce development boards and TWC, executed agreements required by SB 6. Not only has the work to implement SB 6 brought regional DFPS offices and local workforce boards together, but it has fostered collaboration between the two state agencies, paving the way for more coordinated opportunities for youth from foster care seeking employment, education, and training.

A WorkSource representative regularly worked at the HAY Center to assist youth with job finding and to make referrals for job placements. The HAY Center was less successful in getting youth to use the services of the local WorkSource Center. Sometime during Year Two, the relationship broke down and the representative stopped coming. The most likely reason is that

often the representative would come to the HAY Center but no youth would show up. At the time of our last interviews, steps were underway to reinstate the partnership. Staff report that their strongest partnerships are with Houston Community College and the University of Houston. The HAY Center has its own job developer that works closely with youth and employers to help them find a job and to keep the job. The job developer follows up regularly with the employer and the youth to resolve any issues that may arise. Finding jobs for the youth is not a particular challenge; instead, youth work readiness is a challenge, as is retention of youth in jobs. The employment specialists and other staff have noted that substance abuse issues create some of the most difficult barriers to success in terms of job placement and retention. “Many kids simply are not passing the drug screens,” one person noted. HAY has partnerships with several alcohol and drug abuse services but cannot require youth to attend. They continue to reinforce the message that “you can’t get a job unless you are clean.” The Center and its partners all acknowledge that they will need to do more in this area.

Program Legacy and Sustainability

The vision for sustainability is related not only to sustaining the HAY program in Houston but to replicating the model at multiple sites and transition centers across the state. DFPS and TWC believe that if funding supports each site for a start-up year, local agencies should be able to attract local sources of funding for the long term.

The state has exhibited strong leadership when it comes to improving services to youth in foster care. Individuals interviewed for this evaluation have expressed the belief that the relationship between the Texas workforce and child welfare systems have qualitatively improved in the past two years and that this project, along with the SB 6 legislation, are two of the principal reasons.

More specifically, a workforce person now sits on the DFPS transition living services work group, cross-training of staff is being developed at the regional and state level, resource sharing between the two agencies has increased, and both current and former youth from foster care are given priority for services within the workforce system. In May 2006, TWC hosted a workforce forum that brought together workforce and child welfare officials to discuss how they would implement SB 6 in terms of targeting and prioritizing workforce services to youth from foster care. Workforce services administered by TWC and the local workforce boards include TANF-Choices, Food Stamp Employment and Training, child care services, Wagner-Peyser

Employment Services, WIA adult and youth services, and Project Reintegration of Offenders. This sharing of resources heightened the level of collaboration between the two agencies. With the HAY Center, there are currently five other transition centers in the state, two in San Antonio, one in Dallas, two in and near Corpus Christi, and one in Austin. The PAL Youth Center in San Antonio has been instrumental in the development of a rural transition center in Kerrville, which opened in 2007. As a direct result of the success of the HAY Center, TWC approved additional funding to expand transition centers in Texas. These new centers will be expected to replicate services provided by the HAY Center in their community. These centers will be located in El Paso, Beaumont/Port Arthur, and in the rural areas of Killeen, Belton, and Temple. A total of \$1 million will be distributed to the three locations to help support their centers for a period of two years, after which they will be expected to sustain their operations. Leaders from the HAY Center are serving as technical advisors to the new communities. The HAY Center is a model for how to create a work-focused environment for transitioning youth from care while also encouraging and supporting youth achieving their educational goals.

Harris County has put considerable energy into planning for how to sustain the HAY Center. The county has developed a detailed plan and produced marketing materials, including a DVD from which it can extract public service announcements. The county has contracted with a funding development consultant to develop a strategic plan to approach foundations and other sources for this effort. The increased commitment for this effort may be related to the DOL decision to cease funding after year two. Fortunately, the lease on the HAY Center, which was the largest expense, has been reduced by about two-thirds during renegotiations, making this expense much more manageable.

Lessons Learned

The greatest lesson learned, as many people expressed, is that youth aging out of foster care have a tremendous need for a program like the HAY Center. At a transition center or a one-stop center, a young person can go to one location to complete his or her GED certification, receive PAL services, take a community college prep course, talk to the apartment locator service, and receive employment training and placement services. Transition centers provide an opportunity for the youth to develop personal and community connections, another important step into transitioning to adulthood. These types of centers attract and provide services and supports to large numbers of youth. These youth have a hunger for employment services and support. This issue therefore needs to have a higher profile and priority in the state. One person

recommended that “every caseworker in the state should visit the HAY Center to learn about what it does and why it is so important to youth.”

There has also been widespread recognition that these youth have more complex needs than originally anticipated, particularly in “soft skills” related to employment success. Staff needed more training, earlier on, in how to deal with the needs and behaviors of this population, particularly in terms of responding to anger and “de-escalating” potentially explosive situations.

Youth who have experienced the turmoil and trauma of foster care will only invest themselves in a program in which they feel safe and in which they enjoy a sense of fellowship with other participants. Sometimes it may take several visits before a young person feels ready to take the next step and actually engage in the process. When the youth sees the program’s strong emphasis on youth participation, leadership, and decision making, this contributes to that sense of trust and safety. In addition, many of the youth face substantial substance abuse and mental health challenges. Though the Center has made some strides in these arenas, youth in transition are unlikely to make any real strides without behavioral health supports.

Last, it should be noted that several individuals interviewed recognized the important role that lasting adult connections can play in the lives of these youth. The lessons from this project should be built into strategic planning for service delivery reform for younger children in foster care so they are less likely to reach this stage of their lives without the connections they need for stability and success in their adult lives.

Appendix – Additional Data on Houston

Table A. Services Received Based on Youth Characteristics at Entry and Quarters Enrolled in Program

Characteristics at Entry	Category	Job Prep	College Prep	GED/ Basic Ed	Life-Skills	Parenting	Health	Income	Sub-stance Abuse	Other
Age	Under 17	58.9%	--	24.1%	--	No data	43.8%	49.7%	--	13.7%
	17 & older	81.6%	9.1%	27.4%	12.4%	No data	66.4%	56.5%	--	36.7%
Race/ Ethnicity	White	78.0%	--	30.8%	--	No data	57.3%	53.7%	--	31.7%
	Black	77.7%	8.2%	21.9%	15.0%	No data	62.7%	56.0%	--	32.6%
	Hispanic	73.2%	--	--	--	No data	62.5%	55.4%	--	32.1%
	Other	76.9%	--	--	--	No data	61.5%	46.2%	--	--
Gender	Male	74.7%	9.4%	22.0%	11.8%	No data	61.8%	51.8%	--	31.2%
	Female	79.3%	7.9%	30.0%	11.2%	No data	61.2%	56.9%	--	32.4%
School status at entry	In high school	64.9%	--	18.6%	--	No data	52.6%	50.5%	--	26.8%
	In postsecondary	89.6%	--	--	--	No data	65.7%	59.7%	--	28.4%
	Dropout	81.2%	--	35.3%	20.0%	No data	72.9%	58.8%	--	42.4%
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	77.8%	11.1%	--	10.2%	No data	58.3%	51.9%	--	30.6%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	69.5%	--	30.0%	--	No data	54.7%	53.7%	--	22.1%
	Independent living	83.0%	9.6%	29.4%	7.7%	No data	64.8%	57.1%	--	33.5%
	Temporary/ Homeless	74.0%	--	19.2%	22.1%	No data	62.3%	49.4%	--	39.0%
Foster care	In care at entry	62.4%	--	24.7%	--	No data	47.3%	48.4%	--	19.4%
	Out of care	82.3%	10.6%	26.9%	13.5%	No data	66.2%	56.2%	--	36.2%
Incarcerated/ Adjudicated	Yes	72.8%	--	19.3%	15.2%	No data	64.1%	51.1%	--	38.0%

Characteristics at Entry	Category	Job Prep	College Prep	GED/ Basic Ed	Life-Skills	Parenting	Health	Income	Substance Abuse	Other
	No	78.6%	9.2%	29.6%	10.2%	No data	60.5%	55.6%	--	29.7%
Parental status	Not a parent	78.2%	9.0%	26.0%	11.7%	No data	62.2%	54.4%	--	30.9%
	Non-custodial	64.0%	--	--	--	No data	56.0%	48.0%	--	40.0%
	Custodial	76.9%	--	--	--	No data	57.7%	61.5%	--	--
Quarters in program	1–3	62.6%	--	21.5%	13.1%	No data	66.4%	50.5%	--	18.7%
	4–6	81.1%	--	28.6%	10.5%	No data	66.4%	63.6%	--	39.9%
	7–9	86.0%	18.1%	30.0%	10.3%	No data	49.5%	45.8%	--	33.6%
Number of Youth		358	290	182	358	51	358	358	358	358

Notes: a) Variable definitions can be found in Table 2 of the main report; and b) cells containing fewer than 10 participants are suppressed, and marked with --.

Table B. Percentage of Youth with Specific Characteristics Who Attain Different Outcomes

Characteristics at Entry	Category	Attained the Following Outcomes			
		Employment	GED or Diploma ^a	Postsecondary ^b	Any Positive Outcome
Age	Under 17	15.1%	--	--	27.4%
	17 & older	36.4%	32.3%	15.1%	51.6%
Race/Ethnicity	White	32.9%	--	--	42.7%
	Black	31.6%	32.3%	15.6%	48.7%
	Hispanic	32.1%	--	--	46.4%
	Other	--	--	--	42.3%
Gender	Male	31.2%	25.6%	11.5%	45.3%
	Female	32.4%	27.0%	14.6%	47.3%
School status at entry	In high school	18.6%	32.0%	13.4%	44.3%
	In postsecondary	56.7%	-	--	68.7%
	Dropout	29.4%	20.0%	--	44.7%
	High school graduate but not enrolled in postsecondary education	30.6%	-	15.7%	36.1%
Housing at entry	Stable housing	16.8%	28.3%	--	40.0%
	Independent living	41.8%	27.9%	16.9%	52.7%
	Temporary/homeless	28.6%	23.1%	--	41.6%
Foster care at entry	Yes	17.2%	20.5%	--	33.3%
	No	37.3%	30.6%	14.6%	51.5%
Incarcerated/Adjudicated	Yes	29.3%	21.1%	--	39.1%
	No	32.7%	28.8%	14.6%	48.9%
Parental status	Not a parent	30.9%	26.7%	12.3%	45.3%
	Noncustodial	--	--	--	48.0%
	Custodial	42.3%	--	--	57.7%
Number of youth		358	182	290	358

Notes: a) Variable definitions can be found in Table 2 of the main report; and b) cells containing fewer than 10 participants are suppressed, and marked with --.

^a Only youth who were in high school or were high school dropouts at enrollment were considered for this outcome.

^b Only youth who were not in postsecondary school at enrollment were considered for this outcome.

Table C. Percentage of Youth with Various Services Who Attain Different Outcomes

Quarters in Program and Services Received		Attained the Following Outcome			
		Employment	GED or Diploma ^a	Postsecondary ^b	Any Positive Outcome
Quarters in program	1-3	--	26.2%	--	26.2%
	4-6	30.1%	26.0%	9.0%	44.1%
	7-9	57.9%	27.5%	30.6%	69.2%
Outcomes by Service Area and Number of Quarters Served (0-9)					
Job preparation	0	--	--	--	14.6%
	1-3	28.0%	25.9%	9.6%	45.9%
	4-6	73.5%	58.3%	41.7%	85.3%
	7-9	--	--	--	--
College preparation	0	30.7%	26.6%	12.5%	45.3%
	1-3	42.9%	--	--	57.1%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
GED/ Basic Education	0	27.5%	24.6%	10.7%	42.0%
	1-3	50.8%	31.9%	22.2%	65.6%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Life skills	0	31.5%	25.2%	10.9%	45.7%
	1-3	32.5%	--	--	50.0%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Parenting	0	31.7%	26.4%	12.8%	46.2%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Health	0	25.4%	--	8.8%	36.2%
	1-3	35.6%	35.4%	15.4%	52.5%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Income support	0	25.2%	14.5%	--	36.8%
	1-3	37.1%	36.4%	18.8%	54.1%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Substance abuse	0	31.6%	26.8%	12.7%	46.4%
	1-3	--	--	--	--
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Other	0	25.7%	23.4%	8.3%	41.3%
	1-3	50.0%	35.6%	26.8%	61.4%
	4-6	--	--	--	--
	7-9	--	--	--	--
Number of Youth		358	182	290	358

Notes: a) Variable definitions can be found in Table 2 of the main report; and b) cells containing fewer than 10 participants are suppressed, and marked with --.

- ^a Only youth who were in high school or were high school dropouts at enrollment were considered for this outcome.
- ^b Only youth who were not in postsecondary school at enrollment were considered for this outcome.