

**Pasadena Alumni Support Center  
(PASC)**

**Final Report**

**December 2001**

**Research conducted by:**

**Pamela Marx  
Van Villanueva  
Mikala Rahn**

**Public Works, Inc.  
90 N. Daisy Ave.  
Pasadena, CA 91107  
(626) 564-9890  
(626) 564-0657 fax**

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
I. Introduction.....	1
II. PASC Services Under Casey Logic Model Goals.....	2
III. Service Results Based on Data Collected.....	5
IV. Center Operations and Client Service.....	19
V. Interagency Relationships and Coordination.....	27
VI. Future Directions and Next Steps.....	33
VII. Attachment A.....	37
VIII. Attachment B.....	38
IX. Attachment C.....	41
X. Attachment D.....	43
XI. Attachment E.....	49
XII. Attachment F.....	60

## Pasadena Alumni Support Center (PASC) FINAL REPORT – December 2001

### Executive Summary

The Pasadena Alumni Support Center (PASC) is operated by the YWCA Pasadena-Foothill Valley and supported by Casey Family Programs (CFP) in collaboration with the Transition Partners of Greater Pasadena. This partnership was developed to provide services to youth and young adults, 14-23 years of age, who are transitioning/emancipating from out-of-home care. PASC operates as a service center to pre-emancipated and emancipated youth. Its ambitious mission is to serve the needs of these youth in the key areas of education/workforce readiness, health, economic well-being, housing and social and emotional well-being.

In order to assess the effectiveness of PASC's program, Public *Works*, Inc. was contracted by the Los Angeles County Office of Casey Family Programs to provide an evaluation of support and services to the target youth population. The evaluation consisted of the following five components:

1. Discussion of how PASC's services relate to the youth-related outcome indicators outlined in the Casey Logic Model (CLM) and how those CLM indicators relate to the Key Measurable Results (KMR) indicators developed by CFP subsequent to the implementation of the PASC data collection system;
1. In relation to the outcome indicators developed by the Transition Partners and PASC and included in Table 1, analysis of demographic and descriptive data on the youth served at PASC since the Center's opening in May 2000;
1. Identification of strengths of Center operations and barriers to service development;
1. Analysis of interagency working relationships and future challenges; and
1. Definition of next steps and future directions.

### Casey Logic Model

The Casey Logic Model is a strategic plan that must be completed by CFP programs as a prerequisite to funding. As part of its responsibilities under the Casey Logic Model, PASC identified short and long-term outcome goals for youth served by the Center. The timeframe for meeting these outcomes for each youth served was one year for short-term outcomes and three or more years for long-term outcomes. With PASC in operation for less than two years, this evaluation focuses on the following short-term outcomes:

**Outcome #1:** Emancipated young adults in the Pasadena/Altadena area, 18-23 years of age, will have readily available services in the areas of health, housing, economic well-being, social and emotional well-being, education and workforce readiness and legal services.

**Outcome #2:** Pre-emancipated young adults in the Pasadena/Altadena area, 14-17 years of age, will have readily available services in the areas of health, housing, economic well-being, social and emotional well-being, education and workforce readiness and legal services.

**Outcome #3:** At the end of one year, PASC will serve 50% of all pre-emancipated and emancipated youth in the target geographical area.

**Outcome #4:** Emancipated and pre-emancipated young adults served by PASC will demonstrate positive outcomes as described in the short-term indicators (see Table 1). Positive outcomes will be demonstrated in areas for which services were requested, needed and provided.

In the eighteen months that PASC has been in operation, CFP has been involved in developing Key Measurable Results (KMR) outcome indicators to measure their transition programs throughout the country. These indicators serve to assess support and service effectiveness in the categories of child and youth well-being, strengthening families, living situation stability and self-sufficiency.

In order to collect data on the KMR outcome indicators, CFP developed a KMR data collection system. This system includes a variety of forms that will be manually completed and then “scanned in” by Research Services. While PASC does not use the forms developed by the Casey Family Programs, PASC has been using a set of forms developed by Public Works, Inc. that collects data to assess support and service effectiveness. CFP has been working on an ongoing basis with Public Works to review the effectiveness of the forms currently in use and make modifications in implementation as appropriate. Now that the Center has been in operation 18 months, CFP and Public Works are reviewing the forms system in light of information gleaned from operational experience to modify the data collection system to best serve the needs of Center clients and to incorporate the KMR outcome indicators more directly.

## **Evaluation Methodology**

In the course of this evaluation, data as of November 19, 2001, was compared with baseline information provided in the July 2001 Interim Report (Interim Report) on the services and outcomes of PASC. The demographic and descriptive data on the youth served by PASC was compiled from paper forms of the Sign-In Sheet, Face Sheet, Inventory, Support Plan, Quarterly Progress forms, and Progress Notes. Information is provided on youth served by the Center (youth for which there is a completed Face Sheet) and active clients. Active clients (i.e., active cases) are identified by PASC as those youth served by the Center within the last six months. The Face Sheet, Inventory, Support Plan and Quarterly Progress forms also exist electronically in a Filemaker Pro database.

When the forms were originally developed, it was anticipated that the Support Plan and Quarterly Progress forms would be used to demonstrate positive outcomes as described in the short-term indicators (in Table 1 of the report). An audit of the paper and electronic files conducted for the Interim Report, however, revealed that

many of the forms (paper and electronic) were not completed for any of the files. In addition, most Inventory forms (paper and electronic) were either not completed or only partially completed. That audit did reveal that some data was present on certain forms (mostly on the paper form only) that tracked intermediate progress toward meeting youth needs. Public Works reviewed these forms and transferred relevant quantitative and qualitative data from them to the Inventory form on the database so that paper information on clients would be captured in the database. The Public Works transfer of data increased from 27 percent to 44 percent the number of Inventory Forms that had some data. This increase did not, however, fully ameliorate the problems of overall limited data entry and form completion.

In light of the results of the mid-year audit, additional efforts were made to provide greater supervision to youth advocates regarding case management forms and procedures. CFP also hired an on-site interim social worker who works with staff to encourage completion of necessary forms with the goal of providing more appropriate case management and complete information for the report. For this final report, Public Works again audited the paper forms and electronic database to determine completeness of client information. This audit revealed an improvement in completion of case management paper forms, but continuing gaps in the updating of the electronic database.

## **Youth Served**

The evaluation was conducted to determine whether the youth served by the Center receive the support and services they need. While PASC's mission is to offer a variety of services to support youth who are transitioning/emancipating from out-of-home care, the evaluation was necessary to ascertain the effectiveness of actual service provided. The evaluation involved an analysis of the data available on forms used to support and serve youth at the Center. The Face Sheet together with the Inventory form provided most of the information for this analysis.

While 568 youth visited PASC from its opening through November 19, 2001, according to the Sign-in Sheet, only 238 completed Face Sheets exist and the Center's active client base is 139 young adults. An active case client is one with whom the Center has had contact within the last six months. (The number of active cases varies from time to time even within the existing database of youth served because contact with or from a client activates an inactive case.) The target service number in the Casey Logic Model is 200 youth per year. The youth population that PASC serves is primarily age 18 or over and African-American/Black or Latino/Hispanic; more than half are female. The majority (60%) of the youth served reside in the Center's target geographic area (DCFS SPA 3), with more than a quarter (26%) residing in Pasadena and Altadena, the two cities closest to the Center.

Information obtained from staff interviews as well as audit of the case management paper forms indicates that the majority of all youth who sought services from the Center used the telephone as their initial method of contact. Overall, most youth sought assistance with their economic well-being and housing needs. With 53% of the youth unemployed and seeking assistance in finding employment, PASC referred

youth to outside job support agencies as well as to potential employers. Housing was also a significant need as demonstrated by the data, which shows that forty percent of the youth have an unstable housing situation. It appears that throughout the eighteen months of operation, PASC efforts have focused on serving youth employment and housing needs and that PASC's role has primarily been to provide assistance through on-site counseling and referrals to outside agencies. The importance of PASC's focus in these areas was confirmed through staff interviews and client survey data.

Apart from employment and housing needs, youth sought Center help with educational issues ranging from learning about GED requirements, locating vocational programs, and applying for community and other college entrance. The need for educational guidance was also evident in pre-emancipated youth who were interviewed in focus groups for the Interim Report. Other significant needs for which youth sought Center assistance were health insurance and medical referrals. Youth most frequently needed general information about how to extend Medi-Cal coverage.

## **Center Operations**

The Transition Partners and CFP presented the Center with an ambitious mission from the outset. The PASC goal of providing service within a large urban geographic area to the greatest number of pre-emancipated and emancipated youth possible presents challenges on a daily basis. These challenges include finding effective methods through which to contact and establish relationships with a client base that seeks to separate itself from established jurisdictional agencies such as Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and Probation, offering a wide range of support and service to meet youth needs in areas such as housing for which the resources are not within the Center's control, and developing working relationships with service providers who can meet youth needs when those providers are often under-staffed and under-funded. The Center has steadily worked toward the creation of a service referral network and a calendar of programming that can help youth toward the goal of successful independent living despite changes in Center staff, changing commitment levels from community organizations and bureaucratic delays in finding solutions to interagency coordination and support issues. While progress has been made, the Center continues to face significant challenges in defining staff roles, developing an effective outreach program, and bridging gaps in interagency communication.

The problems faced by the Center as one player in the community of agencies and organizations that seek to serve emancipated and pre-emancipated foster care and Probation youth have been recognized at a County level within the last year. Steps are currently underway to reevaluate the systems of providing service and support to these youth and CFP is expected to play a role in the development of these new County directions. As this process moves forward at an interagency level, however, the Center continues to serve clients each day. It will need to review its progress, identify barriers to improving service and make necessary operational changes even as interagency discussions are pending.

## **Next Steps**

This report is provided to help PASC focus its efforts as it faces the challenges of providing quality service to foster care and Probation youth in 2002 and beyond. This report includes general information concerning the youth served by the Center (as identified by completed Face Sheets) that can be useful in planning program improvements as well as data related to the Center's current active client base.

Overall, though, the evaluation's ability to report in more depth on the needs of youth served at the Center and the effectiveness of service is limited for this report, as it was for the Interim Report, by a lack of data. Problems in completing forms and the current system of case management were identified by all staff interviewed as central to the Center's limitations in providing the most effective service possible to the greatest number of youth in need of assistance. Further, transition partner survey data and interviews with community and governmental agency staff indicated that, to maximize the effectiveness of services provided, greater communication and coordination of efforts between agencies at all levels is necessary to focus efforts on youth and eliminate duplication of efforts. Steps to address include:

- Restructure Center staff roles with respect to case management of clients, outreach and programming to ensure quick, consistent service to clients and responsiveness to community groups seeking to coordinate with the Center. To this end, develop job descriptions for each Center staff position, with specific focus on identifying staff members providing primary case management service and staff members undertaking primary responsibility for outreach. Further, clearly define reporting relationships for Center staff, with a priority being placed on ensuring a strong administrative staff role of preferably one administrative staff member in supervising youth advocates.
- Train Center staff in resource availability, including how to use hard copy and electronic directory systems to effectively service clients, with specific attention to providing staff with additional training to ensure that accurate, up-to-date information is disseminated to clients.
- Develop a system of incentives, whether through internal budgeting practices, development of business partners willing to donate or tapping of community resources and donations to ensure a significant and continuing supply of small economic incentives such as food coupons and bus tokens to encourage youth the visit the Center.
- Redefine the role of client outreach in the Center's operations to assure that both under-served pre-emancipated and emancipated youth are reached, with a special focus on contacting emancipated youth in the Pasadena/Altadena area and developing relationships with smaller group homes, MacLaren Children's Center, and foster care caretakers in which or with which pre-emancipated youth reside because such caretakers have historically evidenced limited ability to provide meaningful independent living preparation.
- Develop a new system of client forms that takes into account knowledge gained from the Center's past operational experience to make forms and data collection

user-friendly to Center staff and effective for providing case management, while recognizing that any form system developed now may be subject to a County request for modification as a result of the County's current effort to restructure emancipation service delivery between agencies.

- Improve interagency coordination and outreach to community organizations to ensure that the Center can maximize the effectiveness of the referrals it makes, utilize pre-existing resources in the community to serve its client base, and facilitate the further development of interagency relationships that can result in provision of service on-site. In this regard, take steps to ensure the consistency of the services provided and the Center staff's accurate understanding of what those services are.
- Formalize and clarify interagency relationships integral to effective day-to-day operation of the Center to increase the effectiveness of PASC service delivery to the maximum number of youth possible.



# Pasadena Alumni Support Center (PASC) FINAL REPORT – December 2001

## Introduction

The Pasadena Alumni Support Center (PASC) is operated by the YWCA Pasadena-Foothill Valley and supported by Casey Family Programs (CFP) in collaboration with the Transition Partners of Greater Pasadena. This partnership was developed to provide services to youth and young adults, 14-23 years of age, who are transitioning/emancipating from out-of-home care. PASC operates as a service center to pre-emancipated and emancipated youth. Its ambitious mission is to serve the needs of these youth in the key areas of education/workforce readiness, health, economic well-being, housing and social and emotional well-being.

Out-of-home care youth include those from relative, foster and group home placement where they were placed through the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) or the Department of Probation via a court process or through a school district via an Individual Education Plan (IEP). PASC offers direct services and/or referral support in an attempt to help these youth achieve and sustain good health, stable housing, economic security, and social and emotional well-being.

In order to assess the effectiveness of PASC's program, the Los Angeles County Office-Casey Family Programs contracted with Public *Works*, Inc. to provide an evaluation of the support and services provided by the Center to youth. An interim report on Center operations and progress was submitted in July 2001. This final evaluation report includes data gathered by Public *Works* in 2001. The report is divided into five sections.

Section 1: This section provides a brief discussion of how PASC's services relate to the outcome indicators outlined in the Casey Logic Model (CLM) and a reference to how those indicators relate to the Key Measurable Results (KMR) adopted by CFP since the Center's opening in May 2001.

Section 2: This section focuses on data related to youth served by PASC (as identified through completed Face Sheets) and PASC's active client base as of November 19, 2001. An active Center client is one with whom the Center has had contact within the last six months. This section includes demographic and descriptive data on these youth. This data was compiled from the paper and electronic database that is discussed in detail in this section. Data is analyzed in relation to services provided and client progress in the six outcome indicator areas identified in Table 1 below.

Section 3: This section focuses on current operational strengths and barriers to further growth and development of Center services as identified through a series of staff interviews, information received through a series of focus groups conducted in May 2001, and results of a client survey administered in the month of October 2001.

Section 4: This section focuses on interagency relationships and coordination imperative to the effective operation of the Center in the future and is informed by interviews with staff members of both governmental agencies and community organizations that service pre-emancipated and emancipated youth and the results of a survey administered to 105 community partners in the month of October 2001<sup>1</sup>.

Section 5: This section provides a discussion of next steps to be considered in light of Center operating results for the past eighteen months.

## **1. PASC Services Under Casey Logic Model Goals**

### **Casey Logic Model**

The Casey Logic Model is a strategic plan that must be completed by CFP programs as a prerequisite to funding. As part of its responsibilities under the Casey Logic Model, PASC identified short and long-term outcome goals for youth served by the Center in each of the six basic areas of need: health, housing, economic well-being, social and emotional well-being, education and workforce readiness, and legal. The timeframe for meeting these outcomes for each youth served was one year for short-term outcomes and three or more years for long-term outcomes.

With PASC in operation for less than two years, this evaluation focuses on the following short-term outcomes:

**Outcome #1:** Emancipated young adults in the Pasadena/Altadena area, 18-23 years of age, will have readily available services in the areas of health, housing, economic well-being, social and emotional well-being, education and workforce readiness and legal services.

**Outcome #2:** Pre-emancipated young adults in the Pasadena/Altadena area, 14-17 years of age, will have readily available services in the areas of health, housing, economic well-being, social and emotional well-being, education and workforce readiness and legal services.

**Outcome #3:** At the end of one year, PASC will serve 50% of all pre-emancipated and emancipated youth in the target geographical area.

**Outcome #4:** Emancipated and pre-emancipated young adults served by PASC will demonstrate positive outcomes as described in the short-term indicators (see Table 1). Positive outcomes will be demonstrated in areas for which services were requested, needed and provided.

In reference to Outcomes #1 and #2 above, PASC offers services to emancipated and pre-emancipated youth in the areas listed above such as housing and social and emotional well-being. Some specific services provided to youth by PASC via direct or referral service include:

---

<sup>1</sup> Ninety-five surveys were mailed to the Transition Partners based on a list provided by Casey Family Programs and PASC. Another ten were administered at the October Transition Partner Meeting.

**2001 PASC Final Report**

- Access to Medi-Cal programs and services
- Access to Independent Living Program (ILP) classes
- Housing referrals and links to affordable housing
- Employment referrals and job training information
- Legal and financial information and resources
- Educational and vocational information
- Access to the computer lab
- Support groups
- Social events and informal gatherings
- Information and referral to other needed services

While PASC may offer these services, the question remains as to whether youth in need of assistance actually receive these supports and services. In order to answer this question, the subsection entitled Inventory analyzes data from active clients and youth served (those with completed Face Sheets) to determine PASC’s effectiveness at providing support and service. This data was also used to determine PASC’s progress in relation to Outcome #4. The subsection on Data Collection below details the number of youth served through PASC in relation to Outcome #3.

In order to measure PASC’s progress toward reaching these outcomes, PASC and the Transition Partners specified six areas in which indicators of success were identified along with short-term and long-term goals toward reaching success in each category. The indicators and the short-term and long-term goals for achieving each are set forth in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: PASC Indicators of Success**

<b>PASC Indicators of Success</b>	<b>Short-Term (first year of service)</b>	<b>Long-Term (three years+)</b>
<b>Health</b>		
Decrease in tobacco usage, alcohol, and other drug use	Participation in an education program such as AA	No usage
Increase in health insurance coverage	Coverage through Medi-Cal, Cal Works or other public assistance	Long-term, stable health insurance through individual or employer coverage
Increase in annual medical/dental screening	Annual examination conducted	Ongoing
Decreases in pregnancies between the ages of 14-23	Participation in education and services	Practices safe sex, decrease in pregnancy incidences
<b>Housing</b>		
Increase in stable housing situation	Living in subsidized, family, friend or other housing	Secure, unsubsidized housing and ability to pay rent each month
<b>Economic Well-Being</b>		
Increase in job stability	Placed in a job	Stable job for six months
Increase those earning a living wage	Earning a wage	Earning a living wage
Increase in ability to meet financial obligations	Develops a plan for meeting financial obligations	Able to meet financial obligations for at least 6 months

**2001 PASC Final Report**

<b>Social and Emotional Well-Being</b>		
Mental health needs met	Participation in education programs or services	Healthy adult relationship (i.e. mentor) and peer group; Mental health resources identified if needed
Medication needs met	Needs assessment conducted	Medications needs met; Annual examination to adjust medications
Increase in participation in appropriate social/recreational activities	Interests and social needs identified; Involved in Center activities	Healthy peer community providing active social and recreational activities
<b>Education and Workforce Readiness</b>		
Increase in high school graduation	Enrolled in program and accumulating credit	Attained high school diploma
Increase in completion of GED	Enrolled in program and accumulating credit	Attained GED
Increase enrollment in college or vocational school	Enrolled in program and accumulating credit	Attained AA or certificate
Increase participation in volunteer or paid community service	Placed in a volunteer or work experience position	Ability to use contact in experiences as reference; Full-time employment
<b>Legal</b>		
Decrease in encounters with law enforcement	Develops a plan for resolving current legal issues; engage in Center activities and support	All legal matters cleared up; no future incidences

**Key Measurable Results**

In the eighteen months that PASC has been in operation, CFP has been involved in developing Key Measurable Results (KMR) outcome indicators. These indicators serve to assess support and service effectiveness in the following categories:

1. Child & Youth Well-Being
2. Strengthening Families
3. Living Situation Stability
4. Self-Sufficiency

In order to collect data on the KMR outcome indicators, CFP has also developed a KMR data collection system. This system includes a variety of forms that are to be manually completed and then “scanned in” by Research Services. While PASC does not use the forms developed by the Casey Family Programs, PASC has been using a set of forms developed by Public Works, Inc. that collects data to assess support and service effectiveness. CFP has been working on an ongoing basis with Public Works to review the effectiveness of the forms currently in use and to make modifications in implementation as appropriate. Now that the Center has been in operation 18 months, CFP and Public Works are reviewing the forms system in light of information gleaned from operational experience to modify the data collection system to best serve the needs of Center clients. Attachment A details how PASC forms currently in use address the specific KMR outcomes related to the four categories above.

## 2. Service Results Based on Data Collected

### Data Collection and Description of Forms

This report provides information as of November 19, 2001, on the services and outcomes of PASC. This data was compiled from paper forms (that also exist electronically) discussed in detail in the section below.

The following describes the different forms utilized to support and serve youth who walk in through PASC's doors or phone in to the Center.

#### *Sign-In Sheet*

The Sign-In Sheet is the initial data collection tool used by PASC. This form helps track the number of youth visiting PASC. Youth walking in the door are asked to sign-in, write in their name and check the box next to the reason for their visit and to indicate whether they are a first-time visitor. These boxes are divided into the following nine categories:

- Housing
- Employment
- Finances
- Computer
- Education
- Social
- Legal
- Health
- Meeting

These categories relate to the target areas included in the Inventory form described below.

#### *Face Sheet*

The Face Sheet form includes preliminary information needed to support and serve youth. In addition to basic contact information (e.g. name, address, date of birth), the form also has fields for previous/current placement and independent living program (ILP) information. Placement and ILP information provide crucial background information that helps in completing the detailed forms listed below. Face sheets are to be completed on any potential client, ages 14-23, walking through the door for any purpose.

*Inventory*

Youth about to emancipate and youth that have emancipated are both in need of support and services in the following areas:

- Education/Workforce Readiness
- Economic Well-Being
- Housing
- Social & Emotional Well-Being
- Health
- Legal Issues

The Inventory form includes detailed information in each of these support or service categories. For example, specific fields such as job placement, counseling, health insurance, etc. are included to assess a youth's current situation in different areas of need. Data from this form is used to demonstrate positive short and long-term outcomes (see Casey Logic Model).

Inventories may be completed on a client over time. For example, while at the initial visit a youth may have a housing need so that the housing section of the Inventory form is completed, the youth may phone in or come in for a second visit for an employment-related need, which ideally results in that part of the Inventory form being completed. In response to findings in the Interim Report, the Center implemented policies in October 2001 intended to ensure more rigorous completion of Center data collection forms including the Inventory.

*Support Plan*

The Inventory assessment allows for the development of a short- and long-term Support Plan to address a youth's needs in the categories noted earlier. For example, if a youth has a need for health insurance, a short-term plan might be to provide health coverage through Medi-Cal, CalWorks or other public assistance. A long-term plan might be to provide long-term health coverage through individual or employer coverage.

*Quarterly Progress*

Progress towards these plans is assessed quarterly through the Quarterly Progress form. Short- and long-term plans on the Support Plan form are reviewed and areas of improvement toward meeting the needs of the youth are noted. If the youth's needs have still not been met or have changed, the column labeled "Next Steps" is utilized to plan a different strategy.

*Other Forms*

In addition, the Progress Notes form tracks intermediate progress towards meeting youth needs. There is also a Phone Log and Referral Pad. The Phone Log and Referral Pad forms are used to log phone calls from youth and make referrals to

partner agencies to provide direct services. Based on staff interviews, however, it appears that the Referral Pad form is not in current use.

The Face Sheet, Inventory, Support Plan and Quarterly Progress forms noted above also exist electronically in a Filemaker Pro database. Upon completing the paper versions of these forms, the exact same data is entered into this electronic password-protected database. Electronic data is reviewed quarterly as part of the quarterly progress report.

## **Data on Youth Served**

This report includes descriptive data (Face Sheet and Inventory data) taken from the electronic database and information from Sign-In Sheets. The information provided here provides an in-depth review of service provided to the 139 clients PASC considered “active” as of November 19, 2001, as well as information on a larger number of youth served (not all of which currently have active client status) as gleaned from files for which there were completed Face Sheets. A client is considered to be “active” if he/she has had contact with the Center within the last six months. In other words, as of November 19, 2001 (time of data collection), 58% of youth served (i.e., clients for which there is Face Sheet information) since May 2000, were identified as active clients based on client contact within the last six months. Much of the data has remained relatively constant from the time of the Interim Report. Where significant differences were identified, they are noted in the discussion below.

### *Sign-In Sheet*

While 139 clients were considered active, the Center has undertaken outreach and had other contact with a significantly broader youth base since its opening in May 2000. As mentioned before, the Sign-In Sheet tracks the number of youth visiting PASC. From May 2000 (when the Sign-In Sheet was first used) through November 2001, the Sign-In Sheet reported 568 youth visiting PASC.<sup>2</sup> This reflects 195 new youth visiting PASC from June 22, 2001 to November 16, 2001.

Over half (52%) of youth indicated the purpose of their visit as “Social” or a “Meeting.” Meeting visits included individual visits with PASC staff, organized group Independent Living Program (ILP) meetings and Girl Talk sessions. Social visits included holiday events (e.g. Christmas), special PASC events (e.g. Summer 2001 Fiesta), and visits to interact/socialize with other youth. Since the Interim Report there has been an increase in the number of youth seeking services other than meeting opportunities or social outlets. The number of youth seeking to use the computer lab increased 7%. More importantly, there has been growth in the number of youth seeking help with employment, housing and education issues. As of this report, 27% of youth seeking service sought help with these three areas of need, which constitutes a 7% rise in youth seeking help in the areas of housing and economic stability.

---

<sup>2</sup> This number reflects the number of youth that visited PASC. In addition, entries that could not be verified as youth ages 14-23, indicated by date of birth, were excluded from this count.

**Table 2: Percent of youth seeking services by type of service**

<b>TYPE OF SERVICE</b>	<b>Current N=398</b>	<b>July 2001 N=321</b>	<b>Net Change</b>
Meeting	35%	41%	-6%
Social	17%	20%	-3%
Computer	15%	8%	7%
Employment	12%	10%	2%
Housing	8%	5%	3%
Education	7%	5%	2%
Financial	4%	3%	1%
Health	4%	4%	-1%
Legal	3%	2%	1%

As Table 3 below illustrates, three-fourths (75%) of youth visiting PASC did not return for a second visit. However, since the Interim Report the number of one-time only visitors decreased slightly (-2%), while the number of youth visiting two and three times increased. This small change may reflect a combination of increased PASC outreach efforts, more consistent follow-up procedures and improved case management training.

**Table 3: Percent of youth seeking services by number of visits**

<b>NUMBER OF VISITS</b>	<b>Current N=568</b>	<b>July 2001 N=373</b>	<b>Net Change</b>
One visit	75%	77%	-2%
Two visits	10%	9%	1%
Three visits	4%	3%	1%
Four visits	1%	2%	-1%
Five visits or more	10%	9%	1%

*Face Sheet*

As noted before, the Face Sheet collects the basic background information for youth served at PASC. While 568 youth visited PASC from May 2000 to November 2001 according to the Sign-In Sheet, only 238 Face Sheets (which also exist in electronic form in a database) exist. This is a significant increase of 65 new Face Sheets (37.5%) since the Interim Report.

Of the 568 youth that signed in, 339 youth could not be cross-referenced with the 238 youths in the database. In addition, there were 59 (25%) youth in the database that could not be cross-referenced with the 568 youth that signed in.

In addition to data on the ages, ethnicity and gender of youth served, the Face Sheet also provides information on placement, ILP information, and how youth became aware of PASC.



To begin with, it is important to look at how youth become aware of PASC support and services. Of the 238 youth for whom there were Face Sheets, information was available on 91 (38%) as to how they were referred to PASC. Table 4 below shows the results on how the youth heard about PASC for these youth as well as the smaller group of youth currently identified as “active cases.” For both groups of youth visiting the Center, seventy percent were referred to PASC by their ILP class, group home or foster care facility, a DCFS case worker or PASC outreach and staff efforts. Information on referral source was available on about 41% of the active cases. Over one-third of these Active Cases were referred through David and Margaret’s ILP program, almost three times the number referred from the next most common source. While by no means definitive, these data indicate that PASC is most likely to make meaningful client connections through programs that have strong ILP components and work cooperatively with PASC to encourage youth to access PASC services. Friends, lawyers/judges and relatives/guardians accounted for referral of about twenty percent of youth for which referral information was available (21% and 20% for youth served and active cases, respectively). Overall, the data show that PASC’s client referral sources correlate with efforts by the Youth Advocates (YA)<sup>3</sup> to outreach at various locations including California Youth Conferences (CYC), local junior colleges and foster care facilities.

**Table 4: Percent of youth served by how referred to PASC**

“How did you hear about us?”	Youth Served (N=91)		Active Cases (N=57)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
ILP class/David & Margaret	26	29%	20	35%
Group Home	13	14%	7	12%
Case Worker/DCFS	13	14%	6	11%
PASC Outreach/Staff Efforts	12	13%	7	12%
Friend	8	9%	4	7%
Lawyer/Judge	6	7%	5	9%
Relative/Guardian	5	5%	2	4%
Counselor	3	3%	2	4%
Walk-In	2	2%	2	4%
Probation Officer	2	2%	2	4%
Hotline/Agency Referral	1	1%	0	0%

Tables 5 and 6 below indicate the ages and gender of PASC clients, respectively. The youth reflected under youth served are those for which information was available on the Face Sheet. All of the active cases are included within the youth served, but active cases reflect only clients who have had contact with the Center within the last six months. While approximately nineteen percent of youth served at PASC are 14-17 years of age, the vast majority (81%) are 18 years or older. However, when active cases are considered in relation to youth served, 78% (32 out

<sup>3</sup> The Youth Advocates (YA) serve as peer counselors and case managers to youth needing support and service. As they are emancipated foster youth themselves, they understand and can easily establish a rapport with youth who have also been in the foster care system. The YAs are also involved in providing programs and services on-site (e.g. social events) as well as in coordinating and assisting in PASC outreach efforts.

of 41 youth served) became active cases within the 14-17 year old age group, whereas only 57% (100 out of 174 youth served) became active clients in the 18 years and older age group. This would seem to indicate that it is more difficult to develop active working relationships with emancipated as opposed to pre-emancipated youth. This conclusion is consistent with the fact that pre-emancipated youth remain under the supervision of the court system and residence authorities who may help foster their connections with PASC and the conventional wisdom that emancipated youth are both so overwhelmed by the responsibilities of adulthood and so uncomfortable with formalized systems of support that they fail to consistently seek help until their need has reached a crisis stage.

Table 6 shows that three-fifths of youth served by PASC for whom information is available is female. When only active cases are considered, the percentage increases somewhat with nearly two-thirds (64%) of the active clients being female.

**Table 5: Percent of youth served by age**

AGE	Youth Served (N=216)		Active Cases (N=132)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
14-17	41	19%	32	24%
18-23	174	81%	100	76%
24 or older	1	0.40%	N/A	N/A

**Table 6: Percent of youth served by gender**

GENDER	Youth Served (N=230)		Active Cases (N=135)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Female	139	60%	86	64%
Male	91	40%	49	36%

Almost three-fourths (72%) of youth served at PASC identify themselves as either African-American/Black or Latino/Hispanic. Table 7 further illustrates the ethnic groups served by PASC.

**Table 7: Percent of youth served by ethnicity**

ETHNICITY	Youth Served (N=186)		Active Cases (N=110)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
African-American/Black	75	40%	40	36%
Latino/Hispanic	60	32%	41	37%
Caucasian/White	22	12%	13	12%
Multiple	11	6%	8	7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	8	4%	4	4%
Native American/Alaskan	2	1%	1	1%
Other	8	4%	3	3%

Table 8 illustrates that the majority of youth served (60%) reside in cities included in PASC’s target geographic area (see Casey Logic Model for more information) which is Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) Service Planning Area (SPA) 3 together with non-SPA 3 areas located within a 10-mile radius of the Center. SPA 3 stretches from Pasadena/Altadena in the northwest to Pomona/San Dimas in the northeast, from Diamond Bar/Rowland Heights in the southeast to Monterey Park/Alhambra in the southwest. Twenty-six percent of youth served by PASC reside in the two cities nearest to the Center, Pasadena and Altadena. Of the roughly thirty-six percent of youth that do not reside in SPA 3, 14% live in Los Angeles. Within the category of “Other”, only twenty-five percent of youth served reside in SPA 3 communities, while the remaining seventy-five percent identify themselves as residing in areas as far away as Eureka and San Diego, with many residing in the San Fernando Valley, the South Bay, and areas east of the eastern edge of SPA 3.

**Table 8: Percent of youth served by city of residence**

CITY OF RESIDENCE	Youth Served (N=201)		Active Cases (N=133)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Pasadena	32	16%	25	19%
Los Angeles	28	14%	16	12%
Altadena	21	10%	8	6%
Azusa	15	7%	10	8%
La Verne	15	7%	15	11%
El Monte	10	5%	7	5%
La Puente	6	3%	4	3%
West Covina/Covina	5	2%	3	2%
Long Beach	5	2%	1	1%
Alhambra	4	2%	3	2%
Chino/Chino Hills	4	2%	3	2%
Monrovia	4	2%	4	3%
Baldwin Park	4	2%	1	1%
Inglewood	3	1%	3	2%
Compton	3	1%	2	2%
Claremont	2	1%	2	2%
North Hollywood	2	1%	1	1%
Van Nuys	2	1%	2	2%
Other	36	18%	23	17%

Table 9 shows that 14% percent of youth served by PASC for which information was available have one child and 4% have two children. All children were 4 years of age or younger except for one six year old.

Table 9: Percent of youth served by number of children

NUMBER OF CHILDREN	Youth Served (N=238)		Active Cases (N=139)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
ONE	34	14%	18	13%
TWO	9	4%	4	3%
THREE	1	0%	1	1%

The vast majority (82%) of youth served for which information was available were or are involved with DCFS (see Table 10). Sixteen percent of the youth served were or are involved with Probation or both DCFS and Probation. In looking at both youth served and active cases below, the number of Probation and DCFS/Probation youth served, 16% and 19%, respectively, has increased from the numbers reflected in the Interim Report. As of that report, 13% of youth served for which information was available had Probation connections. This rise in the percent of Probation-involved youth served may reflect a combination of efforts by PASC to outreach to Probation facilities as well as increased capability of Probation due to staff growth to partner with PASC.

Table 10: Percent of youth served by current/previous involvement

INVOLVEMENT	Youth Served (N=185)		Active Cases (N=112)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
DCFS	152	82%	88	79%
Probation	25	14%	18	16%
DCFS/Probation	4	2%	3	3%
DCFS/DMH	1	1%	1	1%
DCFS/Other	2	1%	1	1%
Other	1	1%	1	1%

Table 11 reflects that 79 of the 92 (86%) youth served for which information was available live in non-relative placement (i.e., group homes, foster homes, probation placements or MacLaren Children’s Center) or transitional housing. Fifty-two percent of placed youth lived in group homes while 28% lived in foster homes. The number of served youth who indicate placement through probation remains low with only one percent indicating this as their living arrangement. Of the remaining thirteen youth, ten (11%) resided in relative care with the remaining three (3%) stating that they live on their own. Of the 11% that indicated that they live in relative caregiver homes, it is not clear how many of these youth are living with family under DCFS supervision.

**Table 11: Percent of youth served by current placement**

CURRENT PLACEMENT	Youth Served (N=92) <sup>4</sup>		Active Cases (N=61)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Group Home	48	52%	31	51%
Foster Home	26	28%	15	25%
Relative Caretaker	10	11%	9	15%
Independent Living	3	3%	3	5%
Transitional	3	3%	2	3%
Probation	1	1%	0	0%
MacLaren Children's Ctr	1	1%	1	2%

Although data on Independent Living Program (ILP) completion was missing for 32% of the records, for the records that did have data 77% of youth served by PASC completed the ILP. (This data, as with the other data included in this report, is self-reported.) See Table 12 below.

**Table 12: Percent of youth served by ILP completion**

ILP	Youth Served (N=163)		Active Cases (N=102)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Completed	126	77%	77	75%
Did not complete	37	23%	25	25%

*Inventory*

The Inventory form (paper and electronic) is used to assess youth needs in the following six categories:

- Education/Workforce Readiness
- Economic Well-Being
- Housing
- Social & Emotional Well-Being
- Health
- Legal Issues

The data from this assessment allows for the development of a short- and long-term Support Plan to address a youth's needs in the six categories. Progress towards these plans is assessed every three months through the Quarterly Progress form. Short- and long-term plans on the Support Plan form are reviewed and areas of improvement towards meeting the needs of the youth are noted.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Youth Served data reflected in Table 11 includes pre-emancipated and emancipated youth. Only 29% of the youth served (27 out of 92) are between the ages of 14-17. Youth in this age bracket currently reside in group homes, foster homes, or with relative caretakers (59%, 26%, and 15%, respectively).

Ideally, data from the Support Plan and Quarterly Progress forms would be used to demonstrate positive outcomes as described in the short-term indicators (see Attachment A) mentioned earlier. At the time of the Interim Report, an audit of the paper and electronic files conducted on the 173 youth files at PASC found that these forms (paper and electronic) were not completed for any of the files. In addition, completion of Inventory forms (paper and electronic) was also identified as a problem. Since that report, additional staff training has occurred resulting in retrievable information from a limited number of support plan forms as discussed below. Table 13 indicates the number of files for which entry information was available both on the 238 youth served for which Face Sheets exist and the 139 youth considered active case clients. The data discussed below and the percentages reflected are based on the totals listed in this table.

**Table 13: Number of Updated Fields by Database Category**

<b>Database Areas Completed</b>	<b>Youth Served</b>	<b>Active Cases</b>
Education Inventory Entry	89	61
Economic Well-Being Inventory Entry	108	66
Housing Inventory Entry	109	64
Social & Emotional Well-Being Inventory Entry	53	37
Health Inventory Entry	84	54
Legal Inventory Entry	23	12
Education Short-term Plan Entry	56	52
Economic Well-Being Short-term Plan Entry	55	51
Housing Short-term Plan Entry	56	52
Social & Emotional Well-Being Short-term Plan Entry	54	51
Health Short-term Plan Entry	56	52
Legal Short-term Plan Entry	53	50
Housing Long-term Plan Entry	55	51
Economic Well-being Long-term Plan Entry	55	51
Education Long-term Plan Entry	55	51
Social & Emotional Long-term Plan Entry	52	48
Health Long-term Plan Entry	55	51
Legal Long-term Plan Entry	54	50
Quarterly Progress Entry	72	62

- **Education/Workforce Readiness**

A section of the form is focused on educational status and experience, educational needs and interests and workforce preparedness. It should be noted that the information from the inventories remains very limited and data between categories may conflict due to inconsistencies in completion of the form. Of the total clients served (shown in Table 14 below), the inventories indicate that four have earned their GED, seven are currently attending adult school, and twenty-one are attending college or vocational school. Of the 24 youth served who indicated attending a specific college/vocational school, 21% attended Pasadena City College. Of the twelve clients with active case status, a higher percentage (33.3%) attended Pasadena City College.

Table 14: Number of Youth Served by Education Level

Education Level	Youth Served	Active Cases
Currently Attending High School	18	14
Earned GED	4	2
Earned High School Diploma	42	29
Currently Attending Adult School	7	5
Currently attending college/vocational school	24	12
Attending Pasadena City College	5	4

Information was available on thirty-one youth concerning their perception of their workforce readiness and education needs. Of these youth, thirty-five percent needed help or assistance of some kind with independent living program (ILP) issues. Another thirty-five percent needed help accessing a school program of their choice, be it college or vocational.

The Inventory form also collects information on youth participation in community service. Quantitative data indicate that nine youth participated in community service. The types of community service included church activities, working with disabled children, washing police cars and volunteering for the Pasadena Humane Society. The data does not indicate whether youth were placed in community service activities by PASC.

- **Economic Well-Being**

This section of the Inventory includes data (as shown in Table 15) related to employment and economic status of youth (e.g. meeting financial obligations, etc.). Review of the inventories showed that 50 youth indicate being employed. Fifty-seven indicated that they were unemployed. It was difficult to ascertain from the data the number of hours youth worked or the rates of pay. The limited information showed that it was common for youth to make minimum wage or a little above that. Of the 40 youth disclosing their employer, twelve (30%) worked at schools or governmental agencies, ten youth (25%) worked in the restaurant industry, nine (23%) worked in retail outlets and two (5%) worked in nursing homes. When directly queried about the type of employment held, industry areas in which youth were employed included health care, cleaning, tutoring, temporary work, food service and secretarial. Two indicated that they were self-employed. As to those youth with active case status, the number of youth employed and unemployed was nearly equal, 33 and 32 youth, respectively.

**Table 15: Number of Youth Served by Economic Well-Being Inventory Areas**

Economic Well-Being Inventory Areas	Youth Served	Active Cases
Employed	50	33
Unemployed	57	32
Employed in the restaurant industry	10	9
Employed at schools/governmental agencies	12	5
Employed in retail outlets	9	7
Employed in nursing homes	2	2
Needs Assistance with finding employment	26	22
Needs Assistance with financial issues	10	5
Needs Assistance with ILP financial issues	7	4

The inventory asks youth to identify the areas in which they need assistance. Of 39 youth reportedly seeking assistance in this area, twenty-six youth (66%) indicated needing employment that would enable them to attend school or meet their financial obligations. Ten (26%) sought help with financial issues and seven (18%) sought help with ILP issues that often included financial help.

- **Housing**

In the area of housing stability, 57 forms indicated that housing was stable and 44 indicated that it was not as indicated in Table 16 below. Of the 51 forms that indicated where the youth resided, seventeen (33%) were living with family members, eleven (22%) were living with friends or boyfriends, nine (18%) were in placement (three of these being placed at MacLaren Children’s Center), six (12%) were on their own, four (8%) were living in transitional housing and four (8%) were living in school housing (i.e. dormitories). Of the thirty-seven forms that indicated duration of the living arrangements, 15 youth (41%) reported that they could remain in their residences indefinitely or until graduation.

**Table 16: Number of Youth Served by Housing Inventory Areas**

Housing Inventory Areas	Youth Served	Active Cases
Living in stable housing	57	41
Living in unstable housing	44	22
Residing with family members	17	14
Residing with friends/boyfriends	11	5
Residing in placement	9	7
Living on their own	6	6
Residing in transitional housing	4	2
Living in school housing	4	1

Of the 109 youth served for which information was available, 44 (40.3%) of the files indicated that the youth lived in unstable housing. Among active case clients, a smaller percentage (34%) of files indicated youth living in unstable housing. It is difficult to determine whether PASC service had any affect on lowering the percentage of active case files reporting unstable housing, given the small number of



clients from which the information is drawn and the paucity of information in the files indicating exactly what support was or was not provided. It should be noted, however, that stable housing is of paramount importance to PASC's ability to effectively service youth because it directly affects the ability of youth advocates and other PASC staff to follow-up with youth.

- **Social and Emotional Well-Being**

While this section includes data on issues related to participating in services such as counseling, drug use, and recreational activities, only 53 youth files had any data in this category. The data from these limited files indicate that 22 youth have contact with their biological family, with mother and siblings being the contact for 18 and 21 youth, respectively. Nine youth indicated that they were receiving counseling through agencies such as ICAN and Pacific Clinics. Another twelve youth indicated that they wanted to receive counseling. Thirteen youth indicated that they were on medication, with half of those stating that Medi-Cal paid for the medication.

Data on cigarette or drug usage on youth served was limited and reflected only 6 cigarette users, 5 alcohol users, and 3 illegal substance users.

- **Health**

In addition to data on insurance coverage, the health section also includes data on disability, medication, and routine medical examinations. Of the 84 youth files in this category, thirty-one youth indicated needing assistance with health or medical issues. Twelve youth (14%) had disabilities or existing health conditions that included ADD, dyslexia, and asthma. In terms of routine medical examinations, 31 youth (37%) had physical exams, 23 youth (27%) had dental exams and 22 youth (26%) had eye exams. The health section of the Inventory also includes data on sexual activity. While 25 youth (30%) admit to being sexually active, 22 of the 25 youth (88%) claim to have used some sort of contraception, the vast majority indicating condom use.

The quantitative data reflect that youth consistently seek PASC's assistance in relation to securing Medi-Cal insurance. Of the 50 youth (60%) who reported having medical insurance, 46 (92%) indicated that the coverage was through Medi-Cal. To meet the needs of those youth that do not qualify for Medi-Cal, youth are routinely referred to Young & Healthy or other local medical care agencies.

- **Legal Issues**

The twenty-three inventories containing data show that six youth have pending legal matters involving parental rights, child custody, restraining orders and inheritance issues. Four youth records indicated a need for current legal assistance; the legal issues for which assistance was sought included credit matters, dependency questions, and legal counseling related to business.

### *Support Plan*

The support plan provides for the development of both short-term and long-term goals to meet youth needs in the categories previously noted. Depending on the category of information, support plan data was available for approximately 56 youth files. The data on support plans reflects new data obtained since the Interim Report.

Information from these support plans is provided below by service or need category. These categories parallel the categories in the inventory. They reflect some information on progress toward short-term and long-term goals where such information was available. It should be noted, though, that support plan information was available on only about twenty-three percent (23%) of the overall client base. Note that due to the limited number of complete support plans available, the information discussed below is limited to Goal 1 data. In addition, no further comparison of active client information to overall youth served data was made due to the small difference in the number of database areas completed as noted in Table 13.

- **Education/Workforce Readiness**

Fifty-six plans were completed with information about education. Of those youth, seven reported intentions to complete or obtain a high school diploma or G.E.D. Thirteen plans indicated that the youth intended to attend and graduate from a community college program. One youth noted plans to attend Cal State Los Angeles and four others planned to obtain a vocational certification (e.g., C.N.A., medical assistant). As to short-term goals, fourteen indicated the need to be enrolled in appropriate programs while one youth sought additional tutoring resources. Progress data indicated that for Goal 1, twenty youth were in progress toward their goal, eleven had met their goal, and four failed to meet their goal.

- **Economic Well-Being**

Fifty-five plans were completed with information in this category. Twenty youth indicated that they were stable in their jobs, although several mentioned looking for higher paying positions. Other goals reported youth pursuing careers in the medical field, the computer field, animation industry, and joining the Navy. Short-term goal planning showed that thirty were currently looking for a job, two needed ILP information and another was on SSI. For Goal 1, progress data showed that thirty youth were in progress toward meeting their goal, seven had met their goal, and three failed to meet their goal.

- **Housing**

Fifty-six plans contained information about housing. Short-term goal information (Goal 1) indicated that ten youth were in subsidized housing, 23 planned to move into supported housing (i.e. transitional housing), and 10 were living with family and friends. Progress assessments indicated that two youth had met their goals; four others were in progress while another did not meet his/her goal. Under long-term

housing goals, file notes indicated general dissatisfaction with current living situations (30 youth sought unsubsidized housing), but plans to solve the problem could not be determined from the data. Anecdotally, it is generally recognized in the SPA 3 and the greater Los Angeles area that there are a limited number of transitional housing facilities and supported living residences available to youth. Accordingly, PASC staff members may be limited in their ability to help youth solve these housing issues.

- **Social & Emotional Well-Being**

Fifty-four youth support plans included information in this category. Ten of the plans indicated a long-term goal of desiring to have a healthy adult relationship while 17 youth desired healthy peer community involvement (i.e. PASC involvement). Under short-term goal planning (Goal 1), twelve plans identified increased involvement in PASC activities, nine plans indicated youth participation in educational programs related to mental/emotional health, six youth disclosed receiving counseling or plans to receive it, and four youth noted continued participation in healthy activities (i.e. attending church) or relationships (i.e. finding a mentor). Progress data toward these goals indicated that seventeen youth have met their goals, ten were in progress, and one was not met.

- **Health**

Fifty-six support plans indicated that goals had been set for clients in this area. In the area of long-term goals, fourteen indicated regular medical examinations, fourteen indicated obtaining long-term stable health coverage (i.e. employer benefits) and four youth desired to lead a healthy life style (i.e. sobriety, good eating habits, physical fitness, etc.). Another eleven youth plans indicated the need to practice safe sexual practices to lower the number of pregnancy incidents. Under short-term goals planning (Goal 1), five plans indicated medical examinations as the plan and issue. Progress data showed that 24 youth had met their goals, fifteen were in progress, and three did not meet their goals.

- **Legal Issues**

Fifty-four plans were completed with goals or information in this area. Forty-eight plans indicated that youth had no legal problems. As to plans that indicated pending long-term issues, one referenced a credit history problem, one indicated a financial issue, one mentioned reducing the future number of legal incidents, and one referenced a child support issue. Under short-term goal planning (Goal 1), two indicated financial issues, one indicated developing a plan to resolve current legal issues, one indicated filing a criminal report, and one indicated a child support issue. As to progress toward the short-term goal, twenty goals have been met with two in progress, and one failing to meet the goal.

### **3. Center Operations and Client Service**

Public Works, Inc. collected data related to Center operation and client service in order to improve the case management model in place. Over the course of the last

year of PASC's operation, data collection efforts focused on both the operation of the Center itself and on the concerns of the youth community to be served and the awareness within that community of the PASC operation generally. The purpose of this strand of the evaluation was to develop as comprehensive a picture as possible of the Center's service strengths and barriers to effective service as perceived internally by staff and externally by the youth community to be served.

- **Focus Groups.** In May 2001, six focus groups were conducted with pre-emancipating foster care and probation youth in out-of-home placement in Los Angeles County. At that time the Center had been in operation for about one year and the focus groups were held to provide a check into youth awareness of both emancipation issues generally and the Center's operations specifically. Staff members at the sites at which the focus groups were held were also interviewed as a part of this process. The findings of these focus groups and interviews are provided below as a backdrop to the findings related to staff at the Center who actively serve youth each day and to the views of PASC clients themselves as determined by survey.
- **Interviews.** In an attempt to better understand the day-to-day operations of the Center and to identify its service strengths and barriers to improving existing services from an internal perspective, interviews were undertaken with PASC staff and on-site works employed by other agencies. The interviews were undertaken in late November and early December 2001. The interview protocol used for these interviews is included as Attachment B. In this report, references to PASC administrative staff relate to non-youth advocate staff members working on-site at the Center.
- **Survey.** To ascertain the client perspective on the effectiveness of Center services, a client survey was administered by mail to all clients (active and inactive) in the PASC client database. Fifty-six youth responded and these responses are included as a reference point to staff views of Center operations and to illuminate the area of client satisfaction with services provided.

### **Findings Related to Emancipated and Pre-Emancipated Youth**

Six focus groups were held with pre-emancipating foster care and probation youth in out-of-home placement in May 2001. Youth ages 15 to 18 were interviewed at Optimist Boys' Home, MacLaren Children's Center, Hillside, and Rosemary Children's Services. The purpose of the focus groups was to ascertain the primary concerns and problems that youth face as they plan for their emancipation from DCFS or Probation supervision. The interview protocol used for these focus groups is included in Attachment C. The youth were both male and female and most were between the ages of 16 and 18. Each of the six groups was comprised of between five and nine youth. Staff at the focus group sites were interviewed as well.

As to the general issue of youth and staff awareness of Center operations, the focus groups and attendant staff interviews provide only a "snap shot" view of the awareness of the larger target youth population, but the results can be instructive nonetheless. As background, in developing the original outreach plan for the

Center in October 2000, the outreach committee recognized the importance of ensuring pre-emancipated youth awareness of the Center's existence. The justification was that, if pre-emancipated youth were aware of and comfortable with the Center, they would frequent the Center upon emancipation to receive the services they need.

The focus group results showed that those group homes with strong ILP programs and good outreach of their own had been in contact with the Center and that youth at these sites were positive about the programs provided by the Center, enjoyed the environment of the Center, felt comfortable there, and hoped to be able to participate in Center programs in the future. Conversely, youth who were living in facilities with arguably less strong ILP components or programs in which there was greater client fluidity had little or no knowledge of the Center. The one youth at these sites who was familiar with the Center had been in contact with the Center when he had lived at a larger group home facility.

The fact that only youth who had resided at large residential facilities had visited PASC and become familiar with its services is a concern since the conventional wisdom is that youth at these facilities, while they can always benefit from more life skills training and programming, are more prepared for emancipation than their counterparts who live at small group homes or transitional short-term facilities. At this stage, the youth in the larger group homes are those with whom the Center has generally established the most consistent ties.

With respect to the staff, awareness of PASC was mixed. Staff members interviewed at two large group homes were aware of PASC and enthusiastic about its programs. By contrast, few if any of the staff at two other residential facilities had heard of PASC. In general, staff noted that for the Center to be able to effectively serve the youth when they emancipate, it is necessary for PASC to forge a strong connection with the youth before they are freed from court supervision. While it may be ideal to have youth visit the Center repeatedly, transportation is an obstacle for many youth at MacLaren and other small group homes. As such, it was suggested that PASC "go on the road" to visit sites repeatedly so that youth are familiar with the Center's services and the staff that works there.

As to youth's general level of concern about emancipation and the specific areas of concern that occupy youth, the overriding response from youth, whether they reside in facilities with strong or weak programs, was that they are concerned about jobs, education and housing. These service categories dovetail with Center experience over the last eighteen months, inasmuch as these are the three areas for which the Center gets the most requests for service. For a detailed discussion of youth concerns related to the Center's target service areas, see Attachment D.

## **PASC Operations**

PASC staff members and personnel from other agencies stationed at PASC were interviewed in November and December 2001 to identify strengths in Center operations and barriers to continued growth and quality of service delivery.

*Reporting Relationships*

From the director level to the youth advocate level, there was confusion about reporting relationships. This is due in part to the fact that, according to the original memorandum of understanding, CFP was to provide Center funding while the YWCA was to be the Center's operator, an arrangement that contributed to some confusion over supervisory relationships. The complicated supervisory structure results in a small staff reporting to multiple people both within and outside of the Center itself. The confusion is evidenced dramatically within the youth advocate ranks. For example, one youth advocate reported that his/her supervisor was the on-site Center director while another indicated that he/she reported to the Center director or a CFP staff person. Yet another reported that he/she reported to the Center's on-site social worker. Moreover, PASC administrative staff members indicated reporting to personnel at PASC, CFP, and the YWCA, with no indication of how that supervision is coordinated as between these external agencies.

As those who work on-site discussed their various job roles, there were clear gaps in a cohesive view of the role each played in the Center's service structure. Different expectations exist as between DCFS staff and PASC staff on whether and how to coordinate case management service to emancipated youth in both the DCFS and PASC case files. The DCFS position is that service of the DCFS emancipated youth caseload is the sole responsibility of a DCFS staff member and that PASC staff has no affirmative role in these cases. PASC staff by contrast views the DCFS caseload as a potential source of active clients.

*Service Roles*

In addition to the lack of clarity that exists about reporting relationships at the Center, there is significant agreement among staff that there needs to be a shift in the case management role from the youth advocates to experienced professional staff who are trained in social work and case management skills.

The role of the youth advocates has been less than clearly defined from the outset. While it has been perceived as a fixed-term position, there has never been a clear job description that indicated the employment term. One on-site staff member noted that the youth advocates would not be youth forever and that some limit needed to be put on the position. Several indicated that an appropriate term for the "youth advocate internship" would be eighteen months. An alternate view of how to resolve some of the Center's staffing shortfalls was to make the positions full-time. Most comments pointed toward the need for a restructuring of the youth advocate hours as imperative to ensure that there is adequate follow-through and coordination of services and outreach.

As to the appropriateness of a youth advocate case management role, PASC administrative staff indicated that this is a difficult proposition given that these young people have no formal education in providing such services. At times erroneous information has been provided to clients, due to the youth advocates' lack of training and lack of understanding of the complexity of the bureaucracies with which they deal. Others recognized that the lack of professional case management

training resulted in the advocates' failure to understand the importance of timely follow-through and documentation of services provided. PASC administrative staff indicated that the youth advocates' time would be better spent in undertaking a greater role in outreach and a supportive role in case management. Moreover, the suggestion was made that the youth advocates might serve a crucial role in the actual development of local referral resources by spending time researching and identifying low-cost housing and similar resources and services in the local area. Regardless of the particular suggestion for restructuring the youth advocates' job description, it was generally agreed that a new focus and direction were needed. The youth advocates themselves even recognized the difficulties they have in providing case management and their discomfort with those aspects of the job that relate to case documentation.

The service goals of the Casey Logic Model clearly reflect service based on a psychosocial case management model. The development of short and long-term goals and outcomes for each client and the forms developed to document client service reflect such a service directive. Notwithstanding this initial mission, the provision of case management services given the present staffing design and logistical problems with case follow-up for the target population have made effective implementation of these services difficult. To add further confusion to the Center's role as case manager on a psychosocial model, DCFS staff stationed on-site comes to the Center with a fluid caseload of assigned emancipated youth for which the follow-up and services to be provided are presumably similar to those the Center contemplated providing in its initial mission. The youth on the DCFS caseload are the responsibility of DCFS staff to be served in accordance with current DCFS directives and there is no DCFS directive or agreement to work collaboratively with Center staff on these cases due to the confidentiality rules that DCFS imposes. The identification of this parallel, non-collaborative service approach to both current and potential Center clients reveals a larger gap in interagency coordination with respect to Center services. (See the Interagency Relationships and Coordination section below.)

## **Client Service**

In addition to staff interviews, a client survey was administered in October 2001 in order to develop as complete a picture as possible of client service at the Center. All clients included in the database, whether active or not, were mailed a survey with a \$5.00 incentive to be provided for completion. Fifty-six youth responded to the survey, a little over 80 percent (82%) of whom were age 17 and older. About 60 percent (59%) of the respondents were female. Complete survey results are contained in Attachment E.

### *Number of Youth Served*

According to staff interviewed, the number of clients who visit the Center on any given day was reported to be between three and ten generally. In addition, clients often call in with service requests. This information concerning telephone contact is consistent with client survey data which indicated that over 50 percent (54%) of the youth surveyed had contacted PASC by telephone or email two or more times. An

administrative staff member estimated that as many as 75% of the current clients are youth with whom that staff member was familiar from prior working experience in emancipated services/ILP programs. This would seem to indicate that current outreach efforts have been most effective in reaching those who have been involved to some extent with ILP services or otherwise reached by some emancipation service process in the past.

With client foot traffic into the Center each day identified as variable, ranging from very few to perhaps ten on any given day, staff was queried as to whether the Center was serving a volume of clients that is consistent with its staff size and scheduling. Administrative staff indicated that, given the current part-time scheduling of youth advocates, the Center might be at capacity in the number of clients served. Service to the walk-in clients they see can be very time intensive. As an example, one case involving a young woman who needed emergency housing was referenced in which the identification of housing, interagency contacts and follow-up with the client took numerous hours. In addition to foot traffic, much of the Center's service is provided through telephone contact with clients. Notwithstanding the time-intensive nature of individual client service, the youth advocates seemed to feel that generally they would like to see more clients visiting the Center on a continuing basis. The consensus was that they had the capability to expand the current client base to serve more youth.

### *Client Satisfaction*

Based on the results of the client survey, PASC clients have a high level of satisfaction with services provided. Out of 164 surveys mailed out, responses were received from 56 youth. Sixty-four percent (64%) of the surveys completed were from the mailing, with 21 percent (21%) having been completed by youth while participating in an on-site group discussion session and 14 percent (14%) having been completed by Center drop-in clients. Seventy-one percent (71%) of the respondents were PASC clients who have completed Face Sheets.

Youth were queried about the particular PASC services they value. As indicated in Table 17 below, the results consistently indicated that the youth surveyed consider services in each potential service area as important to them. While the services that youth most frequently identified as important to them were job counseling (74%) and education/financial aid (70%), other service categories were considered important by nearly as many youth: 69 percent (69%) for emergency funds, 68 percent (68%) for health and Medi-Cal counseling, 68 percent (68%) for life skills classes, 67 percent (67%) for housing referrals, 66 percent for legal information and assistance, 66 percent for ILP funds/assistance, and 65 percent (65%) for computer lab availability. On average about 21 percent (21%) of the youth surveyed in each service category indicated that the particular service area was not applicable to them personally.



**Table 17: Percent of Youth Agreeing that PASC Service is Important (N=56)**

<b>PASC Service</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>
Job counseling	74%	7%
Education/financial aid	70%	7%
Emergency funds	69%	8%
Health/Medi-Cal	68%	11%
Life skills classes	68%	11%
Housing referrals	67%	10%
Legal issues	66%	13%
ILP funds/assistance	66%	11%
Computer lab	65%	14%
Social events	60%	21%
Discussion groups	55%	22%

The substantial majority of youth surveyed had positive feelings about the usefulness of information they receive from PASC staff and the usefulness of services provided. As to the usefulness of the information provided by PASC staff, 76 percent (76%) responded that they agreed or strongly agreed that the information PASC staff gave them in response to questions asked was useful. Youth were less positive about the usefulness of referrals, with 59 percent (59%) of those surveyed agreeing or strongly agreeing that referrals to other agencies are useful. The substantial majority of youth surveyed, however, indicated that services provided by PASC in each service category were useful as indicated by in Table 18 below.

**Table 18: Percent of Youth Agreeing with Usefulness of PASC Services N=56**

<b>PASC Services/Referrals Are Useful/Helpful</b>	<b>Agree/Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</b>
Housing referrals	67%	18%
Medical referrals	67%	16%
Employment referrals	64%	22%
Counseling referrals	61%	20%
Education/financial aid	60%	24%
Legal referrals	56%	24%

While clients indicated a high percentage of agreement with inquiries regarding the services they value at PASC and the quality of service provided, the significance of these results is not clear. While a substantial majority of youth surveyed indicated substantial satisfaction with service in each service area, only between 7% and 21% indicated actually receiving services in the individual service categories. Moreover, the two types of service that youth most reported receiving were computer access time and meeting participation. These data indicate that the Center’s computer lab and hosting of meeting and discussion groups are good offerings to draw youth into the Center to develop relationships that will enable them to be served when a specific need arises. See Table 19 below.

**Table 19: Percent of Youth Receiving Service** **N=56**

<b>PASC Service</b>	<b>Served</b>	<b>Not Served</b>
Computer	38%	63%
Meeting	36%	64%
Education	21%	79%
Employment	20%	80%
Health	18%	82%
Social	16%	84%
Legal	7%	93%
Finances	7%	93%

When asked what staff member they would be most likely to contact if they had a problem or question, nearly half (49%) of the youth indicated they would contact a youth advocate. This response supports the importance of having staff members on-site that emancipating and emancipated youth view as peers and with whom these clients can identify. A significant, if smaller, number indicated that they would contact the PASC director (20%) or the PASC social worker (14%) about a problem. Only 8 percent indicated that they would contact a DCFS worker who might be stationed at the site.

*Outreach*

In October 2000, the PASC outreach committee through a series of meetings developed an outreach plan for the Center which was put into written form by *Public Works, Inc.* The plan identified youth organizations and events, service community members and governmental agencies to be contacted regarding Center services. It suggested methods of outreach for different venues that ranged from letters to hosted events at the Center, flyer disbursement to off-site presentations. The plan also provided a timeline of outreach activities in an attempt to prioritize efforts. Further, a chronological version of the plan was provided as well as a version that identified efforts by outreach type (e.g., flyer campaign, hosted events, community fair booths). Some suggestions were made in the committee discussions surrounding development of the plan and included in the plan as to what staff members were most appropriate to certain outreach tasks. The plan was provided in both hard copy and disk form so that it could be modified and updated as appropriate to be more useful to Center needs. In addition, *Public Works, Inc.* has provided some ongoing suggestions concerning how to track flyers and other public relations materials sent to clients for purposes of determining the effectiveness of outreach methods used, but no such tracking methods are currently in use.

Staff interviews indicated a general consensus concerning the Center’s need to become more focused in its outreach efforts. Both youth advocates and administrative staff indicated that more needed to be done on a consistent basis. The sporadic nature of outreach efforts to date is perhaps best indicated by the fact that, as of December 7, 2001 it was still not possible to call 411-Information and receive a telephone number for “Pasadena Alumni Support Center”, “PASC”, or “Alumni House”. Basic elements of making the Center available to area youth are still

needed. Changes in administrative staffing have necessarily disrupted planning and follow-through of outreach efforts. A lack of defined staff roles and supervision of youth advocates to ensure on-going completion of specific tasks has affected outreach implementation. All members of the staff recognized that the youth advocates should play a more significant role in defined outreach. This perspective is supported by the client survey data, which indicated that if a youth needed help with a problem, he/she would be more likely to seek it from a youth advocate than another staff member.

However, the evaluation recognizes that effective outreach is not a simple task. Not only is it difficult to find and follow-through with emancipated youth, a significant challenge exists in how to reach pre-emancipated youth to forge a connection, especially those youth who do not reside in large group homes with strong independent living components and relationships with the Center. While there is a general recognition among supervisory staff at the Center of the need to do additional outreach to the smaller groups homes in the greater Pasadena area and to youth living with foster care families, progress in this area has been limited with current efforts focusing on developing connections for initial outreach to foster caretakers. Further, many of the past efforts have focused on outreach to youth living under DCFS supervision. Until recently, Probation has had limited staffing to coordinate independent living services and to collaborate with the Center on its outreach efforts. Currently, the Probation ILP staff is comprised of ten workers enabling Probation to become more involved in ILP follow through and ideally providing an opportunity for the Center to coordinate with this new Probation staff to do effective outreach to Probation youth.

#### **4. Interagency Relationships and Coordination**

In order to provide a cohesive picture of how the Center's operations fit into both the present and any future system for the delivery of emancipation services and independent living programs to youth ages 14-23, it is important to analyze the operation of the Center during its initial period of operation in relation to the agencies with which it worked in order to provide its services. This analysis was undertaken utilizing the following methods.

- **Interviews.** Interviews were undertaken with representatives of community and governmental organizations that work with foster care youth, staff members of DCFS who serve youth at or through the DCFS Alumni Resource Center (ARC), and Probation staff.
- **Survey.** A survey of community partners involved in both the development and ongoing operation of the Center was administered in October 2001. A complete copy of survey results is attached as Attachment F.

#### **Interagency Perspectives**

The perspectives of agencies with which Center staff has worked over the last eighteen months and with which CFP has been involved in a continuing dialogue through both Transition Partner meetings and other discussion forums should be

considered both as to their relevance to the relative strengths and weaknesses of current Center operations and to the improvement of service delivery in the future.

*Probation*

From the outset, it has been the Center's goal to serve both emancipating foster care and Probation youth. This has been a challenge due to technological and staffing limitations within the Probation Department. In addition, the initial research information available provided more insight into the location and needs of foster youth; as a result, the Center's initial focus has been on reaching foster care youth. There have been some successes with Probation outreach. Chiefly, these successes have involved the Center's active relationship with Optimist Boys' Home. Youth interviewed there in May 2001 were favorably impressed with both the Center facilities and the discussion program on PASC's premises to which they were transported on an ongoing basis.

Commencing in January 2002, a Probation ILP Coordinator will be stationed at the Center two days a week. The staffing level of the Probation ILP unit has roughly tripled in the last year. From that department's perspective, it now has sufficient staff concentrating on ILP issues to be an effective partner with the Center in the delivery of ILP and emancipation services to its youth. The hope is that placement of a Probation ILP worker on Center premises will be a significant step in the direction of providing "seamless" delivery of support services to youth leaving the jurisdiction of the County delinquency court system.

From a staffing perspective alone, the opening of the Center in May 2001 was premature to the development of Probation's own infrastructure devoted to working with emancipating youth. Probation was not able to collaborate effectively with PASC or be a meaningful partner. As a result, few Probation youth were served. According to the database, for every five DCFS youth served only one Probation youth was served by PASC. Now that Probation staffing is up and the department is focused on developing procedures and methods for tracking and serving its emancipating youth, the department has the capability of being a meaningful partner with PASC. In a sense, Probation has caught up to the Center's lead.

*Department of Children and Family Services*

DCFS historically has been charged both with the delivery of ILP and emancipation services to the County's foster care youth and to act as Probation's arm in the disbursement of relevant funds to County Probation youth. Although current efforts at the County level as more fully discussed in Future Directions and Next Steps below may result in significant restructuring of the mechanisms currently in place for serving youth, the perspectives of the DCFS ARC staff that have grown out of both their efforts to serve their client base and to coordinate with the Center's staff may be instructive as to certain aspects of day-to-day Center operation.

Currently, a DCFS service coordinator is stationed at the Center about four days a week and comes to the Center with a caseload of nearly 300 emancipated youth

from the greater San Gabriel Valley and significant parts of San Fernando Valley. It is expected that, because the DCFS service coordinator is now located nearer to her client base, youth may frequent the Center to receive service. This arrangement has the benefit of being convenient to the youth in need and helping the Center to develop relationships with the emancipated youth they desire to serve. Despite the DCFS employee's location on site, she maintains the files she brings with her separately from the services offered by Center staff. Neither the youth advocates nor the on-site social worker has access to those files or a specific role in servicing those clients. From the perspective of PASC staff members, it would seem appropriate for there to be some sharing of efforts, but such a coordination of services is unlikely to occur without the development of specific interagency protocols and agreements that authorize the DCFS workers to engage in such cooperation.

In looking at the Center's role in serving emancipated youth in relation to the DCFS ARC operation, there are clear gaps in each agency's expectations of the other. While Center staff serve both pre-emancipated and emancipated youth using a case management model, DCFS line workers are troubled by this role. They understand that they have been given a caseload to service and are under certain privacy constraints and departmental restrictions in the serving of their clients. They do not see a role for the on-site Center worker in serving clients except to engage in crisis intervention as appropriate and then to refer clients to DCFS for receipt of appropriate ILP and emancipation services. Conversely, the on-site Center staff members view themselves in the role of service providers engaging in individual case management of clients. The disparity between these two perspectives will need to be resolved to effect a truly coordinated cross-agency provision of services to Center clients.

Notwithstanding the conflicting perceptions of service roles, the experience of DCFS staff workers in dealing with emancipated youth can be instructive to the overall enhancement of Center services. DCFS ARC staff noted that their interactions with Center staff and youth who have visited the Center give rise to the following operational suggestions:

- There has occasionally been a gap between the service touted to be provided at the Center and the service actually provided, e.g., confusion as to whether a Medi-Cal eligibility worker was at one time stationed periodically at the Center. In order to gain youth trust and to have credibility with youth, the services advertised must be the services provided.
- Youth tend to respond to incentives. If the Center wants youth to visit the Center, there must be a reason for the youth to visit. Incentives such as meal coupons, albeit to be dispensed for a quid pro quo such as completion of appropriate forms to ensure referral to the DCFS service coordinator and follow up, would be of significant help. Since DCFS acknowledges that it is not able to provide such incentives, DCFS staff suggest that the Center needs to either establish business relationships that provide a steady flow of incentives or to budget on an ongoing basis for the purchase of such incentives.

- Employment and development of job skills in former foster youth works best, according to DCFS experience in its internship program, when the reporting relationships are clearly defined and youth are assigned specific tasks for which they are held accountable. They need to be supervised in a consistent manner by a single “boss” who mentors their job growth and more fully trained in their role and the information they are to provide to clients.

*Community and Transition Partners*

To determine the effectiveness of the interaction between Transition Partners and the Center and to obtain input on perceived strengths and weaknesses of Center operation from the perspective of community agencies with which PASC works and might work in the future, a survey was administered at a Transition Partner meeting in October 2001. The survey was also distributed by mail to Transition Partners who may not have been in attendance at that meeting. In addition, interviews were conducted with representatives of other community and governmental organizations that work with foster care youth in the greater Los Angeles area.

The Transition Partners to whom the survey was administered are a group of community agencies and service organizations that came together with the goal of establishing the Center in Pasadena. After the Center opened, the partners continued to provide support and input through monthly meetings. Over the eighteen months of PASC operation, some of these community partners have changed, but many have been involved from the inception. The partners offer a wealth of important services within their communities, which are potentially related to the needs of and beneficial connections for helping to transition foster care and Probation youth to independent living. Many of the agencies offer multiple services. Respondents indicated that they provide services in the following areas:

**Table 20: Services Provided by Community Partners**

Service Provided	Percent Providing Service
Education	59%
Employment/Job Readiness	41%
Housing	33%
Mental Health	30%
Financial Resources/Support	26%
Health	19%
ILP Classes	19%
Substance/Alcohol Abuse	11%
Legal	7%

The three most often identified services offered were education (59%), employment and job readiness support (41%), and housing (33%). The services offered by the Transition Partners parallel the two most significant areas of need identified by youth in survey results contained in Table 17 (i.e., employment (74%) and education (70%)). The relationship of services offered by partners to the needs of the youth to be served demonstrates the Center’s effectiveness in connecting with a significant number of local community resources that can serve its clients.

Generally, 96 percent of those responding had visited the Center and so had at least viewed the operation first hand. Most of the partners identified their role in relation to PASC services as that of an information or service resource. Two-thirds (67%) identified themselves as an information resource for staff. Over half (52%) identified themselves as a referral resource meaning that PASC staff could refer youth to them to receive direct services. Over a quarter (26%) indicated providing in-kind services to PASC while only four percent indicated making monetary contributions. What this service breakdown demonstrates is that, in general terms, the partners' involvement is active and central to the Center's operations. Few merely provide monetary support.

Notwithstanding this kind of service connection, the staff at the Center felt that to be effective serving the greatest number of youth possible, the Center needed even more active support from its partners and community members. Staff noted that, while many partners are actively participating in important support committees such as the mentoring and housing, the Center still needed more active help and support to be effective serving youth. Further, in survey comments, some Transition Partners (11%) specifically noted the need for more active and focused participation from the partners.

To the extent that the Transition Partners and Center staff feel that there is a gap between community support provided and community support available, the existence of such a gap is substantiated in two ways. First, while two-thirds (67%) of the partners indicated that they serve both pre-emancipated and emancipated youth, thus indicating a very basic interest in and connection to the services provided at the Center, a significant percentage (30%) indicated that they do not participate on Center committees. Conversely, those who do participate are very committed in their participation. Of the partners responding, 41 percent serve on two or more committees. This information does support a renewed look at Transition Partner support and participation. While Partners are committed enough to attend the meetings, their involvement has not been translated into a more active role in sufficient numbers which Center staff indicates it needs to effectively serve youth, given the small size of its own staff. Barriers to higher levels of participation were identified by some partners as the "need to focus and move to decision more quickly," that fact that meetings can "lapse into just being complaining sessions," and the feeling among the participants themselves that "more participation [is needed] from other partners" and that there is a "need [for] more private sector participation."

Another gap between community support available and community support received by the Center is the fact that community organizations serving emancipated youth tend to focus in specific geographic areas because of the number of potential clients to be served and the size of the County overall. It is difficult for these organizations such as PASC in the San Gabriel Valley area and the Children Youth and Family Collaborative that operates in the Crenshaw area of Los Angeles, for example, to find effective mechanisms for sharing the lessons learned by each in the task of attempting to serve pre-emancipating and emancipated youth. Just as the governmental organizations such as DCFS and Probation have operated on arguably

parallel rather than coordinated paths, so too do these community organizations operate in this manner due to limited resources, limited staffing and time constraints. A case in point is the Children Youth and Family Collaborative which has attended Center mentoring committee meetings to provide guidance on how to develop an effective mentoring program but which does not participate on an ongoing basis in Transition Partner meetings or Center committees. The goals of the two organizations are similar, but because they operate in different geographic areas there is no mechanism for a formal sharing of information that might enable each to learn from the experience of the other. Within the community of organizations working to provide emancipation support to foster care and Probation youth, development of better communication and coordination of service is imperative to maximizing the number of youth effectively served overall.

Another problem in making effective use of support may be that the offer of services is often made informally, thus increasing the likelihood that follow-through and capture of the offered service may not occur given the limited staffing at the Center. Transition Partners noted that they most frequently offer support to the Center orally, either at Transition Partner meetings (52%) or at other meetings in the community (56%). Only eleven percent indicated formalizing an offer of service or support in a letter or other written document, although nearly 15% indicated having some sort of memorandum of understanding with the Center.

Several of the operational concerns raised by the Transition Partners paralleled operational concerns identified by Center staff. For example, when asked how to improve delivery of services from the Transition Partner's agency to the Center's clients, suggestions included development of a "very well organized and detailed kind of community and government based service and resources" list to be used by the youth advocates. Another noted there needed to be "communication about services available." There is a need for more extensive training about resources available in the community and how to use directories (both hard copy and on-line) to identify appropriate resources for clients. One PASC worker suggested as well that the youth advocates might have a role in searching out actual resources within the local community, such as low cost housing resources, if their schedules were adjusted to enable them to include such activities within the work day.

The specific need to reach small group home residents and youth living in foster care homes was noted in the survey results. Transition Partner suggestions to improving outreach included inviting local group home staff to monthly open houses, arranging site visits with agencies, and development of a website. Further, both the limited hours and the location of the Center were identified as barriers to providing effective service to youth. The suggestion was made to extend hours into the evening and perhaps weekends.

Finally, several Transition Partners identified the lack of effective inter-agency coordination as a barrier to effective service delivery. Partners in several ways noted the confusion over the roles and coordination protocols. One stated that "a clear or more specific definition of Partners' role" was necessary. Any lack of clarity in this regard might be contributing to less than full commitment by some partners. Another identified the need for "consistency or follow-through with other agency



staff for PASC on-site programs” as an area of concern to be addressed. Still others stated that there needed to be a “seamless connection to County ILP resources” and that “networking must be enforced and implemented”. The suggestions offered to eliminate these barriers to service included the need to build “greater collaboration and trust w/County entities,” the increased involvement of “the partners in policy decision making process,” and that the “organization on a whole must eliminate operating in solo.” The failure of County government to effectively include within its planning a role for PASC was also noted as a barrier to effective delivery of ILP and emancipation services. Based on discussions with DCFS ARC staff, it is clear that such changes can only occur if specific directives are made at the highest administrative levels of the coordinating agencies and these directives are coupled with the development of a comprehensive set of procedures and protocols for cooperation and coordination of service between DCFS, Probation and third party providers. Without the development of such specific, hands-on guidelines, effective coordination of services between government workers and third party providers will not be effective because the roles will remain confused and undefined.

## **5. Future Directions and Next Steps**

Casey Family Programs as a nationally recognized charitable organization focused on the plight of emancipated foster care youth at a time when energies and emotions of communities, service organizations and government agencies were just beginning to focus on the grave needs of these young people. With the passage of the federal Chafee Legislation, which established the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program in 1999, more funding became available on the federal level to be disbursed through local governments to serve these youth. CFP had been on the cutting edge of social thinking in regard to its concern for emancipating foster youth as the ground work had already been laid at that time for the development and opening of its first Los Angeles-area emancipated foster care service center in 2000, the Pasadena Alumni Support Center.

When the Center first opened its doors in May 2000, it operated through a staff that included a director, an administrative assistant, and four youth advocates (staff members who are former foster care youth). In addition, several community organizations provided one-day a week or other support. For example, United Friends of the Children provided a career counselor who worked at the Center one day each week. The staff proceeded to develop programming that included female support groups (i.e., Girl Talk), a young men’s group that focuses on fatherhood issues, cooking classes, legal clinics and social events that include open microphone nights and holiday events.

As operations continued in the first eighteen months, staff changes ensued and personnel on loan from other agencies for certain days of the week changed. Currently, the only original staff members are the four youth advocates. DCFS now stations one of its service coordinators on-site four days a week. Her caseload of nearly 300 cases involves youth who live in the greater San Gabriel Valley and most of the San Fernando Valley. An additional DCFS staff member is also onsite at the Center on a part-time basis. The changes in on-site staff and workers have led to a lack of continuity of services provided at the Center. This lack of continuity has

been a challenge to the Center's efforts to maximize effective service to youth. The Center itself has structured service in alignment with the Casey Logic Model around a case management model. Currently, however, although the County emancipates roughly 1,200 foster youth each year, the active caseload at the Center is 139 clients.

As the Center moves forward to provide service in the new year, its strategies and efforts may ultimately be significantly affected by intergovernmental changes regarding the administration of emancipation and ILP services that are pending at the County level. The Department of Children and Family Services historically has been charged both with the delivery of ILP and emancipation services to the County's foster care youth and to act as Probation's arm in the disbursement of relevant funds to County Probation youth. Concerns have been raised since the dramatic growth of the initial program of transition services as to ability of DCFS to serve the youth on a timely basis, including the prompt and efficient disbursement of funds to which youth are entitled and for which they have such a serious need.

In August, 2001, a report entitled "Findings and Recommendations Regarding Los Angeles County's Emancipation Services and Independent Living Programs" written by Sharon G. Watson, Ph.D., was submitted to the County Board of Supervisors. The report identified significant problems with the efficient and timely delivery of service to emancipated youth and submitted suggestions for a revamping the program. The report identified the overriding problems contributing to specific operational difficulties as 1) disagreement about the vision of these programs between those who view the provision of these services as part of a comprehensive, integrated continuum of support to ages 14 to 21 and those who view emancipation services simply as a federally-funded program for foster care youth who want and need transition assistance; 2) the absence of strong leadership; and 3) the failure of effective joint planning among the program's public and private partners and funders. These problems have led to specific deficiencies in ILP and emancipation service delivery that include:

- Lack of proactive planning that results in late budget submission, last minute efforts to spend money so that it is not forfeited, and inequitable distribution of some program resources;
- Lack of a unified program across departments and sectors involved in providing the services and disbursing the funds;
- Insufficient training of case-carrying workers administering the program;
- Caseloads that are too high for proper case administration;
- Insufficient outreach to eligible youth; and
- A cumbersome system that delays service and cash assistance.

As a result of Board action taken in response to the report, Watson is currently working as a consultant to the County's Chief Accounting Office and as interim

team leader toward developing a structure, as yet undefined, that would facilitate the provision of services through a collaborative of relevant agencies. She is currently in the process of developing a leadership team to analyze the problems and define solutions. The goal is to develop a structure of service provision that includes the Center and others like it in a key role to provide youth with prompt and efficient service through a true blending of interagency effort. Current thinking is that DCFS and Probation workers might be stationed at an emancipation house such as the Center to work alongside other agencies and Center staff in serving youth on a drop-in basis. While the Center currently services youth on a case management model, as presently conceived the new service model for emancipated adults would not necessarily include a case management component. Rather, the focus would be to operate more as a drop-in or one-stop center at which youth could receive service referrals, funds to which they are entitled and other appropriate on-site service. For pre-emancipated youth, the Center's role would be to use outreach efforts to ensure that youth are both aware of and comfortable with the Center so that, once they emancipate, they actually take advantage of the services available there. Once again, the service model for pre-emancipated youth is not conceived of currently as a case management model. Since this potential refocusing of service delivery efforts to pre-emancipated and emancipated youth is inconsistent with the Center's current approach, the Center may be called upon in the future to reevaluate its service structure to be consistent with the new collaborative model that is being developed. The process that Watson is leading for redefining service delivery to youth is expected to take about ten months, meaning that a new service delivery structure might be in the initial stages of implementation by yearend 2002.

In light of the pending changes in emancipation service delivery that are under discussion at the County level, any significant changes in the Center's service model would be premature. Nonetheless, the insights obtained through eighteen months of operation inform many aspects of day-to-day Center operation that should be applicable regardless of interagency service delivery changes that are implemented at the County level.

Next steps for the improvement of service delivery at the Center, which are appropriate to consider currently, are as follows:

- Restructure Center staff roles with respect to case management of clients, outreach and programming to ensure quick, consistent service to clients and responsiveness to community groups seeking to coordinate with the Center. To this end, develop job descriptions for each Center staff position, with specific focus on identifying staff members providing primary case management service and staff members undertaking primary responsibility for outreach. Further, clearly define reporting relationships for Center staff, with a priority being placed on ensuring a strong administrative staff role of preferably one administrative staff member in supervising youth advocates.
- Train Center staff in resource availability, including how to use hard copy and electronic directory systems to effectively service clients, with specific attention to providing staff with additional training to ensure that accurate, up-to-date information is disseminated to clients.

- Develop a system of incentives, whether through internal budgeting practices, development of business partners willing to donate or tapping of community resources and donations to ensure a significant and continuing supply of small economic incentives such as food coupons and bus tokens to encourage youth the visit the Center.
- Redefine the role of client outreach in the Center's operations to assure that both under-served pre-emancipated and emancipated youth are reached, with a special focus on contacting emancipated youth in the Pasadena/Altadena area and developing relationships with smaller group homes, MacLaren Children's Center, and foster care caretakers in which or with which pre-emancipated youth reside because such caretakers have historically evidenced limited ability to provide meaningful independent living preparation.
- Develop a new system of client forms that takes into account knowledge gained from the Center's past operational experience to make forms and data collection user-friendly to Center staff and effective for providing case management, while recognizing that any form system developed now may be subject to a County request for modification as a result of the County's current effort to restructure emancipation service delivery between agencies.
- Improve interagency coordination and outreach to community organizations to ensure that the Center can maximize the effectiveness of the referrals it makes, utilize pre-existing resources in the community to serve its client base, and facilitate the further development of interagency relationships that can result in provision of service on-site. In this regard, take steps to ensure the consistency of the services provided and the Center staff's accurate understanding of what those services are.
- Formalize and clarify interagency relationships integral to effective day-to-day operation of the Center to increase the effectiveness of PASC service delivery to the maximum number of youth possible.

## Attachment A

### KMR Outcome Statement by PASC Form

KMR Outcome Statement – 2001	Data Drawn From
<b>1. Child Safety.</b> 2001 Target: No youths will be confirmed victims of child abuse or neglect while receiving services.	Inventory
<b>2. Youth Access to Services.</b> 2006 Target: 99% of youths gain access to all critical health and mental health services identified by youth and caseworker.	Inventory
<b>3. Youth Relationship with an adult.</b> 2001 Target: 95% of youths served by CFP age 12 or older will have a close, positive relationship with an adult “most” or “all of the time” as reported by social worker or youth.	Not Applicable*
<b>4. Teen parenthood.</b> 2001 Target: 98% of youths age 10-20 years do not become parents while receiving services.	Face Sheet/Inventory
<b>5. Youth homelessness.</b> 2001 Target: 100% of youths leaving care will <i>not</i> be homeless.	Inventory
<b>6. Placement changes.</b> 2001 Target: 60% of youths will not have placement changes while receiving services.	Face Sheet
<b>7. Child Placement.</b> 2001 Target: 80% of youths will not be removed from birth family while receiving family reunification or family preservation services.	Inventory
<b>8. Current Grade Point Average (GPA).</b> 2001 Target: <i>Current</i> GPA across all youths enrolled in the 6 <sup>th</sup> grade or above and receiving Casey services will be 2.6.	Not Applicable*
<b>9. School Attendance.</b> 2001 Target: Of youths attending school, 80% were attending school 95% of the time or higher during the reporting period.	Inventory
<b>10. High School Diploma or GED.</b> 2001 Target: 80% of youths, age 18-25, who were served by CFP, have a high school diploma or GED.	Inventory
<b>11. Youth Employment.</b> 2001 Target: 95% of youths 16 years or older currently served by CFP are employed full-time (35 hours or more per week) if not in school or job training.	Inventory
<b>12. Sufficient youth income at discharge.</b> 2001 Target: 80% of youths <i>leaving care</i> report that their income is sufficient to meet monthly food and housing needs.	Inventory

\*These KMR outcome statements refer to data on Casey youth in foster care, which is not a population that PASC serves.

## Attachment B

### Staff Interview Protocol

Name of Interviewee:

#### Introductory Questions

1. How long have you worked at PASC?
2. What is your title? What are your duties?
3. To whom do you report?
4. What makes up your workday? Approximately how do you allocate your time?

#### General Client Service

##### *Youth Advocates*

1. How many clients do you see each day?
2. What is your role when you see clients?
3. How many follow up contacts do you make each day?
4. When clients raise issues or problems, what are the barriers that exist to servicing those needs?
5. Are they internal issues?
6. Do they relate to the referrals you need to give clients?
7. What kinds of staff positions would it be useful to have on-site?
8. What kinds of service providers would it be useful to have on-site?
9. What aspects of client service work best?
10. What aspects of client service cause the most problems?

##### *All Other Staff*

11. What role do you play each day with clients?
12. How much of your day involves serving clients directly?
13. What are the successes in providing service to clients?

14. What are the problems in providing adequate service to clients?
15. What kinds of service providers would be useful to have on-site?
16. What kinds of staff positions would be useful to have on-site?
17. What aspects of client service work best?
18. What aspects of client service cause the most problems?

### **Referrals**

#### *All Staff*

1. What are the problems you encounter with referrals?
2. What problems do clients report to you concerning referrals you have given them?
3. What works about the current system of referring clients to outside resources?
4. What resources and tools do you use to find resources to give clients? Referrals to people or agencies who can give them referrals to the help they need? Referrals directly to an appropriate service provider?
5. What are the limitations of the current system of referring clients to outside resources?
6. How could referral problems be remedied?
7. To the extent that there are too few service providers to which to refer clients, how can PASC deal with this problem?
8. Is there currently an internal procedure for developing a network of referrals in each service category?
9. Is there a systematic method in place for enhancing the referral network?

### **Outreach**

#### *All Staff*

1. What kinds of outreach do you do? Each day? Each week? Each month?
2. What outreach methods seem to work the best?
3. What are the barriers to effective outreach?

4. Is there a goal for how many clients PASC will serve each month?
5. How many clients do you think PASC could service each month with existing staff?
6. How far are you from that goal?
7. If there is a gap between the number of clients you could serve and the number of clients actually being served, how could PASC staff close that gap?
8. From whom would you need help?
9. How could these people/agencies help?

**Community Support/Transition Partners**

*All Staff*

1. What role do you see for transition partners?
2. What function does the monthly meeting serve?
3. How could these meetings be more useful to the needs of the Center?
4. Do Transition Partners or other community members who want to work with PASC or who want to provide service to youth ever contact you?
5. What do you do with these contacts? How do you follow-up on them?
6. What are the barriers to turning inquiries into actual service or help to PASC?
7. What types of roles would you like to see transition partners play?
8. What roles do you see transition partners playing now? Be specific.
9. In what service areas are transition partners/community agencies most effective?  
  
Housing? Education? Finances? Counseling? Legal? Health?  
Employment? Social Functions (including sports and music opportunities)?
10. In what service areas are there gaps? What kind of problems do you deal with in these areas??



## Attachment C

### PASC Emancipation Survey

Male -- Female  
(Identify participants by age)

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Facility: \_\_\_\_\_

### Housing

1. What have you and your social worker discussed about housing when you leave the system?
2. If it were up to you alone, with whom or where would you live? Relative? Foster parent? Friend? Transitional living? College dorm?
3. What is the biggest problem you see with housing? Location vis-à-vis work/school? Cost? Access to grocery shopping? Laundry facilities? Doctors? Food preparation? Furnishings?

### Employment

1. What is your biggest concern about getting a job? Figuring out what jobs to apply for? Filling out applications? Your level of training? Your experience?
2. Do you have a resume or know how to prepare one?
3. Do you have a job plan for the first 12 months after you leave the system? Does it involve combining school and work? Is this a concern?
4. Do you have a job now? How long? >6 months? 6-12 months? <12 months?
5. If you have a job now, what is your biggest concern or problem with the job? Do you plan to stay at this job for 6 months? 12 months?

### Transportation

1. Are you worried about getting from place to place? Are you comfortable using buses?
2. Do you have a car? Driver's license? Do you know how to get insurance?

### Health

1. What health issues are of particular concern to you? Do you regularly visit a doctor?
2. Do you know how to get insurance/MediCal coverage?
3. Do you know how to get medical services?
4. If you had an unexpected health concern—car accident, broken bone, pregnancy, etc— would you know how to get help?

### **Finances**

1. What is your biggest concern about money? Do you know how to budget money?
2. Are you concerned about bills you might have to pay each month? What do you think your bills will be?
3. Do you know how to get telephone service? Do you know how the telephone rates work?
4. Do you have a checking account? Savings account?
5. Do you know how to balance a checkbook and pay bills?

### **Education**

1. What education/training plans do you have after high school?
2. Do you have any worries about how to get connected with the programs in which you are interested?
3. Have you visited local junior colleges? What kinds of training do they offer?
4. If you are going to college, what are the unanswered questions you have? Where will you live during school? On vacations?

### **Legal**

1. Are there any court issues that you need to have resolved? Delinquency? Debt? Insurance?
2. Do you have your state ID card? SS number? Green card?
3. Is there anyone who can help you with these questions or problems?

### **Social/Emotional**

1. Are you worried about staying in touch with friends? How to make new friends?
2. Do you have relatives or friends you want to stay in touch with?
3. If you needed to talk to someone, where would you go?
4. If there were one thing you could take care of before you leave the system, what would it be?
5. If there were one thing you could change before you emancipate, what would that be?
6. PASC – Have you heard of the Pasadena Alumni Support Center? If yes, what services does it provide?

## Attachment D

### Focus Groups

(In significant part as submitted in the Interim Report July 2001)

Five focus groups were conducted in May 2001 with pre-emancipating foster care and probation youth in out-of-home placement in Los Angeles County. Due to the size of each facility, the sites listed below were selected under the assumption that a larger cross-section of pre-emancipated youth would be sampled. Efforts were made to ensure that a gender balance for the focus groups was represented.

The purpose of the focus groups was to ascertain the primary concerns and problems that youth foresee upon emancipation or with which they are currently struggling as they plan for their emancipation from DCFS or Probation supervision. The youth were both male and female and most were between the ages of 16 and 18 years. Each of the six groups listed below was comprised of between five to nine youth.

PLACEMENT	AGE RANGE	SEX
Optimist Boys' Home	16-18	Male
MacLaren Children's Center	15-18	Male
MacLaren Children's Center	16-17	Male
MacLaren Children's Center	16-17	Female
Hillsides	16-18	Male/Female
Rosemary Childrens' Services	15-18	Female

The focus group findings are divided into two parts. The first part provides an overview of youth and staff awareness of PASC and its programs. The second part is a summary of youth responses from the focus groups. The summary is broken into the PASC support and service areas on the *Inventory* form, i.e. Housing, Education/Workforce Readiness, Health, Economic Well-Being, Legal Issues and Social & Emotional Well-Being. Questions in reference to transportation were also included, as this is also an important need for youth.

### Youth and Staff Awareness

While the focus group discussions represent a cross-section of youth in placement in Los Angeles County, the statements made cannot be generalized to create an overall picture of PASC visibility within the San Gabriel Valley within youth and youth worker populations. The results of the discussions are, however, worth noting for the insights they can provide.

The youth in each focus group were queried as to whether or not they were familiar with PASC. The youth at Optimist all responded enthusiastically that they participated in facilitated group discussions at the home every other week. The youth at Hillsides were also all familiar with PASC and the girls had participated in the "Girl Talk" series that they felt was very helpful. Both groups liked the center and thought it was a comfortable place with good computer facilities.

By contrast, the youth at MacLaren and Rosemary with one exception each had not heard of the center. The one male youth who had heard of PASC learned about it when he was living at Arrowhead, a large residential facility that has participated as a transition partner. He, too, liked the center very much – especially its computer facilities. The one female youth at Rosemary was familiar with PASC because she had visited the Center during one of her community college ILP classes.

The fact that only youth who had resided at large residential facilities had visited PASC and become familiar with its services is a serious concern. The conventional wisdom is that the youth at these facilities, while they can always benefit from more life skills training, are far more prepared for emancipation than their counterparts who live at small group homes. Yet, these youth who live at well-established large homes are the ones with whom the center has established consistent ties and programs.

With respect to staff, staff members interviewed at Hillsides and Optimist were aware of PASC and its programs. By contrast, none of the staff at MacLaren and only a few staff at Rosemary had heard of PASC. The ILP Coordinator at MacLaren noted that these are some of the neediest youth in the system – anything PASC could provide at MacLaren in the way of classes and information would be much appreciated. She also noted that repeated exposure to information was the only way the youth at MacLaren would really become familiar with PASC as a resource when they emancipate.

In general, staff noted that repeated contact with PASC was necessary for the youth to have the necessary connection to ensure that they access the Center upon emancipation. While it would be ideal to have youth visit the center repeatedly, transportation is an obstacle for many youth at MacLaren and other small group homes. As such, it was suggested that PASC “go on the road” to visit sites repeatedly so that PASC was a comfortable, familiar site with whom foster youth could identify with.

Staff and youth at different sites offered several ideas for how to reach youth with information on PASC and to insure that the youth call the center when they need help after they emancipate. One idea was to provide wallet-size (business card-size) cards that include PASC’s telephone number and other emergency numbers. Telephone numbers that youth might need would include the Hall of Records, youth crisis line, hospitals that take Medi-Cal, Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), Planned Parenthood and the police department. The ILP Coordinator at MacLaren suggested that PASC provide youth with some sort of bag imprinted with the PASC address and phone number. The reasoning behind this suggestion was that the youth protect their small belongings and that they would hold onto a bag that held these items.

## **Youth Responses**

The following section describes in detail the specific issues of concern for youth related to areas of potential PASC support and service.

### *Housing*

While most of the youth interviewed indicated that they had plans for post-emancipation housing, further inquiry revealed that they viewed housing as a concern. There was difference in the practicality and specificity of youth housing plans, depending upon both placement and gender. Generally, Hillside's youth were aware of programs offered to foster youth in transitional living facilities or supported apartments. Women, both at Hillside's and MacLaren, overall had a better connection to housing plans, with several MacLaren girls reporting plans to handle job training and housing issues by joining Job Corps and several others planning to live in dorms at four-year colleges. The female youth at Rosemary were concerned with transitional housing for the most part. Many of the other youth had plans to return home or find a roommate.

Youth concerns about general housekeeping skills varied. Youth at Optimist and Hillside's had significant experience with cooking and ordinary housekeeping chores such as laundry. MacLaren youth who had lived in other placement settings were less knowledgeable about housekeeping issues. Many youth thought that they needed to learn more about cooking as well as grocery shopping. All youth indicated interest in cooking classes, with the girls (especially those with children) emphasized the need to learn how to make practical family foods.

### *Education/Workforce Readiness*

The practicality of the youths' education and training plans after emancipation varied greatly, depending upon the facility in which they lived. The youth with the most practical, well-investigated plans were those living at Hillside's whose plans ranged from joining the Navy to four-year colleges to community college. The women at MacLaren had specific plans as well. About half planned to go to Job Corps with the remaining youth planning to go to college, although it was unclear whether the college plans were well grounded in reality. One planned to attend Georgetown and have a career in law, but probably needed significant counseling to determine how to best make those plans happen, i.e. if her grades and coursework make it a possibility at all. Four of the seven female youth at Rosemary had post-secondary education plans ranging from attending community college to four-year college.

College counseling is not a strength of the MacLaren program or many of the other group home programs in which youth are placed. Overall, most youth have little access to college counseling or education-related resources such as the Internet and other materials. While several of the youth (both male and female) at both Optimist and MacLaren planned on careers in the military, some planned to go to vocational schools. At MacLaren, youths' plans were vague at best and the capability of any existing programs to provide much needed information was limited. This is in part due to the fact that the program services a transient population.

Apart from post-secondary education, some youth also raised an issue related to their high school education. These youth did not know about the differences and consequences associated with obtaining a GED versus a high school diploma. The

youth expressed a concern about whether the GED would limit them and what problems it might cause.

### *Transportation*

Most of the youth at all facilities felt that they knew how to use public transportation. Generally, the issue of getting from place to place upon emancipation did not seem to weigh very heavily in youths' concerns. While younger youth in the Hillside's group had not yet become familiar with public transportation, this would be a part of the formal training program at their home when youth were ready.

Most of the youth interviewed did not think that they would be using a car upon emancipation, although a number expressed curiosity about the procedures to follow in order to obtain a license and several were familiar with a DCFS program to provide driver training to foster youth. Overall, youth were unsure about issues such as car insurance. At least one youth in each group planned to have a car or was very interested in finding out about it.

### *Health*

Health care was not an issue of serious concern for most youth at the different facilities. In terms of insurance, most youth were generally aware of the fact that their Medi-Cal coverage would continue for several years after emancipation. While some expressed concern about the procedures to get it extended, most relied on their social workers to take care of this issue. One who was returning home to another state was concerned about the procedures for extending Medicare in the state to which he was moving. In addition, most youth were familiar in regards to what they would do for medical care if they needed it.

In reference to pregnancy care and birth control, female youth indicated that they were aware of the issues. At Hillside's, the group generally made it very clear that they had been repeatedly received information regarding the dangers of unprotected sex. As for the female youth at MacLaren, several of whom were mothers, they indicated that they planned on abstinence or would require partners to use a condom.

### *Economic Well-Being*

Experience and opportunities in relation to employment varied greatly between the youth at the two large group homes, Optimist and Hillside's, and the youth at MacLaren that may be due to the fact that MacLaren's youth population is transient. The youth at the two large group homes participated in programs that helped them to be independent and use public transportation to hold summer and/or after-school jobs. Several of the male youth at Optimist, all of whom were placed through probation, had after-school jobs. The older Hillside's youth all had summer jobs that related in some way to their ultimate career plans. Many of these youth felt their experiences would enable them to get jobs upon emancipation, but

many (especially the Hillsides' youth) recognized that minimum wage jobs do not easily support independent living.

The MacLaren youth were divided in responses. Most of the females had clear ideas about how to handle work issues upon emancipation with three out of six of them planning to go into Job Corps. At least one male youth planned to enter the military. Generally, female youth had more focused and realistic plans than the males. Male youth who did not have specific military or college plans thought that getting a job was no problem, even if they had had very little work experience. Overall, female youth at Rosemary did not have much experience with jobs or the job application process.

Almost all youth expressed the need to learn more about finance-related issues, such as budgeting and paying bills including those youth that had participated in strong life skills-based programs. In addition, nearly all youth expressed concern with issues of setting up savings and checking bank accounts. The exceptions to this were the female youth at Rosemary who seemed to lack sufficient knowledge to identify finance-related issues in which they might need training.

### *Legal Issues*

Generally, except for the youth that resided at Optimist, legal issues were not a concern. The Optimist youth had two major concerns. The first related to how to go about having their records sealed. While some thought it happened automatically, others knew you had to do something but didn't know what it was. Youth expressed a need for training in this area. The other issue of significant concern was in regards to how the laws on paternity testing worked. Many of the youth were fathers and were taking parenting classes at the group home. Most were very concerned about losing their parental rights, about child support and their inability to pay it and how to prove they were or were not the father of a particular child. The females who were mothers, on the other hand, expressed little concern about the fathers providing child support and did not seem to expect any formal kinds of support or help with parenting.

Other legal issues such as obtaining state ID cards and social security cards concerned the youth, but these were not major concerns. Most youth noted that these matters were usually dealt with by social workers. In any case, one female youth was worried that as her mother had her birth certificate and would not give it to her, she thought she could never get a driver's license without it and did not know she could request one from the Hall of Records. Practical problems like this were raised from time to time as concerns and some youth did not realize there was any way to deal with the problem they faced.

Another issue that arose among youth at the Optimist Home was that youth need assistance with clearing and/or paying tickets. Some youth have tickets outstanding that will cause them further difficulty if stopped by the police.

*Social & Emotional Well-Being*

While male youth had little to say on social and emotional issues, female youth were of two schools. Those at Hillside talked about how they would need to get involved in activities at college to meet people and develop friendships and also thought hobbies were a way to get to know other people. These youth also expressed some concern about the need to talk with a counselor following emancipation. The girls at Hillside specifically indicated a need for training, classes and/or discussion groups on how to deal with female friendships, especially those that were counterproductive to their own emotional health. It should be noted that Hillside alumni will have access to therapists after emancipation.

In contrast, female youth at MacLaren stated that they needed no one and, if they needed to talk, would talk to God. These youth did not demonstrate clear recognition that they might want to talk with a mentor, counselor or therapist.



**ATTACHMENT E**  
**Pasadena Alumni Support Center**  
**Youth Survey**

**Survey ID**

	Frequency	Percent
By mail	36	64.3
During group sessions	12	21.4
Random center drop-ins	8	14.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>

**Youth PASC case status**

	Frequency	Percent
Youth is a PASC case	40	71.4
Youth is not a PASC case	16	28.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>

**Case Status**

	Frequency	Percent
Not a PASC case	16	28.6
Active	33	58.9
Closed	1	1.8
Inactive	6	10.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>

\*\*\*The above tables were not questions asked in the survey but rather data cross-referenced with the PASC database to better identify the population surveyed.

**Q 1a. Has PASC provided services to you in...Housing**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	5	8.9
No	51	91.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 1b. Has PASC provided services to you in...Computer**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	21	37.5
No	35	62.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 1c. Has PASC provided services to you in...Legal**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	7.1
No	52	92.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>

**2001 PASC Final Report**

**Q 1d. Has PASC provided services to you in...Employment**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	11	19.6
No	45	80.4
Total	56	100

**Q 1e. Has PASC provided services to you in...Education**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	12	21.4
No	44	78.6
Total	56	100

**Q 1f. Has PASC provided services to you in...Health**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	10	17.9
No	46	82.1
Total	56	100

**Q 1g. Has PASC provided services to you in...Finances**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	7.1
No	52	92.9
Total	56	100

**Q 1h. Has PASC provided services to you in...Social**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	9	16.1
No	47	83.9
Total	56	100

**Q 1i. Has PASC provided services to you in...Meeting (attending meetings on topics of interest)**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	20	35.7
No	36	64.3
Total	56	100

**Q 2. How many times have you contacted PASC by telephone or email?**

	Frequency	Percent
None	20	36.4
1 time	5	9
2 times	11	20
3 times	5	9
More than 3 times	14	25.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 3. How many times have you visited PASC?**

	Frequency	Percent
None	4	7.4
1 time	17	31.5
2 times	7	13
3 times	5	9.3
More than 3 times	21	38.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 4. How many times have PASC youth advocates or other staff members contacted you?**

	Frequency	Percent
None	20	36.4
1 time	5	9
2 times	10	18.2
3 times	4	7.3
More than 3 times	16	29.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 5. How often do you hear from PASC youth advocates or staff either by mail, phone or other contact?**

	Frequency	Percent
more than once a month	15	30.6
once a month	21	42.9
every 3 months	7	14.3
less than every 3 months	6	12.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100</b>

**2001 PASC Final Report**

**Q 6. Which of the following staff members you would most likely contact when you have a problem or a question.**

	Frequency	Percent
PASC Program Director	10	19.6
PASC Social Worker	7	13.7
DCFS Social Worker	4	7.8
Youth Advocate	25	49
Administrative Assistant	1	2
Other	4	7.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 6a. Other staff members you would most likely contact when you have a problem or a question:**

	Frequency
All of them	2
ILP Coordinator	1
PASC staff	1

**Q 7. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...ILP funds/assistance**

	Frequency	Percent
Important	35	66
Not Important	6	11.3
Not Applicable	12	22.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 8. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Computer lab**

	Frequency	Percent
Important	34	65.4
Not Important	7	13.5
Not Applicable	11	21.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 9. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Job counseling**

	Frequency	Percent
Important	40	74.1
Not Important	4	7.4
Not Applicable	10	18.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100</b>

**2001 PASC Final Report**

**Q 10. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Health and Medi-Cal counseling**

	Frequency	Percent
Important	36	67.9
Not Important	6	11.3
Not Applicable	11	20.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 11. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Discussion groups (i.e. Girl Talk)**

	Frequency	Percent
Important	28	54.9
Not Important	11	21.6
Not Applicable	12	23.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 12. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Social events**

	Frequency	Percent
Important	31	59.6
Not Important	11	21.2
Not Applicable	10	19.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 13. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Housing referrals**

	Frequency	Percent
Important	35	67.3
Not Important	5	9.6
Not Applicable	12	23.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 14. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Education/Financial Aid**

	Frequency	Percent
Important	38	70.4
Not Important	4	7.4
Not Applicable	12	22.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100</b>

**2001 PASC Final Report**

Q 15. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Life Skills Classes (e.g. Cooking)

	Frequency	Percent
Important	36	67.9
Not Important	6	11.3
Not Applicable	11	20.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 16. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Legal issues

	Frequency	Percent
Important	35	66
Not Important	7	13.2
Not Applicable	11	20.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 17. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Emergency Funds

	Frequency	Percent
Important	36	69.2
Not Important	4	7.7
Not Applicable	12	23.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>92.9</b>

Q 18. Other:

	Frequency	Percent
	54	96.4
Actually getting me a job	1	1.8
Location	1	1.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 18a. State whether the following PASC services are important to you...Other:

	Frequency	Percent
Important	2	16.7
Not Important	1	8.3
Not Applicable	9	75
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 19. I would like to be contacted at least once a month by PASC.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	8	14.5
Disagree	3	5.5
Agree	21	38.2
Strongly agree	22	40
Not Applicable	1	1.8
Total	55	100

Q 20. When I ask for information, I am provided with information that I can use.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	8	14.8
Disagree	3	5.6
Agree	19	35.2
Strongly agree	22	40.7
Not Applicable	2	3.7
Total	54	100

Q 21. When I need services or help, I am given referrals to other agencies that I find useful.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	7	13.2
Disagree	6	11.3
Agree	13	24.5
Strongly agree	18	34
Not Applicable	9	17
Total	53	100

Q 22. PASC help in obtaining education/financial aid information is useful.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	8	14.5
Disagree	5	9.1
Agree	16	29.1
Strongly agree	17	30.9
Not Applicable	9	16.4
Total	55	100

Q 23. PASC housing referrals are helpful.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	4	7.3
Disagree	6	10.9
Agree	16	29.1
Strongly agree	21	38.2
Not Applicable	8	14.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 24. PASC employment referrals are helpful.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	6	10.9
Disagree	6	10.9
Agree	19	34.5
Strongly agree	16	29.1
Not Applicable	8	14.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 25. PASC referrals for medical problems are helpful.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	7	12.7
Disagree	2	3.6
Agree	21	38.2
Strongly agree	16	29.1
Not Applicable	9	16.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 26. PASC referrals for counseling services are helpful.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	6	11.1
Disagree	5	9.3
Agree	16	29.6
Strongly agree	17	31.5
Not Applicable	10	18.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 27. PASC legal referrals are helpful.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	7	12.7
Disagree	6	10.9
Agree	11	20
Strongly agree	19	34.5
Not Applicable	12	21.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>



Q 28. I enjoy PASC social events.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	5	9.1
Disagree	4	7.3
Agree	14	25.5
Strongly agree	19	34.5
Not Applicable	13	23.6
Total	55	100

Q 29. I would recommend PASC services to others.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	6	11.1
Disagree	2	3.7
Agree	16	29.6
Strongly agree	30	55.6
Total	54	100

**2001 PASC Final Report**

**Q 30. What PASC services do you value most?**

	Frequency	Percent
All services	3	6.7
Cohesing services	1	2.2
Coming and playing with computer and the good counseling	1	2.2
Computer lab, phone and availability of Youth Advocate workers	1	2.2
Cooking Class	2	4.4
Education and housing	2	4.4
Employment	2	4.4
Employment and housing	3	6.7
Financial Aid	1	2.2
Friendliness	1	2.2
Girl talk	1	2.2
Girl talk/computers	1	2.2
Have not utilized PASC services yet.	4	8.9
Health and financial information	2	4.4
Health and medical counseling	6	13.3
Help me learn a lot of stuff that I need to know	1	2.2
Help with ILP	1	2.2
Helpful social services	1	2.2
I haven't really used them, but the cooking classes or Girl Talk or ILP funds	1	2.2
I value the social event where I can get to know other people	1	2.2
Meetings	1	2.2
Talking in a group with my peers	1	2.2
That they are able to help you with almost anything	1	2.2
The computer	1	2.2
The help of youth advocate (Ebony)	1	2.2
The services that I value most is their helpfulness	1	2.2
There groups that they have to help us out	1	2.2
This one	1	2.2
To get to know other people	1	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

**2001 PASC Final Report**

Q 31. What problems, if any, have you had with referrals you have been given?

	Frequency	Percent
Assist my coordinator	1	2.9
I have had no problems	30	85.7
I haven't had any referrals	1	2.9
I need help with transportation and housing	1	2.9
No health call but no call back	1	2.9
Well, the jobs they refer are not enough to be able to survive	1	2.9
Total	35	100

Q 32. What services or activities would you like to see PASC provide?

	Frequency	Percent
More social events/sports activities	9	22.5
All	3	7.5
Another garage give away by January 2002 with transportation	1	2.5
Debt consolidation/test tutoring for city jobs in Pasadena	1	2.5
Do single cooking projects	1	2.5
No Opinion	13	32.5
Housing, education and computer gaming	1	2.5
Job training - to help you get that job w/benefits.	1	2.5
Learning about public transportation especially bus routes	1	2.5
Legal referral	1	2.5
More Girl Talk	1	2.5
More ILP workshops	1	2.5
More counseling	1	2.5
More education	1	2.5
More employment information	1	2.5
The PASC activities are good for me	1	2.5
They provide good events.	1	2.5
Unfortunately it's too far for me.	1	2.5
You all have done enough, thanks!	1	2.5
Total	40	100

**ATTACHMENT F**  
**Pasadena Alumni Support Center**  
**Transition Partner Survey**

**Q 1. Have you ever visited the center?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	25	96.2
No	1	3.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 2a. What types of service does your agency provide...Housing?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	9	33.3
No	18	66.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 2b. What types of service does your agency provide...Mental Health?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	8	29.6
No	19	70.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 2c. What types of service does your agency provide...Substance/Alcohol Abuse?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	3	11.1
No	24	88.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 2d. What types of service does your agency provide...Employment/Job Readiness?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	11	40.7
No	16	59.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 2e. What types of service does your agency provide...Health?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	5	18.5
No	22	81.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 2f. What types of service does your agency provide...Legal?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	2	7.4
No	25	92.6
Total	27	100

Q 2g. What types of service does your agency provide...Financial Resources and Support?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	7	25.9
No	20	74.1
Total	27	100

Q 2h. What types of service does your agency provide...Education?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	16	59.3
No	11	40.7
Total	27	100

Q 2i. What types of service does your agency provide...ILP classes?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	5	18.5
No	22	81.5
Total	27	100

Q 2j. What types of service does your agency provide...Other:

	Frequency	Percent
Aftercare for emancipated youth	1	12.5
Arts education, reunification camps for foster youth and siblings	1	12.5
Government oversight/intervention	1	12.5
Mentoring/Teen Parent Support	1	12.5
Operational, Volunteers, P.R., Advisory	1	12.5
Recruit eligible youth to participate in various services	1	12.5
We administer the ILP program for probation youth	1	12.5
We do community organizing/advocacy work	1	12.5
Total	8	100

Q 3. What groups of youth do you service?

	Frequency	Percent
pre-emancipated	3	13
emancipated	2	8.7
both	18	78.3
Total	23	100

Q 4. How often have representatives of your agency attended Transition Partner meetings?

	Frequency	Percent
Never	5	18.5
1-2 times a year	3	11.1
Quarterly	3	11.1
Every other month	7	25.9
Always	9	33.3
Total	27	100

Q 5. If your agency has attended Transition Partner meetings, how useful did you find them?

	Frequency	Percent
very useful	7	29.2
useful	16	66.7
not useful	1	4.2
Total	24	100

Q 6. If your agency has not attended Transition Partner meetings, why has this occurred?

	Frequency	Percent
Did not receive notice	3	60
Did not receive notice in time	1	20
Do not have staff available to attend	1	20
Total	5	100

**2001 PASC Final Report**

**Q 7. If you would like to see a change in the Transition Partner meetings that would make them more useful to you, please explain.**

	Frequency
Action oriented, follow-up and accountability	1
I believe there should be a chair	1
If topics were directly related to our services	1
Introductions go on too long. Stop retelling the history of PASC - new members should attend a pre-meeting explaining the history	1
More action steps as people leave each meeting	1
More commitment from the partners	1
No comment at present time	1
Post meeting dates/times for committee meetings on transportation agenda	1
Speakers on issues related to emancipated youth: policy makers, advocates, youth presentations, etc. It's assumed that we are linked to the accomplishments and/or challenges on a regular basis.	1
To infuse them more with pre-emancipated and emancipated youth	1

**Q 8a. On what PASC committees do you participate...Housing?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	8	29.6
No	19	70.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 8b. On what PASC committees do you participate...Education?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	14.8
No	23	85.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 8c. On what PASC committees do you participate...Public Relations?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	1	3.7
No	26	96.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

**2001 PASC Final Report**

**Q 8d. On what PASC committees do you participate...Advisory?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	5	18.5
No	22	81.5
<b>Total</b>	27	100

**Q 8e. On what PASC committees do you participate...Private Emancipation Services?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	3	11.1
No	24	88.9
<b>Total</b>	27	100

**Q 8f. On what PASC committees do you participate...None?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	6	22.2
No	21	77.8
<b>Total</b>	27	100

**Q 8g. On what PASC committees do you participate...Mentoring?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	14.8
No	23	85.2
<b>Total</b>	27	100

**Q 8h. On what PASC committees do you participate...Other:**

	Frequency
Let me know what committee would need me	1
Long range - does it still exist?	1



**2001 PASC Final Report**

Q 9. If you participate on a PASC committee(s), in what ways are they effective? In what ways can they be improved?

	Frequency
Bringing resources together and providing focus. So far so good.	1
Establish clear goals and objectives; but timeliness; act on plan within a 12-month period. Otherwise, we can lose sight your purpose. We don't have the time to meet for meeting's sake!	1
Focus and move to decision more quickly	1
Good for brainstorming and can potentially be action oriented. Can lapse into just being complaining sessions.	1
Just getting involved	1
More participation from other partners	1
More people can participate. People who attend do follow through	1
Not involved at present time would like to be	1
People need to make a true commitment and show up	1
Regularity and minutes are effective - calendar of meeting dates is not in my possession therefore could not plan.	1
Small enough to reach consensus. Need more private sector participation.	1

Q 10a. What kind of services has your agency provided to or through PASC...Information resource support to PASC staff?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	18	66.7
No	9	33.3
Total	27	100

Q 10b. What kind of services has your agency provided to or through PASC...Referral resource for PASC youth needing services?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	51.9
No	13	48.1
Total	27	100

Q 10c. What kind of services has your agency provided to or through PASC...Monetary contributions?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	1	3.7
No	26	96.3
Total	27	100

**2001 PASC Final Report**

Q 10d. What kind of services has your agency provided to or through PASC...In-kind contributions?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	7	25.9
No	20	74.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 10e. What kind of services has your agency provided to or through PASC...On-site services at PASC:

	Frequency
Employment	1
Healthy Fathers/Healthy Men	1
ILP classes (skills center)	1
Legal clinics	1
Mental Health Services-Did some training for staff	1
Outreach worker	1
Presentation to youth from David & Margaret Group Home	1
Staff servicing DCFS emancipated youth	1
YWCA operates the PASC program	1

Q 11a. How have you offered your services to PASC and its clients...Orally at Transition Partner meetings?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	51.9
No	13	48.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 11b. How have you offered your services to PASC and its clients...Orally at other meetings?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	15	55.6
No	12	44.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

Q 11c. How have you offered your services to PASC and its clients...By letter or other written offer?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	3	11.1
No	24	88.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

**2001 PASC Final Report**

**Q 11d. How have you offered your services to PASC and its clients...Memorandum of Understanding?**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	14.8
No	23	85.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

**Q 12. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve the delivery of services from your agency and/or other agencies to PASC clients? Please explain.**

	Frequency
A very well organized and detailed kind of community and government based service and resources to be utilized by YAs.	1
Communication about services available	1
Facilitate more effective collaboration, identify the goals and achievements of the systematic changes in housing and education.	1
Have a coordinator onsite to help increase youth participation at site.	1
I would love to coordinate a internet link w/RFCPP.org	1
Not at this time.	4
Put an ILP coordinator on site	1
Send out more info to community	1
What we experienced from Healthy Fathers/Healthy Men is the importance of assigning hours to a youth advocate for outreach referrals.	1
Would love to assist with coordination of health services	1

**2001 PASC Final Report**

Q 13. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve coordination of services between agencies to enhance delivery of service to PASC clients? Please explain.

	Frequency
Develop a structure when vests authority in a partners decision-making. Also utilize partners and provide training in their strengths instead of developing new.	1
I think that it's important to have regular staff updates in community services rather than assume knows what is offered. Plus staff needs to consider arranging site visits w/agencies.	1
Invite local group home staff to "Open Houses" monthly	1
Marketing - timely sharing of information	1
None	3
On site nurse (part-time, limited hours)	1
The internet is the key	1
There should be PASC referral forms that get returned for "proof of services"	1
Website	1

Q 14. What barriers, if any, exist to providing services to PASC clients? Please explain.

	Frequency
A clear or more specific definition of Partners role	1
Consistency or follow-through w/other agency staff for PASC onsite programs (I.e. Healthy Fathers/Healthy Men)	1
Funding/Staffing	1
Hours need to extend into evening	1
Location	1
Money to support on full time staff member onsite	1
Networking must be enforced and implemented	1
None	1
Not personally aware of any	1
Our location to PASC, our program is located in S. Central Los Angeles	1
Seamless connection to County ILP resources.	1
Space at PASC isn't enough to support all agencies who can provide services	1
Unknown	1

Q 15. How could those barriers be eliminated? Please explain.

	Frequency
Agency staff orientation (onsite PASC) to program services offered so that they become stakeholders and commit to refer their youth.	1
Available funding (grants)	1
Develop more centers	1
Don't Know	1
Greater collaboration and trust w/County entities. More inclusion by County of PASC	1
Involve the partners in policy decision making process	1
Longer hours - perhaps weekend hours	1
No Comment	1
Organization on a whole must share information and eliminate operating in solo	1
We could collaborate to raise the money needed	1

Q 16. What are the strengths and weaknesses of PASC services?

	Frequency
A great resource center	1
I think PASC is doing a good job for its age	1
Not sure	1
Outreach is an area of weakness with DCFS emancipated youth.	1
Strength – One-stop services. Weaknesses - outreach to youth who were in single homes is limited and lack of referrals to services provided for and by various other non-profits.	1
Strengths - Comprehensive in meeting the overall needs.	1
Strengths - Resources available to clients and community. Weaknesses - None seen at this time	1
Strengths – a variety of services available to youth is very helpful. Weaknesses - hours to be evening/weekend	1
Strengths - location and casual atmosphere. Weakness - Expand boundaries of outreach to foster parents and foster parent association.	1
Strengths – user-friendly youth participation, energy enthusiasm are high and open to ideas. Weaknesses - Need to outreach directly to all group homes.	1
Strengths are your indomitable spirit and the way in which you get programs up and running	1
They are the only ones that exist in this area. They could be expanded significantly.	1
Weakness in the employment area	1
YAs are both strengths and a challenge.	1

Q 17. Do you understand the referral process PASC uses to refer clients to your agency?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	6	85.7
No	1	14.3
Total	7	100

**2001 PASC Final Report**

Q 18. If no, how would you like to receive information about the referral process?

	Frequency	Percent
In writing	1	50
At a Transition Partners meeting	1	50
Total	2	100

Q 19. How often do you receive client referrals from PASC?

	Frequency	Percent
Monthly	3	50
Quarterly	2	33.3
Never	1	16.7
Total	6	100

Q 20. When you have received referrals from PASC, how often have you been able to provide the needed service?

	Frequency	Percent
Seldom	1	20
Frequently	4	80
Total	5	100

Q 21. If you have not been able to provide the needed service, why?

	Frequency
Inability to service additional youth	1
PASC youth failed to follow through	2

Q 21a. If you have not been able to provide the needed service, why....Other:

	Frequency
At times the age makes them ineligible	1

Q 22. If the inability to provide the service was due to lack of PASC client follow-through, can you suggest follow-up procedures to help ensure that clients receive needed services? If so, what are they?

	Frequency
Difficult issue	1
No, some clients change their minds after asking for help.	1

Q 23. Do you think that your agency could provide services for which clients are not being referred?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	6	22.2
No	6	22.2
Total	12	44.4

**2001 PASC Final Report**

Q 24. If yes, please state what client service(s) your agency could provide:

	Frequency
HIV education & confidential testing, STD clinic, CHDP substance abuse program	1
Help those who want to go to college and those in college for added support	1
Job Placement and Job Retention	1
Mental Health	1
Mental Health & Career Counseling	1
Volunteer development, social, advocacy, and specialized skills (e.g. self defense)	1