AGENDA AND NOTICE OF A PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BLACK PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS
COMMITTEE CHAIR: Jacqueline Waggoner  VICE CHAIR: Kelli Bernard

Monday, July 16, 2018
1:00 p.m.

Location:
A.C. Bilbrew Public Library
150 E. El Segundo Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90061

ITEM AND DESCRIPTION PRESENTER PAGE
---

Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum

Agenda Items - The public will have an opportunity to speak to any agenda item when the item is called and before action is taken. A Request to Speak Form must be submitted to the Secretary prior to the completion of the agenda item. The Chair will determine the order of speaking and unless the Chair grants more or less time, the speaker’s limit is two (2) minutes on each agenda item, subject to the total 20-minute period.

- Welcome and Introductions. Commissioner Waggoner
- Review and approve minutes from the meeting of Monday, June 18, 2018. Commissioner Waggoner 3
- Discussion of Committee Work Plan. Patricia Lally 6
- Discussion of Listening Session Findings to Date. Patricia Lally Earl Edwards 15
- Presentation & Discussion: Children’s Data Network. Regan Foust 23
- Presentation & Discussion: Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services. Roberta Medina Cynthia McCoy-Miller V. Gail Winston
- Presentation & Discussion: Youth Lived Experience Panel. Earl Edwards Nikyra Houston Nova Mirari Tanisha Saunders
- Presentation & Discussion: Insights from Committee Members. Va Lecia Adams Kellum Veronica Lewis
- Discussion of Potential Recommendations. Patricia Lally Sarah Mahin
• **Public Participation**
  Each Public Participant speaker is limited to two (2) minutes and may address any topic within the Commission’s jurisdiction. A Request to Speak Form must be filled out and submitted to the Secretary prior to the beginning of Public Participation. Subject to the total 20-minute period, each Public Participation speaker is limited to two (2) minutes.

**Adjournment**

Packets of materials on agenda items are available to the public during normal business hours at 811 Wilshire Boulevard, 6th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017. For further information, you may call 213-683-3333. Upon request, sign language interpreters, materials in alternative formats and other accommodations are available to the public for LAHSA meetings. All requests for reasonable accommodations must be made at least three working days (72 Hours) in advance of the scheduled meeting date. For additional information, contact LAHSA at (213) 683-3333 or TTY (213) 553-8488.
MINUTES OF THE
LOS ANGELES HOMELESS SERVICES AUTHORITY
AD HOC COMMITTEE ON BLACK PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS MEETING
Held June 18, 2018

The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness Meeting, held at the Constituent Service Center of Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson located at 8475 S. Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, California, was called to order at 1:15 pm by Commissioner Waggoner.

Attendance
LAHSA Commissioners Present:
Jacqueline Waggoner, Chair
Kelli Bernard, Vice Chair

Committee Members Present:
VaLecia Adams Kellum
Wendell Blassingame
Brian Ford
Juataun Mark
Alisa Orduna
Brenda Shockley
Reba Stevens
Chancela Al-Mansour
Rachel Brashier
Robin Hughes
Nova Mirari
Molly Rysman
Lola Smallwood-Cuevas
Oliver Buie
Anita Nelson
Suzette Shaw
Sean Spear
Jack Barbour
Monique King-Viehland

Committee Members Absent:
Edward Anderson
Chela Demuir-Cartier
Janet Kelly
Veronica Lewis
Pete White

LAHSA Staff:
Sarah Mahin, Director of Policy & Systems
Brenda Wheatley, Executive Assistant

Call to Order/Roll Call/Establishment of Quorum
Roll was called and quorum was established at 1:15 p.m.

1.0 Welcome and Introductions.
Commissioner Waggoner thanked the members for participating and outlined the issues that will be examined by the Committee. She introduced the new members. Commissioner Waggoner shared that future discussions will be held on employment and criminalization of homeless. Commissioner Bernard thanked the members and staff. Patricia Lally, Facilitator, welcomed the group.

2.0 Review and approve minutes from the meeting of Monday, May 21, 2018.
Ms. Stevens requested an amendment to the minutes to capture corrections to Josh Hall’s presentation regarding Measure H funding.

Motion: The Committee members moved and seconded acceptance of the minutes as corrected.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

Action: The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Lally addressed housekeeping matters.
3.0 Discussion of Racial Equity Toolkit & Committee Work Plan.
Patricia Lally, Committee Facilitator, gave the report:

- Ms. Lally walked the Committee members through the work plan and shared information on the racial equity toolkit as shown in the provided presentation.
- Ms. Stevens raised a question about record keeping. Ms. Lally explained the way that feedback is being captured at Committee meetings and community listening sessions and explained the plan for sharing the consolidated feedback with the Committee.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

4.0 Presentation and Discussion: Listening Session Findings to Date.
Patricia Lally, Committee Facilitator and Earl Edwards, Co-Facilitator, gave the report:

- Mr. Edwards provided an update on the listening sessions being conducted in various locations across the County. He encouraged members to attend.
- Mr. Edwards and Ms. Lally shared themes and comments specific to re-entry that have emerged from listening sessions to date.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

5.0 Presentation and Discussion: Re-Entry Initiatives, Office of Diversion and Reentry.
Corrin Buchanan, gave the report:

- Ms. Buchanan presented on the re-entry initiatives: flexible housing subsidy pool, court partners referrals, partnerships within the justice system, and Misdemeanor, Incompetent to Stand Trial (MIST)- Community Based Restoration.
- There was discussion about Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion, a program that diverts people away from system before they are booked.

Public Speaker(s):
- Katrina Swafford asked who they could contact to foster relationships with property owners.
- Charles stated that people with nonviolent crimes, serving 25-30 years, continue to face challenges after re-entry.
- Rev. Dr. Mello Desire asked how providers could receive funding without all the red tape.

6.0 Presentation and Discussion: From Prison to Skid Row, A New Way of Life Re-Entry Project.
Susan Burton, A New Way of Life Re-Entry Project, gave the report:

- Ms. Burton reported on the challenges related to criminal justice system involvement and homelessness, including high arrest rates for persons experiencing homelessness, high numbers of homelessness among those incarcerated. She indicated that the homeless are underserved and over-policed, experiencing significantly higher arrest rates compared to the general population.
- There was discussion about the increased number of women in prisons and jails and the need for more research about women specifically African American reentering the penal system. There was also discussion about a need for funders to revamp their contractual processes to afford small agencies more bidding opportunities.
- Ms. Adams Kellum suggested that a solution to some of the issues identified is fostering partnerships with organizations like A New Way of Life Re-Entry Project to employ formerly-incarcerated persons within the homeless service system.

Public Speaker(s):
- General Jeff asked Ms. Burton to share expertise in successfully running a shelter.
- Carmen Taylor Jones stated that when someone goes to jail, the whole household falls apart, which forever impacts their family. There is a need to be watchful and ensure that legislation does not create greater barriers.
7.0 Discussion of Potential Recommendations.

- Committee members discussed potential recommendations, including:
  - Look at increasing restorative justice programs.
  - Have homeless service providers partner with agencies who have re-entry experience, especially smaller ones that hire people with lived experience.
  - Establish cross-functional teams to work with law enforcement and housing and service providers.
  - Scale Office of Diversion and Reentry programs to meet need.
  - Look at how to reinvest savings within the criminal justice system into effective service models.
  - Expand transitional job programs.
  - Require implicit bias trainings for service providers and law enforcement.
  - Gather better data on women and re-entry, and on homelessness and criminal justice system overlap.
  - Partner with re-entry programs to hire people to work in the homeless services field.
  - Explore strategies to expand the base of providers.
  - Reduce contracting requirements with public agencies.
  - Fund enhanced services to help people thrive in community (not just get into housing).
  - Involve more young people throughout the process of program and policy design.

Public Speaker(s): There were no public speakers.

8.0 Public Participation

Public Speaker: Carmen Taylor Jones commented that there need be safety nets for service providers, and better dialogue with law enforcement about how to provide safety in housing.

Public Speaker: General Jeff expressed concern for a homeless family present at the meeting who needed immediate housing.

Public Speaker: Dr. Princess Sykes indicated that she was one of 36 neighborhood council budget advocates with recommendations for use of City funds.

Public Speaker: Kevin Collins commented that there is a need for more training and a need to work with young people to create businesses.

Public Speaker: Tori Bailey commented that service providers need to know the community in which they work and suggested that City Controller Ron Galperin be engaged and invited to the table.

Public Speaker: Daley Barnwell-Moore commented that there is a need for more data about Black youth ages 16-25, as this is often where incarceration and system-involvement begins.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m.
1.0 OVERVIEW

At its December 2017 meeting, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) Commission established the Ad Hoc Committee on Black People Experiencing Homelessness to address the issue of sustained overrepresentation of Black people experiencing homelessness in Los Angeles County. The purpose of the Committee is to provide focused attention to better understand the factors contributing to the overrepresentation of Black people among the population experiencing homelessness, identify opportunities to increase racial equity within the homeless service delivery system, and develop recommendations to more effectively meet the needs of Black people experiencing homelessness.

2.0 COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

LAHSA Commissioners:
Kelli Bernard, Vice-Chair  Jacqueline Waggoner, Chair

Committee Members:
Va Lecia Adams Kellum  Juataun Mark
Chancela Al-Mansour  Nova Mirari
Edward Anderson  Anita Nelson
Jack Barbour  Alisa Orduna
Wendell Blassingame  Molly Rysman
Rachel Brashier  Suzette Shaw
Oliver Buie  Brenda Shockley
Chela Demuir-Cartier  Lola Smallwood Cuevas
Brian Ford  Sean Spear
Robin Hughes  Reba Stevens
Janet Kelly  Pete White
Monique King-Viehland  Dhakshike Wickrema
Veronica Lewis  

LAHSA Staff Liaisons:
Sarah Mahin, Director of Policy & Systems  Brenda Wheatley, Commission Liaison
Erin Cox, Supervisor, Policy & Systems  

3.0 GOALS

1. Provide Focused Attention and a Forum for Discussion
   a. Hold public monthly meetings on subjects related to Black people experiencing homelessness
   b. Invite public speakers to present on aspects of homelessness and offer recommendations
   c. Host community listening sessions and focus groups across the county to engage advocates, service providers, and community members to better understand key challenges and barriers to service
   d. Expand and adjust discussion of subjects based on feedback and progress
2. Develop and Promote Recommendations
   a. Analyze data related to Black people experiencing homelessness
   b. Apply a racial equity analysis to develop appropriate strategies and recommendations related to Black people experiencing homelessness
   c. Identify and make recommendations to the LAHSA Commission, the County, the City, and other stakeholders on how to improve efforts to address racial disparities impacting Black people experiencing homelessness
   d. Share recommendations and results of the Committee’s work with community members
   e. Produce a report that presents data on Black people experiencing homelessness in LA, information gathered from presentations and discussion, and recommendations made by the Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Potential Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| April 4/16/18 | Orientation Training on Implicit Bias & Racial Equity Toolkit (RET) Application | • Establish Committee purpose & goals  
• Conduct racial equity training  
• Review the use of a Racial Equity Toolkit to establish desired racial equity outcomes, identify harms and benefits, and develop strategies to achieve racial equity |   | • Use a Racial Equity Toolkit, with clear racial equity outcomes, to examine critical programs, policies budget decisions, procedures  
• Examine hiring practices and job requirements to eliminate barriers for persons of color  
• Ensure that racial justice is a focus in the implementation of City & County homeless strategies |
| May 5/21/18  | Introduction to LAHSA & the Coordinated Entry System (CES)  
Examining Equity in the Homeless Service System through Data | • Understand the role of LAHSA and the function of the Coordinated Entry System  
• Understand demographic characteristics and experiences of Black people experiencing homelessness in LA County  
• Examine racial equity in the homeless service system through data on program enrollments, housing placements, and retention | □ Provide information about plan for capturing justice system involvement in CES assessment tools  
□ Report to full Committee on themes emerging at listening sessions  
□ Provide more in-depth information about housing programs and matching process  
□ Provide further analysis of recidivism/why people are exiting housing placements | • Involve persons with lived experience, persons of color, and service providers in data analysis and research efforts  
• Strengthen and expand homelessness prevention programs  
• Advocate for inclusionary zoning policies  
• Advocate for fair hiring practices to reduce barriers to employment  
• Address cultural competency of program staff  
• Advocate for fair chance housing legislation to prevent rental restrictions based on criminal records |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 6/18/18</th>
<th>Re-entry &amp; Criminal Justice System Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Understand the connection between re-entry and homelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore barriers and possible solutions for accessing housing and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learn about and discuss existing City and County re-entry initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learn about and discuss community-based programs to support formerly-incarcerated persons in accessing safe and stable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update on community listening sessions and focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Apply the RET to address racial inequities impacting formerly-incarcerated Black people at risk of or experiencing homelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Create one list of listening sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Presentation on themes from listening sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services/Partnerships:**
- Advocate for the development and growth of community-rooted programs, providers, and networks owned and/or led by formerly incarcerated individuals to guide successful reentry.
- Increase the scope and scale of criminal justice diversion programs provided by the LA County Office of Diversion and Reentry.
- Expand the use of restorative justice programs.
- Strengthen working relationships between law enforcement, service, and housing providers.
- Support partnerships with homeless service providers, re-entry agencies, economic development organizations, and unions to provide job training, apprenticeships and a hiring pipeline for formerly incarcerated individuals.
- Target Black families for homelessness prevention services.
- Adopt use of the Justice Discharge-Vulnerability Index-Service Prioritization Decision Assistance Tool (JD-VI-SPDAT).
- Employ a Black person-centered trauma informed care model.
- *Create (or expand funding for) a Re-entry Navigator program to provide peer-to-peer mentorship, guidance, and support for re-entry populations in accessing housing, employment, healthcare, and education services.*
• Coordinate with appropriate agencies to target and leverage any housing dollars to support those living with criminal history.
• Partner with community colleges to create re-entry education programs for persons leaving incarceration.
• Assess current service provider practices (including how providers ask what people need) to ensure formerly incarcerated individuals are connected to the appropriate services.
• Generate a network of Reception/Transition Hubs with culturally relevant services.

Funding:
• Fund and build capacity for programs that conduct effective wrap-around service models for people who are formerly incarcerated and who are, or at risk of becoming, homeless.
• Fund programs that hire Black people who are formerly-incarcerated as caseworkers and managerial staff to support other formerly incarcerated people and employ trauma-informed care training and practices in their services.
• Engage the philanthropic community to leverage funding and strengthen new and existing partnerships.
• Reduce contracting requirements with public agencies; facilitate joint-ventures versus subcontractor models.
• Conduct a fiscal, cost, and power analysis of criminal justice investments and redirect criminal justice spending to early intervention, diversion, and behavioral health services.
• Encourage the City and County to shift investments in high-cost systems, such as the criminal justice system, to housing and service investments that help this population thrive in the community.

Housing/Policy:
• Ensure rental and housing search/stability assistance is readily available for those exiting from incarceration.
• Increase available data and metrics on homelessness and criminal justice—especially focusing on women and incarceration.
• Involve a younger generation of advocates in program and policy design and implementation.
• In advocacy, use a framework that focuses on prevention, public safety, and human rights.
• Adjust policies to prevent non-violent arrests from removing individuals experiencing homelessness from city and county controlled housing placement lists.
• Redefine the definition of “homelessness” for non-HUD funded projects to include individuals exiting long-term incarceration.
• Champion the criminal justice system to be homeless and housing informed and
| July 7/16/18 | Child Welfare System Involvement | • Discuss the unique challenges of child welfare system involvement for families experiencing homelessness  
• Discuss strategies to support youth of color exiting the foster care system  
• Update on community listening sessions and focus groups  
• Apply the RET to address racial inequities impacting Black people involved in the child welfare system | operate with an anti-racist lens; train law enforcement on implicit bias and institutional racism.  
• Assess current booking criteria and sentencing guidelines; divert all homelessness-related bookings to services rather than jail.  
• Review and redesign compliance requirements to be human-centered and racially just. |
| August 8/20/18 | CES Outreach & Assessment | • Review and discuss CES assessments of Black people experiencing homelessness  
• Review and discuss street outreach and engagement services provided to Black |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 9/17/18</td>
<td>Permanent Housing</td>
<td>• Learn about housing models within the homeless service system (i.e. rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore ways to improve connections to housing opportunities of all forms (i.e. affordable housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Examine reasons for high rates of housing exits and recidivism for Black people served through the homeless service system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn about promising housing services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Update on community listening sessions and focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Apply the RET to address racial inequities impacting Black people seeking shelter and/or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October (date TBD)</td>
<td>Final Review of Recommendations</td>
<td>• Review all potential recommendations that have emerged from the Committee’s work and finalize for inclusion in the Committee’s public report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applying the Racial Equity Tool to Child Welfare Systems and Homelessness

July 16, 2018
The Racial Equity Toolkit is a set of questions to guide us as we assess how our policies, projects, initiatives, and budget decisions benefit and burden communities. This process is intended to disrupt institutional racism and lead us towards more equitable results.
Step 1: Racial Equity Outcome

Eliminate racial disparities impacting Black people experiencing homelessness by ensuring racial equity within the homeless crisis response system.
Step 2: Engage Stakeholders and Analyze Data

The Transitional Living Program needs to improve.

- We receive internships, but there is no sustained support.
- Individuals who are deemed “able-bodied” are discriminated against.
- The current model is not a “human-centered design.” It is more about completing a checklist vs. building the capacity of people.

Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles Member

Providers try to steer youth towards a particular activity. They want to place youth into funded programs.

Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles Member
Step 2: Engage Stakeholders and Analyze Data

TLPs should link and connect youth to other programs. Don’t focus on money and funding; focus on what youth need first. [TLPs] are not human-centered. It’s more money for the bodies.

Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles Member

There is no conversation as to what the youth person needs; the programs are prescriptive. If I am competent and succeeding, don’t take away resources because of it.

Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles Member
I was in a Hollywood shelter, and I was looking into a work program. I asked my case manager, but I didn’t receive any support, so I looked on my own. I spent weeks researching programs, and I found this program all the way in Long Beach, so I spent hours getting there only to see the van of the shelter I was staying at in their parking lot! . . . Once I was accepted into the work program, the shelter then tried to take credit!

Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles Member
There is only one place I know that offers LGBT housing, and they are not welcoming to Black youth. I went there and they saw me as a threat. Everyone looked at me as if they were scared of me. I walked in that one time for help and never went back.

Homeless Youth Forum of Los Angeles Member
1. Black youth face multiple forms of discrimination based on age, sexual orientation, sexual identity, gender, and race.

2. Transitioning youth demonstrating independence are often at risk of prematurely losing support and services.

3. TLPs and other youth services must be tailored to suit the specific needs of the youth receiving services.

4. Youth-focused service providers, particularly those serving LGBTQ youth, are not trained to serve Black youth.
An Exploration into the Characteristics, Service Needs, and Child Protection Involvement of Families Accessing Services through the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority: Preliminary Results

July 16, 2018
Harnessing the scientific potential of linked, administrative data to inform children's programs and policies.
Animation 1: Applications

What is linked administrative data? And why is it important?

http://www.datanetwork.org/about-us/#video-1
**Statewide:**
- Developmental Service Records (DDS): 2000-2014
- Corrections & Rehabilitation Records (CDCR): 2000-2013
- Hospital Discharge Records (OSHPD): 2006 birth cohort
- CalWORKs Records (CDSS): 2016
- CalFresh Records (CDSS): 2016

**County:**
- LA County Homeless Service Authority Records (LAHSA): 2013-2016
- LA County Safety Net Program Records (DCFS): 2014-2016
- SPAs 1 & 2 Head Start, Subsidized Child Care, and CalWORKs Stage 1 Records (CCRC/DPSS): 2006-2014
- SF County Homeless Service Records (SF HSA): 2000-2014
- OC Bridges Newborn Assessment Records (CFCOC): 2016

*Please visit our Research Page for project information: [http://www.datanetwork.org/research/](http://www.datanetwork.org/research/)*
Focus: Family Homelessness

• Goals:
  • Better characterize families who received LAHSA services in terms of their demographics, services, and child protection involvement.
  • Identify differences between TAY Parents (Parents between ages 18 & 24) and their older, parenting counterparts.

• Process:
  • Linked the records of individuals accessing LAHSA services between January 1st, 2013 and December 31st, 2016 to Child Protection records (Retrospective!)
Current study cannot:

• Address prospective questions
• Provide information about individuals without children or youth under age 18
  
  e.g., How many children in foster care went on to access homeless services?
• Be taken as final

Current study can:

• Provide preliminary information about the demographic makeup of families seeking services in 2013-2016 and differences by TAY status
Definitions:
Individuals Accessing Homeless Services

- Individuals (n=155,900)
- Heads of Household (HoH) (n=122,070, 78% of Ind.)
  - Parents (n=12,918, 11% of HoH)
    - TAY Parents (n=2,325, 18% of Parents, 2% of HoH)

Individuals ages 18 and older
HoHs with one or more minor child attached to them at any point during the study window

Parents between the ages of 18 & 24
Finding 1: Number of parents accessing homeless services for 1st time doubled between 2013 & 2016

Figure 1.1. Parents with First Service Encounters between 2012 and 2016, by year

Figure 1.2. Transitional Age Youth (TAY) Parents with First Service Encounters between 2012 and 2016, by year

Notes: Scale differs between the two graphs! Data limited to active clients in 2013-2016, so 2012 totals do not include clients with first service encounters in 2012 who exited in 2012.
Finding 2: Parents were predominantly Black and Latino, Female, and with young children.

Overall:

- Nearly half (48%) of the parents in this cohort were Black, 39% were Latino, 9% were white, and 2% were Asian / Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander.
- The vast majority (83.1%) of parents were Female.
- 41.1% of parents had only one minor child attached to them at any point during the study window, 29.7% had two, 16.7% had three, and 12.6% had four or more.
- Nearly 60% of parents had children under the age of 5 at first encounter.

Children’s Data Network
Finding 3: TAY Parents were disproportionately Black, Female, and with fewer, younger, children

1 of every 6 parents in this cohort (18%) were between the ages of 18 and 24 (TAY), but the demographic profile of TAY families were different from Non-TAY parents in important ways:

Compared to the overall population, a significantly higher proportion of TAY parents:

• Were Black (53.3%);
• Were Female (92.7%);
• Had one minor child attached to them (61.8%); and
• Had a child under age 5 (93.1%).

(See Appendix A)
Finding 4: Parents accessed a variety of services

Figure 3.1. Percentage of Families Accessing each Project Type 2012-2016

- Coordinated Assessment: 58.3%
- PH-Rapid Re-Housing: 37.5%
- Homelessness Prevention: 9.4%
- Services Only: 14.5%
- Street Outreach: 2.9%
- PH-Permanent Supportive Housing (disability req. for entry): 7.8%
- Transitional Housing: 12.0%
- Emergency Shelter: 23.4%

Overall
**Finding 5:**
A significantly higher proportion of TAY Parents received Transitional Housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>TAY Parents (Ages 18-24)</th>
<th>Non-TAY Parents (Ages 25 and Older)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Assessment</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH-Rapid Re-Housing</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness Prevention</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Only</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Outreach</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH-Permanent Supportive Housing (disability req. for entry)</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Housing</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.2. Percentage of Families Accessing each Project Type 2012-2016, by Age
**Finding 6:**
Two-thirds of families accessing LAHSA services had been referred for alleged maltreatment.

---

**Figure 4.1. Percentage of Families with CPS Involvement**
- **Referred:** 65%
- **Substantiated:** 33%
- **Case Opened:** 29%
- **Placed in Out-of-Home Care:** 18%

**Timing of 1st Ever Referral**
- Occurred Before First LAHSA Encounter: 6900
- Occurred Contemporaneously with or After First LAHSA Encounter: 1343

**Timing of 1st Ever Substantiation**
- Occurred Before First LAHSA Encounter: 851
- Occurred Contemporaneously with or After First LAHSA Encounter: 3301

- **Concurrent Case Open:** 6.6%
- **Concurrent Out-of-Home Placement:** 1.4%
**Finding 7:**
A higher proportion of Non-TAY families had CPS involvement.
Discussion

- Number of parents accessing homelessness services for the first time is increasing (doubled since 2013).

- While there may have been some demographic and service differences between TAY and Non-TAY, the big take-away is that two-thirds of families had CPS involvement, and that involvement was mostly before their first LAHSA encounter.
  - Underscores the importance of providing trauma-informed services, and the value of cross-system coordination in the provision of those supports.
  - **Highlights the opportunity for prevention.** Prevention-oriented family support and strengthening could have helped to resolve family problems at an earlier stage, potentially preventing later entry into homelessness.
Thank you!

Regan Foust, PhD
rfoust@usc.edu

Jonathan Hoonhout
hoonhout@usc.edu

http://www.datanetwork.org
Appendix A:  
Parent Demographic Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAY Parents (18%)
### Table 2. Parent Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall (n=12,918)</th>
<th>Non-TAY Parents (Ages 25 and Older) (n=10,593)</th>
<th>TAY Parents (Ages 18-24) (n=2,325)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6,234</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>4,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4,968</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other includes Non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaska Native, Multiple Race Stated, Missing, and No Race Stated*

For Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Black, and White parents, ethnicity equals Non-Hispanic

* Indicates significant differences from the Overall population (p=<0.001)
Table 3. Parent Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall (n=12,918)</th>
<th>Non-TAY Parents (Ages 25 and Older) (n=10,593)</th>
<th>TAY Parents (Ages 18-24) (n=2,325)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,738</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>8,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>1,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Cases</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Other Cases includes Transgender (i.e., MTF, FTM), Other, Client Doesn’t Know, Client Refused, and Data Not Collected

* Indicates significant differences from the Overall population (p=<0.001)
Table 4. Number of Distinct Children Per Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall (n=12,918)</th>
<th>Non-TAY Parents (Ages 25 and Older) (n=10,593)</th>
<th>TAY Parents (Ages 18-24) (n=2,325)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>3,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>1,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates significant differences from the Overall population (p=<0.001)
### Table 5. Child Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall (n=12,918)</th>
<th>Non-TAY Parents (Ages 25 and Older) (n=10,593)</th>
<th>TAY Parents (Ages 18-24) (n=2,325)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents with children under 5 at first encounter</td>
<td>7,554</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>5,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents without children under 5 at first encounter</td>
<td>5,364</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>5,203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parents without children under 5 at first encounter includes children whose date of birth is after the household's entrance into the program.

*Indicates significant differences from the Overall population (p=<0.001).
Appendix B: Referred Child Demographic Information
### Table 6. Referred Children Attached to a Parent, by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Referral Frequency</th>
<th>Referral Percent</th>
<th>Substantiation Frequency</th>
<th>Substantiation Percent</th>
<th>Case Open Frequency</th>
<th>Case Open Percent</th>
<th>Placement Frequency</th>
<th>Placement Percent</th>
<th>Universe Frequency</th>
<th>Universe Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7540</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>3758</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>3326</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12489</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7813</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>3761</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>3364</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>12847</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Cases*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15369</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7525</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6695</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3710</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25367</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Transgender (i.e., MTF, FTM), Other, Client Doesn’t Know, Client Refused, and Data Not Collected
### Table 7. Referred Children Attached to a Parent, by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Referral Frequency</th>
<th>Referral Percent</th>
<th>Substantiation Frequency</th>
<th>Substantiation Percent</th>
<th>Case Open Frequency</th>
<th>Case Open Percent</th>
<th>Placement Frequency</th>
<th>Placement Percent</th>
<th>Universe Frequency</th>
<th>Universe Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6380</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>2776</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>11026</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7319</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>3928</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>3502</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>11637</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15369</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7525</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6695</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3710</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25367</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaska Native, Multiple Race Stated, Missing, and No Race Stated

For Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Black, and White parents, ethnicity equals Non-Hispanic
### Table 8. Referred Children Attached to a Parent, by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Referral Frequency</th>
<th>Referral Percent</th>
<th>Substantiation Frequency</th>
<th>Substantiation Percent</th>
<th>Case Open Frequency</th>
<th>Case Open Percent</th>
<th>Placement Frequency</th>
<th>Placement Percent</th>
<th>Universe Frequency</th>
<th>Universe Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>5130</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>9378</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4724</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>7445</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>3672</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>5501</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-&lt;18</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2354</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15369</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>7525</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>6695</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>3710</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>25367</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes children whose date of birth is after the household’s entrance into the program.
### Table 9. Referred Children Attached to a Parent, by Maternal Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternal Age</th>
<th>Referral</th>
<th>Substantiation</th>
<th>Case Open</th>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Universe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>3269</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>3388</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>2523</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Missing)*</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15369</td>
<td>7525</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>6695</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maternal Age calculated based on birthdate of attached guardian, who may not be birth mother.
*Missing indicates lack of a attached female parent to the child.
LAHSA and CPS records cleaned, standardized, and coded on non-networked workstation.

Deterministic and probabilistic (i.e., fuzzy matching) code developed to incorporate LAHSA records (clues already developed for CPS).

Iterative training of algorithms using machine learning...ongoing.

Initial set of matched records exported, stripped of personal identifiers, and re-integrated with analytic fields.

Descriptive analyses conducted on secure university server.
An Exploration into the Characteristics, Service Needs, and Child Protection Involvement of Families Accessing Services through the Los Angeles County Homeless Services Authority: Preliminary Results
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Thank you!

- We greatly appreciate the opportunity to link and analyze LAHSA data
  - Enhance our understanding of the intersection of homelessness and child welfare.
- And are honored to share our findings with you – stakeholders, policy makers, advocates, and those who have experienced homelessness –
  - You know it best!
LAHSA Project: Summary

• Goals:
  • Introduce the CDN
  • Present preliminary results
  • “Member check” the findings
  • Generate questions of interest
Harnessing the scientific potential of linked, administrative data to inform children’s programs and policies.
LAHSA Project: Summary

Focus: Family Homelessness

• Goals:
  • Better characterize families who received LASHA services in terms of their demographics, services, and child protection involvement.
  • Identify differences between TAY Parents (Parents between ages 18 & 24) and their older, parenting counterparts.

• Process:
  • Linked the records of individuals accessing LASHA services between January 1st, 2013 and December 31st, 2016 to Child Protection records (Retrospective!)
Current study cannot:

• Address prospective questions
• Provide information about individuals without children or youth under age 18
  
  e.g., How many children in foster care went on to access homeless services?
• Be taken as final

Current study can:

• Provide preliminary information about the demographic makeup of families seeking services in 2013-2016 and differences by TAY status
Definitions: Individuals Accessing Homeless Services

Individuals (n=155,900)

Heads of Household (HoH) (n=122,070, 78% of Ind.)

Parents (n=12,918, 11% of HoH)

TAY Parents (n=2,325, 18% of Parents, 2% of HoH)

Individuals ages 18 and older

HoHs with one or more minor child attached to them at any point during the study window

Parents between the ages of 18 & 24
Finding 1: Number of parents accessing homeless services for 1st time doubled between 2013 & 2016.

Figure 1.1. Parents with First Service Encounters between 2012 and 2016, by year

Figure 1.2. Transitional Age Youth (TAY) Parents with First Service Encounters between 2012 and 2016, by year

Notes: Scale differs between the two graphs! Data limited to active clients in 2013-2016, so 2012 totals do not include clients with first service encounters in 2012 who exited in 2012.
Finding 2: Parents were predominantly Black and Latino, female, with young children.

Overall:

- Nearly half (48%) of the parents in this cohort were Black, 39% were Latino, 9% were white, and 2% were Asian / Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander.
- The vast majority (83.1%) of parents were Female.
- 41.1% of parents had only one minor child attached to them at any point during the study window, 29.7% had two, 16.7% had three, and 12.6% had four or more.
- Nearly 60% of parents had children under the age of 5 at first encounter.
Finding 3:
TAY Parents were disproportionately Black, female, with fewer, younger, children

1 of every 6 parents in this cohort (18%) were TAY, but the demographic profile of TAY families were different from Non-TAY parents in important ways:

Compared to the overall population, a significantly higher proportion of TAY parents:

- Were Black (53.3%);
- Were Female (92.7%);
- Had one minor child attached to them (61.8%); and
- Had a child under age 5 (93.1%).

(See Appendix A)
Finding 4: Parents accessed a variety of Services

Figure 3.1. Percentage of Families Accessing each Project Type 2012-2016

- Coordinated Assessment: 58.3%
- PH-Rapid Re-Housing: 37.5%
- Homelessness Prevention: 9.4%
- Services Only: 14.5%
- Street Outreach: 2.9%
- PH-Permanent Supportive Housing (disability req. for entry): 7.8%
- Transitional Housing: 12.0%
- Emergency Shelter: 23.4%

Overall:

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
**Finding 5:**
A significantly higher proportion of TAY Parents received Transitional Housing

![Diagram showing percentage of families accessing each project type.](image-url)

- **Coordinated Assessment:** 54.7% (TAY) vs. 59.0% (Non-TAY)
- **PH-Rapid Re-Housing:** 35.1% (TAY) vs. 38.1% (Non-TAY)
- **Homelessness Prevention:** 10.3% (TAY) vs. 10.3% (Non-TAY)
- **Services Only:** 14.0% (TAY) vs. 16.7% (Non-TAY)
- **Street Outreach:** 3.1% (TAY) vs. 2.1% (Non-TAY)
- **PH-Permanent Supportive Housing (disability req. for entry):** 8.2% (TAY) vs. 6.2% (Non-TAY)
- **Emergency Shelter:** 23.4% (TAY) vs. 23.4% (Non-TAY)
- **Transitional Housing:** 20.4% (TAY) vs. 10.2% (Non-TAY)
Finding 6: Two-thirds of families accessing LAHSA services had been referred for alleged maltreatment.
Finding 7: A higher proportion of Non-TAY families had CPS involvement (not statistically significant)
Finding 8: 61% of children had CPS Involvement. Rates by racial / ethnic group were all very high, but Black and Latino children were overrepresented.

Table 1. Referred Children Attached to a Parent, by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Referral Frequency</th>
<th>Substantiation Frequency</th>
<th>Case Open Frequency</th>
<th>Placement Frequency</th>
<th>Universe Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6380</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>2776</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>2465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7319</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>3928</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>3502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15369</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>7525</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>6695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaska Native, Multiple Race Stated, Missing, and No Race Stated
For Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Black, and White parents, ethnicity equals Non-Hispanic
Discussion

- Number of parents accessing homelessness services for the first time is increasing – doubled since 2013.

- Rates of CPS involvement among children by racial/ethnic group were all very high, but **Black and Latino children were overrepresented**.

- **Two-thirds of families and 61% of children had CPS involvement, and that involvement was mostly before their first LAHSA encounter.**
  - Underscores the importance of providing **trauma-informed services**, and the value of cross-system coordination in the provision of those supports.
  - **Highlights the opportunity for prevention.** Prevention-oriented family support and strengthening could have helped to resolve family problems at an earlier stage, potentially preventing later entry into homelessness.
Thank you!

Regan Foust, PhD
rfoust@usc.edu

Jonathan Hoonhout
hoonhout@usc.edu

http://www.datanetwork.org
Appendix A:
Parent Demographic Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Interval</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAY Parents (18%)
### Table 2. Parent Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Overall (n=12,918)</th>
<th>Non-TAY Parents (Ages 25 and Older) (n=10,593)</th>
<th>TAY Parents (Ages 18-24) (n=2,325)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6,234</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>4,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4,968</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other includes Non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaska Native, Multiple Race Stated, Missing, and No Race Stated*

For Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Black, and White parents, ethnicity equals Non-Hispanic

*Indicates significant differences from the Overall population (p<=0.001)*
### Table 3. Parent Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall (n=12,918)</th>
<th>Non-TAY Parents (Ages 25 and Older) (n=10,593)</th>
<th>TAY Parents (Ages 18-24) (n=2,325)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,738</td>
<td>8,583</td>
<td>2,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Cases</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>81.0%*</td>
<td>92.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>7.1%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates significant differences from the Overall population (p=<0.001)

---

*All Other Cases includes Transgender (i.e., MTF, FTM), Other, Client Doesn't Know, Client Refused, and Data Not Collected
Table 4. Number of Distinct Children Per Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-TAY Parents (Ages 25 and Older)</th>
<th>TAY Parents (Ages 18-24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall (n=12,918)</td>
<td>Overall (n=12,918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent 41.1%</td>
<td>Percent 36.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>1,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent 36.5%*</td>
<td>Percent 61.8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent 30.2%*</td>
<td>Percent 27.3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent 18.6%*</td>
<td>Percent 7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent 14.7%*</td>
<td>Percent 3.1%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates significant differences from the Overall population (p=<0.001)
## Table 5. Child Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall (n=12,918)</th>
<th>Non-TAY Parents (Ages 25 and Older) (n=10,593)</th>
<th>TAY Parents (Ages 18-24) (n=2,325)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents with children under 5 at first encounter</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents without children under 5 at first encounter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents with children under 5 at first encounter</td>
<td>7,554</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>5,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents without children under 5 at first encounter</td>
<td>5,364</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>5,203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parents without children under 5 at first encounter includes children whose date of birth is after the household's entrance into the program.

*Indicates significant differences from the Overall population (p=<0.001).
Appendix B:
Referred Child Demographic Information
### Table 6. Referred Children Attached to a Parent, by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Referral Frequency</th>
<th>Substantiation Frequency</th>
<th>Case Open Frequency</th>
<th>Placement Frequency</th>
<th>Universe Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7540</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>3758</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>3326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7813</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>3761</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>3364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Cases*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15369</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>7525</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>6695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Transgender (i.e., MTF, FTM), Other, Client Doesn’t Know, Client Refused, and Data Not Collected.
### Table 7. Referred Children Attached to a Parent, by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Referral Frequency</th>
<th>Substantiation Frequency</th>
<th>Case Open Frequency</th>
<th>Placement Frequency</th>
<th>Universe Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6380</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7319</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>3502</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15369</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>7525</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>6695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Non-Hispanic American Indian/Alaska Native, Multiple Race Stated, Missing, and No Race Stated

For Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, Black, and White parents, ethnicity equals Non-Hispanic
### Table 8. Referred Children Attached to a Parent, by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Referral Frequency</th>
<th>Referral Percent</th>
<th>Substantiation Frequency</th>
<th>Substantiation Percent</th>
<th>Case Open Frequency</th>
<th>Case Open Percent</th>
<th>Placement Frequency</th>
<th>Placement Percent</th>
<th>Universe Frequency</th>
<th>Universe Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>5130</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>9378</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4724</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>7445</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>3672</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>5501</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-&lt;18</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>2354</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15369</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>7525</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>6695</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>3710</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>25367</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes children whose date of birth is after the household’s entrance into the program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternal Age</th>
<th>Referral Frequency</th>
<th>Substantiation Frequency</th>
<th>Case Open Frequency</th>
<th>Placement Frequency</th>
<th>Universe Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>3269</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>5255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>3388</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>5254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>2523</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>3891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Missing)*</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>3820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15369</td>
<td>7525</td>
<td>6695</td>
<td>3710</td>
<td>25367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maternal Age calculated based on birthdate of attached guardian, who may not be birth mother.
*Missing indicates lack of a attached female parent to the child.
Files Prepped

LAHSA and CPS records cleaned, standardized, and coded on non-networked workstation.

Probabilistic Linkages

Deterministic and probabilistic (i.e., fuzzy matching) code developed to incorporate LAHSA records (clues already developed for CPS).

Training

Iterative training of algorithms using machine learning...ongoing.

Restricted Dataset

Initial set of matched records exported, stripped of personal identifiers, and re-integrated with analytic fields.

Analysis

Descriptive analyses conducted on secure university server.
Department of Children and Family Services
County of Los Angeles

(DCFS)

HOMELESS PREVENTION EFFORTS
The Department of Children and Family Services is currently servicing 34,248 children.

The ethnic breakdown of this population, is as follows:

- 19,443 - (56.8%) were identified as Hispanic/Latino
- 8,230 - (24%) were identified as African American
- 3,190 - (9.3%) were identified as White
- 587 – (1.7 %) were identified as Asian Pacific/Islander
- 81 – (0.2%) were identified as American Indian/Alaskan Native
- 2,717 – (7.8%) were identified as Other

Gender:

- 50% are male
- 50% are female
As of the end of June 2018, there were 17,985 children placed in Out of Home Care, of which approximately 50% are placed in the home of relatives. Another 2,868 children are currently in Adoptive Homes pending finalization and Legal Guardianship homes.

The ethnic breakdown of the population in OHC is as follows:

- **10,563** – (50%) were identified as Hispanic/Latino
- **5,643** - (27%) were identified as African American
- **2,098** - (10%) were identified as White
- **291** – (2%) were identified as Asian Pacific/Islander
- **70** – (1%) were identified as American Indian/Alaskan Native
- **2,213** – (10%) were identified as Other
Figure 1. LA County DCFS Key Decision Points for Calendar Year 2017

Note: The “in care” decision point represents point-in-time data as of Jan 1, 2018.
Note: Missing and multi-race values were excluded from percent calculations.
PREVENTION PROGRAMS TO ASSIST FAMILIES AND REDUCE HOMELESSNESS

DCFS developed a variety of family support programs which are targeted to assist families and reduce homelessness by providing assistance with move in costs such as first and last month, rental assistance and the provision of HUD vouchers. Families in the Department may access one or more of the following programs during the life of their case.

1. Family Preservation (FP)
   - Auxiliary funds are available for families enrolled in the Family Preservation program.
   - Auxiliary Funds are used for various family needs, including move-in, rent or mortgage payments.
   - The Family Preservation agencies, in conjunction with the assigned Children’s Social Worker (CSW), determines the need and completes eligibility determinations.
   - The Family Preservation agencies can provide $2,500 to each family per open FP case, with County Program Manager approval required for amounts greater than $2,500 (to a maximum of $4,999).
2. **Prevention and Aftercare Services (P&A)**

- Prevention and Aftercare Services (P&A) are available at no-cost to all County families, whether DCFS-involved or community clients.
- P&A agencies may provide Emergency Basic Support Services (EBSS) for families participating in P&A activities or services.
- EBSS funds are limited to $1,000 and may be used to assist with rent, utilities and other expenses. EBSS fund requests above $1,000 require County Program Manager approval.
- P&A also provides case navigation services to link families to available resources that may assist in preventing homelessness whether directly or through supportive services as P&A agencies are connected to networks within their communities.

3. **Supportive Therapeutic Options Program (STOP)**

- All families at risk of becoming homeless that are involved with DCFS at any point in the referral and/or case continuum can request rental assistance through their assigned CSW, including foster youth about to age out of the child welfare system.
- The STOP Program provides direct payments to providers of many supportive activities including parenting, individual, and conjoint counseling to address many issues including domestic violence, child abuse prevention/treatment, and substance abuse prevention and treatment.
• The basic eligibility requirements are DCFS involvement and demonstration of genuine need as ascertained through CSW’s referral or case assessment.
• In adherence to the LA County Fiscal Manual and IRS reporting rules, all payments are made directly to the service providers or rental property owners. W-9 forms are required to ensure accurate reporting of all payments to the IRS.

4. Family Unification Program (FUP)
• DCFS, through an MOU with the City of LA (HACLA), the Housing Authority of the County of Los Angeles (HACoLA), and the Housing Authority administers FUP family vouchers.
• When FUP vouchers are available, the FP staff acting as the Countywide Coordinator notifies FP agencies.
• FUP family vouchers are provided to any family with a Family Maintenance or Family Reunification case even if they are not enrolled in the FP program.
• DCFS recently developed a joint request to increase the number of HUD vouchers for Families with children and TAY currently experiencing homelessness.
Family Reunification Housing Subsidy (FRHS)

On 1-1-2017, DCFS implemented the county-wide FRHS Program, as part of the Homeless Initiative (B6). FRHS is a rapid re-housing program for families with children in foster care placement, where the parents are in compliance with case plan and homelessness is the sole barrier to the reunification with the children. The cost savings for each child leaving foster care is re-invested back into the program.

- Total families referred to date = 277
- Total children referred = 502
- Total families permanently housed = 79
- Total children permanently housed = 173
- 24% of clients served are African American (data through 3/31/18)
BRINGING FAMILIES HOME (BFH)

On 1-1-2018, DCFS implemented the state funded BFH program. Assembly Bill (AB) 1603 (Chapter 25, Statutes of 2016) established BFH. BFH is a program to provide rapid re-housing and case management services to homeless families in the child welfare system who are receiving family maintenance services. The BFH program is a Housing First model with goals to significantly reduce the number of families in the child welfare system experiencing homelessness & to prevent foster care placements when homelessness prevents a parent or guardian from addressing issues that could lead to placement.

- Total families referred to date = 117
- Total children referred = 378
- Total families permanently housed = 13
- Total children permanently housed = 27
- 3 of 13 families housed (23%) are African American
Figure 3. LA County Exits from Foster Care by Race

Calendar Year 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reunified</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin-GAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Guardianship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Out/Emancipated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: CCWIP, CW8/CMS 2018 Quarter 1 Extract. Extracted on July 5, 2018.
Note: Missing and multi-race values were excluded from percent calculations.
Through the various services and supports included under the YDS umbrella (which includes, ILP, Specialized Services, THPP, THPP-NMD, THP-ILP and THP-Plus programs) YDS provides targeted assistance to prevent/curtail homelessness. Although not specific to youth of color, the following efforts are the supportive services offered through these programs:

As of July 6, 2018, 237 youth have submitted a housing application, 61% are African American youth.
Current Efforts to Support Foster Youth

- Job readiness training and support;
- Life skills training;
- Regular meetings with a Case Manager;
- Mentoring;
- Maintaining a savings fund;
- Food and necessity stipend;
- Referrals to medical, dental, mental health, parenting and substance use class;
- Child care referral or on-site child care;
- Monthly bus pass;
- 24-hour crisis intervention and support;
- Rental Assistance
- Individual and group therapy, provided either by the housing provider or through referral; and,
- Aftercare services, including support groups and community resources.
Barriers for Youth of Color

- Housing affordability;
- Ongoing challenges/ and over representation with the juvenile and adult justice systems;
- Pregnant and parenting youth;
- Mental health/behavioral concerns;
- Lack of educational attainment;
- Unsteady employment/ Lack of Employment Opportunities;
- Gang Involvement
- Significant representation in subgroups (i.e., foster youth, LGBTQ, etc.) that experience additional discrimination and bias; and
- Substance abuse disorders.
Strategies to Reduce the Barriers

• Extending ILP Services to Age 24 (which is not allowed by Federal Policy)

• Early intervention and engagement for those exiting foster care;

• Broader education and employment opportunities;

• Immediate access to emergency shelter beds;

• When possible, reunifying youth with family with continue supports; and,

• Long-term support.
St. Joseph Center Mission

St. Joseph Center's mission is to provide working poor families, as well as homeless men, women and children of all ages, with the inner resources and tools to become productive, stable and self-supporting members of the community.

St. Joseph Center (SJC) was founded on July 8, 1976 by two Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet. Though we are a separately incorporated 501(c)(3) non-profit organization, we retain an affiliation with the Sisters as a “Sponsored Institution”.

Outreach & Engagement
- 5,543 homeless men, women, and children engaged
- 4,526 homeless people assisted through housing navigation, housing placement, referrals
- 26,823 hot, nutritious meals served to homeless men and women at Bread and Roses Café

Housing
- 596 homeless people placed in permanent housing
- 1,000 formerly homeless men, women, and children assisted to retain housing

Mental Health
- 408 men, women, and children benefitted from life-changing mental health services
- 93 individuals accessed DMH representative payee services to prevent homelessness

Education & Vocational
- 56 men and women graduated from our Culinary Training Program; 75% found jobs
- 34 women graduated from our web development training program; 44% found jobs

*2017 Annual Totals
Family CES
Family CES

Assessment and Linkage:
- Diversion and Prevention services
- Shelter (Upward Bound House)
- Rapid Re-housing
- Permanent Supportive Housing
- Reunification
- Supportive services designed to remove barriers to housing attainment and retention

Organizations:
- DPSS
- DMH
- DPH
- LAUSD
- Employment services
Family CES Outcomes between July 01, 2017 - June 30, 2018

- Assessed 1,160 families
- Served 304 families
- Housed 125 families
- Stabilized through prevention 55 families
Food Pantry
Food Pantry provides low-income, housed families with fresh groceries and canned food.

- Currently 1500 families are registered with the food pantry
- We serve about 400 families a week

“Choice Model”: Our clients have the dignity of walking through the pantry and selecting their own fruits and vegetables, just like in a grocery store.
The pantry is facilitated by community and client volunteers who form a powerful connection between the surrounding community and those we serve.

- Annual Adopt-a-Family program also links community members with our families.

- Weekly educational workshops empower our clients to make positive and healthy changes in their lives.
Codetalk is an intensive 15-week digital web technology vocational program for low income and underserved women of all age groups.

- Coding and website design
- Fundamentals of front end web development
- Soft skills
Program Features
- Tuition Free
- Employment Planning, Resume Workshops & Interview Coaching
- Case Management
- Industry Guest Speakers and Access to Industry Experts
- Transportation Assistance
- Daily Meditation
- Alumnae Community
Outcomes
- 47% Full time tech jobs
- 74% Increased income with employment
- 67% Report income from freelance or ad-hoc tech work
- 100% Report benefits, increased self-confidence, quality of life

Average starting salary: $41k + benefits
Youth Resource Team (YRT)
The Youth Resource Team (YRT) works to help 49 highly vulnerable Santa Monica youth, age 15-24, and their families.

The program provides:
- Trauma-informed assertive case management
- Referrals to peer organizations
- Support services
Notable Statistics

- 12% of YRT youth are homeless
- 41% of YRT youth are receiving mental health services
- 16% of YRT youth receiving direct support in helping to reduce substance use

100% HS graduation rate for the ‘17-’18 academic school year
What makes the program unique? Bi-monthly collaborative case conferencing:

- SM School District
- SMPD
- City of Santa Monica Housing Authority
- CLARE
- Family Services of Santa Monica
- Safe Place for Youth
- JVS
- HTA
- Chrysalis
- Venice Family Clinic
- Santa Monica College
- LA County DMH
¡Ánimo!
Integrated health care services grounded in culturally relevant, innovative practices:

Conventional services
- Substance abuse
- Mental health
- Physical health care

Cultural healing practices
- Faith-based counseling
- Infant/family treatment

All services are provided in a non-stigmatizing environment that reflects Westside Latino communities both linguistically and culturally.
Serve 80 clients with Axis 1 diagnoses
  ○ 15 families (Husband/Wife, Siblings, Parents and their Children)

Indirectly serve approximately 200 people through family therapy, collaterals, case consultations, and collaborating agencies.
100 % Bi-cultural, Bilingual Staff:

- One LMFT program manager
- Four ASW therapists
- Two graduate college interns
- Two B.A. case managers
- One M.D. psychiatrist

Our therapists provide home visits and conduct on-site and community workshops as a form of outreach.
¡Ánimo!

For Clients Only
- Acupuncture and Reiki
- Workshops: Immigration, Drugs & Alcohol, Nutrition

For Clients and Community Members
- Zumba
- Yoga
- Tai Chi
- Drumming (Virginia Ave Park)
- Weekly Groups: Grief & Loss, Seeking Safety, Jewlery, Guitar, Meditation
QUESTIONS