From Novelty to Expectation: Recommendations to Develop a System of Campus Support for Foster Youth

Prepared for the Walter S. Johnson Foundation and the Stuart Foundation

July 10, 2007

Putnam Community Investment Consulting
http://www.putnamcic.com

David Pontecorvo, Consultant
Kris Putnam, President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

As longtime funders of efforts to promote educational opportunity for current and former foster youth, the Walter S. Johnson Foundation (WSJF) and Stuart Foundation are well aware of the discouraging statistics regarding K–12 and postsecondary education for youth in foster care.

While state and national data are limited and estimates vary, recent research has shown that 75 percent of foster students in California function below their grade level, 83 percent are being held back by grade three, and 46 percent drop out of high school, compared with 16 percent of non-foster youth.[1] Even foster youth who are high school graduates often lack the support necessary to overcome the numerous barriers they face to enrolling and persisting in college. Fewer than 20 percent of foster youth attend postsecondary education, compared with 60 percent of their peers.[2] Of those who do attend college, it is estimated that only 2 percent complete a four-year degree.[3]

Several factors account for this situation. Unlike the majority of young adult college students, whose families provide ongoing financial, practical, and/or emotional support, youth who emancipate from foster care at age 18 often have little or no support system. Many former foster

> *"All youth run into life- management issues…but former foster youth don't have a safety net."*
>
> —Joni Pitcl, Executive Director, Foster Youth Education Fund, Sacramento

youth on college campuses have not developed strong independent living skills. They can become overwhelmed by going to school while managing daily living, finding housing, and earning money to pay tuition and support themselves. Moreover, former foster youth often begin college with a weak academic foundation, and many struggle with mental health problems that undermine their ability to succeed academically. Student services personnel are often ill-prepared to deal with the unique issues and concerns that foster youth bring with them to higher education.

Guardian Scholars and other campus support programs for former foster youth (CSPs)[4] seek to reduce these barriers and increase college success rates by providing former foster youth with year-round housing, financial aid, academic support, counseling, and emotional support. Successful campus support programs in California, Washington, and elsewhere have raised awareness about the needs of former foster youth in postsecondary education. They have inspired a growing number of public and private colleges and universities to initiate similar efforts to promote the success of

---

[1] Casey Family Programs news release, "Groundbreaking Summit to Address Foster Youth Education Needs," January 16, 2007, Press Wire News Association, http://www.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=104&STORY=/www/story/01-23-2007/0004510948&EDATE, visited April 15, 2007.

[2] Thomas R. Wolanin, *Higher Education Opportunities for Foster Youth: A Primer for Policymakers,* Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Higher Education Policy, Executive Summary (2005), p. xiv.

[3] Orangewood Children's Foundation (2005), *Guardian Scholars FAQ*

[4] This report uses "campus support programs for former foster youth" (abbreviated in this document as CSP) as a general phrase to describe a range of efforts to promote the success of former foster youth in postsecondary education. "Guardian Scholars," as the best-known model, is the name often adopted by new programs. However, other names are also being used—for example, Renaissance Scholars (after the successful program at UC Santa Cruz); Connect, Motivate, and Educate Society (CME, at San Jose State University); Governor's Scholars (the statewide program in Washington State)—and undoubtedly others will emerge. To avoid unintended implications about program elements associated with a particular name, we have chosen to use the general term except when referring to a specific program.

---

former foster youth on their campuses. There are currently more than 30 such programs operating at colleges, universities, and technical schools in Orange County (CA), the San Francisco Bay Area, Washington State, and locations across the country.

WSJF, in coordination with the Stuart Foundation and other funders, has been in the forefront of efforts to replicate successful models of campus support programs for former foster youth at public institutions of higher education (IHEs) in the Bay Area and Northern California. In the past 18 months, six campuses have received planning grants to develop programs, and CSPs have recently been initiated or formalized at three California State University Campuses: San Francisco State University, San Jose State University, and California State University East Bay.[5] In addition to dollars, these foundations have also provided statewide leadership around issues of program development, evaluation and legislative advocacy.

The W.S. Johnson and Stuart foundations now seek to determine what additional investments could be made to help additional campuses implement CSPs and to move the field toward a "tipping point" where temporary philanthropic support for a relatively small number of demonstration programs begins to be replaced by on-going public support for the widespread replication of CSPs throughout the state's public institutions of higher education.

The Foundation engaged Putnam Community Investment Consulting to begin to develop a Campus Support Sustainability initiative that would provide a range of technical assistance, professional development, convening, and evaluation resources, and promote extensive replication of campus support programs for former foster youth.

This paper is the result of in-depth interviews with 26 key informants,[6] including:
- Leaders of seven Northern California CSPs at various stages of planning and implementation.[7]
- The College Success Foundation in Washington State, a statewide support network and scholarship program for former foster youth.
- Key informants from advocacy organizations, intermediaries, funders, and others with expertise in the field.

Through these interviews, as well as a review of grantee documents, websites, and literature, we sought to:
- Understand the challenges and barriers faced by campuses seeking to replicate campus support programs for foster youth.
- Determine what campuses need for effective replication and the most useful ways such support could be delivered.
- Create a design for an initiative that both builds the capacity of new and existing CSPs and promotes effective advocacy to increase public support and funding for the widespread replication of these programs.
- Make recommendations for the type of intermediary needed to manage the initiative.

---

[5] Additional campuses, most notably UC Berkeley, have initiated Guardian Scholar-like programs with funding from other sources.
[6] See Appendix B for a list of key informants and campus leaders interviewed for this report.
[7] See Appendix C.

PART I: CONTEXT FOR A CAMPUS SUPPORT SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVE

A. Legislation Context and Advocacy

In recent years, momentum has been building in the California State Legislature for the passage of legislation to support youth in foster care and emancipated foster youth who are transitioning to adulthood. The Assembly Select Committee on Foster Care, created in 2005 and chaired by Assemblymember Karen Bass (L.A.), has raised the profile of foster care issues within the Legislature, with the media, and with the public. The Committee has held a series of hearings on foster care and child welfare issues, and in 2006 it introduced a package of bills focused on reforms related to emancipation, health, education, relative-caregivers, child-welfare workers' caseloads, juvenile court reform, state oversight, and caregiver support. Key California legislation that relates to campus support programs for former foster youth includes:

- AB 2463 (1996) and SB 1639 (2004) took steps toward addressing the needs of foster youth and their caregivers for greater access to information about postsecondary options. Implementing this legislation calls for a range of creative approaches that bring together, at the county or regional level, universities, community colleges, Independent Living Programs (ILP), Foster Youth Support liaisons, foster care providers, foster youth, child welfare departments, and others.

- AB 427 established the Transitional Housing Placement-Plus (THP-Plus) program in 2001 to address the housing needs of the approximately 4,200 young adults who exit the state's foster care system each year. Subsequent legislation removed barriers to implementation, including a county match requirement, and increased the upper age limit from 21 to 24. THP-Plus provides affordable housing and comprehensive supportive services for up to 24 months to help former foster and probation youth ages 18 to 24 make a successful transition to independent living. A major budget increase, from $4.8 million to almost $15 million, is included in the Governor's proposed FY 2007-08 budget. If the budget increase is adopted, the program capacity will jump from 135 to 1,200 youth.

- Advocates and campus-based support programs were encouraged by the introduction of the Foster Youth Higher Education Preparation and Support Act of 2006 (AB 2489, Leno). Among other provisions, the bill sought to create tuition/fee waivers at UC and CSU; provide automatic Cal Grant eligibility, housing preferences, and year-round housing; and offer incentives to expand Guardian Scholars-like programs. In the tight budget environment, AB 2489 was viewed as too costly and did not pass. A scaled-down bill, AB 1578, has been drafted and (at the time this paper was written) is moving through committees in the current legislative session. This bill would fund pilot programs for three years at a small number of campuses. According to advocates, even the scaled-back bill may have difficulty passing in this year's tight fiscal climate.

Efforts to promote broad support and public funding for CSPs clearly benefit from the general environment of heightened awareness and support for foster youth. However, some fear that with the State's ongoing budget difficulties, legislators will feel they have "done enough" for emancipated foster youth by increasing funding for the THP-Plus housing program. This points to a need for increased advocacy and better coordination among advocates for foster youth in transition. Currently, advocacy for state funding for campus support programs for former foster youth is

spearheaded by a loose coalition of advocacy groups, with no one group or individual leading the effort. According to leaders of campus support programs, funders, and advocates themselves, this has led to an ad hoc and somewhat piecemeal approach. To a great extent the Walter S. Johnson and Stuart foundations have stepped into this void to provide leadership and coordination of advocacy efforts, but neither foundation seeks to play this role on an on-going basis. It will be important in the coming period to identify an individual or organization whose role it is to improve coordination among advocacy groups, university and college administrators, campus support program leaders, former foster youth, and other key stakeholders to advocate for public funding for campus support programs for former foster youth.

B. Other Policy-Related Activities

One organization which has provided considerable leadership on policies relating to higher education for former foster youth is the Child and Family Policy Institute of California (CFPIV). In January 2007, CFPIC, under the auspices of the Foster Youth Education Task Force and in partnership with Casey Family Programs, co-hosted the 2007 California Foster Youth Education Summit. In preparing for the Summit, a number of professionals and advocates from across California wrote background/issue papers.[8] Proceedings from the Summit will be finalized in the summer of 2007, with specific recommendations for statewide policy and local implementation actions in a number of issue areas, including higher education for former foster youth. Some preliminary recommendations related to higher education include:[9]

- Expand Guardian Scholar-type programs to all CSU, UC, and community college campuses in the state.
- Provide funding for the extension of the Independent Living Program to the age of 12.
- Provide funding for an environmental scan of existing promising practices in the area of postsecondary success through the California Department of Social Services or California Department of Education.
- Fund educational advocates in Child Welfare Departments statewide to create a single point of contact on educational issues.
- Require that foster youth be given the opportunity to participate in college exploration opportunities on college campuses.

C. Existing Mechanisms for Replicating Campus Support Programs for Former Foster Youth

Many efforts are already underway to support successful replication and implementation of campus support programs. Any additional efforts should seek to learn from, build upon, and partner with these approaches and projects.

Catalyst organization model

Support and technical assistance from an outside "catalyst" organization has been a feature of the Guardian Scholars model from its inception at CSU Fullerton in 1998. In Southern California, the Orangewood Children's Foundation (OCF) has played that catalyst role, providing advice, guidance, and fundraising assistance to existing programs, as well as leadership in expanding the program to

---

[8] Issue papers can be found at http://www.cfpic.org/#.
[9] From email correspondence from Gene Howard at OCF, forwarded by Stuart Oppenheimer at CFPIC, 4/2/2007.

additional campuses. OCF convenes a Council of Colleges as a support network for campus support programs in the region and has also been involved in local and statewide advocacy efforts. OCF has provided replication assistance on a limited basis for programs in Northern California and elsewhere. It does not currently have the capacity to provide more extensive replication support outside its Southern California service area.

In partnership with Casey Family Programs and the Lumina Foundation, OCF hosted national convenings of campus support programs for former foster youth in 2005 and 2006. These convenings brought together campus support programs, national child welfare organizations, funders, and former foster youth to discuss the successes and challenges of their programs and how to expand and sustain these efforts. Planning is underway for a third national convening in late 2007.

Northern California replication and support

In 2004, a presentation in Oakland by OCF on the Guardian Scholars model provided the inspiration and impetus for several Bay Area campuses to launch on-campus support programs for former foster youth. Since that time, two informal support networks have emerged that bring together a growing number of four-year and two-year campuses at various stages of planning or implementing services for former foster youth:

- The Northern California Council of Colleges is convened quarterly by Honoring Emancipated Youth (HEY), a San Francisco-based foster youth advocacy group. Meetings are hosted by participating campuses on a rotating basis.
- The Northern California Foster Youth University Consortium is a self-convening group of university (University of California and California State University) campuses, which meets quarterly at member campuses.

Inspired by the Council of Colleges in Southern California, these networks provide a forum where program staff can come together to network, share information, generate new ideas, and discuss successes, challenges, and promising practices. These networks have been particularly valuable for campuses as they plan and launch new programs; established programs also find them useful as a way to stay connected and discuss emerging challenges.

Foster Youth Success Initiative

A significant development in the area of technical assistance for campus support programs was the creation of the Foster Youth Success Initiative (FYSI), developed through the California Community Colleges System Office (Chancellor's Office). In 2006, the Chancellor directed each community college campus to designate a financial aid administrator as a Foster Youth Liaison (FYL). The Office hired a consultant to create a comprehensive manual and hosted a two-day training in early 2007 to help FYLs understand the unique challenges and barriers faced by foster youth and to understand federal financial aide guidelines related to foster youth. This first training was extremely successful and has led to requests for future training and support from community college campuses across the state. Although it is currently unfunded, the FYSI hopes to establish an ongoing statewide network of FYSI liaisons representing financial aid offices in the California Community Colleges System and to develop a referral network of available on- and off-campus support services, resources, and programs.

PART II: THE NEED FOR A CAMPUS SUPPORT SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVE

The informal networks and national con, convenings described above will continue to play a critical role in supporting the replication of campus support programs at a growing number of UC, CSU, and community college

> *"We're at a tipping point. People are energized. There's no better time to strike. But we can't wait for state funding, or we'll lose the momentum."*
> —Gene Howard, Orangewood Children's Foundation

campuses in Northern California and throughout the state. However, program staff, funders, and advocacy groups interviewed for this report identified the need for a greater level of capacity-building support than can be achieved through informal peer networking. Technical assistance is needed by individual campus programs and by the rapidly growing field in the critical areas of program development, fund development, evaluation, outreach and marketing, and legislative advocacy.

The essential purpose of a Campus Support Sustainability initiative would be two-fold:

- To provide the tools to help IHEs understand *how* to initiate and sustain an effective CSP. (What investment of dollars and campus resources is required.)

- To build a compelling case for *why* campus support programs are a good investment for the state and its public higher education systems. (What return on investment can be expected in terms of increased persistence; completion and other positive outcomes for former foster youth.)

A Campus Support Sustainability initiative would provide staffing to coordinate the provision of a range of technical assistance, training, convening, and communications resources for CSPs. Such an initiative would sustain and accelerate the pace of replication of campus support programs and build a core of successful programs that would provide models for broader replication. A sustainability initiative will help build a knowledge base about what works in different settings—from densely populated urban campuses to suburban and rural campuses, and across all three public higher education systems—and disseminate that information back to the field. Most importantly, a sustainability initiative should document and quantify the potential of the campus support programs to improve outcomes for former foster youth in higher education, and use that information to support a stepped-up level of advocacy to promote the shift from private support to partial public support.

A. Key Challenges for Replication

The first step in designing a system of support for emerging and existing campus support programs for former foster youth is to identify the challenges these programs face at various stages of development. We asked the campus leaders, foster youth advocates, funders, and others whom we spoke with to describe the greatest challenges they have experienced in establishing and sustaining support programs for former foster youth on college and university campuses. The following summarizes their responses:

Getting to the starting gate

Several of the campus staff we spoke with represent programs that are still in the planning or early implementation stage. These programs described a number of challenges involved with moving from the initial idea to the point where implementation can begin:

- Some campuses found it problematic to dedicate staff resources for a time-intensive planning process. Programs with limited staffing find it difficult to participate regularly in networking and learning opportunities that could assist in their efforts to plan and launch their programs.

- Obtaining early buy-in from top campus administrators has proven to be a critical first step in establishing a successful program. Support from leaders in key campus offices (financial aid, development, student services) is also important. Establishing these strong vertical and horizontal relationships on campus can be challenging. Some campuses have difficulty demonstrating the need for specialized services because the number of identified former foster youth on campus is not known, or is relatively small.

- Although there is an emerging consensus about what constitute "essential elements" for campus support programs for former foster youth, programs must often balance this ideal against the reality of available resources and staff capacity. While the Guardian Scholars model is regarded by many as the "gold standard," some four-year campuses, and most two-year campuses, are not in a position to offer the full range of financial, academic, and emotional support demonstrated in the Guardian Scholars and similar models.

- Replication efforts are looking for easy-to-access information on the nuts and bolts of starting a a support program for former foster youth. While this information is available, it is not well organized and can be difficult to find. Several programs mentioned the need for a "how-to" resource manual with concrete, task-oriented information on designing, launching and sustaining campus support programs for former foster youth.

- A related challenge is the need for a concrete analysis of what it costs, in dollars and other campus resources, to initiate and sustain a CSP at IHEs of different types and sizes. This kind of information will facilitate the adoption and implementation of CSPs at new campuses, as well as informing advocacy with system administrators, legislators and policy makers.

Working with the former foster youth population

- Many campus support programs for former foster youth are set up under EOPS[10] or other existing on-campus programs for disadvantaged youth. Experienced program managers, advocates, and former foster youth themselves argue that the practical, academic, and emotional needs of former foster youth are distinct from those of disadvantaged youth in general.

- Program staff and advocates stressed the need for targeted training for campus staff on how to relate to, work with, and provide effective assistance for former foster youth. Former foster youth should be involved in developing and delivering this training.

---

[10] Extended Opportunity Programs and Services, state-funded college support services for low-income and educationally disadvantaged students.

- To be effective, campus program coordinators must possess knowledge about how to work effectively within the campus institutional structure as well as experience working with the former foster youth population. Even when resources are available to hire a program coordinator, it is challenging to recruit people with this dual skill set.

- Moreover, as other campus departments (financial aid administrators, student services, student housing, etc.) become engaged with former foster youth, the need for training increases.

- Youth with mental health or learning disabilities need specialized support. Programs need a model for addressing mental health needs with services on campus and in the community.

Program capacity and staffing

- Even well-established campus support programs typically operate with minimal staffing. The key staffer may have responsibility for other areas of student services. Often one person is doing all the outreach, building the program and on-campus relationships, and providing direct services to the students.

> *"Our program is very resource-intensive. We're the victims of our own success. We've gotten lots of attention and lots of community partners. There's lots of excitement, but not enough capacity to do everything."*
>
> —Campus support program coordinator

- Staff turnover can cause set backs and instability for established programs. Once a key person has built relationships with students and other campus staff, it can be very challenging when that person moves on. Staff turnover in other campus departments can also set back efforts to build relationships on campus.

Housing

> *"Housing can be the breaking factor for success, even for former foster youth who are strong academically. Let's create multiple streams of revenue … to make sure that these programs are funded at the level that they need in order to be successful, including housing."*
>
> —Amy Lemly, John Burton Foundation

- Securing year-round housing for former foster youth, even at universities with on-campus dorms, continues to be one of the principal challenges for campus support programs. Finding appropriate on-campus housing for students with children presents an additional challenge at some campuses.

- Some two- and four-year programs are looking at the THP-Plus program as a solution for some students. This option holds promise, but there are also potential administrative barriers involved in obtaining county certification as a THP-Plus provider.

Identifying eligible students and creating a pipeline to college

- Some campuses have faced difficulty in initially identifying eligible students. During program planning, before specific benefits are being offered, it has been difficult to get students who

checked "wards of the court" on the FAFSA (federal student aid) form to come forward and self-identify as foster youth. This creates a conundrum for staff who try to make the case to campus administrators about the need for services without accurate information about the number of students. The CSU financial aid form now has a place for students to indicate that they have been in foster care, but retrieving this data continues to be problematic.

- Campus support programs and their institutions need help thinking through strategies for "reaching down" to make inroads into K–12 education. Often campus outreach programs target older high school students, but programs need to reach students as early as eighth grade to plant the idea that going to college is possible.

> *"We can't necessarily change the public school system, but we can help these [foster] kids see themselves as having the option of going to college."*
>
> —Amy Lemley, John Burton Foundation

- Many program coordinators do not have a complete understanding of how the foster care systems work. Program staff expressed the need for a basic overview of the foster care system, social services, and ILP programs, with practical information on how to navigate these systems. Furthermore, only an estimated 30 percent of foster youth are in ILP programs. Campuses are struggling to find strategies for reaching other youth in foster care.

> *"As an ILP worker, I had to create my own master list for youth, since there wasn't anything else like it. We need a resource for ILP workers, CASAs, attorneys, courts."*
>
> —Former ILP worker, current campus program leader

- There is a need for better connections and information flow between campus programs, ILPs, and schools. ILP programs, high school counselors, foster parents, and foster youth need better access to information about postsecondary educational options, financial aid, and information on campus support programs for former foster youth.

- Former foster youth interviewed for the FYSI were eager for information about college opportunities, but they did not know what is available. Currently no resource manuals or web-based information exists with concrete, comprehensive, and accurate information about post-high school options for foster youth.

> *"[An] important reason why foster youth do not apply to college is that they are not aware of the college opportunities available to them, and they do not have the practical knowledge and skills to successfully navigate the complex college application process." [11]*

- Online information about campus support programs has not kept pace with the replication of these programs. The State Office of the Foster Care Ombudsman hosts a website for foster youth that provides information about postsecondary education and financial aid. The only information

---

[11] T.R. Wolanin, *Higher Education Opportunities for Foster Youth: A Primer for Policymakers.* Washington, D.C., The Institute for Higher Education Policy, December 2005, www.ihep.com/Pubs/PDF/fosteryouth.pdf, p. 38.

about campus support programs on this site is a link to the Cal State Fullerton Guardian Scholars program; at the time this report was written, the link was not working.[12]

Funding

As long as there is no significant source of year-to-year public funding for campus support programs for former foster youth, campuses will face the challenge of initiating and sustaining their programs with a variety of private sources. Programs expressed a need for assistance from current funders on how to position their programs to get the attention of other foundations and donors. Some raised the concern that as more campus support programs come online, there will be increased competition for funding from a finite group of funders. Among other things, this kind of competitive environment can hamper efforts to foster collaboration and mutual support among campus support programs for former foster youth. Challenges are listed below:

> *"It's like running a little nonprofit on campus."*
>
> —Lisa Villareal,
> The San Francisco Foundation

- The people who know the needs are often not the same ones who know how to fund-raise. Many program staff emphasized the importance of building a strong working relationship with the campus development office early on.

- The experience and capacity for fundraising varies considerably among the program staff we spoke with. Even on campuses with development office support, program staff expressed a need for technical assistance and training in fund-raising techniques and help developing a fund-raising plan for their services for former foster youth.

- Managing multiple funding sources on a university or college campus presents a host of bureaucratic complications that can pull precious staff time away from other program activities and student services. As the number of funding sources grows, tracking expenses and salaries back to each source on a monthly basis can become a full-time job. Funding cycles and deadlines vary from source to source, as do reporting and accountability requirements.

Collaboration and coordination

Campus programs involved in collaboration with other campuses or service providers at the local or regional level provided insights into some of the challenges of these collaborations:

- Ongoing regional collaboratives need strong, consistent leadership. There is a need for training on collaborative models and practice, group facilitation, and process.

- It is difficult to participate in regional planning efforts while at the same time building a program on campus. With limited staff and resources, programs prioritize on campus services and see regional coordination a secondary priority.

- An up-to-date resource guide of key agencies and staff within a region would facilitate coordination between campuses and key outside resources. Such a guide should include housing resources, ILP coordinators, social service providers, and public school liaisons.

---

[12] Visit http://www.fosteryouthhelp.ca.gov/College.html.

- Building collaborative relationships with community-based housing and social service agencies can be challenging and slow to gain momentum.

Evaluation/assessment

Our interviews revealed a strong consensus among practitioners about the importance of creating a common set of evaluation measures as a means to both improved programs and increased public investment. WSJF is currently exploring options for conducting a cross-site evaluation of its grantees. The preliminary investigation for that study will reveal more detailed

> *"The more types of data you track, the more constituencies you can attract, the more legislative committees you can speak to."*
>
> —Lisa Villareal

information about the challenges that campus support programs are facing in the area of data collection, program assessment, and outcome evaluation. Programs interviewed for this report indicated the following challenges regarding evaluation:

- Programs and funders face the challenge of defining outcome measures to capture the full range of positive impacts that campus support programs may have for former foster youth in postsecondary education.
- The capacity for data collection and analysis varies widely from campus to campus. Some university-based programs have created evaluation partnerships with social work departments and faculty, while others need technical support in collecting and analyzing. Community colleges may require greater assistance in the area of data management and evaluation.

Challenges for community colleges

Most former foster youth in postsecondary education start out, and often drop out, at community colleges. Community colleges are thus a critical part of the "pipeline" in efforts to promote college enrollment and completion for former foster youth.

> *"Community colleges are struggling. That's where the biggest work needs to be done. We need to look at a 'good/better/best practice' model, rather than setting the bar too high for most campuses."*
>
> —John Emerson, Casey Family Programs

Many of the challenges described above are amplified for community colleges seeking to provide support for former foster youth on their campuses. Community colleges in California and Washington face an additional set of challenges resulting from their distinct mission, campus culture, and the student populations they serve:

- There are few models of successful community college programs for former foster youth to reference. Most community colleges do not have the resources or capacity to provide all of the elements of support that 4 year campuses typically include in their programs.
- There is resentment on the part of some community colleges that, despite the fact that most former foster youth attend community colleges, more resources go to campus support programs at four-year campuses serving smaller numbers of students.
- Most former foster youth in postsecondary education start out, and often drop out, at community colleges. Community colleges are thus a critical part of the "pipeline" in efforts to promote

college enrollment and completion for former foster youth. There is resentment on the part of some community colleges that, despite the fact that most former foster youth attend community colleges, more resources go to campus support programs at four-year campuses serving smaller numbers of students.

- The biggest challenge for community colleges is securing year-round housing for students. With no available on-campus housing, colleges are challenged to form partnerships with community-based housing providers, private apartment owners, THP-Plus providers, faith-based organizations, four-year universities with on-campus housing, and a range of other creative solutions. For community colleges, the housing issues present not only a financial challenge but one of staff time and training in the management of these community partnerships

> *"For community colleges, no matter how much support they provide, without housing it's not going to work."*
> —Michele Byrnes, John Burton Foundation

- Because they have open enrollment, community colleges serve students who are often not college-ready. Entering students range from those who are academically prepared to those with multiple academic, psychological, cognitive, and physical challenges.

- Many community college students have competing demands, including jobs with hours that conflict with school schedules. Campuses are challenged to provide a package of funding, including scholarships, tuition fee-waivers, and private donations, to reduce the need for jobs.

- Few community colleges have funded program coordinators. The Foster Youth Liaisons at each college, designated under the Chancellor's Foster Youth Support Initiative, are financial aide officers who have full time-responsibilities in addition to their new roles in assisting former foster youth.

- It is more difficult to create an identity-based program at community colleges, because campus culture is not conducive to the development of community.

- It has been more difficult to build institutional support for this population, since former foster youth typically constitute only a small percentage of the total number of students from disadvantaged backgrounds at a community college.

- Community colleges are challenged to develop assessment measures that recognize the totality of the community college mission beyond completion of an AA degree and transfer to a four-year campus. These include certificate completion, career technical education, short-term job skills and employability training, and independent living skills.

B. COSTS

The WSJF and Stuart foundations' experience funding campus support programs provides some preliminary information about the cost of replicating these programs on other campuses. The operating budgets of four Northern California campus support programs for former foster youth that are current or past grantees of these foundations were examined to answer some preliminary cost questions. Table I (Appendix D) summarizes cost information obtained from a review of grant proposals and budgets from California State University East Bay (CSUEW), San Jose State University (SJSU), San Francisco State University (SFSU), and University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC). This analysis should be viewed with the following caveats in mind:

- Cost data are based on projected, not actual, expense and revenue budgets
- Information contained in the budgets and proposals available to us was not always clear or self-explanatory. These data were not confirmed these data with project staff.
- In particular, projected scholarship amounts are speculative for some of the programs. The figures represent a goal, but are entirely dependent on these programs' future fundraising success.
- There are significant differences in program design and structure, and these data have not been corrected for those differences.

With these caveats in mind, we can begin to develop some general answers to the following questions:

What are campuses spending to launch these programs?
The 3- year operating budgets for these programs (exclusive of direct student aide) range from a low of $520,000 (CSUEB) to a high of $665,000 (UCSC). In addition, each campus set goals for direct student support such as scholarships, emergency funds and housing gap support. In some cases these costs were built into the initial budget. In other cases a goal for future fundraising was established to cover direct student aid. Targets for direct student aid ranged between $120,000 and $210,000 over the three year grant period.

What is the cost per student?
For three of the four campuses, the total operating budget averaged over the number of matriculated students is in the range of $4,200 to $4,400, for comparable populations of 40-45 students. Because SJSU proposes to serve up to 100 students per year, the cost per student is significantly lower—about $2,200. It should be noted that these programs also provide outreach activities and services to larger numbers of high school and community college students. It would be useful in a future analysis to separate out the cost of these services to gain a more accurate picture of the cost per student for different levels of service.

How are they being funded?
At all four campuses, foundation grants from the WSJF or Stuart Foundation represent the majority of funding in Year 1, ranging from 55% to 90% of the combined operating and student aid budgets. By Year 3, the proportional contribution of the lead foundation decreases in all cases. All the campuses have made a commitment to sustain their programs at the same level beyond the initial foundation grant, and are generally looking to other private and internal sources to make up the difference, but it is too soon to know whether and how they are able to achieve this goal.

How are foundation dollars being used?
The majority of grant funds at each campus support personnel. Personnel costs, as a percentage of total operations, range from 71% at UCSC to 90% at SJSU. In general, foundation dollars support the hiring of a program coordinator, as well as student mentors, tutors and support staff at some sites. University cost share contributions typically include administrative personnel such as the director of student service, EOPS or other campus administrative staff. In general, the foundations support covers at least a portion of office costs, student activities, marketing/outreach and other basic program expenses.

Despite the limitations noted above, this preliminary analysis may serve as a starting point for a more thorough examination of the relationships between program costs, levels of service, and eventual program outcomes. Such an analysis would be extremely useful to help secure public and additional private funding for the broad replication of these programs throughout the California public higher educations system and beyond.

PART III: PROPOSED CAMPUS SUPPORT SUSTAINABILITY INITIATIVE

This section provides recommendations and a framework for the development of an initiative to build on current legislative and programmatic momentum in order to reach a "tipping point" where on-campus support services for former foster youth become the norm throughout the CCC, CSU and UC systems, and, as such, receive sustaining public funding. Such an initiative, while focusing on California's public institutions of higher education, would also serve programs in Washington State and elsewhere.

A. Recommendations

In order to move the field as rapidly as possibly toward broad public support and universal uptake by campuses, an array of additional investments could be made to build on existing momentum. This includes:

1. Build infrastructure: Support the development and sustainability of existing and new CSPs, which can serve as models for the field;

2. Advocate for policy change: Support legislative, policy, and systems change efforts to develop or re-allocate new public funding streams, increase systems coordination among public agencies and IHEs, institutionalize support for CSPs, and build political and public will for college success for foster youth;

3. Make the case: Conduct research and evaluation to continue demonstrating the impact and value of CSPs, and to inform and strengthen the field; and

4. Spread the word: Develop communications and outreach strategies that capture and disseminate knowledge to improve the field, and inform foster youth about opportunities for college support.

Recommendation 1: Build infrastructure

Strengthen existing and emerging CSPs through technical assistance, coaching, and training

Virtually everyone we spoke with places a high value on existing peer support networks, and wants continued and expanded opportunities for informal networking among campus support programs for former foster youth. However, most of those we spoke with also identified a need for more formalized mechanisms of support in the form of coaching, technical assistance and training. This kind of support would not only strengthen existing programs, but help emerging programs get up to speed more quickly by efficiently leveraging the experience of established CSPs. This section details both the delivery mechanisms and priority content for technical assistance and training that a Campus Support Sustainability Initiative could provide. These proposed new infrastructure supports should be seen as enhancing and strengthening, rather than replacing, existing networks such as the Council of Colleges and the Foster Youth University Consortium.

How CSPs want to receive assistance

- Expert advice and guidance from an "on-call" coach. This would be valuable for established as well as developing programs. (In southern California, Orangewood Children's Foundation serves in this capacity for the Guardian Scholars programs in its network.) The types of support programs that might be needed include advice and guidance on program design and best practices, assistance identifying and cultivating internal school leadership and external champion support, facilitating planning with internal and external partners, and general assistance solving the many large and small problems that arise in the course of program implementation.

- Technical assistance, consulting, and training for staff of individual campus programs. This type of assistance can be tailored to the specific needs of a program at a critical juncture in the program's development, and it can therefore be effective in helping programs make significant improvements or confront difficult issues. Flexible technical assistance funds can be offered for grantees to purchase consulting, specialized training, or meeting facilitation, or for travel expenses to off-site trainings and conferences

- In-depth trainings and presentations. Program staff and other key informants identified a number of priority training issues (see below). The trainers/presenters could be either expert consultants or experienced campus staff, but the purpose would be to take a more in-depth and formal approach to issues than typically happens in a peer networking meeting. One model for this type of presentation is the recent training for community college financial aid administrators, coordinated by the Community College System Office with assistance from an outside consultant.

- Intensive peer-to-peer T.A. Casey Family Programs employs a Peer T.A. Framework (initiated by the Center for the Study of Social Policy in 1995) that could be adapted for use with campus support programs, particularly those in the planning or early implementation stages. A Peer T.A. Framework develops through a process of joint problem-solving between one to two teams of individuals who are requesting assistance and a team of peer consultants who has firsthand experience related to the targeted issue. The learning exchange occurs in a one-and-a-half-day, intense, solution-focused meeting in which joint problem-solving results in the requesting team's commitment to an action plan.

- Technology-assisted distance learning. Given time constraints and limited travel budgets, respondents were very supportive of using technology to increase the accessibility of training as well as to facilitate peer-to-peer networking. Suggested methods include:
    - Facilitated conference calls
    - Hosted online chat sessions and online forums
    - Webcasts and podcasts
    - Web conferences and "Webinars" (online seminars)[13]
    - DVD recordings of training sessions, available at cost

---

[13] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Web_conferencing.

Content for training and technical assistance

The following issues were consistently requested for additional training and technical assistance:

- Understanding the unique challenges and barriers faced by former foster youth. There is a need for training among and across campus departments, program coordinators, financial aid administrators, faculty mentors, and others in this critical area. Training should be based on lessons learned by established programs and should incorporate input from former foster youth.

- Providing creative housing solutions. Many new ideas and are being explored and tested in this critical area of support for former foster youth: housing partnerships between universities and community colleges; THP Plus and other subsidized housing for students; host home; mentor-roommate housing arrangements; and others. Technical training is needed on how to navigate THP Plus and other housing programs. Campus program administrators also need opportunities to learn about what is working on other campuses and how to implement workable solutions in their own context.

- Understanding financial aid. Financial aid administrators need training and regular information updates about changes in regulations and procedures governing FAFSA, Chaffee vouchers, and other student financial aid opportunities.

- Creating sustainability. Many campus program staff reported a need for basic training in proposal development and grant writing. Others need assistance in planning for sustainability through outreach to corporations and alumni donors and through endowment building.

- Building on-campus partnerships. Program coordinators of new programs often need to learn strategies for building institutional support for services specifically targeting former foster youth. Many also need to learn how to work more effectively with administration, financial aid, development, and other campus departments.

- Building off-campus partnerships. It is crucial for universities and local community colleges to create linkages to facilitate student transfer to four-year schools, as well as improve connections to ILPs, social services, and high schools.

- Understanding the foster care system. Some program coordinators come into their roles with an incomplete understanding of how the foster care system works, which can slow down the process of creating relationships with local social services and Independent Living Programs.

- Marketing. Programs need technical assistance to develop marketing and outreach materials to promote their programs on campus, to potential students, to donors, to funders, and to the broader community.

- Evaluating. Programs need to design data-capture and tracking systems to document program outcomes.

Recommendation 2: Advocate for policy change

Campus support programs cannot be sustained through philanthropic and campus investments alone. Significant public funding must be available to encourage and support CSPs. Additionally, systems barriers must be identified and reduced, and policy solutions must be developed to address the critical challenges, such as the lack of year-round housing.

The Initiative could fund an existing organization or a campaign consultant to act as liaison to identify policy opportunities and targets, and coordinate policy advocacy with the Legislature and state and county social services and educational systems. Such an entity could provide the education, training, communications and messaging to ensure a coordinated approach with existing advocacy groups, campus programs, university administrators, researchers, funders, and others.

Specific policy and systems-change activities identified by interviewees included:

- Promoting increased coordination and articulation between the California Community Colleges, California State University and University of California systems.

- Working with the Community College System Office to build on the success of the Foster Youth Success Initiative (FYSI). Consider funding the System Office to provide ongoing management on FYSI. Help disseminate the FYSI manual (*A Guide for Financial Aid Administrators*); sponsor follow-up trainings and convenings for California community colleges; sponsor similar financial aid trainings for colleges and universities in Washington State.
- Convening meetings to facilitate regional planning to assist current grantees (four- and two-year programs) in reducing systems barriers and improving coordination with other postsecondary institutions, child welfare agencies, ILPs, housing providers, and public schools in their regions.
- Convening housing experts and campus program leaders on a regional basis to work toward creative housing solutions for community colleges and universities in key regions.

Recommendation 3: Make the case

There was strong consensus among practitioners interviewed that it is time to begin evaluating CSPs to make the case for public "uptake" and sustained support. An evaluability assessment is currently being conducted by Chapin Hall to ensure that CSPs are ready for evaluation. Evaluation efforts should focus on:

- Program specification. Until there is a clear set of commonly-used definitions and program elements, it will be difficult to evaluate across programs and aggregate evaluation findings. Research and evaluation can uncover the different ways CSPs define and organize their interventions, so that efforts can be made to better coordinate them.

- Process. Process evaluation will help identify the best and most cost efficient ways of organizing and implementing CSPs, as well as help develop consensus around standards of practice and essential program elements (with flexibility to allow for variation in resources, conditions and cultures on individual campuses).

- Outcome and impact. Intermediate and long-term outcomes and impacts, primarily on foster youth but also on IHEs, should be the ultimate focus of evaluation efforts.

- Cost benefit. As described previously, a more in-depth study of the exact costs and benefits of CSPs should be conducted.

- Capacity building. CSPs will need technical assistance, training, and capacity building in order to work with evaluators, and to collect and utilize data.

- Continuous improvement. Evaluations should provide continuous feedback to CSPs so that program improvements can be made.

Recommendation 4: Spread the word

Conduct outreach and marketing to foster youth

Currently there is no single updated clearinghouse of information on campus support programs for foster youth. Foster youth interested in applying to colleges with support programs need such a centralized, regularly updated resource, as well as outreach efforts to connect them to post-secondary opportunities. This initiative could:

- Improve outreach to youth in foster care through the K-12, child welfare and other systems to increase awareness and access to information about higher education opportunities.

- Encourage and facilitate collaboration among campus support programs to develop strategies and materials to support joint marketing and outreach.

- Create web-based and printed materials for outreach to foster youth in secondary schools and to ILP workers, foster families, school counselors and others who play a role in helping foster youth pursue postsecondary education.

- Develop print, audio and video materials explaining the goals of campus based support programs for former foster youth. Individual campuses could use these materials in their efforts to build on-campus support as well as for external marketing to donors and others.

Capture and disseminate knowledge

Many respondents also identified a need for a central information clearinghouse on strategies to create and sustain CSPs. As the field grows and matures, it will be important to be able to capture and disseminate new information on best practices that emerges from campus networking meetings, conferences, research, and evaluation findings.

- New written and electronic resources
    - Capture peer learning to create regularly updated best practice briefs and "good idea" guides for campus program administrators and advocates. Much of the peer to peer and expert guidance offered to campus programs is shared verbally (e.g., at the Northern California Council of Colleges). However, after the meeting ends, there is no recording of the "good ideas" for others to access.
    - Create and update online and print-based resources

- For campus support programs: Fact sheets, how to guides, and training materials such as the Training Manual created by Casey Family Programs and Tracy Fried, and other documents.

- For foster youth and those who help them (e.g., foster families, ILP coordinators, school counselors): Easy-to-access, up-to-date information about campus support programs, financial aid, and other information about college access and success.

  o Make audio or video recordings of trainings, and use them to create podcasts and webcasts

  o Post new documents, podcasts and webcasts on the website (see below). Announce new postings via the listserv (see below).

- Website. Develop and maintain a website that serves as an online clearinghouse of information and resources for campus support replication programs. There is a growing body of information about postsecondary education for former foster youth, but it is not organized and archived in a way that programs can easily access.

  o The Website could serve three primary audiences: Grantees (including link to a grantee-only extranet), other campus support programs, and youth. Other stakeholders (school counselors, ILP programs, foster families) would be secondary audiences who could benefit from website content.

  o Resources available online could include: manuals, "how-to" documents, reports, conference proceedings, podcasts, upcoming events and convenings, and policy information.

  o Online trainings and listserves could be hosted on the site, and future visitors to the site could download podcasts of the trainings

  o Grantees-only extranet would provide an online meeting place, information hub, and archive of communication related to the initiative.

  o Youth portion of site would provide information on campus support programs for foster youth, financial aid, and links to other relevant information to access college resources.

- Listserv. Develop and maintain a listserv for campus support programs to share information, disseminate resources, and ask and answer questions. Listserv topics can be automatically archived so that listserv participants can review previous electronic "discussions." Relevant documents, resources, and event announcements shared on the listserv could be posted on the website.

B. Organizing the Initiative

Retain an Initiative Coordinator

At the beginning, the Campus Support Sustainability initiative can be staffed by a full-time Initiative Coordinator, with part-time administrative support. The initial tasks of the Initiative Director will be to work with the key stakeholders to develop a strategic work plan and identify a pool of technical assistance providers with expertise in the critical training areas.

Some of the key qualifications for the Initiative Coordinator include:

- Strong background and understanding of the foster care system and the needs of current and former foster youth.
- Familiarity with public higher education systems (UC, CSU, CCC).
- Experience in planning and leading a technical assistance/systems change initiative.
- Knowledge of best practices in the delivery of technical assistance and training, and ability to lead trainings on critical issues for campus support programs for former foster youth.
- The ability to be a systems thinker who can "connect the dots" and build bridges between disparate public systems.
- Passionate commitment to promoting postsecondary educational success for former foster youth.
- Familiarity and/or experience in philanthropic or nonprofit organizations.

The first step of the Coordinator would be to develop strategic action plan for the Initiative. The Coordinator may decide to contract with other consultants, nonprofit intermediaries, and grantee agencies with specific content expertise (housing solutions, financial aid, regional convening; fund development, marketing, web design, Initiative evaluation, etc.) in order to accomplish its goals. Additionally, the Coordinator would either oversee or coordinate with policy advocacy and communications firms retained to fulfill Initiative goals.

Identify and retain a lead policy advocacy coordinator

As described above, it will be important to identify an organization or individual with the expertise to identify policy- and systems-change solutions, and coordinate stakeholders to advocate for those solutions.

Identify and retain a communications firm

Similarly, a communications vendor can assist with the myriad of communications activities, such as messaging, building political and public will, outreach, a centralized internet clearinghouse, and knowledge dissemination.

Administrative structure

Ideally, the Initiative can be housed within a nonprofit agency or academic institution with expertise, a track record, and an exemplary reputation working on behalf of current or former foster youth. This agency would provide administrative and office infrastructure as well as linkages with key partners and constituencies. (See Appendix for a list of potential partners and models for the Initiative structure.) If no appropriate partner can be identified immediately, it would be possible for the Initiative to be managed directly by WSJF. One important consideration is that in order to promote trust and openness between grantees and T.A. providers, the Initiative Director, staff, and consultants must be seen as independent of the grantmaking processes of WSJF, Stuart Foundation, and other funders.

Initiative oversight

It may be useful to form an oversight committee or task force to guide the initiative. The Committee could be advisory in nature, or it could function in a more active steering committee role. The

---

Committee should be of manageable size (particularly if given actual oversight responsibility) and should include leaders of organizations and systems that have an impact on increasing foster youth access and success in postsecondary education, such as:
- o Initiative funders
- o Administrators from both four-year and two-year campuses
- o Foster youth advocacy groups and intermediary organizations
- o K–12 administrators
- o Child welfare system administrators and/or ILP coordinators

Appendix A: Potential Partners and Models for the College Support Sustainability initiative

A. Potential Partners

This section contains the results of an initial investigation into potential Initiative partners. We looked at groups with an established track record and a clear connection to issues facing foster youth in higher education. With the possible exception of the Child and Family Policy Institute of California, none of these groups appears to be a good fit as a lead organization for the Initiative. However, because these groups have expertise in one of more areas that the Initiative will address, they will likely be key partners and/or subcontractors for the Initiative.

It is important to note that no direct conversations were held with any of these groups about potential partnerships with the Campus Support Sustainability initiative. The information in this section comes from the organizations' websites, other online sources, and general conversations with representatives of some of these groups.

Child and Family Policy Institute of California
www.cfpic.org
The Child and Family Policy Institute of California (CFPIC) is a private, nonprofit organization incorporated in 2004 under the auspices of the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA). The purpose of the CFPIC is to "advance the development of sound public policy and promote program excellence in county Human Services Agencies through research, education, training, and technical assistance."

In January 2007, CFPIC and Casey Family Programs co-hosted the **2007 California Foster Youth Education Summit.** They are currently finalizing the proceedings from the Summit with specific recommendations for statewide policy and local implementation actions in a number of key issue areas, including postsecondary education.

Several characteristics of CFPIC indicate that it could potentially serve as the institutional home for the College Support Sustainability initiative:

- The existing technical assistance and training infrastructure could be built upon to include services for campus support programs.
- CFPIC has experience and expertise in legislative advocacy and could help coordinate advocacy efforts for campus support programs for former foster youth.
- The organization's focus could provide an opportunity to strengthen the critical links between public postsecondary institutions and the Child Welfare system.
- CFPIC has existing philanthropic partnerships with the Stuart Foundation, Casey Family Programs, the Zellerbach Family Fund, and the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Other potential partner organizations
The following organizations could become partners with the Campus Support Sustainability initiative, providing training materials, technical expertise, convening, knowledge management, and other key supports and services.

John Burton Foundation
http://www.johnburtonfoundation.org/

Areas of expertise: THP-Plus Housing and transition issues for foster youth

The John Burton Foundation for Children without Homes, founded in 2004 by retired President Pro Tem of the California State Senate John Burton, is dedicated to improving the quality of life for California's homeless children and developing policy solutions to prevent homelessness. In June 2006, the Foundation launched the THP-Plus Statewide Implementation Project to help foster youth make safe, successful transitions. The Project seeks to reduce homelessness among former foster youth by expanding access to the Transitional Housing Placement-Plus Program (THP-Plus). The Project will expand participation in this important program by providing training and technical assistance to counties and advocating for expanded public funding.

Orangewood Children's Foundation
http://www.orangewoodfoundation.org/programs_scholars.asp

Areas of expertise: Coaching and replication training, convening, knowledge management

Orangewood Children's Foundation (OCF) has been a key partner in the development of Guardian Scholars since its inception in 1998, raising money to provide scholarships and grants, providing leadership in expanding the program to additional campuses, convening a Council of Colleges, stimulating and directing local and statewide advocacy efforts, improving systems for college access, and providing pre-college support to foster care youth. OCF has also facilitated the expansion of the Guardian Scholars Program throughout Orange County and surrounding counties and is now providing replication assistance on a limited basis to programs in Northern California, Georgia, Texas, and Florida. In partnership with Casey Family Programs, OCF has hosted two national convenings of campus support programs for former foster youth.

Casey Family Programs
http://www.casey.org

Areas of expertise: Convening, training, publications, links to national policy and beset practice

Casey Family Programs is a Seattle-based national operating foundation that has served children, youth, and families in the child welfare system since 1966. Casey Family Programs provides direct services, and promotes advances in child-welfare practice and policy. Casey Family Programs has been instrumental in convening, training and research to advance the field of campus support programs for former foster youth.

Honoring Emancipated Youth
http://www.heysf.org/issues.html

Areas of expertise: Convening, replication support, information and knowledge management

Honoring Emancipated Youth (HEY) is a San Francisco-based advocacy coalition working to improve the opportunities for youth leaving the foster care system. In addition to housing advocacy and education projects, HEY works as a catalyst organization to develop on-campus support programs for former foster youth in colleges and universities. HEY convenes the Northern

California Council of Colleges, which provides a quarterly forum for peer learning, support, and networking for higher education institutions supporting foster youth.

Tracy L. Fried & Associates (private consulting firm)

Areas of expertise: Training and technical assistance for financial aid administrators and other key campus support staff, meeting facilitation, regional coordination, foster youth input

Tracy L. Fried was formerly Coordinator of Foster Youth Services for the San Diego County Office of Education. As a consultant she worked intensively with the California Community Colleges System Office over the past 18 months to develop the Foster Youth Support Initiative (FYSI), which provided in-depth training to Foster Youth Liaisons from 109 community college financial aid offices.

California Youth Connection (CYC)
http://www.calyouthconn.org

Areas of expertise: Policy advocacy, foster youth participation

California Youth Connection promotes the participation of foster youth in policy development and legislative change to improve the foster care system. California Youth Connection strives to improve social work practice and child welfare policy. CYC Chapters in counties throughout the state identify local issues and use grassroots and community organizing to create change.

B. Models for Initiative structure

There are numerous examples of networks, consortia, and foundation-sponsored initiatives that provide technical assistance, training, and other supports to a field of nonprofit service providers. While none of these may provide an exact model for the College Support Sustainability initiative, elements of the following examples could be adapted to the needs of the Initiative:

Family to Family
http://linux1900.dn.net/initiatives/familytofamily/index.htm

One of the interesting features about F2F is the extensive library of online training manuals, fact sheets, and other tools to assist programs in improving their practices.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation's Family to Family Initiative began in 1992 as a national effort to help states and communities re-conceptualize, redesign, and reconstruct their foster care systems to achieve new system wide goals around placement and family reunification for youth in foster care. The Foundation's role has been to assist states and communities with a portion of the costs involved in both planning and implementing innovations in their systems of services for children and families, and to make available technical assistance and consultation throughout the process. The Foundation

is also committed to accumulating and disseminating both lessons from states' experiences and information on the achievement of improved outcomes for children.

The Foundation and Family to Family grantees together developed a set of tools to help others build a neighborhood-based family foster care system. The initiative provides access to online tools—fact sheets, summaries, and manuals—on a wide range of topics to assist in the redesign and rebuilding of child welfare systems. These have been written by teams of practitioners and leading experts in child welfare reform and are built on lessons learned working inside child welfare agencies and with community and political leaders.

See online tools: http://linux1900.dn.net/initiatives/familytofamily/tools.htm

The **California Connected** by **25 Initiative** (CC25I) is a youth transitions reform initiative which is part of California's Family to Family Initiative. The purpose of CC25I is to develop a comprehensive continuum of services supporting successful foster youth transition to adulthood. CC25I was launched in 2005 through the collaborative efforts of the a number of foundations, including WSJF and Stuart Foundation.

YouthBuild USA
www.youthbuild.org/site/c.htIRI3PIKoG/b.1223923/k.C7D6/About_Us.htm

What is interesting about YouthBuild as a model for the Campus Support Sustainability initiative is its two-tiered structure, whereby all programs receive access to regional trainings and telephone assistance, while programs that meet accreditation standards receive access to additional funding, technical assistance, and staff leadership development opportunities.

Since 1990, YouthBuild USA has guided the development of the national YouthBuild network of more than 226 local programs that act in collaboration to improve their outcomes and impact. YouthBuild USA provides local YouthBuild sites with:

- National and regional trainings
- On-site and telephone technical assistance
- Research, publications, curriculum, and Web-based resources
- Grants and loans
- Quality assurance through the management of the YouthBuild USA Affiliated Network, which sets program design and performance standards, collects and analyzes data on YouthBuild program outcomes, and accredits outstanding programs. Accredited affiliates have completed a minimum of two program cycles and a comprehensive accreditation process, and their outcomes meet or exceed YouthBuild performance standards.

YouthBuild USA also represents and advocates for YouthBuild programs by securing federal and private funding to support YouthBuild programs, coordinating a national advocacy coalition and supporting the of state-level advocacy coalitions, and bringing public attention to the YouthBuild network and issues facing youth in transition.

Regional Network of the After-School Partnerships Office (California Department of Education)
http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ba/cp/cclcregntwrk.asp

(Note: the Regional Network represents the technical assistance component of a state-funded competitive grant program. As such, it could serve as a model for technical assistance for campus support programs for former foster youth if and when the State Legislature funds these programs on a broader scale.)

The Regional Network develops and provides resources, training, and technical assistance for programs funded under the CDE's 21st-Century Community Learning Centers and After School Education and Safety Program. In each of 11 regions, technical assistance is provided by a regional lead (technical assistance contractor) and a CDE staff member who work together to implement training opportunities and activities uniquely designed to fit the needs of local before- and after-school program grantees. The regional leads spearhead this regional system of support, which is administered by local county offices of education. Each regional lead works with local grantees to plan specific assistance and workshops, increase communication and networking among program sites and with local Regional Learning Centers, and increase site level support for program coordinators, staff, and community partners.

Foundation Consortium for California's Children & Youth
The Campus Support Sustainability initiative might also find inspiration in the Foundation Consortium for California's Children & Youth (no longer in operation). From its roots as coalition of funders promoting state funding for school-linked services, the Foundation Consortium grew into a professionally-staffed support network for improving outcomes for children and families, offering "policy leadership, technical assistance, and support to promote innovative thinking and motivate organizations and individuals to experiment with new ideas, tools, and practices."

Appendix B: Key informants

Michele Byrnes, John Burton Foundation (formerly with Honoring Emancipated Youth)

Miryam Choca, Casey Family Programs

Amy Dworsky, Chapin Hall Center for Children, University of Chicago

John Emerson, Casey Family Programs

Amy Freeman, Stuart Foundation

Tracy Fried, Tracy L. Fried and Associates

Gene Howard, Orangewood Children's Foundation

Diana LaMar, Orangewood Children's Foundation

Amy Lemley, John Burton Foundation

Crystal Luffberry, California Connected by 25 Initiative (CC25I)

Joni Pitcl, Foster Youth Education Fund (Sacramento)

Sara Razavi, Honoring Emancipated Youth (HEY)

Jennifer Rodriguez, California Youth Connection

Lisa Villareal, The San Francisco Foundation

Nancy Wiltsek, Pottruck Foundation

Campus Program Leaders

Diana Balgas
Kevin Bristow
California State University East Bay

Michael McPartlin
City College of San Francisco

Mary Herrick
College Success Foundation, Washington State

Joy SalvettiWolf
Sacramento State University

Xochitl Sanchez-Zarama
Sonja Rashid
San Francisco State University

Connie Hernandez
Eloise Stigletz
San Jose State University

Celeste Hunziker
University of California, Davis

Corrine Miller
University of California, Santa Cruz

Appendix C: Campus Support Programs and Intermediaries funded by WSJF and Stuart

County	4-year	2-year	Intermediary/other	Funding P= Planning I=Implementation	
				WSJF	Stuart
San Francisco	SF State University				P/I
		City College of San Francisco		P	
Santa Clara	San Jose State			P/I	
Alameda/Contra Costa	Cal State Univ. East Bay			P/I	
Santa Cruz	UC Santa Cruz				I (grant ended)
Sacramento/Yolo	Sacramento State University			P	
	UC Davis			P	
		Los Rios Community College District		(not currently funded, but part of Sacramento collaborative planning effort)	
			Foster Youth Education Fund		P
Bay Area/ Northern CA			Honoring Emancipated Youth (HEY)		
Orange County/ Southern CA			Orangewood Children's Foundation		I
Washington State			College Success Foundation		I

Appendix D: Cost Information

Budget analysis for four campus-based support programs for former foster youth

| Campus | 3 year operating budget* | Personnel as % of operation | Direct student support (scholarship, housing, emergency fund, etc.) | Year 1 | | | Year 3 | | | # students served [15] | Ave. Annual operat-ing cost per student | Ave. annual direct student support per student[16] |
				WSJF and/or Stuart	Campus direct cost share [14]	Other sources	WSJF and/or Stuart	Campus direct cost share	Other sources			
CSU East Bay	$ 519,625	77%	$122,060	63%	37%	0%	44%	40%	16%	40	$4,330	$3,052
SJSU	$665,295	90%	$150,000	55%	20%	25%	27%	54%	19%	100	$2,218	$1,500
SF State	$ 528,362	75%	$210,000	90%[17]	10%	0%	92%[18]	8%	0%	40	$4,403	$5,250
UC Santa Cruz [19]	$ 562,343	71%	$150,000	66%	16%	18%	61%	15%	24%	45	$4,166	$3,333

---

[14] Does not include indirect costs as calculated by each campus

[15] Includes only matriculated students with access to full range of services. Some programs serve many additional students through outreach activities.

[16] Expense is averaged over all students in program, although not all students receive direct financial support.

[17], [18] Represents projected grants from both Stuart Foundation and WS Johnson Foundation.

[19] UCSC estimates approximately $972,000 in contributed volunteer time over the 3 year grant

Appendix E: Casey Family Programs Peer Technical Assistance Initiative

What is Peer TA?

Peer technical assistance is a technical assistance (TA) approach that rapidly disseminates information about successful practices, policies, and tools related to a defined issue, concern or challenge. Peer TA is solution-focused and occurs through a process of joint problem-solving between a team of individuals who is requesting assistance and a team of peer consultants who has first-hand experience related to the targeted issue.

The Peer TA Framework used by Casey Family Programs was initiated by the Center for the Study of Social Policy in 1995. Casey is using peer TA to broaden the impact of successful practices across the areas of permanence, transition, and systems improvement that are in alignment to Casey's vision, mission, and goals.

What occurs at a Peer TA event?

The peer TA event provides a venue for colleagues to engage in facilitated conversations for the purpose of jointly developing solutions to identified challenges. The learning exchange occurs in a one and a half day intense solution-focused meeting where joint problem-solving results in the requesting team's commitment to an action plan. Discussions include in-depth details regarding program development, implementation, and assessment assuring that information is practical, relevant and takes into account issues related to political climate, power, and culture.

Who are the participants of Peer TA?

Learning exchanges related to an identified challenge occur between two teams, the requesting team and the peer consultant team. Teams requesting peer TA are poised for change and may include administrators, front-line workers, consumers, and stakeholders who can leverage ideas and create change in their agencies and communities. Peer consultants who have had first-hand experience addressing the identified challenges are enlisted from within Casey and other child welfare organizations. The consultants' profile of responsibilities, roles, and positions mirrors that of the requesting team, hence the peer event is often called a "peer match."

What are the expected results from participating in Peer TA?

Peer TA results in benefits for both the TA recipient and peer consulting team. Peer TA will:

- Increase knowledge and mutual learning
  Discussions are planned to engage the team requesting peer TA in an examination of current resources, strengths, and relationships that will assist them as they address challenges. Knowledge is increased for both the requesting team and peer consultant team.

- Result in the development and implementation of an action plan
  The peer TA event results in the development of an action plan that addresses challenges identified by the requesting team. The action plan includes timelines and commitments. A core belief of peer TA is that the requesting site has the prerequisite skills, knowledge, and

motivation to affect changes. The summary report provides a written account of the event and the action plan.

- <u>Accelerate the pace of change</u>
  Sharing of lessons learned about what worked and what did not work in other programs/organizations that have managed similar challenges with similar populations should result in acceleration in the pace of change with less barriers confronted.

As Casey moves towards the achievement of their mission and goals, Peer TA can provide a means of rapidly sharing information between colleagues. Ideas for ways that peer TA could be used include:

- Sharing lessons learned about systems improvement strategies used at the local and state level.

- Taking to scale new practices, policies, resources, and methods.

- Facilitating transition work as programs exit from communities and need to share aspects of their work with collaborating agencies to assure continuity of care for Casey youth.

If you would like to explore how the Peer TA Initiative can be of service to your work contact

Dena Huff
Manager, Peer Technical Assistance
Casey Family Programs
1808 Eye Street, N.W. 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: (202) 467-4441 Fax: (202) 467-4499
<u>E-mail: dhuff@casey.org</u>

References

A Roadmap for Improved Outcomes: Report of the First National Convening of Postsecondary Education Support Programs for Former Foster Youth, November 7–8, 2005, Fullerton, CA, available online at http://www.calyouthconn.org/files/cyc/PDF/2005Convening-FinalReport-4-06.pdf.

Davis, Ryan J., *College Access, Financial Aid, and College Success for Undergraduates from Foster Care,* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), 2006.

Emerson, John, *From Foster Care to College: Supporting Independent Students in Leadership Exchange,* Vol. 4, Issue 4, Winter 2007, NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education).

Honoring Emancipated Youth (HEY), *Essential Elements for On-Campus Support Programs for Former Foster Youth,* working paper, 2006.

Honoring Emancipated Youth (HEY), *Barriers Facing Foster Care Youth: National and Local Statistics about Emancipating Foster Youth,* available online at http://www.heysf.org/pdfs/HEYFosterYouthStatistics.pdf.

Wolanin, Thomas R., *Higher Education Opportunities for Foster Youth: A Primer for Policymakers,* Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2005.