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Project Goals

- Understand data on out-of-home placement population
- Identify challenges with out-of-home placements
- Weigh alternatives and make recommendations for how to address challenges
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Figure 1. Youth in OOHP as a proportion of total active probation caseload
Last day of month point-in-time, January 2020 – January 2021

Figure 2. Youth in STRTPs and resource families as a proportion of total OOHP youth
Last day of month point-in-time, January 2020 – January 2021

Source: SFJPD Monthly Statistics January 2021

Other OOHP statuses: pre-placement, pre-adjudication, pre-disposition, AWOL, home trial, transitional housing, county jail on adult criminal complaint
Demographics

African American youth make up 51% of the total active probation caseload.

African American youth more overrepresented in out-of-home placement compared to total probation caseload.

**Figure 3. Youth with OOHP dispositions by race / ethnicity**

All youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021, N = 92

![Pie chart showing race and ethnicity distribution of youth with OOHP dispositions]

- 63% African American
- 25% Hispanic
- 7% AAPI
- 3% White
- 2% Other

Source: SFJPD Augustus Database on Juvenile Court History
Demographics

Figure 4. Age at most recent OOHP disposition date
All youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021, N = 92

Figure 5. Youth with OOHP dispositions by gender
All youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021, N = 92

Source: SFJPD Augustus Database on Juvenile Court History
Figure 6. Proportion of youth with a prior child welfare placement

All youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021, who overlapped with CWS/CMS data, N = 74

45%

Prior child welfare placement

No prior child welfare placement

Source: CWS/CMS Data 2021
# Juvenile Court History

## Table 1. Juvenile court history.

All youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>25th Pct.</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>75th Pct.</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referrals per youth*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals with at least one 707b offense</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Hall bookings per youth</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average days in Juvenile Hall per booking per youth</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained petitions per youth</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained petitions with a 707b charge per youth</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of home placement dispositions per youth</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All referrals, including those for probation violations.

** Two of 92 youth were never booked into Juvenile Hall.

Source: SFJPD Augustus Database on Juvenile Court History
Figure 7. Offenses associated with out of home placement dispositions.
All youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021

- Robbery: 51
- Assault: 18
- Theft: 15
- Other Offenses: 15
- Other Status Offenses: 10
- Other Felonies: 6
- Burglary: 6
- Assault and Battery: 6
- Burglary (M): 4

Source: SFJPD Augustus Database on Juvenile Court History and California Policy Lab Crime Crosswalk
Placements

Figure 8. Placements by type.
Last day of month point-in-time, January 2020 – January 2021

Source: SFJPD OOHP Monthly Statistics
Placements

Figure 9. Placements by location.
Last day of month point-in-time, January 2020 – January 2021

Source: SFJPD OOHP Monthly Statistics
## Placements

### Table 2. Number of Placements per youth since January 1, 2019

All youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021, who overlapped with CWS/CMS data or SFJPD OOHP Monthly Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placements per youth since January 1, 2019*</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>25th Pct.</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>75th Pct.</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not all resource family placements are recorded in CWS/CMS data, so placements per youth are likely an undercount

** Nine of 92 youth were not in CWS/CMS data or SFJPD monthly OOHP data.

Source: CWS/CMS Data 2021 and SFJPD OOHP Monthly Statistics (December 2019 – December 2020)
**AWOLs**

**Figure 10. Reasons placements ended.**
All probation placements since January 1, 2019, among youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021, and were in CWS/CMS data, N = 59

- Child Ran Away from Placement: 51%
- Child Returned Home for Trial Visit: 23%
- Incarcerated: 11%
- Lower Level of Care Required: 5%
- Other: 4%
- Child’s Behavior: 3%
- Moved to THPP/THP+FC: 2%
- Moved to SILP: 1%

Source: CWS/CMS Data 2021

**Figure 11. Youth who went AWOL at least once by gender.**
All probation placements since January 1, 2019, among youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021, and were in CWS/CMS data, N = 58

- All Youth: 62%
- Boys: 55%
- Girls: 81%

At Least One AWOL
Never AWOL
At Least One AWOL

Source: CWS/CMS Data 2021
Out of Home Placement Challenges
OOHP Challenges

- Youth spend too much time in Juvenile Hall after an OOHP disposition
- Few local placements
- Few resource family placement options
- High AWOL rates
Too much time in Juvenile Hall after OOHP disposition
The Problem

Placement matching takes time

Secure detention is associated with worse health, education, and employment outcomes.

Secure detention does not decrease future delinquency.

Need: non-secure temporary placement options
Data Analysis

Table 3. Days in Juvenile Hall after out of home placement disposition.
All youth with OOHP dispositions January 1, 2019 – March 8, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days in Juvenile Hall after out of home placement disposition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>25th Pct.</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>75th Pct.</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>52*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Forty of 92 youth were not in Juvenile Hall on their disposition date.
Source: SFJPD Augustus Database on Juvenile Court History
Data Analysis

Figure 12. Pre-placement youth in Juvenile Hall in 2020
Last day of month point-in-time, January 2020 – January 2021

Source: SFJPD Monthly Statistics January 2021
Alternatives

- Temporary Local Congregate Care Beds
- Emergency Foster Care
- Emergency Intensive Services Foster Care
Recommendations

1. Reserve at least 15 temporary placement beds whether family-based, congregate care, or a combination, for youth awaiting an OOHP match.

2. Allow youth to stay in temporary placements for up to 90 day, with the goal that most youth stay for three weeks or less.

3. Contract with a Foster Family Agency to create an emergency foster care program.

4. Acquire temporary placement beds in a local STRTP.

5. Consider allowing youth to stay in temporary placements for the full placement period if it is going well.
Few Resource Family Options
The Problem

Resource family placements increased in 2020 as a proportion of all placements

One non-relative/kin resource family

No ISFC resource families

Need: Recruit non-relative/kin resource families, including ISFC resource families

Source: SFJPD Monthly Statistics January 2021
Alternatives

- Contract with Foster Family Agency to recruit and support resource families
- Establish Treatment Foster Care Oregon (TFCO) Program
- Refer more youth to Family & Me
Recommendations

1. Contract with a Foster Family Agency to recruit and retain resource families, including regular non-relative and ISFC resource families.

2. Refer youth who have been affected by CSEC or at risk to Family & Me.

3. Identify a liaison from JPD to attend monthly Family & Me meetings.
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