



**Testimony to the Committee on Human Services
For the Oversight Hearing on Child and Family Services Agency**

**Nadia Gold-Moritz, Executive Director
Young Women's Project**

March 17, 2011

Overview and Presentation

Good afternoon Chairman Graham and members of the Human Services Committee and thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I am Nadia Gold-Moritz Executive Director of the Young Women's Project. First I want to thank you for making this a safe and welcoming place for our youth staff to share their stories and concerns. We really appreciate your commitment to youth and your willingness to involving them in the policy process.

As you've heard today -- older youth are facing significant barriers as they prepare to age out. Most of the 170 youth who will emancipate this year—as our youth – are dealing with a stalled economy, a housing shortage, and few remaining family connections, limited education, and no real vocational skills. They are facing poverty and homelessness. They are working hard. And they are hanging on by their finger nails.

And while they were moving through the system – from house to house, family to family, without training or support or healthy living conditions or a decent education or job training– someone was getting paid to provide these things. Contractors were getting upward of \$100,000 per youth per year. OYE continue to get \$1.3 million in Chaffee funds year after year to reach 35 youth, social workers and social worker supervisors and monitors, foster parents. Everyone is getting paid. There are ten people sitting through a 3 hour transition meeting that accomplishes nothing – but they are all getting paid. And our youth are struggling to buy food and clothes.

The good news – is that there are actions that you can take that will change this situation and dramatically improve the lives of the 1,096 older youth in the system. These solutions do not require any additional funding. They can be done quickly and they do not require any additional capacity building within CFSA.

First, we strongly urge you amend the Chapter 63 and Chapter 62 regulations in order to increase the level of direct financial support that youth in congregate care receive. Independent living stipends – which have not increased since 2001 -- should be increased from the current \$500 a month minimum (which is what most youth in

ILPs actually receive after fines are deducted) to \$1,250 a month. Group home allowance should be increased from the allowable minimum of \$1 to \$350. This would allow youth to buy adequate food, clothing, and transportation. This increase in financial support should also be used as an opportunity to encourage positive development by rewarding youth who attend school, get good grades, join leadership programs, and participate in other enrichment programs.

We have been relentlessly prodding CFSA for the past year to take up this issue. We heard from them on Tuesday that they decided to put together a working group to revise the regulations. We applaud this gesture but are concerned about CFSA's ability to move this work forward. We are asking that your Committee be involved in this project to ensure its timely completion.

Next, we need high quality, comprehensive, outcome-based, start at 16 programming and services for older youth that includes aggressive educational advocacy and college prep, vocational training and placement, and real community connections. CFSA is not providing it. The Office of Youth Empowerment has been failing older youth for ten years. For year, YWP has documented the appalling absence of programming or outcomes. There are no goals, no outcomes, no data, little training, no data bases, and usually – no youth. In CFSA's 2010 Annual Progress and Services Report to the US Children's Bureau reported no outcomes or data for OYE activities and instead talked about the OYE restructuring and the Youth Transition Planning process. In the 2009 report, they reported serving 35 youth with educational services. CFSA receives \$1.1 million in federal Chafee program dollars to provide educational and aging out services to older youth. It's not acceptable to serve 35 youth with \$1.1 million. There are 1,096 who need the services, who need help going to college, who need vocational training.

We are asking you to recommend that the \$1,091,992 in federal Chafee fund be removed from CFSA and put out into the community through a competitive bidding process to a private service provider with a strong track record in youth development, college preparation, and vocational training and placement. To ensure high quality youth-focused programming, the RFP will set a new precedent with a number of requirements including: 1) Youth involvement in program design and decision making; 2) Rigorous outcomes that document youth progress in key Chafee areas (education, employment, health and wellness, financial management); 4) Bi-annual collection and public sharing of youth outcome data; and 5) Providing matching funds of 20% of the budget. An effective education-employment program for foster youth could be the foundation of a transition center that would provide additional support in these areas to youth aging out. Many of the most successful educational and aging out



programs -- supported by the federal Chafee funding-- are run by community based organizations. DC has a rich network of nonprofit educational and youth development resources that are ready to take responsibility to expand educational opportunities for DC foster youth. *This recommendation was approved by the majority of City Council members in May 2010 but the CFO did not sign off in time to include it in the FY2011 budget.*

On March 11th, CFSA released an RFP for Youth Transitional Living Support Services (CFSA-11-R-0001) seeking RFPs from contractors "to deliver youth empowerment and career development services to include: life skills training, educational services and college preparation, and job readiness-placement." Although the scope of work seems to include the full range of services mandated in the federal Chafee Program. Youth participation is controlled through social worker-only referrals and the minimal number of referrals is – 1. The structure of this RFP runs counter to best practices and effective programming – which requires a proactive, broad outreach focused effort that targets every youth when they turn 15 and to engages them in aggressive educational advocacy, support, and enrichment. This can't be done at age 20 or on a one at a time referral basis. And it can't be parceled out one dollar at a time.

These youth have been working on these issues for three years. They testified at more than 20 hearings. Held dozens of meetings with council members, CFSA staff, mayoral staff – with dozens of people who had the power to change these issues but didn't, completed surveys, collected evidence and models and mobilized their peers. We hope that this is the year we can finally show these young people -- who are taking enormous personal risks just by testifying here today -- that there are adults who have their backs.

Full Testimony

Good afternoon Chairman Graham and members of the Human Services Committee and thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I am Nadia Gold-Moritz, Executive Director of the Young Women's Project (YWP) -- a multicultural organization that builds the leadership and power of DC youth so that they can lead campaigns to improve youth-serving institutions. Right now we have two campaigns up and running. One focuses on improving rights and opportunities for older youth in the foster care system. One is focused on improving reproductive health information and access for DC teen women and men.



Since 1999, YWP has worked to expand the rights, opportunities, and leadership development of DC foster youth through the Foster Care Campaign (FCC). Each year, we develop 25-35 youth staff (80% are foster youth) as leaders, advocates, peer educators and organizers through a year-long program. They work side by side with adult staff to develop and move an ambitious agenda that seeks to advance foster youth well-being in five areas:

- Expanding educational opportunities
- Improving living conditions for youth in congregate care and foster homes
- Increasing support for youth aging out
- Reducing poverty for youth in ILP programs and congregate care
- Expanding vocational and economic opportunities and support for youth in care

We've cultivated dozens of FCC youth leaders, training 100s of foster youth, delivered numerous testimonies to City Council, convened 100s of youth and adults in Leadership Institutes, released two youth-created Handbooks and a documentary, and sponsored several successful youth-led campaigns. In our first campaign in 2000, we worked with the Deputy Mayor's office to write and advocate for foster care group home regulations which became law in September 2001. These regulations created a legal floor for improving the quality of life and enforcing the rights of teens in group homes.

FCC's work is focused primarily on the unmet needs of older youth in the foster care system. Older youth are more than half of the youth in care population. Any meaningful system reform must address the needs of this group. CFSA's inability to meet the basic needs of this group – in terms of providing supportive placements, connecting them to permanent homes, and preparing them to assume the responsibilities of adulthood -- is glaring evidence of its failure to meet its responsibilities as an agency.

The first and most essential step in meeting the needs of older youth is to set goals and outcomes that are actually -- youth focused and not process focused. We need to measure our success by how many youth have homes and jobs and decent clothing and not by how many meetings were held or referrals made. Right now, CFSA is succeeding at checking process-focused boxes but failing to make progress in the two most important performance indicators: 1) how many children are in permanent homes; and 2) what happens to foster youth when they age out at 21. Making these outcomes central to the Agency's work would help to shift its policy in a more productive direction.

This testimony focuses on problems and solutions as they impact older youth in the child welfare system specifically in education, aging out, congregate care, and data collection-sharing. The YWP staff has compiled research, policy, legislation, and best practices in all of these areas and would be happy to serve as a resource to your staff.

Overview of Older Youth in Care: As of January 15, 2011, there were 2,007 in CFSA's care; 1,069 (or 53%) of them are ages 13-21. About a third of these older youth reside in congregate care: 140 in group homes, 119 in Independent Living Programs, and 88 in Residential Treatment Centers. About 650 of these youth have the permanency goal of APPLA (Alternative Planned Permanent Living Arrangement) which positions them to emancipate from foster care without a permanent legal relationship like guardianship, adoption, or reunification.ⁱ

1) Expanding educational opportunities

Current Problems: Education and specifically college is probably the single most effective strategy for increasing the life prospects and well-being for foster youth. Yet, education seems to be absent from agency goals, priorities, policies and data collection. Not surprising, the rates of college enrollment are low. In May 2009, CFSA reported that 82 youth ages 18-23 were enrolled in college: that's about 8-10% of the total older youth population. This number is low compared to national foster youth enrollment rates of 13%, DC enrollment rates of 29%, and national enrollment rates of 48%.ⁱⁱ High school graduation rates for DC youth and DC foster youth are close (43% and 40% respectively).ⁱⁱⁱ But college enrollment rates differ significantly: 29% for DC youth and 8-10% for foster youth. Further, foster youth face many placement-related school barriers: When youth change placements -- 44% do once a year -- they change schools and usually lose 3 to 6 months of their education.^{iv} Group home rules and strict curfews often prohibit youth from taking part in after school activities. Further, most group homes and ILPs offer little educational support for youth residents (including working computers and access to the internet).

Currently, CFSA operates two programs address the educational and aging out needs of older youth under the Office of Youth Empowerment (formerly the Office of Youth Development). Both are funded through the federal **Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP)**, established in 1999 as a federal grant program to 1) help youth make the transition from foster care to self-sufficiency by providing academic support, career exploration,



vocational training and placement, and life skills training and 2) To help youth prepare and enter post-secondary training and education.

Center for Keys for Life (CKL-now just referred to by CFSA as the Office of Youth Empowerment) receives \$1.1 million from the Chafee Program to provide academic support, career exploration, vocational training, job placement, life skills, and address all of the purposes listed above. In the past ten years, CKL has reached few youth at a huge cost to tax payers. Some of the problems include:

- ✓ **Programs reach a fraction of youth:** In 2007 and 2008, CKL reported serving 35 youth to achieve their academic goals; 30 in 2008;^v 30 in 2009.^{vi} That's 3% of the older youth population.
- ✓ **Excessive cost per participant:** CKL spends 1.1 million to serve 35 youth – that's a cost of \$31,500 per youth to participate in a program with no outcomes. We don't even know how many of these youth went to college or survived their aging out. And then there are the 1,165 others who didn't even get services. CKFL does have other events and on line programs that reach more youth -- but it is unclear what kind of services these youth received or if they made any progress toward education or independence.^{vii}
- ✓ **No goals or benchmarks.** Assessing the performance of CKL is a challenge because CFSA keeps very little data on this program. As part of the 2010 Committee on Human Services CFSA performance oversight hearing, CHS requested information about objectives, benchmarks, and outcomes for CKL. None was provided.
- ✓ **Minimal outreach.** CKL keeps a low profile. There are few materials, no website, little outreach, and limited accessibility. Youth have to be referred by their social workers. CFSA did hold two annual outreach meetings this year. Information about programs, opportunities, or deadlines for ETV funding is not available to youth.

Recommendation: CFSA receives \$1,091,992 in Chafee grant money each year from the federal Chafee *Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP)* to provide educational and aging out programming for older youth in care. These funds should be through a competitive bidding process to a private service provider with a strong track record in youth education and development. To ensure high quality youth-focused programming, the RFP will set a new precedent with a number of requirements including: 1) Youth involvement in program design and decision



making; 2) Rigorous outcomes that document youth progress in key Chafee areas (education, employment, health and wellness, financial management); 4) Bi-annual collection and public sharing of youth outcome data; and 5) Providing matching funds of 20% of the budget. An effective education-employment program for foster youth could be the foundation of a transition center that would provide additional support in these areas to youth aging out. Many of the most successful educational and aging out programs -- supported by the federal Chafee funding-- are run by community based organizations. DC has a rich network of nonprofit educational and youth development resources that are ready to take responsibility to expand educational opportunities for DC foster youth. ***This recommendation was approved by the majority of City Council members in May 2010 but the CFO did not sign off in time to include it in the FY2011 budget.***

The Education and Training Voucher (ETV) is an annual federal grant program that provides up to \$5,000 to foster youth enrolled in college, university and vocational training programs to support a range of educational needs. Administered by Office of Youth Empowerment, this program received \$207,052 in federal grants distributed to 123 youth in college and trade school for 2008. Some of the problems include:

- ✓ **CFSA does not use any (or uses very few) of the national best practices.**
- ✓ **Recruitment and Outreach is minimal.** Most youth surveyed do not know about ETV. For example, only 3 of the 30 college bound staff members YWP worked with in the past year knew about the ETV before they came to YWP. In many cases – the social workers and GALs don't know about the program or how to apply.
- ✓ **The program has no publically accessible guidelines or application procedures.** Youth do not know how to apply or when or what to expect. Although there is an on-line application through the Orphan foundation, few students know about it (and it's not mentioned in OYE material on the subject). There is no information available on the CFSA website about this program.
- ✓ **CFSA does not have a tracking system.** The program cannot determine whether grants were received and spent by students, how the grants were used, and the educational status of students.

Recommendation: Like CKFL, ETV should be run by an organization and staff whose intention is to get as many foster youth into school as possible. We recommend that the program be reclassified as a community based



program funded through a competitive RFP process. To ensure high quality youth-focused programming, the RFP will set a new precedent with a number of requirements including: 1) Youth and community involvement; 2) Youth-focused goals and outcomes; 3) Outcome data collection and sharing; and 4) Publically accessible guidelines and operating procedures.

2) Improve support for youth aging out

Current Problems: Each year, between 150-200 foster youth turn 21 and age out of the system. Most do not have the knowledge, skills, and supports they need to be self-sufficient, successful adults. Although CFSA social workers and OYE staff provide some support for emancipating youth – through team meetings, technical assistance, and referrals – it’s totally inadequate. The support is built around referrals. Social workers set up meetings and then the youth go to the meeting and are referred to someone who refer them to someone else who refer them to someone else --- sometimes back to the same people that started the referral process. And in most of the cases we’ve been involved with --- there is no one in charge, setting outcomes, and making sure that progress is being made. YWP’s own research shows a profound neglect of youth, age 20, who are within a year of aging out of the system. We started the year with 12 youth staff that will emancipate within the year. Before we got involved in their cases,

- ✓ Only five were receiving help from CFSA and their social workers with the aging-out process;
- ✓ 11 were not yet referred to a collaborative or to RSA;
- ✓ Three had received educational support from CFSA;
- ✓ Most have never discussed permanence with their social workers (or know what it is);
- ✓ One had a cohesive, documented transition plan.

This lack of support has severe consequences. According to CFSA’s 2008 Quality Assurance Unit study (which echoes many national studies) at the time of discharge from the system^{viii}:

- ✓ Only 14% have all the necessary resources to support themselves ;
- ✓ 59% had insufficient funds to cover their living expenses;
- ✓ 46% were unemployed;
- ✓ 66% suffer from mental illness or substance abuse;
- ✓ 34% are pregnant or parenting;
- ✓ 37% had identified an adult connection that would support them after leaving the system;


- ✓ 34% were living in independent apartments when they emancipated.

Although DC does not keep data on youth aging out, a 2007 study by the University of Chicago focused on foster youth in the Midwest found that 68% of men and 46% of women are arrested within one year of aging out and that the average earnings of a foster care youth during the first year after aging out is \$7,000.^{ix} The 88 youth who reside in residential treatment centers (RTCs) face even more significant burdens since they are cut off geographically from family and community support and then at age 21 sent back to DC to live on their own.

Currently there are six Community Collaboratives were being paid \$250,700 to serve 100 youth in 2009. This was news to YWP (and many of the Collaboratives) who told us that there were actually three Collaboratives (North Capitol, South Washington West of the River, Far Southwest) providing services to 55 youth during 2009. Last report we received from CFSA was that the Collaboratives were only service six youth. Our interviews with staff and leadership at these programs indicate that the Collaborative Aftercare program is pretty much a referral service. Youth come in and meet with staff or volunteers – who refer them to other organizations for services. There is no follow up, no tracking, no benchmarks, and little data available about outcomes or what youth learned or how they used the referrals. In other words – no one really knows what has happened to any of the youth who've gone through the Collaboratives transition services.

Housing is a major obstacle for youth aging out of care – the majority of who end up couch surfing or homeless. Currently, CFSA has one housing support program. Rapid Housing, administered by the Collaboratives, provides housing assistance for families with children and youth aging out of care through a \$5,000 rental subsidy available to youth employed full-time or enrolled in school and working part-time to qualify for funds. For FY08, \$750,000 was allocated, and 79 emancipating youth were served, along with 49 families. Although this program is important – it does not serve the neediest youth who are unlikely to have full time livable-wage jobs.

Recommendations: YWP supports the creation of a community-based, adult-youth run DC Foster Youth Transition Center (YTC) that would provide intensive training and support services for youth ages 15-25 in a nurturing environment that offered a range of services and training in life skills, academic strengthening, employment preparation and placement, housing, health, and relationship building. Built on a foundation of youth development programming, the Center would provide:

- 
- Aggressive educational interventions (including college preparation, enrollment, retention and identifying quality DC high schools) that allows us to increase the percentage of youth in college (from 8 to 40%) within five years
 - Weekly group trainings for youth 15-17 that allow for peer-to-peer and interactive learning and build youth skills in self advocacy, leadership, health and wellness, and life skills.
 - Comprehensive vocational training and tracking
 - A range of viable housing options for youth transitioning out of care.
 - Significant leadership, decision making, and staff roles for youth at the center
 - Building an engaged network of community members-volunteers to provide mentoring, educational and vocational support to individual youth
 - Building a committed network of businesses and educational institutions who will provide opportunities and support to youth transitioning out of care
 - Ambitious outcomes and tracking for all of these areas
 - Genuine commitment to youth by involving them on YTC staff and boards

Such a Center could be created and financially supported by consolidating several ineffective CFSA programs and contracts – mainly CKFL and the Collaborative Aftercare program. Using the \$1.3 million in federal Chafee funds currently awarded to (and squandered by) CFSA -- the Center would be awarded through a rigorous RPF process to a community based organization (or collaboration) with a record of successful youth outcomes, expertise in employment, education and youth development, and engaging youth as leaders and staff. We also support the expansion of Rapid Housing to include the neediest transitioning youth who may not have full time employment.

3) Reducing poverty for youth in independent living programs (ILPs) and congregate care

Current Problems: About a third of older youth reside in congregate care: 140 in group homes, 119 in Independent Living Programs, and 88 in Residential Treatment Centers. Currently, CFSA contracts with 22 group home providers, 9 independent living program providers, and 33 residential treatment centers. Although there has been some improvement in congregate care quality since the regulations were passed in 2001, in general these contractors continue to be overcompensated and underperforming. According to the 2008 Auditor's report on congregate care, the median contract payout rate ranges from \$73,000 to \$174,000 per youth per year and are among the highest paid in the country.^x Yet very few of these resources are used to offer direct support to youth



clients. According to budgets reviewed in the same report, direct “client costs” make up between 4% and 18% for the budgets that were analyzed as part of the report.

Most youth in congregate care (group homes and ILPs) live in poverty. For group homes, the average allowance is \$10 a week. Teens living in ILPs receive \$540 a month that must purchase everything they need – food, clothes, public transportation, school supplies, hygiene and hair care, furniture, and savings. None of our ILP teens have enough to eat. Most can’t afford cell phones or weather-appropriate clothing. Few can save more than a couple dollars a month. All have daily struggles getting to work or school. ILP regulations mandate that youth receive \$540 a month – which totals \$6,000 a year – which is significantly below the poverty line (\$10,800). Further, congregate care fees have nearly tripled in ten years while youth stipends stayed the same.

Meanwhile, congregate care facilities are not required to meet specific outcomes or contribute to youth development (personal, academic, employment) or well being, keep data, or even commit to keeping teen residents in care (many are removed from their homes for minor violations). And the quality of life for most of the teens we work with (and have interviewed) is poor. Food is locked up and of poor nutritional quality. Transportation is inadequate. Allowance is often withheld when teens have jobs and provided at a minimal level (average is \$10 a week) when they don’t. Disciplinary guidelines are inconsistently and unfairly enforced. Staff is often poorly trained, petty, and frequently violates youth confidentiality. Facilities lack basic support infrastructure – like working computers and internet. Further, teens report frequent disruptions of privacy, no protection from theft or violent house mates, and unfair allowance withholding.

Recommendations for Congregate Care: There are several issues that need to be addressed here.

First, the overall quality and orientation of group homes and ILPs need to be addressed and the transition made from a profit maximization (and so provide as little care as possible) model to proven, evaluated, results-oriented programs that can prepare our youth for college, employment, and self-sufficiency. We have a few successful youth development focused models (LAYC, Catholic Charities, and Sasha Bruce are three who we’ve worked with). We need to replicate and expand our existing models, attract new models to DC, and shut down the programs that are not producing positive outcomes.



Next, contractors need to be held to much more rigorous standards performance based outcomes, consistent and detailed financial statements, and collecting and sharing data with the public. As far as we know, the Human Care Agreements that are in the works (and have been for years) do not link outcomes to payment.

Finally, youth needs for adequate food, transportation, clothing must be addressed. We recommend expanding the scope of group home and ILP regulations (Chapter 62 and 63) to ensure that adequate resources are being devoted to youth care and development specifically in the areas of financial support, academic strengthening, and increased youth development support. These expanded regulations should focus on four main areas:

- 1) Require that group homes spend minimal percentages of budget resources directly on youth to provide food, hygiene products, proper hair and body care, transportation, and other direct expenses.
- 2) Increase the resources allocated directly to youth for material needs and savings through a Mandatory Allowance Program (MAP) that would provide the following:
 - ✓ Monthly allowance via direct deposit to all qualifying youth living in group homes
 - ✓ 15-16 year olds receive \$300; 17 and older receive \$350 as long as they meet program standards for grades, school attendance, and enrichment program participation
 - ✓ All youth receive a base allowance of \$150 a month regardless of MAP participation
 - ✓ All youth receive a mandatory savings allotment of \$50
- 3) Increase the minimum ILP youth stipend to \$1,125 per month. \$1,400 for teen mothers.
- 4) Increase the quality and quantity of youth development and life skills training and support and link training to youth outcomes and goals.
- 5) Improve academic support and resources for youth (including computers! tutors, internet access)

4) Improving Data collection and Public Reporting

Current Problems: The inability of CFSA to collect and share data and information in a consistent and accessible way is a significant obstacle to effective advocacy, good program design, public engagement, and quality services.



The CFSA website offers little useful information to partners or youth in the system. Annual reports focus on spin over substance. And advocacy and service organizations who struggle to serve the needs of the youth overlooked by the system are forced to spend precious resources trying to find and make sense of data.

Recommendation: We are recommending the CFSA be required to start collecting and publically sharing data and information on critical areas impacting older youth well being including education, employment, aging out, permanent relationships, health, and the quality of congregate care. This data should be shared through three website accessible report cards that are updated quarterly. As of October 1, CFSA was required by federal law to start collecting data on older youth. As of October 1, 2010 – CFSA will be required by federal mandate collect data for the National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD) on each youth who receives independent living services, surveying youth on the following outcomes: 1) financial self-sufficiency; 2) experience with homelessness; 3) educational attainment; 4) positive connections with adults; 5) high-risk behavior; and 6) access to health insurance. We recommend that the data they are collecting as part of this federal requirement be made available on their website and updated annually.

ⁱ Source: Child Welfare Outcomes 2002-2005: Report to Congress – Chapter V. State Data Pages http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/pubs/cwo05/state_data/districtofcolumbia.htm; *LaShawn v. Fenty* Amended Implementation Plan Report – June 2007, page 27; Progress Report in Preparation for *LaShawn v. Fenty* Status Hearing on April 1, 2008, page 10; Implementing the Adoptions and Safe Families Amendment Act of 2000 in the District of Columbia, February 2009, page 33; National Child Welfare Resource Center for Adoption <http://www.nrcadoption.org/youthpermanencycluster/ki.html>

ⁱⁱ Double the Numbers for College Success: A Call to Action for District of Columbia, October 2006. doublethenumbersdc.org.

ⁱⁱⁱ Profile District Youth, Ages 15-21, in Out-of-Home Care; May 2009. Released at the 2009 Youth Permanency Convening.

^{iv} CFSA Annual Public Report, 2009; cfsa.dc.gov/cfsa/frames.asp?doc=/cfsa/lib/cfsa/pdf/fy_2008_annual_public_report.pdf

^v 2007 Annual Progress and Services Report.

^{vi} CFSA FY09-10 Performance Oversight Responses (Round 2), p.10: "College summit – (30 youth served). This program provides an opportunity for High School Seniors to enhance and support their post-secondary involvement."

^{vii} 2007 Annual Progress and Services Report. Prepared by the Office of Planning, Policy, and Program Support. DC Government Child and Family Services Agency for the US Children's Bureau.

2008 Annual Progress and Services Report. Prepared by the Office of Planning, Policy, and Program Support. DC Government Child and Family Services Agency for the US Children's Bureau.

^{viii} *Youth Who Transitioned from DC's Foster Care System: A Study of Their Preparation for Adulthood*, CFSA Quality Improvement Administration, June 2008.

^{ix} Courtney, Mark E., Amy Dworsky, Gretchen Ruth Cusick, Judy Havlicek, Alfred Perez, and Tom Keller, *Midwest Evaluation of the Adult Functioning of Former Foster Youth: Outcomes at Age 21*, University of Chicago Center for Children, December 2007.

^x "Audit of Child and Family Services Agency's Congregate Care Contract Expenditures," Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, April 1, 2008.