

Los Angeles Performance Partnership Pilot (LAP3)

Flash Report Revised 3/10/17

Prepared For:

City of Los Angeles

Workforce Development Board

Economic and Workforce Development Department



Workforce *Development* Board
City of *Los Angeles*

Authors:

Richard W. Moore, Ph.D.

Cristina Rubino, Ph.D.

Ari Malka, Ph.D.

Akanksha Bedi, Ph.D.

Eric Iskowitz, MBA

Tiffany Gustanski

The College of Business and Economics

CSUN

CALIFORNIA
STATE UNIVERSITY
NORTHRIDGE

Contents

Executive Summary.....	i
I Introduction	1
II Approach	2
III Key Findings.....	2
Description of Program Participants	2
Best Practices and Barriers	3
Policy Level.....	4
Operational Level.....	6
Barriers to Success and Issues.....	8
Policy Level.....	9
Operational Level.....	10
IV Recommendations	17
Near Term (Next Six Months).....	17
Mid-term Years 2 and 3 of project. Especially next Contract Cycle, Starting July 1, 2017	20
Appendix A: Comparison of WIOA and non-WIOA Clients.....	22
A.1: Enrollments by Gender	22
A.2: Foster Care Enrollments.....	22
A.3 Homeless Enrollments.....	22
A.4 Probation Enrollments	23
A.5 Runaway Enrollments	23
A.6 TANF Household Enrollments.....	23
A.7 Food Stamp Household	24

Executive Summary

The Los Angeles Pilot Performance Partnership (LAP3) initiative represents a *profound change* for how youth services are delivered in Los Angeles City and County. In our view, this profound change is taking place at two levels, at the policy level and the operational level. At the policy level, newly formed partnerships between City and County Agencies, the federal government, nonprofit and philanthropic organizations are creating novel ways to change policies and relationships to create a new, more collaborative way to serve disconnected youth. At the operational level, City of Los Angeles' YouthSource Centers (YSCs) – who operate WIOA youth services under contract with Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD) – through LAP3 are working to integrate the delivery of services with a wide array of County, City, and nonprofit organizations to reinvent services to disconnected youth.

Our team at Cal State Northridge has been charged with evaluating the LAP3 innovation. This “Flash Report” provides our initial insights and ideas about how implementation of the LAP3 model has gone in the first six months (July 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016).

Essentially, this report seeks to accomplish four things:

1. Provide a basic description of the youth served in the first six months of the program.
2. Identify best practices that have moved P3 towards its vision at the policy and operational level.
3. Identify barriers and issues that emerged at the policy and operational level that need to be overcome to realize the LAP3 vision.
4. Make recommendations for the near and mid-term to improve the implementation of LA P3.

Who Was Served?

The data in CalJobs provides a snap shot of who was served in the first six months of LAP3 Operations. As the data below indicate, of the 1,902 youth served, nearly 90% were enrolled in WIOA and only 11.2% were non-WIOA clients. Over 75% of the youth were out of school, but 40% were high school graduates. The number of clients in target groups remains small; there were only 41 foster youth (2.2%), 38 probation youth (2.0%), 81 homeless youth (4.3%), and three runaway youth (0.2%).

Best Practices at the Policy and Operational Level

At the policy level we observe a number of best practices that are moving the LAP3 initiative forward. A major accomplishment is engaging relevant agencies in a dialogue about disconnected youth, through a number of key activities including:

- Shared strategic planning process which engages many partner agencies
- Creating and supporting regional meetings where a range of governmental and nonprofit agencies come together to find new ways to serve disconnected youth.
- A number of governance committees that engage a range of stakeholders in building the LAP3 project.

The city has also moved aggressively to seek waivers to federal and state regulations that keep agencies from cooperating and reaching disconnected youth. The LAP3 project disseminated valuable information to many agencies and nonprofit groups in the City and County, most notably a series of research papers on the status of LA Youth in the labor market and education. Building the LAP3 grant, the project leaders have been able to attract additional resources to support serving disconnected youth. Finally, we observe that long-term infrastructure is being built to support innovation and cooperation to serve disconnected youth.

At the operational level we note a number of best practices which support the LAP3 vision. Within each region of the city, YouthSource Centers (YSCs) are meeting regularly with partners to find ways to coordinate and improve service delivery. These meetings create communication among partners which simply had not happened before. Results of regional meeting are shared through various online venues which have been initiated in the regions. PSA counselors who are LAUSD employees are expanding their roles within the YSCs to better serve disconnected youth. A mental health screening tool has been developed and is used in many YSCs to assess youth when they first enter the program. Cross training sessions between YSC staff and County agencies have helped to coordinate services.

Unplanned innovations have also emerged as the new model is implemented. Some YSCs have sped up the enrollment process by conducting one-on-one information sessions on demand rather than make youth wait for a scheduled session. On initial contact a number of centers are “triaging youth” to identify immediate problems such as homelessness or mental health issues rather than make youth wait for a full formal assessment. A short referral form has been created to ease referrals among partner agencies.

Barriers and Issues at the Policy and Operational Level

We observe three significant issues at the policy level. First, LAP3 may not be reaching all the target groups in significant numbers. This appears to be largely due to the YSCs continuing to focus on WIOA eligible participants and not reaching out to other populations because of incentives in their contracts to enroll WIOA eligible clients. In fact, by comparing the number of P3 clients entered into CalJobs, with the number of clients seen by LAUSD PSA counselors we estimate the actual number of youth touched by the YSCs is under counted by 49%. Second, as with all change initiatives, sustaining partners’ commitment and enthusiasm for remaking the system over an extended period of time may be a challenge. Finally, tracking and measuring the impact of LAP3 over time requires changes in the CalJobs data system and how it is used. While some progress has been made, more is needed to achieve the goals of LAP3.

Other barriers and issues have emerged at the operational level. A significant issue is that contractors have not fully “bought into” the LAP3 Innovation. The most obvious evidence for this is that half the centers have not enrolled any non-WIOA clients into the CalJobs system. In interviews many YSC staff and directors report that do not see LAP3 as a significant change in the system. YSC staff are quick to note that they did not receive any additional resources to serve non-WIOA clients. This relates to the issue that many staff in the YSCs have limited

understanding of the LAP3 vision and purpose. We note that most training for YSC operators has focused on the mechanics and rules of the change and little attention has been paid to a change in vision. We note that contractors' participation in the current strategic planning process has been limited.

Many new partnerships have emerged in LAP3, but it appears that depth and quality of the partnerships varies substantially between regions. All participants see the regional meetings with partners as valuable, but we observe the quality of the meetings is uneven. Some are well planned and productive but some are not.

Recommendations

We divide our recommendations into two time periods, the *near term* which deals with the next six months of the initial roll-out period, and the *mid-term*, which pertains to the next two years of the project.

Near Term- Next Six Months

1. Create a sense of urgency and shared vision in the YSCs by engaging Directors and Staff in a two-way discussion of the LAP3 vision.
2. Bring contractors into the guiding coalition so they develop a deeper understanding and commitment to the LAP3 model.
3. Invest resources in supporting the regional meetings.
4. Expand the strategic planning process to allow for participation by YSC directors and staff.
5. Celebrate successes at both the policy and operational level.
6. Ensure the data system is capturing data required to effectively manage the system and provide required data for the evaluation system.

Mid-Term Next Two Years

1. Increase focus on non-WIOA participants.
2. Formalize governance structure to sustain the engagement of partners at policy and operational level.
3. Establish an online channel for exchanging information.
4. Try to move more services under the roof of YSCs.
5. Celebrate successes and disseminate best practices to improve performance.

I Introduction

According to organizational change thought leader Peter Senge:

“a profound change is an organizational change that combines inner shifts in people’s values, aspirations, and behaviors with outer shifts in processes, strategies, practices, and systems. In profound change, there is learning. The organization doesn’t just do something new; it builds its capacity for doing things in a new way – indeed, it builds its capacity for ongoing change.”

Los Angeles’s Pilot Performance Partnership (P3) initiative represents a *profound change* for how youth services are delivered in Los Angeles City and County. In our view, this profound change is taking place at two levels, at the policy level and the operational level. At the policy level, newly formed partnerships between City and County Agencies, the federal government, nonprofit and philanthropic organizations are creating novel ways to change policies and relationships to create a new, more collaborative way to serve disconnected youth. At the operational level, City of Los Angeles’ YouthSource Centers (YSCs) – who operate WIOA youth services under contract with Economic and Workforce Development Department (EWDD) – P3 are actually working to integrate the delivery of services with a wide array of County, City, and nonprofit organizations to reinvent services to disconnected youth. As Senge suggests, a change of this magnitude requires changes in how people and organizations both think and act. This requires that people and organizations learn and adapt.

The initial directive introducing LAP3 to the YouthSource Centers (YSCs) described the vision for LAP3 this way:

Under LAP3, government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and others are expected to collaborate in reducing administrative and programmatic barriers and to blend funds to deliver effective services to disconnected youth....In Los Angeles, more than 25 organizations are bringing programs and services together to form a comprehensive integrated system¹.

City managers recognized that profound change of this magnitude would not happen overnight, as the same directive noted that: *“EWDD will begin with a soft roll out and slowly build out the program in phases.”*

Our team at Cal State Northridge has been charged with evaluating the LAP3 innovation. Our overall approach includes a formative evaluation, which first tracks and assesses the implementation of change initiatives, and then provides feedback to program operators to improve the program before the ultimate impact of the program is measured. Our formative evaluation will track the LAP3 implementation for its first year of operation, July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017. This “Flash Report” provides our initial insights and ideas about how

¹ WDS Directive No. 17-01 Los Angeles Performance Partnership Pilot (LAP3) YouthSource System Implementation, July 12, 2016.

implementation of the LAP3 model has gone in the first six months (July 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016).

Essentially, this report seeks to accomplish four things:

1. Provide a basic description of the youth served in the first six months of the program.
2. Identify best practices that have moved LAP3 towards its vision at the policy and operational level.
3. Identify barriers and issues that emerged at the policy and operational level that need to be overcome to realize the LAP3 vision.
4. Make recommendations for the near and mid-term to improve the implementation of LAP3.

II Approach

Our formative evaluation is based on a case study approach. We have chosen four YSCs through which we observe the implementation of LAP3 at the operational level. These sites are in four distinct areas within the city including: the San Fernando Valley, Central Los Angeles, South Los Angeles, and East Los Angeles. They also represent a variety of public and nonprofit contractors. We have spent time at the sites, interviewing staff and participants, observing meetings, orientation sessions, and other activities. We have also collected documents on these YSC's policies and procedures, and have regularly observed the regional meetings in which our four sites participate to build collaborative relationships with cooperating agencies. We emphasize that we are not evaluating these sites but rather using these sites, which volunteered to cooperate, as a window into the larger LAP3 initiative.

At the policy level, we have been participant observers. Members of our team served on various committees charged with shaping the LAP3 initiative at the policy level. The committees include: the Operations Committee, the Waiver Committee, the Research and Data Committee, and the Strategic Planning Working Group. We observed various training sessions and strategic planning meetings, to understand the policy-level effort to integrate these programs. Finally, we collected and analyzed a wide array of documents, which together illustrate the implementation process, as well as describe the details and intricacies of the LAP3 initiative itself.

III Key Findings

Below, we summarize the key findings from our initial fieldwork to provide an objective view on how the reform is emerging. A final report on the formative evaluation will provide a more detailed analysis.

Description of Program Participants

The data in CalJobs provides a snap shot of who was served in the first six months of LAP3 operations. As the data below indicate, of the 1,902 youth served, nearly 90% were enrolled in WIOA, while the remaining (11.2%) were non-WIOA clients. Over 75% of the youth were

out of school, but 40% were high school graduates. The number of clients in target groups remains small; there were only 41 foster youth (2.2%), 38 probation youth (2.0%), 81 homeless youth (4.3%), and three runaway youth (0.2%).

We should note there were a small number of duplicate cases listed as both WIOA and non-WIOA; those cases were dropped for this analysis. It is also important to note that these data rely on youth self-identifying. As such, it may be that more of the target groups were served, but some youth chose not to identify himself or herself as homeless or foster youth or some other group.

We will discuss the implications of these results in more detail below.

Table 1: LAP3 Participant Characteristics

	Count	Percent
Program Category		
WIOA	1689	88.8%
Non-WIOA	213	11.2%
Total	1902	
Gender		
Male	862	45.3%
Female	1037	54.5%
Education Status		
In-School Secondary or Less	380	20%
In-School Alternative School	34	1.8%
In-School Post-Secondary	33	1.7%
Not In-School Secondary Dropout	688	36.2%
Not In-School, H.S. Grad or Equivalent	767	40.3%
Not In-School Within Age for Compulsory Attendance	0	0%
Foster Youth	41	2.2%
Homeless Youth	81	4.3%
Offender (Probation)	38	2.0%
Runaway Youth	3	.2%
TANF Household	113	5.9%
SSI Household	17	.9%
Food Stamp Household	168	8.8%

Finally, it does not appear that target groups are any more or less likely to end up enrolled in WIOA. For example, the percentage of foster youth in the WIOA and non-WIOA categories are very similar. The implications of this are not clear but may deserve attention in the future. Complete data on the characteristics of WIOA and non-WIOA participants are in Appendix A.

Best Practices and Barriers

As we alluded to earlier, the LAP3 initiative is operating at two levels, the policy level and the operational level. At the policy level, leaders are working to improve the service provided to disconnected youth by changing the way the various institutions communicate and work with

one another other. In this effort, leaders are seeking waivers to change existing regulatory barriers to cooperation, building ties among senior managers, and simply working hard to convene these groups and initiate a dialog among this large, loosely linked network of organizations dedicated to serving disconnected youth.

At the operational level, the LAP3 initiative is attempting to bring about and manage profound change in the attitudes, beliefs, and practices within YSCs and their partners, by expanding the relationship of YSCs with partner agencies. LAP3 also attempts to change who the YouthSource System serves by focusing more on the most disconnected youth, including foster youth, youth on probation, homeless youth, runaway youth, and out-of-school youth.

In our analysis of best practices and barriers, we will focus first on the policy level and then on the operational level.

Policy Level

1. Engaging relevant agencies in a dialog about disconnected youth.

The Los Angeles LAP3 initiative (LAP3), which has a relatively small budget, has leveraged a surprisingly high level of engagement from a wide range of organizations. We note participation by mid- and upper-level managers from a wide array of County agencies, City departments, educational institutions, foundations, and other nonprofit organizations. LAP3 leadership has effectively communicated a sense of urgency about the myriad problems of disconnected youth and that sense of urgency is reflected in the participation of the following organizations in a variety of LAP3 working groups and meetings.

The following are specific examples of how relevant agencies were engaged:

- *Shared strategic planning*
Currently, LAP3 is developing a strategic plan. The initial conference hosted by the Annenberg Foundation attracted widespread participation from partner agencies, although we note participation from YSC operators was limited.
- *Sending people to regional meetings*
As we report below, regular monthly regional meetings that bring together YSC operations and public and nonprofit partners have triggered a new exchange of information among the agencies and started to build positive relationships and trust.
- *Participating in governance committees*
LAP3 has an informal governance structure of committees made up of volunteers from partner organizations and YSC operators. These committees have been meeting bimonthly for six months to a year, and have provided a venue to allow partners to help make the LAP3 vision a reality.

2. Identifying and receiving federal and non-federal waivers.

A key part of the LAP3 program is seeking waivers of federal and non-federal regulations which are barriers to achieving the LAP3 vision. We observe that as the process has gone forward, more and more ideas have emerged for waivers which can improve services for disconnected youth. Appendix B includes all the federal waivers at some stage of being requested and Appendix C includes all the non-federal waivers. Reviewing the list shows that the LAP3 and its partners are moving aggressively to break down regulatory barriers which limit who the program can serve and to remove barriers to employment and further education. If a substantial number of these waivers are ultimately approved, it could create a major lasting impact on the larger system.

3. Disseminating information about the challenges disconnected youth face.

LAP3 has taken the lead on disseminating information about research and innovations related to disconnected youth. EWDD sponsored a series of four papers on the disconnected youth and the Los Angeles Economy by Professor Paul Harrington and Neeta Fogg of Drexel University. EWDD also hosted two well-attended discussions of the work and widely disseminated the papers in fall of 2016. The four papers were:

- *Experience Required: The Diminished employment Prospects of Teens and Youth Adults in Los Angeles*
- *Rising School Enrollment Among Teens and Young Adults in Los Angeles*
- *The Human Capital Investment Gap: Understanding the Diminished Prospects of Disconnected Youth in Los Angeles*
- *Opportunity Rising: Increases in Human Capital Investment and Declines in Disconnection Among Teens and Youth Adults in Los Angeles*

These papers provide a detailed description of the economic and human capital context in which the LAP3 program must operate.

4. Attracting additional resources for the initiative.

Given the scope of the problem LAP3 addresses, the funding from the federal innovation grant is small. Essentially the goal of LAP3 is to use existing resources more efficiently. But, sustaining the innovation and piloting the new initiatives will require more resources. We find that LAP3 has begun to secure additional resources.

Working with EWDD, the CSUN evaluation team has secured a \$100,000 grant from the Conrad Hilton Foundation to expand the evaluation and take a special look at Foster Youth. EWDD also won \$175,000 of additional funding to help YSCs do outreach to target populations such as foster, probation and homeless youth. The city also contributed to Project Tipping Point, which provides wrap-around services to former foster youth enrolled at Los Angeles Trade Technical College. Finally, the City partnered with two Youth Opportunity YSCs, Watts and Boyle Heights, to win a Jobs for

American Graduates JAB grant, which provides wrap-around services to foster youth ages 18-24 who are seeking a high school diploma and employment.

5. Building long-term infrastructure to support the innovation.

EWDD managers have collaborated with leaders in the five California State University Campuses in Metropolitan Los Angeles to develop a proposal for the Reconnect L.A. Youth (ReLAY) institute. The institute, which will receive seed funding from the City, will contain four centers designed to support the work of LAP3: a research and evaluation center, an innovation hive, a training academy and a service learning center. The vision for the center is to tap university expertise and students to support the LAP3 innovation using the expertise and facilities of all five CSU campuses.

Operational Level

Best practices at the operational level are necessarily more detailed and specific. The practices observed here were not necessarily found at each of the four sites studied. We did see each practice in at least one site. The idea here is to identify best practices so that they can be disseminated to other sites.

1. Regional meeting with partners.

Our observations and interviews with YSC staff and partner staff show that the regional meetings are viewed as a valuable resource. New relationships are being established and information exchanged that can lead to improved services. We have seen some very well-organized and well-facilitated meetings. Conversely we have seen some meetings which start late, and are not well planned or facilitated. Participants leave these meetings frustrated and believing progress is not being made. In our view, maintaining the quality and effectiveness of the regional meetings will be a key to successful change in the system.

A common activity at regional meetings is the presentation of actual client cases followed by brainstorming that identifies resources and potential solutions to the cases. We observe that participants are energized by these discussions, and that they build a shared commitment towards working together to help clients.

2. Creating two-way communications among partners.

Through the regional meetings and other less formal activities, we notice an increase in two-way communication between YSCs and their partners. It is not just YSCs reaching out to partners, but partners reaching out to YSC. We view this a strength of LAP3 to date.

3. PSA Counselors have informally expanded their roles to improve YSCs and implement the LAP3 vision.

We find the PSA counselors to be highly skilled and dedicated professionals. As PSA counselors build ties within YSCs, they find ways to help beyond just counseling out-of-school youth. They share their professional networks and insights with WIOA case

managers. They are enthusiastic participants in regional meetings and they contribute in staff meetings. We find that they take on other tasks where their skills are useful (e.g., such as the triaging of clients) which we discuss below.

4. Disseminating regional meeting results through the web.

Regional meeting participants see the value of information and contacts provided by the meetings. Partners in some regions have found ways to capture and share information online among the partners. For example, City facilitators have set up websites or Google documents to share information. We observe there is growing enthusiasm for this among meeting participants. The focus of these online resources is regional and currently no system wide LAP3 website exists to connect these regions.

5. Developing process for mental health screening.

Working with the County Department of Mental Health and LAUSD, a tool has been developed to screen youth for mental health issues. Training has been provided to over 200 staff. Implementation of the tool has been uneven across the sites studied. At one site, the PSA counselor does not administer the tool but does informally identify youth with mental health issues and refer them for help. At another site the tool does not appear to be regularly used as part of the intake process.

6. Centers with more programs and partner agencies under one roof seem better able to realize the LAP3 vision.

Below we discuss the low number of non-WIOA youth enrolled in the LAP3 program so far, but also note that a few centers have enrolled a substantial number of non-WIOA youth. What we see is that YSCs that have other partners and programs under their roofs are better able to provide the comprehensive services envisioned by LAP3. For example, at one site we observed that site had a foundation-funded counselor to provide mental health services to foster youth, the counselor also saw other youth who had an immediate mental health need. Similarly, one YSC was co-located with a charter school which made it easier to quickly re-enroll youth if the school was a good fit. Additionally, centers with a wider range of programs may benefit from additional funding streams from which they can provide services to non-WIOA youth.

7. Expediting recruitment process with one-on-one information sessions.

YSC staff members felt compelled to reach WIOA enrollment targets and did not want youth inquiring about the program to wait for a scheduled information session. At two centers, when youth came in to inquire about the program, available staff explained the program in one-on-one sessions, thus preventing the youth from waiting for a scheduled information session that was days away.

8. Triaging youth on initial contact.

YSC staff recognize that youth may arrive at their centers in crisis. We observed at one center, at the end of each information session, the PSA counselor would meet privately and briefly with each youth to see if they had any immediate needs such as, being homeless. If a youth was in a difficult situation, the PSA counselor and agency staff would provide immediate help. At another site the senior case manager meets with each youth privately after the information session to check to see if there are immediate needs that require attention.

This step was not designed into the original LAP3 process, but in our view successfully catches youth in crisis, rather than postponing services until they are formally enrolled in the program. The limit of this intervention is, of course, the youths' willingness to reveal the problems they face.

9. Short referral form.

This has been a bottom-up innovation. At one regional meeting a participant noted that they had a standard referral form for referring a client from the YSC to city contracted FamilySource Centers, and suggested a similar system for referrals between YSCs and partners.

The referral form has 5 sections: 1) Referral From – Contact info for the person/agency referring the youth 2) Referral To – Contact info for the agency the youth is being referred to and appointment info 3) Person Being Referred (Youth and Adults) – Basic information about youth (name, age, address, phone number) and parent information if the youth is a minor 4) Reason for referral (services) – check boxes for services the youth is seeking at referred agency (and comment box for more a detailed description) 5) Referring Agency Use Only – a place for the referring agency to document their follow-up and note if the referral was successful.

10. Cross Training Events.

Increasing levels of partner commitment is evidenced by cross training events conducted by partner agencies. In collaboration with EWDD, DPSS has held multiple “DPSS 101” information sessions in which YSC staff and other interested parties were debriefed on programs such as CalWORKS, GROW, GAIN, CALFresh, MediCal and General Relief. The training also included tutorials on the usage of MyBenefitsNow.com – a portal which allows users to apply for and view their benefits online. Planning for future events of a similar nature conducted by other partner agencies is reported to be in discussion.

Barriers to Success and Issues

As a pilot program in its first six months, LAP3 has encountered a variety of barriers and problems. Here, we lay out the barriers and issues we have observed at both the policy and operational levels.

1. LAP3 may not be reaching all the target groups in significant numbers.

In the first six months of operations, nearly 40 percent of the YSCs (five of thirteen) did not enroll a single non-WIOA client, and two others reported only one or two non-WIOA clients. In total, only 213 non-WIOA clients were entered into the CalJobs system, compared to 1,689 WIOA eligible clients. Clearly, the existing contracts have incentivized YSCs to continue to recruit and enroll the youth they would traditionally serve under WIOA. Conversely, they have no set goals for enrolling non-WIOA youth, or incentives to reach out to and enroll youth from the very target groups that LAP3 is attempting to reach (i.e., probation, foster or homeless youth). The data in Table 1 reveal that the YSCs have served only 38 youth offenders (probation), three runaway youth, 41 foster youth, and 81 homeless youth.

2. Sustaining the engagement of partners may be difficult over time.

Many initiatives begin with a good level of energy and commitment, but over time, that energy and commitment declines as partners are pulled away by immediate demands from routine work. Potential evidence of a decline in partner commitment may be apparent in declining attendance at regional and committee planning meetings. LAP3 has asked a lot of its partners and the power of the vision has kept up a good level of engagement so far, but continuing to focus on the vision, celebrating successes along the way and recognizing the contributions of partners will be important to maintain commitment overtime.

3. The CalJobs data system may not be collecting data required for the evaluation.

A number of issues have emerged with the CalJobs data system that may keep us from executing the impact evaluation as planned. Some issues also are tied to operational issues, which we discuss here.

- First, it appears that follow-up measures are not going to be collected on non-WIOA participants. This includes measures related to employment, earnings, and educational outcomes. The evaluation design assumes that these measures will be available for both WIOA and non-WIOA participants. If they are not going to be available, the design will have to be changed.
- There appears to be an emerging practice of exiting non-WIOA clients as soon as the minimal three activities are entered in the database. This means the database will not capture the full amount of services delivered, and will likely lower the impact of the program on non-WIOA participants in the impact evaluation. It is unclear if partners are actually using the CalJobs system to enter data on services provided to LAP3 participants.
- Staff have noted that the initial intake form collects information that does not go into CalJobs, that means that these data are available only on paper and do not follow the client through the system and are thus of little use.

- Finally, the low number of non-WIOA clients in the CalJobs system suggests that YSCs may not be entering non-WIOA clients who pass through information sessions and orientations.

Operational Level

In this section, we examine the issues that have emerged through our fieldwork at the four sites under study and discuss their implications for LAP3 implementation.

1. Contractors have not fully “bought into” the LAP3 Innovation.

There are a range of attitudes and understandings about LAP3 among contractors and their staff. Many contractors and their staff do not believe P3 actually represents a profound change. Although they see LAP3 as good in theory, they see actual implementation, as business as usual. This is displayed most dramatically by the fact that five of the thirteen YSCs have not entered any non-WIOA youth into the database (see Table 2 below). The reasons for this are not clear. It may be that since all contract goals relate to WIOA enrollments, the YSCs simply do not focus on non-WIOA enrollments, thus devoting their efforts toward meeting WIOA requirements instead.

To gain a better understanding of flow of clients through the system we collected the number of youth seen by the LAUSD PSA Counselors, during the same time period. While CalJobs shows 1,902 youth served, combining WIOA and non-WIOA youth, the PSA counselors report seeing 3,601 youth served in the same period, see Table 3 below. This leads us to estimate that the actual number of youth touched by the P3 initiative is under-counted in CalJobs by 1,769, or 49%. This clearly indicates that more youth are passing through the YSCs than are reported in CalJobs.

Our fieldwork provides some more insights into what is happening in the YSCs. We do note a low volume of inquiries for service at some centers. There appears to be limited resources available and/or allocated toward outreach beyond that required to meet WIOA enrollment goals. When asked why non-WIOA enrollments were so low, an YSC program manager stated that, “I don’t think they [non-WIOA eligible youth] know that we can serve them. Our outreach programs still focuses on WIOA eligible youth”.

Indeed, we observed several occasions when scheduled information sessions were canceled because there are no youth attending. It is important to note, however, that some centers are methodically entering non-WIOA youth into the system. For example, YOM Boyle Heights and YOM Watts, have enrolled two-thirds of all non-WIOA Youth. To us, this represents not just a problem with record keeping, but a problem with either contractors’ level of commitment to the LAP3 vision itself or their understanding of the vision.

Contractors are quick to note that there are no outcome measures for non-WIOA clients, so in a sense they “don’t count” as they are pressed to meet WIOA performance goals. In addition, the system allows non-WIOA clients to be exited officially from the data system after they receive three services, and two of the services can be the

required orientation and educational assessment. Contractors point out that they are “not allowed” to let non-WIOA clients participate in WIOA funded services, such as the Innersight Workshop or paid internships. These restrictions also send the message that the system has not really changed. Before LAP3 implementation, YSCs tried to meet immediate needs of all youth and referred non-WIOA clients, as they do now. Overall, they point out that no additional funding is available to serve non-WIOA clients. In some cases both managers and staff in the YSC seem uncertain about the goals of LAP3, as person we interviewed noted: “Before [LAP3] we knew the expectations from the city, and now it is unclear.”

In our fieldwork, we observe that recruiting, enrolling, and serving WIOA clients remains the focus of most contractors. This focus is reinforced by contracts, which specify concrete goals for the number of WIOA youth served, and no goals for the rest of youth, which in the LAP3 vision, would be the majority of clients. In fact, the official process map for LAP3 shows non-WIOA clients being referred out early in the process with no further service or follow up from the YSC.

Some contactors have a number of other funding sources and programs that non-WIOA youth may participate in, but in some YSCs, these options are very limited. As a result, access to services for non-WIOA youth varies substantially from site to site. Most crucially, the official process map shows that non-WIOA youth are not assigned to case management. At some of our sites non-WIOA youth receive no case management. At other sites they get what might be described as “case management lite”. One case manager described the system this way: “If they are WIOA eligible, I follow up with them every week. For non-WIOA, I explain what they can do next [and] give them phone numbers. There is no process for follow up.” Most tellingly we find that non-WIOA clients are often referred to as “P3 clients”, indicating that in the staffs view WIOA is business as usual and P3 simply refers to the clients they don’t enroll in the system as a whole.

Table 2: YouthSource Center With WIOA and Non-WIOA Enrollments by January 2017

YouthSource Center		LAP3 Type		Total
		Non-WIOA	WIOA	
Boyle Heights YSC - YOM Boyle Heights	Count	79	134	213
	% within YSC	37.1%	62.9%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	37.1%	7.9%	11.1%
Central Los Angeles-Hollywood YSC - AYE	Count	0	173	173
	% within YSC	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	0.0%	10.2%	9.1%
Central Los Angeles-Westlake	Count	14	83	97

YouthSource Center		LAP3 Type		Total
		Non-WIOA	WIOA	
YSC - UCLA	% within YSC	14.4%	85.6%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	6.6%	4.9%	5.1%
East San Fernando Valley YSC - El Proyecto	Count	0	164	164
	% within YSC	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	0.0%	9.7%	8.6%
Harbor YSC - LA Harbor College	Count	0	131	131
	% within YSC	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	0.0%	7.7%	6.9%
North San Fernando Valley YSC - YPI	Count	15	74	89
	% within YSC	16.9%	83.1%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	7.0%	4.4%	4.7%
Northeast Los Angeles YSC - PLN	Count	15	123	138
	% within YSC	10.9%	89.1%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	7.0%	7.2%	7.2%
South Los Angeles-Crenshaw YSC - Brotherhood	Count	2	72	74
	% within YSC	2.7%	97.3%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	.9%	4.2%	3.9%
South Los Angeles- YSC - AYE	Count	19	138	157
	% within YSC	12.1%	87.9%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	8.9%	8.1%	8.2%
South Los Angeles-Watts YSC - WLCAC	Count	1	135	136
	% within YSC	.7%	99.3%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	.5%	8.0%	7.1%
Southeast Los Angeles YSC - YO Watts	Count	68	176	244
	% within YSC	27.9%	72.1%	100.0%

YouthSource Center		LAP3 Type		Total
		Non-WIOA	WIOA	
% within P3Type		31.9%	10.4%	12.8%
West Los Angeles YSC - UCLA	Count	0	81	81
	% within YSC	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	0.0%	4.8%	4.2%
West San Fernando Valley YSC - El Proyecto	Count	0	205	205
	% within YSC	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within P3Type	0.0%	12.1%	10.7%

Table 3: PSA Enrollments by YouthSource Center

Youth Source Center	Clients in CalJobs	Clients in LAUSD (PSA) Data System	Estimated undercount
South Los Angeles-Crenshaw YSC - Brotherhood	74	183	109
Central Los Angeles-Hollywood YSC - AYE	173	219	46
South Los Angeles- YSC - AYE	157	336	179
El Proyecto Del Barrio-North	164	236	72
East San Fernando Valley YSC - El Proyecto	205	349	144
Harbor YSC - LA Harbor College	131	268	137
Southeast Los Angeles YSC - YO Watts	244	390	146
Northeast Los Angeles YSC - PLN	138	317	179
Central Los Angeles-Westlake YSC - UCLA	97	188	91

Youth Source Center	Clients in CalJobs	Clients in LAUSD (PSA) Data System	Estimated undercount
West Los Angeles YSC - UCLA	81	11 <i>(Note: No PSA - Vacant)</i>	(70)
South Los Angeles-Watts YSC - WLCAC	136	351	215
Boyle Heights YSC	213	366	153
North SFV YSC- YPI	89	387	298
Total	1902	3601	1769

We have observed that YSC staff often say that before P3, they already made referrals for non-WIOA clients. YSC staff say the primary change, in their view, is that now those clients go into the CalJobs system. It seems that some center directors thought LAP3 would come with an already built referral network. One staff member pointed out that with the start of LAP3: “There is no way to refer to services, only with those that we already had connections with prior. I don’t believe we have that network yet.”

To a large degree, contractors and their staff members view the LAP3 innovation as a top down change that has been dictated to them, rather than change they helped to create. This limits their sense of ownership of the change. As we noted in the report introduction, a profound change is a change in thinking as well as change in practice. We observe that while contractors are partially changing their practice as directed, they are not necessarily changing how they think about their practices and their clients. Many cite a sense of ambiguity about the change as reason they have not done more. For example, one center director said: “We’re not experts in the process we are being asked to implement. It has not been established or embedded yet.”

A related issue is that contractors see communication related to LAP3 as one way. From their perspective, while they receive instructions and directives from the city, the city does not seek their views, and thus they perceive that their voice is often not heard. YSC Staff frequently voiced an interest in having a dialog with the city about LAP3 implementation, as opposed to being told what to do and how to do it. As one YSC staff member noted, “This doesn’t feel like a partnership”. Further, when staff tried to reach out to the City with questions, they noted that often there was no response from the City (or received responses such as, “We will cover that during training”). According to one YSC staff member, “The speed information is shared is slow. Information is scarce. Everyone has questions about P3. We don’t know if they don’t know the answers or if they’re ignoring [the questions].”

Taken together, these dynamics result in contractors and their staff often having to take a “wait and see” attitude towards LAP3, rather than actively working towards the new vision together with the City.

2. Partner staff members often have a limited understanding of LAP3’s vision and purpose.

Since LAP3 envisions a seamless system with many partners working collaboratively to serve disconnected youth, it is important that partner staff have a clear understanding of LAP3 and its vision. In our interviews with partner staff, however, we find that they often have a vague or partial understanding of P3. For example, one partner staff member thought that the discussions and networking activities that took place during regional meetings represented the P3 program in its entirety. Essentially, her impression was that the purpose of LAP3 was to network with other partner agencies at regional meetings. Additionally, this individual was unaware that the location she was at was a YouthSource center, and was unfamiliar with the concept of a YouthSource center as a whole. When asked if she was familiar with the agency representative that had been attending the Operations Committee meetings, she responded, “I don’t know her well. She is the boss of my boss’s boss.” While partner to partner networking appears to be taking place at the regional meetings, it is less clear if YouthSource center staff are making similar connections. Overall, it appears that at the policy-level, partners may have a good understanding of P3, but at the operational level, where changes in practice and thinking need to take place, the understanding is much more limited.

3. Training received by contractors has focused more on the mechanics of LAP3, and less on the vision of LAP3 and contractor participation in the LAP3 strategic plan has been limited.

Our observation is that most contractors do not have a sense of urgency about implementing the LAP3 vision, and further do not see the LAP3 vision as a profound change for the system. Other sites view LAP3 as good in theory (e.g., benefits of creating partnerships to help additional youth), but as currently implemented, see few changes in how youth are served. One YSC Director claimed “We already have partnerships but not because of P3. It’s a great idea, but it’s not really happening.” Another skeptical YSC Director observed: “I don’t see any major benefit of it other than just another bureaucratic procedure.”

Part of the reason for this disconnect is that contractor staff had limited involvement in the development of P3. In the training that launched LAP3, the focus was mostly on the mechanics of what was changing in the system and on new reporting requirements. This left many contractors with the view that LAP3 was “old wine in a new bottle.” The current strategic planning process has also not allowed for widespread participation by the contractors. In our view, without deeply engaging the contractors (who actually deliver the services and build the ties with partner organizations), the LAP3 vision will not be realized.

4. Partnerships at the operational level are in the early stages of forming and are uneven across the system.

It appears that the operational strategy is to bring partners and YSC staff together at regional meetings and just assume that partnerships will emerge. We see some of that happening. But, the connections are minimal compared to what happened when EWDD formed a partnership with LAUSD and each YSC had a PSA counselor permanently assigned to the centers. In that case, the partnership was clear, real and immediate.

There are a limited number of partners near each YSC, and partners' ability to provide services under the roof of the YSC is contingent upon the availability of resources and space. Without co-location, effective referrals are more problematic. Perhaps, in addition to inviting partners to regional meetings, the city should facilitate introductions between P3 case managers and their direct counterparts at nearby partner sites. This would not only help with the referral process, but would promote the much-needed buy-in from partners for the check-in or follow-up.

During interviews with various YSC staff members, we frequently heard questions about the degree to which partner agencies were committed to LAP3. Such concerns were apparent in commentary which included, "The bulk of the work falls on us, not the partners", "This doesn't feel like a partnership", "This will only work through co-case management", "Partners need to share in the work", "The commitment of [our] partners will determine the outcome", and "If you collaborate only with the spirit of collaboration, it doesn't work".

Additionally, we heard reports from multiple YSC staff members that partner attendance at the regional meetings was inconsistent, and some staff voiced frustration that certain partner agencies send different representatives to regional meetings; making it more difficult to form relationships and resulting in attendees who are not fully up to speed. From these interviews it became clear that, to varying degrees, YSC staff have doubts about the extent of partners' commitment to the initiative, and tend to view the program not so much as a partnership but as a program whose primary responsibility is that of the YSC.

We also received reports that YSC staff felt that not enough had been done by EWDD to help centers form relationships with partners. For instance, one individual expressed dissatisfaction with the "meet the partners" activity conducted at the training session held in 2016, stating that it didn't allow for meaningful interaction with the partner agencies. Another individual stated that they felt that at regional meetings they were essentially put into a room with partners and "expected to make [their] own connections". Beyond that, a number of individuals expressed that they were unsure if the representative of the partner agency attending the regional meeting or listed on the resource guide was the "right" agency contact – that is, the correct person to call or contact in the event that their agency's services were in need.

5. Regional meetings are not always effectively facilitated, and therefore, not always productive.

Contractors and partners report a positive overall view of regional meetings, as they can improve coordination and communication. In our observations, some meetings are very effective while others are not. The outcome of the meetings appears to be driven significantly by the quality of the facilitation and planning. On the one hand, when meetings start promptly, and are well organized, with ample opportunities to engage with partners, participants see them as productive and worthwhile. The activity of having participants bring real client cases to the meeting and having participants brainstorm solutions seems particularly effective. On the other hand, when meetings start late, lack a clear agenda, and opportunities for interaction and networking are lacking, participants leave with a feeling that the time was not well spent. We understand the EWDD's plan is to step back from having consultants and city staff facilitate meetings and to turn facilitation duties over to LAP3 liaisons in the YSCs. In our view, this risks sending a signal the city is reducing its focus on building regional networks to improve service. Effective meetings involve careful planning and good facilitation. We will make recommendations below for sustaining the effectiveness of the regional meetings.

IV Recommendations

We divide our recommendations into two time periods, the *near term* which deals with the next six months of the initial roll-out period, and the mid-term the next two years of the project.

Near Term (Next Six Months)

1. Create a sense of urgency and shared vision in the YSCs by engaging Directors and Staff in a two-way discussion of the LAP3 vision.
 - YSC Directors and staff are at the center of the LAP3 innovation, it is critical they understand and commit to the P3 vision. The way to accomplish this is for the EWDD leadership, to engage in dialog with contractors and their staff, around the vision for a different more integrated youth system. Our assessment is that YSC staff are not so much resisting the innovation, as simply not fully understanding it or feeling a sense of ownership of it. It is critical that it be a two way exchange where YSC staff get to share their views and ideas as well as hear from EWDD leadership. Good facilitation will be a key to making these events successful.
 - Reinforce the vision by including references to the vision in all communications to partners and YSC operators. Any directive, activity, or rule should be tied to the

LAP3 vision. It takes constant reinforcement of the vision to create the profound change envisioned by LAP3.

- Explore how LAP3's vision aligns with contractors' organizational vision. A good topic for a regional meeting would be a discussion of how the visions and missions of the various partner agencies align with the LAP3 vision. This would reinforce, for YSCs and partners, why collaboration is critical.
2. Bring contractors into the guiding coalition so they develop a deeper understanding and commitment to the LAP3 model.
 - YSC leadership and staff need to be more engaged with LAP3 at the policy and operational level. This can be accomplished by adding more contractor managers and staff to the existing working groups and involving them in the strategic planning process as, suggested below.
 - Providing more specific resources, which are developed with YSC participation, will help make the vision real. Immediate resources that can help and which are detailed below, include a shared website where YSC and partners can share information, a formalized referral process and continued support for high quality regional meetings.
 3. Invest resources in supporting the regional meetings.
 - Regional planning meetings have become a hallmark of the LAP3 innovation. Supporting them will help sustain and build emerging partnerships. We suggest providing resources to ensure that there is sufficient time to plan effective meetings. Similarly, we suggest that the City either provide or train effective meeting facilitators. Our observations show that the quality of facilitation makes or breaks the meetings. We are concerned that removing city provided facilitators from the meetings will signal that EWDD is withdrawing support from the meetings and de-emphasizing them. It is important that this message not be sent at this critical stage.
 - Meetings generate a lot of good insights and connections, but are not always disseminated beyond the people at the meetings. The City should support and encourage the web-based dissemination of results and partner points-of-contact. The website should include a discussion board where staff of YSCs and partners can share ideas and insights in real time.
 - Regional meetings are an excellent venue to communicate and get feedback from contractors on the LAP3 vision. We suggest that the City use regional meetings to communicate and engage in dialog about the P3 vision, as suggested above.

4. Expand the strategic planning process to allow for participation by YSC directors and staff.

“In preparing for battle I have always found that plans are useless, but planning is indispensable.”

Dwight D. Eisenhower

- We agree that the process of planning is often more valuable than the plan itself. The strategic planning process is an opportunity to bring YSC directors, managers, and staff into the P3 vision. We recommend that an extensive, well-facilitated strategy discussion be held in each of the YSC regions. These discussions will allow participants to brainstorm ideas for making the vision real, and these ideas should (to the extent possible) be reflected in the final plan.
 - Similarly, allowing partner staff at the operational level to participate in the planning process will necessarily increase their understanding of P3, and thus their commitment to the vision.
5. Celebrate successes at both the policy and operational level.
 - The hardest part of innovation is sustaining the early momentum of the effort. A key method to accomplish this is celebrating early “wins” as they occur. We suggest that at each regional meeting and YSC Directors meetings begin with some recognition and celebration of a “win” that supports the LAP3 vision, such as recognition of a new partnership, an event created through LAP3, or waiver that was granted to help serve more youth.
 6. Ensure the data system is capturing data required to effectively manage the system and provide required data for the evaluation system.
 - Our first look at the data in CalJobs indicates that the system is not capturing all the clients served by P3. This will keep the P3 project from achieving its goals set out in the federal proposals. It will also make completing the planned impact evaluation impossible.
 - The system must capture standard WIOA performance measures for non-WIOA P3 participants. It appears currently that CalJobs system will not capture the standard WIOA performance measures such as employment and educational achievement

for non-WIOA clients. Again, without this data the planned impact evaluation cannot be completed.

- EWDD must work collaboratively with contractors to get them to understand the importance of methodically bringing non-WIOA youth into the program, referring them effectively, and entering the client and the referral into the CalJobs system.

Mid-term Years 2 and 3 of project. Especially next Contract Cycle, Starting July 1, 2017

7. Increase focus on non-WIOA participants.

Several steps that can be taken to expand services for non-WIOA participants:

- In the procurement of new contractors, give preference to contractors who are able to provide more services “under the roof” of the YSC, so that more services are readily available to non-WIOA youth.
- Set goals for enrolling non-WIOA youth in the LAP3 system.
- Develop follow-up and performance measures for non-WIOA youth.
- Consider making available a \$50 emergency fund to help address non-WIOA youths’ immediate needs.
- YSCs who procure more services for non-WIOA youth should be recognized and rewarded.

8. Formalize governance structure to sustain the engagement of partners at policy and operational level.

- The existing working groups, such as the waiver committee and the evaluation and data committee are essentially ad hoc and not part of a formal governance committee. We recommend that after the start-up period, EWDD reflect on the usefulness of these groups and create permanent working groups with partners to sustain interest and support for the initiative.
- At the operational level getting partners to use CalJobs to share client information is critical to sustaining the innovation. This will take continued work at the operational level, as current use appears to be very limited.

9. Establish an online channel for exchanging information.

As we noted several regional groups have established online channels for sharing information generated in the regional meetings. We believe EWDD should support this grassroots effort by establishing an online presence to disseminate information and best practices. If the ReLAY Institute is funded this could be a good project for the institute. In our view an effective site would have the following characteristics.

- It would be open so YSC staff and partners could easily post material.
- It would be city wide but have sections for each region, so region specific material is easily available.
- It would have an open forum feature so on ongoing dialog would be possible.

10. Try to move more services under the roof of YSCs.

We know in organizations that proximity matters. When physically close, people develop closer relationships with each other and cooperate more. We see in our field work that the PSA counselors who are physically in the YSCs find new ways to collaborate with the other programs in the Center, as they learn about the other activities and build trust with other staff.

- House more programs under the roof of the YSCs, even part-time collaboration, to speed up and deepen the actual delivery of services.

11. Celebrate successes and disseminate best practices to improve performance.

- The planned ReLAY Institute will have centers to promote best practices and provide training to staff with the P3 system. It will be important to support the activities and engage staff in them to make sure that innovations from P3 become institutionalized.

Appendix A: Comparison of WIOA and non-WIOA Clients

A.1: Enrollments by Gender

			P3Type		Total
			Non-WIOA	WIOA	
Gender	Not Recorded	Count	0	3	3
		% not recorded	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within P3Type	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
	Female	Count	107	930	1037
		% Female	10.3%	89.7%	100.0%
		% within P3Type	50.2%	55.1%	54.5%
	Male	Count	106	756	862
		% Male	12.3%	87.7%	100.0%
		% within P3Type	49.8%	44.8%	45.3%
Total	Count, both genders		213	1689	1902
	% of Total		11.1%	88.9%	100.0%

A.2: Foster Care Enrollments

			P3 Type		Total
			Non-WIOA	WIOA	
Foster Care	Not Recorded	Count	207	1647	1854
		% within P3 Type	97.2%	97.5%	97.5%
	In Foster Care	Count	6	35	41
		% by P3 type	14.6%	85.4%	100.0%
		% within P3 Type	2.8%	2.1%	2.1%
	Not in Foster Care	Count	0	7	7
		% by P3 type	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within P3 Type	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%

A.3 Homeless Enrollments

			P3Type		Total
			Non-WIOA	WIOA	
Homeless	Not	Count	200	1621	1821

Homeless	% by P3 Type	93.9%	96.0%	95.8%
Homeless	Count	13	68	81
	% by P3 type	6.1%	4.0%	4.2%

A.4 Probation Enrollments

			P3Type		Total
			Non-WIOA	WIOA	
Probation	Not Recorded	Count	204	1656	1860
		% by P3Type	95.8%	98.0%	97.8%
Probation		Count	6	32	38
		% within P3Type	2.8%	1.9%	2.0%
Non-Probation		Count	3	1	4
		% within P3Type	1.4%	0.1%	0.2%

A.5 Runaway Enrollments

			P3Type		Total
			Non-WIOA	WIOA	
Runaway	Not Runaway	Count	213	1686	1899
		% within P3Type	100.0%	99.8%	99.8%
Runaway		Count	0	3	3
		% within P3Type	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%

A.6 TANF Household Enrollments

			P3Type		Total
			Non-WIOA	WIOA	
TANF	Not Recorded	Count	141	867	1008
		% within P3Type	66.2%	51.3%	53.0%

Non-TANF	Count	64	717	781
	% within P3Type	30.0%	42.5%	41.1%
TANF	Count	8	105	113
	% within P3Type	3.8%	6.2%	5.9%

A.7 Food Stamp Household

			P3Type		Total
			Non-WIOA	WIOA	
Food Stamp Household	Not Recorded	Count	141	867	1008
		% within P3Type	66.2%	51.3%	53.0%
	Non-Food Stamp	Count	65	661	726
		% within P3Type	30.5%	39.1%	38.2%
	Food Stamp	Count	7	161	168
		% within P3Type	3.3%	9.5%	8.8%

Appendix B: Federal Waivers

Federal Agency	Policy and Waiver Requested	Justification for Request	Local Non Federal Agencies Impacted	LAP3 Outcome Impacted	Status	Next Steps
1. Waiver request to U.S. Department of Education	Change the age requirements for eligible youth under Title 1, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk, to align with WIOA (up to 24 years of age)	<p>Title 1, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk states eligible youth must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To participate in the SA’s N or D program, a child or youth must be: ▪ 21 years of age or younger; ▪ Entitled to free public education up to grade 12; and ▪ Enrolled in a regular program of instruction at either an eligible institution or community day program for the required length of time (20 hours per week if in an institution or community day program for youth who are N or D; 15 hours per week if in an adult correctional institution). ▪ This becomes a barrier as P3 and WIOA has an eligibility requirement of 24 or younger. 	LAUSD	Education Employment		
2. Waiver request directed to US Department of Education (statutory or legislative)	All students with prior convictions related to possession of illegal drugs or firearms to be eligible to receive federal financial aid.	Currently, students that have a conviction for the possession or sale of illegal drugs for an offense that occurred while were receiving federal student aid (such as grants, work-study, or loans) are ineligible to receive federal financial aid. A significant number of students that are identified as disconnect youth have interacted with the juvenile/adult justice systems because of such offenses. Not being eligible for federal financial aid can become a significant barrier for their pursuit of postsecondary education.	LAUSD	Education Employment		
3. Waiver request directed to U.S. Health and Human	Provide a waiver for a family member to not be penalized on the current dollar amount of CalWORKs that families are receiving due to student now	Many families will not take advantage of these types of programs due to fear of losing the CalWORKs benefits, if their student is receiving income. In particular, parenting, older youth (age 18-24) that could greatly benefit from subsidized work experience do not engage for fear of losing	DPSS	Employment		▪

Services	receiving income (which in many times if very little and limited).	their benefits.				
4. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services	Instead of presumptive eligibly for DACA, fees for DACA application (\$465) could be waived and create a streamlined application process.			Education Employment Health and Well Being Housing Stability	▪	▪
5. US Health and Human Services	Allow Chafee-funded Independent Living Program (ILP) providers to serve youth up to age 24. Currently, the program eligibility serves youth, ages 18-21, who have exited foster care or probation. With Extended Foster Care in CA, through AB12 approximately 75% of youth are staying in care until age 21.	Local data indicates that many youth trying to access ILP are at least 20 years old, which leaves little time to be served in the program. Extending age eligibility would allow programs to serve youth until age 24.				
6. Internal Revenue Services	Allow formerly homeless TAY who are living in permanent supportive housing buildings funded with Low Income Housing Tax Credits to go to school full time	A recent evaluation of PSH for TAY in Los Angeles found that a small number of youth in PSH had not completed their high school diploma. Youth that entered PSH with a high school diploma expressed being discouraged that they were not able to go back to school full time after they had stabilized in PSH. Interviews with youth in the evaluation identified education as a barrier for youth in PSH to attaining employment with career pathways. Many youth are able to move on from PSH, but still with limited income. Waiving this LIHTC policy would allow youth to go back to school, after being out of school and on the streets, to quickly complete or attain educational goals, thereby optimizing the time that youth have while in PSH to ensure their longer-term economic self-sufficiency.	DCFS	Housing Stability Education	▪	▪

7. US Housing Urban Development	Allow HUD COC Transitional Housing for Youth to be excluded from existing HUD COC performance measures and use the project to develop specific performance measures that are specific to programs serving youth.	Youth specific performance measures continue to be a concern for providers serving homeless youth in Los Angeles, but also nationally. The Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA) is the lead agency for the Continuum of Care in LA County, and is engaged in discussions with local and regional providers to explore what performance measures across the homeless youth housing programs would be appropriate to the youth population being served.		Housing Stability	▪	▪
8. US Health and Human Services	To ensure ILP-youth who have not aged out of Foster Care and have returned home receive Full Scope Medi-Cal benefits, with no share of cost or out of pocket expenses, any income from the ILP child, parent or caretaker relative should be exempt.	Currently, Full Scope Medi-Cal only serves ILP youth 18-26 whose suitable placement order terminates at, or after, the age of 18 AND where the youth was NOT returned home or to a guardian. Therefore, there are numerous youth rendered ineligible for the same medical services despite being ILP eligible, i.e. youth returned home or to a guardian at any age, 16 through 20. The implications are tragic in that numerous youth are unable to receive medical/mental health services or treatment. An otherwise ILP eligible youth faced with a medical or mental health condition or emergency is at greater risk of losing housing, employment, school attendance, etc. as a result of the unavailability of health coverage. Broadening the eligible population definition to include these remaining youth will ensure access to those in need of the array of services offered through Full Scope Medi-Cal.		Health and Well-Being	▪	▪
9. US Department of Agriculture and California Department of Social Services	Allow AB 212 Youth to be fully eligible for CalFresh benefits by exempting all foster youth income, including foster care payments from monthly CalFresh Program eligibility determination and calculation of benefit	Per CalFresh policy, foster youth's income is calculated in the determination of the monthly CalFresh benefits. Request to waive income for AB 212 youth (non-minor dependents).	DPSS	Health and Well Being	▪	▪

	amount.					
10. US Department of Labor	Foster and Probation youth would be given a waiver on DoL's employment sustainability metrics.		DCFS Probation	Employment	▪	▪
11. Waiver request to U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	<p>Allow the Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services, Los Angeles County Office of Education and the California public systems of higher education (California Community College, California State University and University of California) to share data in order to identify current and former foster youth who are enrolled in college for the purposes of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • individualized outreach to ensure that foster youth are aware of all services for which they are eligible and • Aggregate tracking of outcome indicators in order to gauge effectiveness of interventions. 	<p><u>Department of Education</u> Section 444(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g(b)) (commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”) describes the circumstances under which educational agencies or institutions may share educational records.</p> <p>Under state law (California Education Code Section 42923(b)(2)(A)(vi)(I)), in order to gauge the effectiveness of educational services for foster youth, county offices of education are required to track the number of pupils in foster care participating in foster youth services coordinating programs who successfully transition to postsecondary education. According to guidance issued by the Department of Education (issued May 27, 2014), post-secondary institutions are allowed to share information for students currently in foster care with the child welfare agency. No mechanism exists however to allow postsecondary educational institutions to share information with a county office of education so that it may comply with this requirement and refine practices in order to improve rates of successful college transition.</p> <p><u>Department of Health and Human Services</u></p>	DCFS LACOE LACCD CSU			

		<p>Currently 42 U.S.C.A. § 5106a(b)(2)(B)(viii)-(x) governs the disclosure of information by child welfare agencies. These provisions do not currently provide for data sharing between a child welfare agency and post-secondary institution in order to enable post-secondary institutions to target support services or identify foster youth in order to track aggregate outcomes. Data sharing that enables post-secondary institutions to identify current and former foster youth attending their institution would allow those institutions to inform those students about services for which they may be eligible and to monitor aggregate outcomes for this distinct student subpopulation.</p> <p>It is important that both current and <u>former</u> foster youth be identified because most resources available at the post-secondary level do not require current foster care involvement.</p>				
12. US Department of Labor/ Education	Allow other academic assessment tools to be utilized in addition to CASAS	Youth often OVER assessed at various educational institutions, ie. TABE or community college placement tests, which can be very discouraging and/or frustrating. YouthSource centers currently partner with adult schools as well as community colleges to assist youth in achieving high school diploma/equivalency, but have to administer CASAS even though youth has already assessed at other academic institution. Ability to utilize current assessment scores from adult school and or community college would facilitate enrollment process	LAUSD LACCD LA City Youthsource System	Education	•	•
13. US Department of Education	Foster youth age limit increased to 24	Currently, federal govt. funds foster services through age 21, but many youth do not come into the CC system until they are 22/24... and by then, there are no services for them.	LACCD	Education	•	•
14. Department of Labor,	Waiver to utilize funds to be used toward refreshments for	Youth are often hungry during 3 hour YSC intake meetings. Lite refreshments will not only fulfill an immediate need for	LACCD LA City EWDD	Education	•	•

HHS and Agriculture	youth and or receive resources from calfresh to provide healthy snacks during program orientation meetings	youth but make their visit pleasant. This is also cultural sensitive and may	Youthsource centers			
---------------------	--	--	---------------------	--	--	--

Appendix C: Non-federal waivers

Non Federal Agency Targeted	Policy and Waiver Requested	Justification for Request	Local Non Federal Agencies Impacted	LAP3 Outcome Impacted
1. Waiver request directed to CA Department of Education	Allow LCFF Targeted Student Populations (TSP) funding to help support some of the needs of Disconnected Youths via YouthSource Centers.	Currently, LCFF provides a supplemental grant equal to 20 percent of the adjusted base grant multiplied by ADA and the unduplicated percentage of targeted disadvantages pupils. Targeted pupils are those classified as English Learners (EL), meet income requirements to receive to receive a free or reduced-price meal (FRPM), foster youth, or any combination of these factors (unduplicated count).	LAUSD LA City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Education

<p>2. Coordination of systems within P3 partners.</p>	<p>Assign a contact for families at DPSS office who can get the proof of CalWORKs paper signed. Or redesign the process by which proof of CalWORKs is obtained. Create a process for PSA Counselors assigned at YSC to obtain this proof and expedite the process for program approval.</p>	<p>Currently the program stipulates that when students apply for CalWORKs they must fill out an application, provide proof of residency, birth certificate, social security card, ID, and proof of CalWORKs. The proof of CalWORKs is obtained by researching the students name on DPSS system, if the student is not in the system the parent is required to take a letter to the DPSS office and having the DPSS worker sign off on the form. The barrier is found when parents must take this form to DPSS worker (either walking in/scheduling an appointment). The overcrowding of DPSS offices throughout the county of LA have made this process extremely difficult for families and DPSS workers. Families have no contact person at DPSS offices or have extremely long waiting times. Many families become frustrated with the process and end up not taking advantage of the employment opportunity being offered through programs like this.</p>	<p>DPSS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Employment ▪ Education
<p>3. MOU request directed to LAUSD and DCFS</p>	<p>Develop an MOU between LAUSD and DCFS regarding ownership of clients' mental health and custodial needs.</p>	<p>Currently, the lines in delineating responsibility and communication are blurry. Once piece of communication that has been lacking is clarity on who the educational rights holders are for DCFS clients. Schools are often informed as to who the custodial rights holder is, but not the educational rights holder and they may be different.</p>	<p>LAUSD DCFS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Education
<p>4. Wavier requested to CA Department of Education</p>	<p>Facilitating added support for students that have low scores (TABE, basic academic skills, IEP type (Special Day), reading levels, English Language Learners) to help with job and/or education outcomes.</p>	<p>Currently, there is not much support for individuals that have low scores on different assessments. Enabling YouthSource centers to provide some of these added supports, such as, GED prep classes in languages other than English and direct instruction vs. independent studies, would help facilitate the process of connecting these youths to work or educational opportunities.</p>	<p>LAUSD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Education

	Perhaps, utilizing resources provided through AB 86 to provide planning and implementation grants to regional consortia of community college districts and school districts for the purpose of developing regional plans to better serve the educational needs of adults.			
5. LA County Registrar and recorders Office	Provide free copy of birth certificates for youth	Youth need to provide various legal documents for enrollment in school, employment, etc. and often obtaining duplicate copy is a barrier due to cost	LAUSD LACCD Adult schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Employment •
6. Department of Motor Vehicles	Provide free CA Identification cards	Youth need to provide various legal documents for enrollment in school, employment, etc. and often obtaining duplicate copy is a barrier due to cost (DMH Tay Navigators already get some vouchers, can we get more?)	LAUSD LACCD Adult schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Employment
7. LAP3 System Partners	Set a timeline of 3 years and request that all City and County Departments synchronize their data systems	Data silos exists and this complicates the service provision for disconnected youth.	City of LA LAUSD LA County LACCD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Employment • Health and Well Being • Housing
8. Probation	Create a MOU Between the	LACOE does not have access to probation data for the youth	LACOE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education

	Probation Department and LACOE that allows information sharing to include home evaluation address and health care information.	they serve in the camp once they exit the camp. For example, LACOE has the address of the youth when they entered the camps but many of these youth move when they return because this population is transient. The probation department does a home evaluation prior to release and therefore has the new address but they do not share this with LACOE. Once released, LACOE sends letters with resources and support services to the youth's homes but they get 75% of the letters back because they do not have the new addresses.	Probation	
9. LACOE	Create MOUs between LACOE and existing LACOE-contracted organizations that are already providing services in the camps and also provide reentry services.	The 18-24 year old population exiting the probation camps is released from the camps without a host of wrap around services waiting for them. This is a HUGE missed opportunity. Specifically for incarcerated youth who are already graduated who literally just sit in the camps waiting to be released (This included 52 youth in 2016) LACOE contracts many organizations in the Probation camps to provide services but the those organizations are not given access to the youth once released. An information sharing MOU could help transition the youth back into the community by giving organizations access to the youth they served inside once released from camp to community (ex: this can help New Earth and the LA Chamber to better support the wrap around) LACOE has a need for transition case managers and the CBO's can support their lack of transition case managers and support youth's transition from camp to community. (Current LACOE transition case manager case load is about 150:1)	LA County Probation Department, LACOE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Employment • Health and Well Being • Housing
10. State of CA DOE	More Detail Needed	LACOE has to be able to serve youth across districts Under LCFF, LACOE has to bill student's home districts for the ADA, even if they are no longer serving them or if they expelled	LACOE Probation Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

		them. Funds would follow the youth to the provider/LACOE. This will allow the service provider (LACOE) to be reimbursed for the services they are providing and give LACOE additional funds they can use for case managers, etc. (Note, once a youth is 18, the state stops paying ADA unless the youth is special-ed in which case, the ADA extends to age 24.)	Districts LAUSD	
11. State of CA DOE	More Detail Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LACOE does not have programming or funding for the youth in camps who are graduated but still in camp. (this included 52 youth in 2016) This is partially due to the fact that LACOE gets no ADA for youth over 18. AB216- allows students to graduate with less units (130 units (but this does not include extra-curricular) with their cohorts. • In 2016 LACOE's camp numbers were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2016 had largest graduating class: 537 ○ of those 244 were AB216 kids ○ of those, 226 were over 18 and over ○ of those 52 stayed in camps post-graduation with nothing to do 	LACOE	•
12. Probation	More Detail Needed	If youth/young adult on probation/parole has no address that is considered a violation. What if they are homeless? Can they use a temporary shelter address?	Probation	•
13. Probation	More Detail Needed	Due to HIPAA- Probation or mental health/public health, do not share medical history of youth with LACOE Teachers and Special Education Department. LACOE's Special Ed Dept. needs to know the case history including their Mental and medical diagnosis/meds/etc. in order to properly educate student, diagnose, identify student as a 504, or know that a student is acting out as a result of their diagnosis, drugs, etc.	DMH Probation LACOE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Well Being • Education

		For example, at Glen Rocky or Dorothy Kirby, most students are on psychotropic drugs and then, while in school, some teachers expel them if they are sleeping, acting out, being violent-- but what if they are just over medicated, having a psychotic break, etc.? LACOE teachers and SPED dept. need to know the case history in order to properly educate youth.		
14. DPSS	Amend enrollment and eligibility for DPSS Programs	Is it possible to have youth who enroll in DPSS cache (Low income) to instantly be enrolled in all DPSS's host of services/programs. Why do we expect people to have to research what they are eligible for. When we do this, we block out the most disconnected individuals. Also, if youth are enrolled in YSC's WIOA Program or EDD's YEOP, can they immediately get enrolled in DPSS programs since their WIOA inclusion proves they are low income?	DPSS EDD LA City EWDD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Well Being • Housing
15. DPSS	Amend enrollment and eligibility for DPSS Programs	CalFresh ad MediCAL has too many artificial barriers and eligibility is a huge barrier)(These barriers were created by DPSS not Federally). Therefore, it is difficult to retain families. For Ex: If denied Cal FRESH, you have to do a state hearing to content it, also, some youth who are enrolled in YSC lose their DPSS cache or are deemed ineligible for GROW/GAIN because they are not working full time. But they are in YSC program which is not a full 40 hours.	DPSS LA City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Well Being
16. DPSS	Amend wait times for DPSS CalWorks and CalFresh	Long wait times for DPSS programs create more paperwork and an unnecessary strain on those awaiting services. Shorten wait times for DPSS programs to ASAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Calworks (30 days to wait for Cache/EBT) ○ CalFresh- 3 days 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Well Being

17. DPSS	MOU between EWDD and DPSS to collaborate	One of DPSS's goals is to reduce lobby traffic and enroll more people into their programs through their online portal-through YBN(Your Benefits Now). They currently leave money on the table every year because they do not enroll enough people in GROW, GAIN, calFRESH, etc. If DPSS has a formalized partnership with EWDD, they can train Family Source Center staff, Youth Source Center staff (and possibly other County entities, etc.) to enroll youth through YBN(Your Benefits Now website) and determine eligibility in Cal Fresh, Medical, and Cash so they can funnel more eligible families to DPSS.	LA City EWDD, DPSS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Well Being •
18. CA Department of Education	More Detail Needed	LAUSD has access to the database of out of school youth, but is not able to share this list with City agencies who serve that population and spend a lot of time looking for them. (Most YSC and GRYD agencies have said that they have a difficult time finding this population. Meanwhile, LAUSD as said that they need help reengaging these youth.) An information sharing MOU can help ensure that these youth do not fall through the cracks.	LAUSD, LA City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Health and Well Being
19. EDD	MOU between EDD and LAUSD	LAUSD wishes they could still serve the in school non-probation youth with WIOA funds. Meanwhile, EDD has a program that is underutilized for youth who are in school (The creation of an MOU between the LAUSD,EDD, and FSC's to refer their in-school youth?	LAUSD, EDD,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
20. LA County	MOU and colocation Between LA County CSS, LA City EWDD	LA County's CSS oversees the County's youth centers while the City's EWDD oversees the YSC's The YSC's are limited to serving youth with the City's Boundaries. If the County colocated a Youth Representative in each of the City's Youth Source Centers, more youth would be served	LA County CSS, LA City EWDD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Employment • Health and Well Being • Housing

21.	YMCA	Contract between LA County and YMCA?	YMCA opens some of their centers to provide free showers to homeless in the Valley. The YMCA wants to “get into real youth development “ and serve disconnected youth. Perhaps the County or City can contract them to provide service for the homeless from 6-8AM before their centers are open to the public. YMCA’s can also create a kiosk of information and resources near the showers or even have collocated services available during the homeless-open time.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Well Being
22.	EDD	More Detail Needed	<p>EDD has had a lot of funding cuts in recent years so their case managers are maxed out with 50 youth each. (Despite bylaws stating that they should have 12-25 max/case specialist). They still serve all youth but once their case managers have a full case load those youth do not get a case manager. Can EDD co-enroll their youth with A YSC case manager? EDD recently lost all Downtown LA offices (must be located in a seismically sound building with ADA Compliance. (they would love to be in a building with: youth, vets, department of rehab, DPSS)</p> <p>Meanwhile, since YSC raised the eligibility age to 24, YSC get a lot of older high school grads who want support. YSC therefore need alternative resources for High School grads who are going back to school or need work. EDD wants to serve more mid-20’s aged people. EDD’s YEOP program is state funded and mostly serves 11th and 12th graders. They do not get many homeless youth or 20 year olds.</p>	LA CITY EDD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
23.	DPSS	More Detail Needed	DPSS 10 day hotel voucher cuts into their cache for the first month so youth do not want to use it. (Waiver?)	DPSS LAHSA	Housing
24.	LAHSA	Extended contract period	LAHSA Contracts give providers 90 days with the youth. This	LAHSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing

		is a barrier. In 90 days, the youth barely have time to get settled, get their docs,		
25. EDD	More Detail Needed	In order to get EDD services, people must have a SS card and a CA ID. This prohibits service provision to many youth who are documented but disconnected as well as undocumented.	EDD	• Employment