

COUNTY PLACEMENT UTILIZATION BY GENDER

Of California's 58 counties, only 11 had more males than females placed in either of the subject placement types. For all counties, more males were placed in FFHs than FFAs, at 51 percent of all male children in either placement type. Similarly, more females were placed to FFHs than FFAs, at 51 percent of all female children in either placement type.

Looking at the same 8 counties analyzed in the previous section regarding age, the following county specific data reveals the following snapshot.

- ◆ ALAMEDA: males were 49% and females 51% of children placed in these two placement types; 52% of all male children were placed in a FFA; 51% of all female children were placed in a FFH.
- ◆ FRESNO: males and females are equal at 50% of children placed in these two placement types; 60% of all male children were placed in a FFH; 67% of all female children were placed in a FFH.
- ◆ KERN: males were 51% and females 49% of children placed in these two placement types; 69% of all male children were placed in a FFA; 78% all female children were placed in a FFH.
- ◆ LOS ANGELES: males were 48% and females 52% of children placed in these two placement types; 61% of all male children were placed in a FFA; 63% of all female children were placed in a FFA.
- ◆ ORANGE: males were 48% and females 52% of children placed in these two placement types; 61% of all male children were placed in a FFA; 63% all female children were placed in a FFA.
- ◆ SACRAMENTO: males were 49% and females 51% of children placed in these two placement types; 65% of all male children were placed in a FFA; 63% of all female children were placed in a FFA.
- ◆ SAN BERNARDINO: males and females were equal at 50% of children placed in these two placement types; 51% of all male children were placed in a FFA; 51% of all female children were also placed in a FFA.
- ◆ SAN DIEGO: males were 51% and females 49% of children placed in these two placement types; 86% of all male children were placed in a FFH; 87% of all female children were placed in a FFH.

COUNTY PLACEMENT UTILIZATION BY GENDER (continued)

Based on the gender data presented in Figure 34 below, 33 of California's 58 counties made more of their placements to a FFH than a FFA. The total number of placements to FFHs (26,225) was greater than the total placements made to FFAs (25,053).

Figure 34

COUNTY-SPECIFIC GENDER DATA BY PLACEMENT TYPE

(Shaded boxes indicate placement type with largest number of children. Numbers in bold indicate gender with largest number in each placement type.)

COUNTY	FFA		TOTAL IN FFA	FFH		TOTAL IN FFH	TOTAL
	Male	Female		Male	Female		
Alameda	617	616	1,233	577	651	1,228	2,461
Alpine	1	2	3	1	0	1	4
Amador	7	11	18	8	7	15	33
Butte	253	234	487	80	77	157	644
Calaveras	18	20	38	7	18	25	63
Colusa	3	6	9	2	4	6	15
Contra Costa	226	204	430	396	434	830	1,260
Del Norte	6	3	9	40	59	99	108
El Dorado	32	41	73	58	58	116	189
Fresno	360	298	658	543	614	1,157	1,815
Glenn	25	30	55	25	25	50	105
Humboldt	24	13	37	102	126	228	265
Imperial	2	3	5	52	59	111	116
Inyo	Not given	Not given	Not given	8	15	23	23
Kern	283	196	479	642	698	1,340	1,819
Kings	14	20	34	68	79	147	181
Lake	68	69	137	14	26	40	177
Lassen	50	43	93	5	2	7	100
Los Angeles	4,703	5,198	9,901	3,033	3,050	6,083	15,984
Madera	21	23	44	33	57	90	134
Marin	11	9	20	54	65	119	139
Mariposa	6	2	8	14	12	26	34
Mendocino	56	73	129	92	125	217	346
Merced	62	63	125	107	129	236	361
Modoc	21	22	43	0	1	1	44
Mono	1	1	2	1	4	5	7
Monterey	43	39	82	112	153	265	347
Napa	15	13	28	57	46	103	131
Nevada	17	20	37	14	25	39	76
Orange	644	699	1,343	385	471	856	2,199
Placer	89	125	214	72	88	160	374
Plumas	13	26	39	2	0	2	41
Riverside	114	131	245	713	727	1,440	1,685

COUNTY PLACEMENT UTILIZATION BY GENDER (continued)

Figure 34 (continued)

COUNTY-SPECIFIC GENDER DATA BY PLACEMENT TYPE

(Shaded boxes indicate placement type with largest number of children. Numbers in bold indicate gender with largest number in each placement type.)

COUNTY	FFA		TOTAL IN FFA	FFH		TOTAL IN FFH	TOTAL
	Male	Female		Male	Female		
Sacramento	1,438	1,443	2,881	785	833	1,618	4,499
San Benito	11	13	24	2	3	5	29
San Bernardino	660	665	1,325	626	639	1,265	2,590
San Diego	244	223	467	1,501	1,473	2,974	3,441
San Francisco	326	387	713	228	217	445	1,158
San Joaquin	258	279	537	212	262	474	1,011
San Luis Obispo	78	69	147	97	128	225	372
San Mateo	73	81	154	112	105	217	371
Santa Barbara	43	41	84	105	97	202	286
Santa Clara	385	355	740	328	363	691	1,431
Santa Cruz	26	39	65	117	146	263	328
Shasta	63	51	114	264	247	511	625
Sierra	1	2	3	Not given	Not given	Not given	3
Siskiyou	65	80	145	9	9	18	163
Solano	107	111	218	80	62	142	360
Sonoma	59	59	118	99	102	201	319
Stanislaus	100	88	188	132	160	292	480
Sutter	44	42	86	61	57	118	204
Tehama	37	24	61	57	93	150	211
Trinity	3	4	7	8	13	21	28
Tulare	182	143	325	274	303	577	902
Tuolumne	9	9	18	39	49	88	106
Ventura	60	67	127	129	134	263	390
Yolo	103	110	213	55	58	113	326
Yuba	115	120	235	53	77	130	365
TOTAL	12,295	12,758	25,053	12,690	13,535	26,225	51,278

COUNTY PLACEMENT UTILIZATION BY GENDER (continued)

Based on the gender data presented in Figure 35 below, only slightly more female children were placed in a FFH (51%) than FFA (49%). Counties were almost equal in their placement of male children in a FFH or FFA, with 50.8 percent in a FFH and 49.2 percent in a FFA. Overall, female children outnumbered male children in either placement type.

Figure 35

COUNTY-SPECIFIC GENDER DATA

(Shaded boxes indicate larger gender number. Bold boxes indicate placement type with larger gender number.)

COUNTY	MALE		TOTAL MALE	FEMALE		TOTAL FEMALE	TOTAL
	FFA	FFH		FFA	FFH		
Alameda	617	577	1,194	616	651	1,267	2,461
Alpine	1	1	2	2	0	2	4
Amador	7	8	15	11	7	18	33
Butte	253	80	333	234	77	311	644
Calaveras	18	7	25	20	18	38	63
Colusa	3	2	5	6	4	10	15
Contra Costa	226	396	622	204	434	638	1,260
Del Norte	6	40	46	3	59	62	108
El Dorado	32	58	90	41	58	99	189
Fresno	360	543	903	298	614	912	1,815
Glenn	25	25	50	30	25	55	105
Humboldt	24	102	126	13	126	139	265
Imperial	2	52	54	3	59	62	116
Inyo	Not given	8	8	Not given	15	15	23
Kern	283	642	925	196	698	894	1,819
Kings	14	68	82	20	79	99	181
Lake	68	14	82	69	26	95	177
Lassen	50	5	55	43	2	45	100
Los Angeles	4,703	3,033	7,736	5,198	3,050	8,248	15,984
Madera	21	33	54	23	57	80	134
Marin	11	54	65	9	65	74	139
Mariposa	6	14	20	2	12	14	34
Mendocino	56	92	148	73	125	198	346
Merced	62	107	169	63	129	192	361
Modoc	21	0	21	22	1	23	44
Mono	1	1	2	1	4	5	7
Monterey	43	112	155	39	153	192	347
Napa	15	57	72	13	46	59	131
Nevada	17	14	31	20	25	45	76
Orange	644	385	1,029	699	471	1,170	2,199
Placer	89	72	161	125	88	213	374
Plumas	13	2	15	26	0	26	41
Riverside	114	713	827	131	727	858	1,685

COUNTY PLACEMENT UTILIZATION BY GENDER (continued)

Figure 35 (continued)

COUNTY-SPECIFIC GENDER DATA

COUNTY	MALE		TOTAL MALE	FEMALE		TOTAL FEMALE	TOTAL
	FFA	FFH		FFA	FFH		
Sacramento	1,438	785	2,223	1,443	833	2,276	4,499
San Benito	11	2	13	13	3	16	29
San Bernardino	660	626	1,286	665	639	1,304	2,590
San Diego	244	1,501	1,745	223	1,473	1,696	3,441
San Francisco	326	228	554	387	217	604	1,158
San Joaquin	258	212	470	279	262	541	1,011
San Luis Obispo	78	97	175	69	128	197	372
San Mateo	73	112	185	81	105	186	371
Santa Barbara	43	105	148	41	97	138	286
Santa Clara	385	328	713	355	363	718	1,431
Santa Cruz	26	117	143	39	146	185	328
Shasta	63	264	327	51	247	298	625
Sierra	1	Not given	1	2	Not given	2	3
Siskiyou	65	9	74	80	9	89	163
Solano	107	80	187	111	62	173	360
Sonoma	59	99	158	59	102	161	319
Stanislaus	100	132	232	88	160	248	480
Sutter	44	61	101	42	57	99	204
Tehama	37	57	94	24	93	117	211
Trinity	3	8	11	4	13	17	28
Tulare	182	274	456	143	303	446	902
Tuolumne	9	39	48	9	49	58	106
Ventura	60	129	189	67	134	201	390
Yolo	103	55	158	110	58	168	326
Yuba	115	53	168	120	77	197	365
TOTAL	12,295	12,690	24,985	12,758	13,535	26,293	51,278

COUNTY PLACEMENT UTILIZATION - Out of County/Out of State Placements

Probation-Supervised Children in Out-of-County and Out-of-State Placement

Figure 36 captures a portion of the CWS/CMS data available from June to December 1999¹ regarding Probation-supervised children who are placed out of their home county. These counties are those with the largest number of Probation-supervised placements for June and December 1999.

Figure 36

IN- AND OUT-OF-COUNTY PLACEMENT FOR NINE COUNTIES

COUNTY	June 1999		December 1999	
	IN COUNTY	OUT COUNTY	IN COUNTY	OUT COUNTY
Alameda	22%	70%	20%	76%
Fresno	60%	37%	57%	38%
Los Angeles	84%	16%	83%	16%
Riverside	50%	50%	51%	49%
San Bernardino	26%	46%	27%	47%
San Diego	61%	33%	60%	35%
San Joaquin	11%	38%	12%	38%
Santa Clara	33%	40%	35%	43%
Tulare	68%	27%	64%	34%

Figure 37 shows the percentage of probation-supervised children who are in an out-of-state foster care placement.

Figure 37

OUT-OF-STATE PLACEMENT PERCENTAGES FOR NINE COUNTIES

COUNTY	June 1999	December 1999
Alameda	8%	4%
Fresno	4%	5%
Los Angeles	1%	<1%
Riverside	<1%	<1%
San Bernardino	29%	26%
San Diego	6%	6%
San Joaquin	51%	50%
Santa Clara	28%	22%
Tulare	5%	2%

¹ See Appendix B for each county's in-county, out-of-county, and out-of-state probation-supervised placement data.

COUNTY-ISSUED FOSTER FAMILY HOME LICENSES

Individual county data on the number of county-issued FFH licenses and licensed capacity for June-December 1999 was taken from the LIC 181 report.

Forty-three counties contract with CDSS to license FFHs within their county. The following table shows the number of county-issued FFH licenses and licensed capacity² of seven counties with the largest licensed FFH capacities, except for Los Angeles County. Los Angeles County data was not included on the LIC 181 report form. (See Appendix C for a list of "contract counties" and county-specific data.)

Figure 38

NUMBER OF COUNTY-ISSUED FFH LICENSES AND LICENSED CAPACITY

County	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
ALAMEDA							
Licenses	364	363	366	362	360	357	353
Capacity ¹²	977	974	968	966	963	952	953
Avg. Capacity	2.50	2.68	2.64	2.64	2.68	2.67	2.70
FRESNO							
Licenses	494	494	491	491	488	488	501
Capacity ¹²	1,091	1,085	1,073	1,073	1,069	1,069	1,054
Avg. Capacity	2.21	2.20	2.18	2.18	2.19	2.19	2.10
KERN							
Licenses	429	426	417	428	423	422	421
Capacity ¹²	1,215	1,208	1,187	1,184	1,174	1,162	1,171
Avg. Capacity	2.83	2.84	2.85	2.77	2.78	2.75	2.78
ORANGE							
Licenses	620	627	624	619	616	618	613
Capacity ¹²	1,162	1,181	1,159	1,139	1,138	1,173	1,178
Avg. Capacity	1.87	1.88	1.86	1.84	1.85	1.90	1.92
SACRAMENTO							
Licenses	758	764	708	672	666	653	640
Capacities ¹²	1,948	1,889	1,829	1,745	1,705	1,684	1,651
Avg. Capacity	2.57	2.47	2.58	2.60	2.56	2.58	2.58
SAN BERNARDINO							
Licenses	637	731	730	720	718	736	738
Capacity ¹²	1,327	1,355	1,374	1,370	1,378	1,396	1,409
Avg. Capacity	2.08	1.85	1.88	1.90	1.92	1.90	1.91
SAN DIEGO							
Licenses	1,442	1,464	1,457	1,467	1,469	1,461	1,467
Capacity ¹²	3,282	3,329	3,339	3,365	3,378	3,370	3,427
Avg. Capacity	2.28	2.27	2.29	2.29	2.30	2.31	2.34
STATEWIDE							
Licenses	8,912	8,850	8,510	8,452	8,325	8,476	8,325
Capacity ¹²	21,275	21,176	20,093	19,930	19,608	19,917	19,277
Avg. Capacity	2.39	2.39	2.36	2.36	2.35	2.35	2.32

² Licensed capacity means the maximum number of persons for whom the license is authorized to provide care at any one time.

COUNTY-ISSUED FOSTER FAMILY HOME LICENSES (continued)

As shown in Figure 38 on the previous page, small fluctuations occurred over the time period presented. However, the counties remained somewhat stable in both the numbers of county-issued licenses and capacity.

As of December 1999, three of the counties had an average licensed capacity less than the statewide average licensed capacity (Fresno, Orange, and San Bernardino) and four counties were higher (Alameda, Kern, Sacramento and San Diego). San Diego experienced a small increase in licenses issued (+19) with an increase in licensed capacity (+145), rising from 2.28 children per license in June 1999 to bring it consistent with the statewide average capacity at 2.34 children per license in December 1999. Fresno County had an increase in the number of licenses and a decline in capacity, resulting in an average capacity less than the statewide average. Experiencing a decline in licenses and an increase in capacity put Orange County below the statewide average capacity. On a month-to-month basis, Alameda, Kern and Sacramento Counties had average capacities above the statewide average.

Figure 39 on the following page contains data regarding the actual capacity for the same seven counties presented in Figure 38, taken from the "Performance Indicators for Child Welfare Services in California: Caseload Updates from CWS/CMS Extract" for the second and third quarters of 1999. The percent of licensed capacity was computed based on analysis of the data presented in Figure 38 and Figure 39.

Figure 39

ACTUAL FFH CAPACITY AND PERCENT OF LICENSED CAPACITY
County-Issued FFH Licenses

COUNTY	JULY 1999	OCTOBER 1999
Alameda		
Actual Capacity	882	883
Percent of Licensed Capacity	91%	92%
Fresno		
Actual Capacity	776	836
Percent of Licensed Capacity	72%	78%
Kern		
Actual Capacity	837	893
Percent of Licensed Capacity	69%	76%
Orange		
Actual Capacity	706	703
Percent of Licensed Capacity	60%	62%
Sacramento		
Actual Capacity	1,110	1,136
Percent of Licensed Capacity	59%	67%
San Bernardino		
Actual Capacity	671	746
Percent of Licensed Capacity	50%	54%
San Diego		
Actual Capacity	2,195	2,250
Percent of Licensed Capacity	66%	67%
Statewide		
Actual Capacity	18,686	19,447
Percent of Licensed Capacity	88%	99%

STATE-ISSUED FOSTER FAMILY HOME LICENSES

Individual county data on the number of state-issued FFH licenses and licensed capacity for January-December 1999 was taken from the Licensing Information System database maintained by CDSS' Community Care Licensing Division.

The following table shows the number of state-issued FFH licenses and capacity of the five counties with the largest licensed FFH capacities for a representative month in each quarter of 1999. (For the number of state-issued FFH licenses for all counties in each month of 1999, please see Appendix D.)

Figure 40

NUMBER OF STATE-ISSUED FFH LICENSES AND CAPACITY

County	March	June	Sept	Dec
HUMBOLDT				
# of Facilities	109	110	112	118
Capacity ³	297	293	294	209
Avg. Capacity	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.6
LOS ANGELES				
# of Facilities	2,921	2,944	3,001	3,038
Capacity ¹³	7,714	7,752	7,810	7,883
Avg. Capacity	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6
MADERA				
# of Facilities	53	52	56	55
Capacity ¹³	160	154	165	163
Avg. Capacity	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0
NEVADA				
# of Facilities	30	30	27	28
Capacity ¹³	93	94	81	87
Avg. Capacity	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.1
RIVERSIDE				
# of Facilities	588	598	580	580
Capacity ¹³	1,540	1,579	1,545	1,536
Avg. Capacity	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.6
STATEWIDE				
# of Facilities	3,780	3,812	3,856	3,900
Capacity ¹³	10,019	10,080	10,107	10,191
Avg. Capacity	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6

³ Capacity means the maximum number of persons for whom a license authorizes care and supervision.