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DISPARITY DISCUSSIONS

✓ What? (what defines disproportionality and disparity?)
✓ Who? (who is disproportionately represented?)
✓ Where? (where is disproportionality observed?)
✓ When? (when do disparities arise?)
✓ How? (how is disparity being addressed?)
✓ Why? (why do disparities exist?)
WHY DO RACIAL DISPARITIES EXIST?

race/ethnicity

human resources
social resources
material resources

bias

DISPARITIES

risk
WHY DOES IT MATTER?

The relative contributions of bias versus differences in risk hold important implications for how and where we intervene to reduce/eliminate disparities...as well as what our expectations should be for identifiable improvements.

“Major factors affecting children’s entry into foster care included African American families’ higher rates of poverty, families’ difficulties in accessing support services so that they can provide a safe home for vulnerable children and prevent their removal, and racial bias and cultural misunderstanding among child welfare decision makers.” (GAO, 2007)
Historically, racial disparities have been measured using 
aggregated data, capturing crude (or unadjusted) differences 
between racial groups.

Recent studies, however, highlight the importance of 
adjusting for individual and community-level factors 
correlated with both race and maltreatment risk and suggest 
that both reasons for poverty, and the impact of poverty, 
may vary across groups.
THE TYPICAL AGGREGATE RACIAL DISPARITY ANALYSIS

California, 2011
California:
Ethnicity and Path Through the Child Welfare System, 2011

*(missing values & other race excluded from % calculations)*

- Native American: 0.4%
- Asian/PI: 11.3%
- Hispanic: 53.7%
- White: 28.7%
- Black: 5.9%

Population (9,295,040)
California: Ethnicity and Path Through the Child Welfare System, 2011

(missing values & other race excluded from % calculations)

- Population (9,295,040)
  - Native American: 0.4%
  - Asian/PI: 11.3%
  - Hispanic: 53.7%
  - White: 28.7%
  - Black: 5.9%

- Allegations (475,908)
  - Native American: 9.6%
  - Asian/PI: 53.3%
  - Hispanic: 27.1%
  - White: 14.9%
California:
Ethnicity and Path Through the Child Welfare System, 2011

(missing values & other race excluded from % calculations)

- Population (9,295,040)
  - Native American: 0.4%
  - Asian/PI: 11.3%
  - Hispanic: 53.7%
  - White: 28.7%
  - Black: 5.9%

- Allegations (475,908)
  - Native American: 0.8%
  - Asian/PI: 3.9%
  - Hispanic: 53.3%
  - White: 27.1%
  - Black: 14.9%

- Substantiations (84,756)
  - Native American: 1.0%
  - Asian/PI: 3.5%
  - Hispanic: 55.0%
  - White: 25.7%
  - Black: 14.8%
California:
Ethnicity and Path Through the Child Welfare System, 2011

*missing values & other race excluded from % calculations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian/PI</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegations</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantiations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entries</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data includes population, allegations, substantiations, and entries.
California: Ethnicity and Path Through the Child Welfare System, 2011

*missing values & other race excluded from % calculations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian/PI</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegations</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantiations</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entries</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Care</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Numbers are percentages.*
California:
Ethnicity and Path Through the Child Welfare System, 2011

*missing values & other race excluded from % calculations*

*includes children age 18*
Black Disproportionality
$\frac{18.6}{5.9} = 3.15$

White Disproportionality
$\frac{26.7}{28.7} = 0.93$

Hispanic Disproportionality
$\frac{50.2}{53.7} = 0.94$

Black vs. White Disparity Index
$\frac{3.15}{0.93} = 3.39$

Black vs. Hispanic Disparity Index
$\frac{3.15}{0.94} = 3.36$
Aggregated data such as this do not tell us if there are individual differences in the likelihood of referral, substantiation, or entry to foster care among children of different races/ethnicities who have the same risk factors/risk profile.

Why have we relied on aggregated data in our discussions of racial disparities?

- **GOOD REASON**: aggregate data summarize group over/under-representation (very real)
- **BAD REASON**: we have not had better data to work with
  - Administrative CPS data do not allow for individual-level risk differences to be calculated because we do not have individual-level information for children in the population who DID not have contact with CPS
  - Also missing in the CPS data is information concerning well-established correlates of child maltreatment
A “SNAPSHOT” OF CPS-INVOLVED CHILDREN

before

CPS Data

after

Children not Reported for Maltreatment
EXPANDING CPS DATA WITH POPULATION-BASED DATA LINKAGES

Children not Reported for Maltreatment

before

birth data

CPS Data

child protective service records

derth data

after

population-based information
### BIRTH RECORD VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>female, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Weight</td>
<td>2500g+, &lt;2500g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenatal Care</td>
<td>1st trimester, 2nd trimester, 3rd trimester, no care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Abnormality</td>
<td>present, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Birth Place</td>
<td>US born, non-US born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>native american, black, Hispanic, white, asian/pacific islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Age</td>
<td>&lt;=19, 20-24, 25-29, 30+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Education</td>
<td>&lt;high school, high school, some college, college+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy Termination Hx</td>
<td>prior termination, none reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Father</td>
<td>missing, named father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Children in the Family</td>
<td>one, two, three+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Payment Method</td>
<td>public/med-cal, other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODS / APPROACH

- Prospective analysis of full 2002 California birth cohort (N=531,035) from birth through the age of five
  - Allows us to examine differences in risk of CPS contact by race/ethnicity, maternal nativity, and socioeconomic and health indicators
  - Allows us to examine risk factors associated with CPS contact

- Modeled crude (unadjusted) rates of system contact by race/ethnicity
- Modeled adjusted rates of system contact to examine the independent effect of race/ethnicity when looking at children who have the same “profile” in terms of sex, birth-weight, health, maternal age, paternity, birth order, maternal education, prenatal care
14% of children in cohort were reported to CPS by age 5
- lower bound estimate...could not match 16% of CPS records
- children may have moved out of state and had contact

Significant variations in rates of CPS referrals by sociodemographic characteristics
Percentage of Children Reported for Maltreatment by Age 5: California's 2002 Birth Cohort, *by paternity & birth payment*

- Missing paternity: 34%
- Paternity: 12%
- Medi-cal coverage: 21%
- Private insurance: 9%
Percentage of Children Reported for Maltreatment by Age 5: California's 2002 Birth Cohort, *by prenatal care*

- None: 48.9%
- Third trimester: 25.4%
- Second trimester: 22.3%
- First trimester: 12.3%
Percentage of Children Reported for Maltreatment by Age 5: California's 2002 Birth Cohort, *by maternal age at birth*

- <20 yrs: 25.7%
- 20-24 yrs: 19.0%
- 25-29 yrs: 12.6%
- 30+ yrs: 9.3%
THINKING ABOUT THESE RISK FACTORS...BEFORE GETTING TO RACE
we classified as “high risk” any child with three or more of the following (theoretically modifiable) risk factors at birth:

- late prenatal care (after the first trimester)
- missing paternity
- <=high school degree
- 3+ children in the family
- maternal age <=24 years
- Medi-Cal birth for a US-born mother
ADMINISTERED AT BIRTH?

Full Birth Cohort:

15%

Children Reported to CPS:

50%
RECOGNIZING THE RISK ASSOCIATED WITH THE PRESENCE OF MULTIPLE RISK FACTORS...

High Risk on Every Modifiable Risk Factor: 89% probability of CPS report
Low Risk on Every Modifiable Risk Factor: 3% probability of CPS report

1. Included risk factors are those considered “modifiable”, at least in theory.
2. Risk factors are unweighted and ordered based upon cohort rates (from most to least common).
3. Variables not included are set at the group mean.
RETURNING TO RACE...
Percentage of Children Reported for Maltreatment by Age 5: California's 2002 Birth Cohort, by race/ethnicity

- Native American: 35%
- Black: 30%
- Hispanic: 14%
- White: 13%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 5%
Notable variations were observed in the distribution of cohort characteristics by racial/ethnic group, as well as maternal nativity

- e.g. black vs. white: <HS degree (16% vs. 7%)

Pronounced racial/ethnic heterogeneity in parenting risk burdens in the overall cohort (population), yet a much more consistent picture emerged among the publicly insured

- black vs. white: <HS degree (25% vs. 25%)
WHY FOCUS ON CHILDREN COVERED BY MEDI-CAL?

Percent of Birth Cohort Covered by Public Insurance at Birth

by Race/Ethnicity and CPS Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Pop.</th>
<th>Referral</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Placed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino, U.S.</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino, Foreign-born</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of Birth Cohort with CPS Contact before age 5
by race/ethnicity, insurance status at birth, and level of contact

black
- All referral: 41.0%
- Public referral: 30.0%
- Substitution: 11.8%
- Placed: 6.2%
- All: 30.0%

white
- All referral: 38.3%
- Public referral: 18.4%
- Substitution: 5.4%
- Placed: 2.4%
- All: 13.4%

Latino
- US-born mother
  - All referral: 29.7%
  - Public referral: 13.0%
  - Substitution: 8.4%
  - Placed: 3.8%
  - All: 20.8%

- Foreign-born mother
  - All referral: 10.7%
  - Public referral: 3.2%
  - Substitution: 3.6%
  - Placed: 0.9%
  - All: 3.2%
Examine aggregate (crude) racial disparities in the overall birth cohort

Examine racial disparities among children covered by public health insurance at birth
  - large and fairly racially invariant share of children covered by public insurance across CPS contact points
  - implications of this coverage for surveillance and contact with mandated reporters

Examine racial disparities among children covered by public health insurance at birth, with adjustments for other risk factors earlier shown to be predictive of CPS involvement
Risk of Being Reported for Maltreatment by Age 5 (vs White)

- **RR**
- **95% Confidence Interval**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Crude RR</th>
<th>Adjusted RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.25***</td>
<td>0.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino, US-born mother</td>
<td>1.55***</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino, foreign-born mother</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plotted on logarithmic scale

Risk categories:
- *p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001
Risk of Substantiated Maltreatment by Age 5 (vs White)

- **RR**
- 95% Confidence Interval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino, US-born mother</th>
<th>Latino, foreign-born mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>crude <strong>2.18</strong>*</td>
<td>crude <strong>1.55</strong>*</td>
<td>crude <strong>0.58</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medi-cal 0.97***</td>
<td>medi-cal 0.73***</td>
<td>medi-cal 0.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjusted 0.79***</td>
<td>adjusted 0.66***</td>
<td>adjusted 0.19***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk plotted on logarithmic scale

*<.05  **<.01  ***<.001
Risk of Foster Care Placement by Age 5 (vs White)

- Black
  - Crude: 2.55***
  - Medi-cal: 1.07
  - Adjusted: 0.84***

- Latino, US-born mother
  - Crude: 1.57***
  - Medi-cal: 0.70***
  - Adjusted: 0.65***

- Latino, foreign-born mother
  - Crude: 0.35***
  - Medi-cal: 0.11***
  - Adjusted: 0.10***

* <.05  ** <.01  *** <.001

Risk plotted on logarithmic scale.
Risk of Report, Substantiation, and Foster Care Placement by Age 5 (vs White)

- RR
- 95% Confidence Interval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Report RR</th>
<th>Subst. RR</th>
<th>Placement RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.95***</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
<td>0.84***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino, US-born mother</td>
<td>0.72***</td>
<td>0.66***</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino, foreign-born mother</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<.05  **<.01  ***<.001

Plotted on logarithmic scale.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Cumulative rates of child welfare contact by age 5 vary dramatically across racial/ethnic groups, as does the prevalence of other risk factors.

- Summary statistics indicating large black/white racial disparities mask significant covariate effects.

- The Latino population of children in California consists of at least two distinct subsets, differentially impacted by poverty and with different risks of child welfare contact.
This (and other) recent studies suggest that once we are able to adjust for socioeconomic differences and the cumulative impact of other risk factors, racial disparities continue to emerge, but often not in the manner once thought!

- low SES white children MORE likely than low SES black children to be referred, substantiated, and enter foster care
- differential sorting by poverty (as suggested by Drake)?

Aggregate racial disparities are very real and must be addressed. These disparities almost certainly arise from some combination of risk factors, bias, and access issues.
The CPS system has focused heavily on reducing individual-level bias/increasing cultural understanding – both of which are very important.

BUT the population-based data used in this study suggest that the risk of referral, substantiation, and entry to foster care for individual children varies much more so based on the presence of multiple risk factors at birth and the socioeconomic conditions in which they are born rather than race/ethnicity.

To really “move the needle” to reduce racial/ethnic disparities, we need to not only continue to address individual-level bias, but we must also engage other systems to address entrenched differences in parenting burdens that place certain groups of children at disproportionate risk of CPS involvement.
LIMITATIONS

- These data do not
  - Examine racial disparities for CPS involvement among older children
  - Explore racial disparities in services and outcomes once children are in the system
  - Examine possible variations by county in these dynamics
  - Indicate that there is no racial bias
  - Indicate that there is racial bias
  - Speak to the iceberg question...
THE ICEBERG

Maltreated children not known to child protective services

Maltreated children *not known* to child protective services

Maltreated children known to child protective services
POVERTY DATA

- 2010 estimates of the population of children (ages 0-17) living in poverty by race/ethnicity
- Using the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) 2006-2010 five-year Estimates, poverty multipliers were calculated by race/ethnicity for California and each of its 58 counties
- These multipliers were then applied to California population data from the 2010 U.S. Census
  http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/population.aspx
WHY ARE PEOPLE POOR? *

2006-2010 Estimates of CA Children in Poverty

- Black 29%
- White 9%
- Hispanic 26%
- Asian/PI 12%
- Native American 27%

* http://www.pisab.org/
California:
General Population Disparity Index

Entry Disparity (relative to overall population)

Black Disproportionality
\[
\frac{18.6\%}{5.9\%} = 3.15
\]

White Disproportionality
\[
\frac{26.7\%}{28.7\%} = 0.93
\]

Hispanic Disproportionality
\[
\frac{50.2\%}{53.7\%} = 0.94
\]

Black vs. White Disparity Index
\[
\frac{3.15}{0.93} = 3.39
\]

Black vs. Hispanic Disparity Index
\[
\frac{3.15}{0.94} = 3.36
\]
**California: Population in Poverty Disparity Index**

*Entry Disparity (relative to overall population)*

- **Black Disproportionality**
  \[
  \frac{18.6\%}{8.7\%} = 2.15
  \]

- **White Disproportionality**
  \[
  \frac{26.7\%}{12.4\%} = 2.16
  \]

- **Hispanic Disproportionality**
  \[
  \frac{50.2\%}{71.7\%} = 0.70
  \]

- **Black vs. White Disparity Index**
  \[
  \frac{2.15}{2.16} = 1.00
  \]

- **Black vs. Hispanic Disparity Index**
  \[
  \frac{2.15}{0.70} = 3.06
  \]
QUESTIONS?
COMMENTS?

bneedell@berkeley.edu
ehornste@usc.edu
(IF TIME ALLOWS)
WHAT IS INSTITUTIONAL/STRUCTURAL RACISM?

Stolen shamelessly from:

Annie E. Casey Foundation---RACE MATTERS TOOLKIT
http://www.aecf.org/KnowledgeCenter/PublicationsSeries/RaceMatters.aspx
What Single Policy from Decades Ago Contributed to These Present-Day Outcomes?

• Homeownership disparities
• Neighborhood disparities
• Surveillance & assessment disparities
• Health disparities
• Wealth disparities
What Single Policy from Decades Ago Contributed to These Present-Day Outcomes (continued)

In short, what policy strongly contributed to opportunity-rich or opportunity-poor settings/circumstances for raising kids & the judgments accompanying each?
The GI Bill: A Story of Embedded Racial Inequity
# Philip’s Story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Born Right After WWII</th>
<th>Father’s Status</th>
<th>GI Bill: FHA &amp; VA loans</th>
<th>Consequences for Child’s Education</th>
<th>Consequences for Child’s Well-being in Adulthood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income, White</td>
<td>White veteran, high school diploma, from Philadelphia</td>
<td>Able to use low-interest mortgage provisions to move family from public housing to segregated suburban home ownership</td>
<td>Family borrowed from home equity to support child’s college education (first in family to go to college)</td>
<td>Philip gets professional job, buys own house, inherits appreciated house when father dies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thomas’s Story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Born Right After WWII</th>
<th>Father’s Status</th>
<th>GI Bill: FHA &amp; VA loans</th>
<th>Consequences for Child’s Education</th>
<th>Consequences for Child’s Well-being in Adulthood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income, Black veteran, high school diploma, from Philadelphia</td>
<td>Black veteran, high school diploma, from Philadelphia</td>
<td>Could not access home loan b/c of racially-restrictive underwriting criteria; family remained in rental housing in the city</td>
<td>Family could not afford to send child to college; high school diploma is from under-resourced segregated school</td>
<td>Thomas works in minimum wage jobs, continues to live in family home, considers joining the Army, has to borrow $ when father dies to give him decent funeral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Juan’s Story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Born Right After WWII</th>
<th>Father’s Status</th>
<th>GI Bill: FHA &amp; VA loans</th>
<th>Consequences for Child’s Education</th>
<th>Consequences for Child’s Well-being in Adulthood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income, Latino veteran, high school diploma, from Texas</td>
<td>Could not access home loan b/c of racially-restrictive underwriting criteria; family remained in rural rental housing</td>
<td>Family could not afford to send child to college; high school diploma is from under-resourced language segregated and racially segregated school</td>
<td>Juan works in minimum wage jobs, continues to live in family home, marries newcomer Latina, sends part of family’s limited income to her extended family in Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fast Forward to Today . . .

Philip’s Children:
- Philip gives children his father’s appreciated house
- They live in thriving communities
- Their college education’s paid by home equity
- Philip establishes trust fund for grandchildren

Thomas’ and Juan’s Children:
- They have no houses to inherit
- They live in disinvested communities
- At work, they complete college on work study and student loans, with subsequent starting debts to pay back
- Thomas and Juan have few personal assets to leave grandchildren
Fast Forward to Today . . .

Neighborhood-Based Opportunities include good schools, accessible jobs, affordable quality services, fair financial & retail outlets, safe recreational space, etc.

How Do “Opportunity-Rich” and “Opportunity-Poor” Neighborhoods Affect the Kids/Families You Serve Today?
POSSIBLE PATHWAY FROM THE GI BILL TO CURRENT CHILD WELFARE/JJ/EDUCATION DISPARITIES

GI Bill → Racial Segregation, City & Suburbs → Desegregation Produces Class Separation w/in Communities of Color → Out-migration of Jobs from Inner City, Resource Disinvestment from Schools, Infrastructure


Drugs & Drug Law Disparities

Disparities in Family Supports & Individual Treatment, Which Lengthen Stay in Deep End Systems
Era of Equal Opportunity Policies (50s, 60s, and 70s)

Opportunity Victories . . .
Mendez vs. Westminster  
Brown vs. Board of Education

But Inequitable Outcomes
Schools today remain racially segregated and still unequal in terms of access to resources.

Fair Housing Act of 1968
Discrimination persists in zoning, real estate practices, and lending.

Affirmative Action
Largest beneficiaries have been White women.

Voting Rights Act of 1965
More elected officials of color but w/o adequate resources in urban areas to govern effectively; redistricting to erode political power; ballot box inequities.
Era of Retrenchment (80s, 90s, 00s)

**Challenge to Opportunity Victories**

- English Only Laws as state referenda
- “Racial Privacy” Act as state referenda
- Anti-affirmative action legal challenges

**Inequitable Outcomes**

- Deprives civil rights (e.g. vote, legal proceedings, and education) for those with limited English proficiency
- If it had passed, no data for accountability to promote equity in education, public contracting, or employment
- Erode the small employment and education gains that have been made and increase the likelihood of return to previous practices
How do Child Welfare Policies Map in Terms of Victories & Retrenchment for Racial Equity?

Adoption & Safe Families Act 1997—quicker permanency but quicker termination of parental rights (impact on incarcerated mothers, who are disproportionately women of color)

Family Preservation & Support 1994/Promoting Safe & Stable Families 1997—Do disparities exist in terms of who gets services?


Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008—Kinship guardianship? Other provisions?
Bottom Line

Being classified as Black, Asian, Native American or Latino has never carried, and still doesn’t carry, the same advantages as being classified as White.