

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

HELPING CHILDREN OF INCARCERATED PARENTS  
AND CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE

A FUTURE OF CHILDREN EVENT

Washington, D.C.  
Wednesday, May 9, 2018

**Welcome and Introduction:**

RON HASKINS  
Cabot Chair in Economic Studies, Senior Fellow and Co-Director,  
Center on Children and Families, The Brookings Institution

**Keynote Speech:**

ROBERT J. SAMPSON  
Henry Ford II Professor of the Social Sciences  
Harvard University

**Moderator:**

JOHN H. LAUB  
Distinguished University Professor. Department of Criminology  
and Criminal Justice, University of Maryland, College Park

**Panelists:**

YOUNGMIN YI  
Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology and Policy Analysis and Management  
Cornell University

KRISTIN TURNEY  
Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology  
University of California, Irvine

JOOYEUN CHANG  
Director of Public Policy, Casey Family Programs

BRECHT DONOGHUE  
Deputy Associate Administrator, Innovation and Research Division  
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. HASKINS: Welcome to Brookings. My name is Ron Haskins. Along with Richard Reeves I run a center here called the Center on Children and Families. And one of our favorite and most long-lasting activities is to publish The Future of Children along with our colleagues at Princeton, which we've been for I think about a decade now. And I think we've published 20 volumes, or close to it, and they all had to do with children, every volume focuses on a certain issue. And this volume, of course, actually focuses somewhat on two issues, which is foster care and juvenile justice. So we're very pleased to be involved in this activity and especially in this volume, because it's a little different than we've done in the past.

I want to just very quickly summarize how this event is going to proceed. So the first thing is after I get through, John Laub, who was the editor of the volume and spent untold hours editing the volume -- there's nothing like editing a volume of The Future of Children. I'm sure he had all great authors, no doubt, but occasionally there are authors that aren't great and that gives an extra addition to the task. So John did that and he's going to describe the volume to you in a very abbreviated version, but hopefully get you interested. And copies are available outside.

And then I'm going to talk briefly about our policy brief. We always have a policy brief; we identify one issue in the volume that we think has traction in Washington or in the state capitals and possibly could have some influence on policy. And I'll describe that very briefly. And after that we will have a panel of people who were involved in the volume and people who are not involved in the volume but who know about policy. And they are going to focus only on the policy brief. Once the description of the volume is done the rest of the event focuses just on the policy brief.

In both of these cases, with Robert Sampson from Harvard, who will give a background talk, which I can hardly wait to hear. He has fantastic slides about neighborhoods and families. A big background, very important for this issue, and we've

learned a lot in recent years about this issue. We used to talk about neighborhoods all the time. As you can tell by looking at me, I've been around a while and I was always impressed by -- we didn't know very much and we've learned so much in the last decade or so. And Robert has been right at the forefront of that movement. So that will be very interesting.

And then we will conclude with an opportunity for you to ask questions of the panelists. And then I'm going to bound up here, right at 3:00 o'clock, and say bye-bye and the event will be over.

So we have also -- I didn't mention this to people -- but I think we have 300 people on the web. So welcome to them. We have no way for them to ask questions. So all the questions are for this audience.

John?

MR. LAUB: Thank you, Ron. I just want to give an overview of The Future of Children volume called "Reducing Justice System Inequality". And basically, to start with, the topic of inequality in the United States has become virtually impossible to ignore and the justice system is an important part of that discussion, witness the recent National Research Council report on the causal consequence of high rates of incarceration in the U.S., especially for minority offenders. I've also heard heated debates about stop-question-and-frisk in New York City, as well as other places around the country. And, more broadly, the legal scholar, Michelle Alexander, has referred to mass incarceration and other justice system policies as the new Jim Crow in America.

When considering the known facts, though, about crime, offenders, and victims and the justice system response, important complexities arise both that reflect and contribute to inequality in the wider society. The fundamental fact is that criminal offending and victimization for common law crimes are not randomly distributed across persons and places. Inequities are present in the patterns of serious criminal offending, in serious criminal victimization, even before any contact with the criminal justice system. We could think of these known facts as input to the justice system. At the same time, the justice

system's response often exacerbates inequality amongst young people in America. We could think of these responses as output from the justice system that reinforces and deepened inequalities. For example, researchers have increasingly studied the collateral consequences of justice system involvement. So the analytics distinction between inputs and outputs suggests while crime and justice involvement are typically considered to be outcomes, crime and justice involvement can also drive inequality.

So I have the table of contents of the volume on this slide and just want to talk a little bit about what I see as the distinctive features of this particular volume. First off, I wanted to cover the entire justice system, starting with stop-question-and-frisk by the police, and continuing through the various states of the justice system into courts and corrections. Secondly, it devotes special attention to schools, in particular school suspensions and the role of the police, known as school resource officers, in schools. Third, it covers three domains that contribute to the reproduction of inequality but have received little attention from researchers and policy makers. These three domains are foster care, probation, and jails. And, finally, most important, it assesses policies, practices, and programs that can reduce justice system inequality, what strategies have worked, what strategies should be tried, what strategies should be avoided.

Given the bipartisan support for criminal justice reform, especially at the state level, now seems particularly good time to take stock of what can be done to reduce justice system inequality and each article in this volume assesses such policies, programs, and practices in detail. Thus, this provides a much needed evidence based voice in discussions of criminal justice reform.

So the first two articles in the volume focus on schools and foster care, both of which can be viewed as feeders to the justice system. The notion of a school to prison pipeline has received a fair amount of attention in public discourse, however, less attention has been paid to the possible foster care to prison pipeline. Each article in turn interrogates that issue.

The next article looks at one of the more popular reform strategies for reducing justice system inequality, diversion away from the justice system. Along with decriminalization and deinstitutionalization, diversion was a popular juvenile justice policy during the 1970s, and I think it's worthy of consideration today as a possible strategy to reduce the criminal justice footprint.

The next four articles, the remaining four articles, deal with various aspects of the justice system, policing, jails -- incidentally one of the least explored aspects of the justice system -- mass probably and parental incarceration and child well-being.

So each article in the issue highlights the justice system disparities with respect to race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Moreover, the authors make abundantly clear that the justice system policies affect not just individuals but also families, schools, and communities at large. The articles discuss strategies that may well reduce justice system inequality. But I'd like to make several points that put these recommendations into a broader context.

First, it's not easy to change policies to reduce justice system inequality, especially with regard to racial disparities. For example, a recent report by The Sentencing Project shows that although the number of youths sent to juvenile facilities after adjudication dropped by 47 percent between 2003 and 2013, racial disparities didn't improve. In fact, the gap between black and white youth in secure confinement increased by 15 percent.

Second, in any of the topics covered in the issue, we cannot ignore the enormous various in the treatment of youth and the consequences they experience. Such heterogeneity is evident in school experiences, foster care placements, interactions with the police, jail stays, and probation experiences at the individual, city, county, and state levels.

Third, data on crime and justice responses are notoriously weak. We need stronger data in a broader research infrastructure to successfully translate research into effective and fair justice system policies.

Fourth, there are important gaps in our data. For example, we know very

little about LGBTQ youth in the justice system. Similarly, there are important gaps in our research. We need more research on topics such as alternatives to out of school suspensions, the effectiveness of consent decrees in police departments, and establishing the best programs for the jail population, to name a few. The fact is, we often lack the causal evidence regarding the effects of policies, programs, and practices in the justice system.

And, fifth, we need to move beyond assessing what works to assess why something works and for whom. To do so we need to test the underlying mechanisms of our policy interventions. In the meanwhile, we can do better. We do know that the justice system exasperates inequality and we must change the policies and practices that do so. In an interesting article, a Harvard economist, Sendhil Mullainathan, advocates a different approach to reducing inequality using the metaphor of headwinds and tailwinds. Perhaps a more fruitful strategy for the justice system might be to remove headwinds, which make progress difficult, and at the same time provide tailwinds, which help us move forward.

The authors in this issue call for removing headwinds by such means as reducing out of school suspension, ending cash bail, and lessening the conditions of probation. They also call for creating tailwinds. For example, extending foster care beyond the age of 18, providing community based alternatives to jail, and creating place based and school based services for the children of incarcerated parents.

So in closing, I'm very excited about The Future of Children volume and I thank all of the authors, they all wrote excellent papers. And I also thank Sara McLanahan for allowing me the opportunity to serve as editor. A huge thanks to John Wallace, the Managing Editor of the journal, and thanks, too, to the staff at Princeton and Brookings for their help with this volume and for this event.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. HASKINS: In ten years that's the most succinct overview of a volume we've ever had. That means I can talk for a half an hour. (Laughter)

So here's what I want to do. I want to talk first of all about the number of kinds who are involved in these systems. Those are extremely impressive numbers about how many kids do we have many kids do we have involved in these two systems. It's millions of kids. So if something is not good, if it has negative effects on kids, that means that a lot of kids are going to be affected. And especially it will mean that it has diverse impacts on different types of children, especially as John just mentioned, on black kids. Secondly, we talk about the link between being in the system and negative outcomes. That's the whole point here, that there are negative outcomes, and there's a fair amount of data on that. And then we want to talk a little bit about the ideas that we have for fixing some of those problems, or at least addressing them. John has hinted a little bit at this, and I'll be even more explicit, that most of the things that we propose to do, we would not expect huge success. We don't have easy solutions that we say we can really solve these problems, even though I think we ought to keep trying and we got some ideas at least.

So here are the number of kids with an incarcerated parent, 2.6 million kids with incarcerated mom or dad at any given time. And a lesson for sophomores and Statistics is just looking at one time gives you a very different picture than if you look at it over time. And so as you can see here, there are actually more like 5-8 million kids who are involved during the course of their childhood in having a parent who is incarcerated. So, again, if there are negative impacts on child development or other aspects of a child's life, then it's a lot of kids that are being impacted.

There also are very substantial effects of differences in white kids and black kids. Around about four percent of white kids have an incarcerated parent, compared to twenty five percent of black kids. And that different is intensified if you look at black kids who are born to a high school dropout. There it goes all the way up to fifty percent. So that's really a huge impact and a real -- if you can show that these are negative impacts, we're talking about a very large number of kids. And even more important in this case, a large percentage of the population. So that's of great concern.

There also are a huge number of kids involved in the foster care system. Now, this system is really complex. The article in the chapter is super on this point. It has very good text, but even better, figures and tables that explain what happens to kids that go into the foster care system. It's a very complex system.

So, first of all, there are 6.2 million kids -- these are data for 2013 -- and there were 6.2 million kids who were referred. We have laws about this stuff. People like doctors and teachers and so forth, they must refer if they suspect that there's been abuse or neglect, any kind of mistreatment of a child. So there's 6.2 million of those. They report it to CPS, which is the local agency that runs this whole system, and there are 3.7 million screened for further reviews. So they're screened into the system. The rest are eliminated on the grounds that there's no credibility, and in most of those cases there probably really isn't credibility or could be a mistake here and there. So, now we're down to 2.4 million victims that we need to figure what really is going on. And so CPS has the assignment of looking into those cases, interviewing whoever is necessary, going to the school, going to the parents, doing whatever is necessary, to try to establish facts about the case and determine whether there are sufficient facts that they need to do something about it. And it turns out after all that is done, the kids go in all which direction. Again, they're beautiful illustrations in the article about where they go and the different systems that they go to. Some remain at home, some go into children's homes of various sorts, some go into kinship care. There are various arrangements for the kids. About 230,000 a year wind up in foster care. I'm going to show you one chart about that in just a second that I think you'll find interesting. And it's useful to say to you that there are a whole raft of reasons that kids get referred and get taken into the system, it's not just one thing. We generally use the term, they're either abused or neglected, way more neglected than abused, and there are all kinds of different types of abuse. So there are a range things that happen to these kids that get them accepted into the system.

I thought it might be interesting to show you this chart, which goes through



2015, over a long period of time, since 1982. And as you can see, during the 1980s the number went up very substantially of kids in the foster care system. These are expensive cases, so we spend a lot more money as the years went by on the kids in the foster care system. Probably the main factor -- there are lots of arguments about this, so I'm not saying this is the whole thing -- but the main factor here is drug addiction. And so that reached a peak, started to decline a little bit, and sure enough, the caseload started to come down. It came down quite substantially. I can rarely think of a case like this where some big public system like this has such a change. And it's probably due to there wasn't emphasis through this period that foster care is not necessarily the best thing for kids, so maybe we ought to keep kids out. I'm going to come back to that later. So that may have played a role, but I think it's primarily the change in things that went on outside the system that influenced this very important measure of what the system had to face.

You can see that there are impacts on cases entering the system as well. This is again a very complicated relationship between people entering the system, the total in the system, and people exiting the system. So you have to consider all those. You can only determine the total number in the system by looking at exits and entries into the system. And the worst thing is, if you're trying to really think through this and figure out what we can learn from it, the reason that people enter the system and how they can exit the system and what they go to when they exit the system, are often different. And so this is a very important consideration for people who are running these systems in the states.

So incarceration, as you might expect, is linked to a number of negative outcomes. There are articles in the paper. I think they will probably be at least mentioned, if not discussed in more detail during the panel discussion. And some of these are very interesting, very solid studies. So you can see, aggression, grade retention, depression, homelessness, and, again, as we'll see in all these cases, racial differences. Other differences as well, family income differences, but racial differences in kinds who wind up having a parent who is incarcerated.

And we have pretty much the same sort of thing for -- let me go back here -- these are negative outcomes for children in foster care. A somewhat wider list, but I think they overlap very substantially. I would bet you that if we looked at the entire literature, the specific problems that having a parent incarcerated and being in the foster care system, that there's just a ton of overlap in the various negative outcomes. So I think the thing to emphasize here is the breadth of the outcomes that occur.

And then there is direct evidence of a link between kids who go into foster care and their likelihood that they will eventually be in the justice system. So here are some statistics that are taken from an article primarily in the journal, and maybe that will be discussed here; I'm not sure. But seven percent of prisoners report ever having been in foster care as roughly around half or maybe three quarters of a percent of kids in America are in the foster care system at some point. In any case, I think every estimate is under one percent. So already at seven percent we're way above -- you know, it's a much higher probability. And then if you look at people in the justice system 18-21, it's 15 percent, which is much higher. And then if you look at kids who age out of foster care, and those are the kids who are in the most trouble in many cases, about half of them are incarcerated by their mid-20s. So these rates of incarceration are very high for people who are in the foster care system. So there is this very direct link between foster care and the justice system.

We want to avoid these effects as much as we can. Again, this will be taken up in more detail on the panels. It's obvious that the number one idea I think is that we need to keep people out of the system to the extent that we can. I think this is the real most important development in incarceration now in recent years, is that more and more people, including people who heretofore were hell bent to throw as many people in prison as they could, and they're beginning to understand there are lots of negative consequences to that, not just cost, but many others as well. So keep them out of the system if you can, and a lot these effects that we're worried about here will be minimized. And, similarly, if you have to put people in the system, get them out as quickly as you can, don't leave them in for long

sentences. There's a whole set of research on long sentences. John knows way more about this than I do, but in many cases long sentences do not necessarily serve a great purpose. Pretrial bail and other ways of keeping people out of prison, as I said a few minutes ago, and there's beginning to be literature on this as well, is a very helpful way to go. If we could keep more people out of the system by getting them to promise to other things, to commit to various approaches to solving their issue. And all of these would allow them to remain in their community, remain in their jobs, maintain their family ties, all of these are the best ways to insulate people against the problems that occur with committing more crimes.

And then John has a number of ideas about how to improve visitation for parents who are incarcerated. The kids need to see them, they need to see them under pleasant circumstances. It doesn't necessarily help a kid to walk through a jail -- I will never forget the first time I went into a jail in Mississippi, I thought, oh my god, we keep people in this situation. That is not certainly good for a kid, so we need a huge improvement in visitation.

In foster care, there are many things that we could do. Again, reduce placements, increase the stability of placements, increase quality of treatments. Here's a sad fact, most of our treatments and the problems that lead to foster care are not successful. In fact, there's a clearinghouse in California that keeps track of these things, and they show that about 7 percent of well over 300 treatments have any evidence that they produce significant impacts. So our treatments are not that great. That's something that we really need to develop, because only then will we be able to really solve the family problems. Otherwise, we're going to be left with these kids -- maybe foster care is not the best, but if you can't send them back to their family you still have to deal with the problem.

So we have a lot of big problems here. We have the beginning of some solutions, we have some things that we think have pretty good evidence on, but we can include this, there are lots of kids in the system, it's not necessarily declining very much.

There's no question that both system exacerbate the differences between ethnic groups and racial groups in the nation, there's no question that we have modestly effective programs, so we're not really beginning to solve these problems at a very high level, that we need much more testing of possible solutions, and that we need changes to policy, especially in keeping adults and kids out of these settings.

So, with that, back to John.

MR. LAUB: Thanks, Ron. It's pleasure to introduce my long-time friend and colleague, Robert J. Sampson. Professor Sampson is the Henry Ford II Professor of the Social Sciences, Harvard University, founding Director of the Boston Area Research Initiative, and Affiliated Research Professor at the American Bar Foundation in Chicago. Professor Sampson was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 2008, is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and the American Academy of Political and Social Science. He served as President of the American Society of Criminology in 2011-2012, and in 2011 he was the Co-Recipient of the Stockholm Prize in Criminology.

Professor Sampson has played a leadership role in the social sciences throughout his directorship of three major programs of research. In the 1990s he was the Scientific Director of the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods, which collected original longitudinal data spanning individuals and neighborhoods, and that has produced two decades of research from scholars around the world.

In 2011 he was appointed as the Director of the Social Sciences at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard University. In that position he launched the Boston Area Research Initiative and became its founding Director. This Initiative has grown to encompass multiple universities and now supported by the National Science Foundation.

Professor Sampson's research and teaching cover a wide variety of areas, including crime, disorder, the life course, neighborhood effects, civic engagement, inequality,

ecometrics, and the social structure of the city. He is the author of three award winning books and numerous peer reviewed journal articles. His most recent book, "Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect", which won the best book award from the American Sociological Association, the American Society of Criminology, and the North American Regional Science Association.

Please join me in welcoming Professor Robert Sampson. (Applause)

MR. SAMPSON: Good afternoon. Thank you, Ron and John, for hosting this event. It's a terrific event that Brookings puts on and I'm honored to be here as a speaker. Also because The Future of Children series, in my opinion, is a real wonderful institution really. It's been going on for a while and I read it those of you who haven't yet read this specific volume, because it just came out. But it's available as you come in and go out; you should really pick it up and take a look at it. And those of you on the web, make sure you download it.

So what I thought I would do today is to place the report in a larger context. The panelists are going to go over some of the more detailed aspects of it. It's already been discussed a bit. And I think the role of the keynote is to kind of paint the larger picture, in particular, because I agree with really everything that is said in the report. I think it does a masterful job of going through the different components of the system and noting how they are really interrelated, and puts forth a number of policy proposals, which will be discussed later.

So what I thought I would do is to essentially push it a little bit further and connect the report to some larger issues, because my basic conclusion is that I don't think you can address any one of these -- let's say incarceration or foster care -- without really fundamentally tackling other aspects of inequality. And so I'm going to put out a conceptualization, if you will, about how to think of these reflected in the title of my talk, the idea of inequalities as concentrated and compounded -- I'll elaborate on that. I will then give you a little bit of a taste for some empirical findings based on my own work, but also that of

others, that shows what I'm talking about across multiple dimensions, not just one. And then I will conclude with some ideas for a policy approach, not so much a specific policy, but a policy approach that integrates with the report on The Future of Children. So that's the plan, and I'm told I have to do this exactly on time. (Laughter)

So here we go. First, some what I think of as sort of key facts that might be relevant in this particular context. One is very basic, and that's just the idea of neighborhood concentration, or generally what I think of as the spatial foundations of inequality, but in this case, criminalization. Neighborhoods, or the spatial division of cities, is really one of the fundamental features of not just American cities, but actually many cities, and in fact, even if you go way back in time, archeologists have discovered evidence of division and inequality in ancient cities. So it's something that is quite durable. And the idea of concentration is one thing, but then when mixed in with the fact that it's really not about let's say just incarceration, it's about a number of different phenomenon, or I think of it across diverse phenomenon, hence the idea of compounded adversity. And this traps families and communities. And I'll push that idea a little bit further. So you have spatial concentration, then you have it across multiple phenomenon. And then wrapped around all that is the theme of the report, which is very consistent with the research, are deep racial disparities. Again, across multiple phenomenon, not just one. Furthermore, these disparities are not new, they are really deeply embedded in -- well, the history of America, if we want to really paint the big picture. But depending on a specific phenomenon we're talking about, these are quite enduring, which is not say they're immutable. And we need to attack these and there are positive things we can do. But we need to start with a promise that these things are compounded, they're enduring, they're deeply racially divided, and they are spatially divided.

So let me give you a few examples of this. And I'll start with a report of the Brookings Institution on incarceration. That's part of what the report is about. And here you're seeing what the authors called "where future prisoners are born", which is essentially

the spatial distribution in this case at the commuting zone, think about it as larger community level across the United States. And, of course, you can see that it's anything but random. There are pockets of deep concentration, other areas that have relatively low incarceration. You can pick out your spot and figure out whether you're low or high. I'll note here, just so you can keep this in mind, these are for cohorts that were born between 1980 and 1986. And so sort of, again, the idea of where they're born. If you think about it, these are now many of them becoming parents, and given intergenerational consequences, we may then see -- and I think we do see it very strongly -- an intergenerational spatial concentration. Moreover, these cohorts are the very same era, the same cohorts as some of the children in some of the longitudinal finding I'm going to talk about in a few minutes.

But it's more at the neighborhood level, it's not just at the community level. Let's take a dive into Chicago, a city that I've studied a lot over my career, although we could do this for any city. And it's a persistent spatial concentration, or, in this particular article, called it "punishment's place", the idea that it's really somewhat misleading to think of mass incarceration. It's actually not mass ecologically. Many communities come across virtually scot-free. Northern part of Chicago, the rates are very low. You can see on the west side and down on the south side, very high rates of incarceration. So it's very much circumscribed by neighborhood. If you go to a later time period, you basically see the same thing, a little bit of spreading out with an increase in the rates over that time, and again on the south side and on the west side. So you have this local concentration. But, consistent with the theme that I started with, it's more than just concentration -- and, again, in this case we're talking about incarceration -- but it's also highly racialized. Those neighborhoods on the west side and the south side are predominantly minority neighborhoods, and specifically African American.

And what this shows kind of puts it together by neighborhood. A couple of things going on here. The X axis here is just the incarceration rate in the earlier period and on the left hand side is the incarceration rate about ten years later. And what you can see,

first of all, is remarkably a straight line. I mean you often don't see data like this. There's almost no variance outside the line, that is it's almost 100 percent of the variance explained, meaning that communities that are high incarceration at one point, ten years later, you know, also have high rates of incarceration. But what we also see is that in the top part of the screen are predominantly African American communities and what you can see is this gap in the middle, there's no overlap really in the distribution. Predominantly white communities at the bottom. And if you take the one community -- and I talked about this in my book -- the predominantly white community with the highest rate of incarceration for whites in Chicago, compare it to the highest rate for blacks, a rate of 40 times higher. So not double, not triple, 40 times different. So you can see this profound difference.

Okay, let's move on. It's not just incarceration, as I said. And this is going to be a key theme. Violence is a profound problem in society, especially exposure to violence among children. We've shown, that is to say social scientists, the deleterious effects of exposure to violence over the life course on a number of outcomes. Here is a very simple plot that shows the murder rate proportional to the population, the larger the star, the higher the homicide rate. And then it's shaded by what I'm calling child health. This is low birth weight and infant mortality. You can see that where there is low child health there's also extremely high rates of violence. We also see this relationship hold even when we control for poverty. So there's this link between exposure to violence and child health. And there's a lot of rich research on this.

Now, looking at the effects of violence on not just child outcomes but on mothers, particularly during pregnancy, and the stress in the environment on the health of children. And so when you combine incarceration and violence and poverty in these same communities, you have a very problematic environment. We can even call it a toxic environment. In recent research my colleagues and I have extended our work to look at other risk factors that work through biological pathways. In this case we were able to obtain blood level tests from millions of children in the City of Chicago, and these are plotted out by



the percentage of children above the level of concern set by the Centers for Disease Control. You're starting to see patterns here. So, the west side and the south side, the same ones where we saw high violence, poor child health, high rates of incarceration, also children are exposed to highly toxic environments. The red -- you can't read it, but just so you can think this through -- 76 percent or more of the kids are tested positive for levels of lead above CDC -- 76 percent. We're not talking about one or two neighborhoods, we're talking about entire swaths of the community.

Furthermore, we've shown the link between racial composition, poverty, exposure to smelting plants, and the prediction of this. In further research we have shown the link between exposure to lead and health outcomes and delinquency outcomes among our children.

To summarize on the neighborhood level, we have what I think of as legacies of inequality that stretch back a long time -- 50 years. And I put this one up here because 50 years, it's now a celebration of the birthday this year of Martin Luther King, Jr. It's also 50 years of the Kerner Report on the riots in 1967, and the riots and neighborhoods that King was marching for, are again ones we were looking at earlier on the west side, places like North Lawndale, the original "inner city of Chicago", Washington Park, Woodlawn. These are the areas in the dark that were racially segregated in 1960. So we're going way back. And the pluses are areas where over the next 40 years you saw increases in concentrated poverty. And you can see it's the same areas, and it's pushing further south. And then, furthermore, when we take a macro level event, like the Great Recession, we've already seen the macro level event of mass incarceration, it is disproportionately laid onto the city. Again, it's not just spreading out evenly, these are the areas that are hit by foreclosures which were previously hit by the other things I've talked about. So, again, you get this cumulative and concentrated disadvantage.

Okay, neighborhood level. And I want to just drill down a little bit more in terms of the lives of individual kids, which I've alluded to, but I want to talk about a little more

very briefly. From a study, John mentioned that I'd been working on it for a long time -- and others -- the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods. It's a longitudinal study of children. It started in 1995, with a birth cohort and then three cohorts age 9, 12, and 15. I'm going to focus on those, you're going to see in a minute. So the average age is about 12 and it's connecting more or less to those cohorts that you saw in the earlier Brookings picture. A lot of the early work was presented in my book "Great American City", but I'm moving beyond that because we did a new data collection after the publication of the book. I won't get into the details. We followed the people wherever they moved in the United States. And what I want to look at right now is what I think is a really important indicator, which is living in poverty and also being exposed to a high poverty neighborhood. In other words, Bill Wilson famously argued, it's one thing to be poor, it's another to be poor living in a high concentrated poverty neighborhood, which we define as greater than 30 percent poverty and living in the bottom fifth of individual income. And what I'm going to show you now is the transition to adulthood, following our kids from 1995 to the recent past. And basically, since it's 12 year olds, we're talking about the home, the child's home. The income of the parents, poverty rate as a child, and then around age 30-32 the attained neighborhood of the child as an adult, and the adult's then -- child to adult income. So this is in a sense an intergenerational examination. And we've seen a lot of work by the Chetty team on income, and I want to focus on this more disadvantaged population, which connects to the incarcerated and foster care population.

And these figures, I think, were even surprising to us. If we look at the predicted probability of being in that state of compounded poverty, conditional -- I could talk about this later -- conditional on individual differences and family background. Along the bottom here, as you go along from 1995 to 2013, the black line is Latino children transitioning to Latino adults and then whites in the dotted line. And basically the story there is relatively low exposure to compounded poverty. Latinos doing worse, as you would probably expect, than whites at about a 2-1 ratio, but nonetheless, at an absolute level it's

relatively low, so about 3 percent for Latino Americans. However, African Americans in our sample are basically a world apart, not even close, starting out at 15 percent. Now, again, we're not just talking about poverty, this is simultaneously individual and neighborhood poverty, what we might call the concentrated truly disadvantaged. And what you notice too is that there was some improvement. And what happened to wave three? Well, you can kind of guess. In my earlier slide, with regard to the Great Recession, basically that happened here. And our digging into the data suggests that that uptick happened after the Great Recession. So there's good evidence to suggest that there was a loss. And in fact, at the end, by the age of about 30 or 32, African Americans -- these are men and women -- were higher than at baseline and about a 16-1 ratio to whites. So, again, no comparison. Controlling even for all of the characteristics that economists typically look at in terms of human capital attainment, self-control, measured IQ, family characteristics, can't explain this. So that is I think a fact that has to be considered in the present discussions.

Getting now more closely into the discussion here of incarceration, the point I want to make here is I think that I agree with everything in the report, but I want to make the broader point that people that are incarcerated were also convicted, they're also arrested. Not everybody that is arrested is convicted though, and not everyone who is convicted is incarcerated. There is good evidence to suggest that there are negative effects of conviction on, for example, getting a job -- same thing with arrest. And these things also are clustered together, not only multiple aspects of the criminal justice system, but I want to broaden the definition of families. And focus a bit on parents, right, so children of incarcerated parents, you have an incarcerated father. Well, but maybe the father is not in the household, maybe the father has never been in the household, but they are family members. And many households are complex. There are people moving in and out, there are grandmothers, grandfathers, uncles, aunts. And it turns out, based on our search of criminal records, going well beyond -- and these are not self-reported, these are looking at -- in most cases into records -- that if you have a parent that's arrested, as this example in the

black bar, then about twice as likely to have an aunt or uncle in the family context that has a criminal record, sibling in jail. Or if we look at aunt or uncle in jail, pretty high proportions, about five percent if the parent is arrested. Cousins in jail. You know, this is important if you often -- and especially in ethnographies -- look at the social arrangements, the social organizations of deep poverty, the reliance on kin and family members and cousins and aunts and uncles is an important phenomenon. So the criminal justice system is not interacting with the parent, it is this broader context, which I think makes it more complicated in terms of dealing with policy. And I think the implication, for me anyway, is that it really needs to be child centered because you've got to capture all of this, you can't just focus on the parent.

Now, connects to the point I've been making about racial disparities and the proportion or the prevalence of interaction with the criminal justice system now gets even higher. So this is looking at -- it's probably hard to read but -- on the left is any family member. So now I'm not just limiting it to the parent. But if -- family member's arrest -- you can see that about 44 percent of black have any family member arrest. That's just the baseline. Fully 20 percent in jail compared to only 5 percent of whites and 3 percent of Hispanics. So you really do see not just a racial disparity, but what's interesting in these data is that for arrest Hispanics are much more at risk but for jail and prison less so in these data in terms of the longitudinal. And then if we go to the later longitudinal follow up, this is the criminalization that just is occurring going from wave one to two and wave two to three. And you can see that it's shockingly high, that it's not cumulative, but just in the period going from baseline to the follow up about two years later, about 29 percent had an arrest among African Americans compared to 12 percent of whites and 28 percent of blacks compared to 11 percent of whites at wave 3. So what you really see here is this breadth of criminalization, of families and its impact on children.

Now, I want to conclude, keeping on time. So I want to propose, and maybe we can have more discussion about it, that these facts seem to me to suggest the

importance of what I call a community based approach. And one idea here, or motivation for this, is that community based approaches I think have been shown to have an important effect on the violence reduction in the United States. That is to say that this is a huge trend. We know that crime or violence has dropped overall. And recent work by Patrick Sharkey, a paper in the American Sociological Review, also in his book, has shown that community nonprofits -- I'm not going to get into the details, but nonetheless the density of community nonprofits that are providing support services to youth, neighborhood crime prevention, counseling, job supports, were shown to have a causal effect on the reduction in the violence rate. So we have evidence then to believe that communities that have strong base of nonprofit organizations, or what I like to think of as collective efficacy, especially collective efficacy among residents that's linked to organizations, is powerful for the control of crime. And that's important given what I've said and shown you about the role of violence in American society and the role of violence in undermining children's development.

So why not apply this to incarceration, but more broadly criminal justice reform? In other words, we have all these facts in the sense of decline in incarceration, it's been noted. This is happening, it's real. But what does that mean? It means people are coming out into the community. I'm a little less sanguine, by the way, about that fact because we're kind of celebrating that, that's good, but we're talking about very vulnerable people that are being released. If you just give someone a ticket they have to go somewhere, they're going to go into a community, that community is going to be one of the - - most likely -- concentrated disadvantaged communities that I've been showing you, that has all these other problems, drug problems, we now have the opioid epidemic. So there has to be an integration of a new kind of policy, not just decarceration. The report talks about alternatives to prison, new visitation, re-entry support. I think that all makes sense but, again, I think it has to be coordinated and I think it needs to have a community level basis.

Secondly, I want to say we can't let go of the violence reduction. I think that

we're going to see increases in violence, there's going to be disruption in some of these communities, there's going to be public backlash. We have to be prepared for that and I think we need community based organizations to confront that head on. And I really do think of the community based organizations as perhaps the unsung heroes in all of this.

And, finally, then the idea would be something like community or neighborhood based centers for children in trouble. And that's how I titled my keynote here. Because it really is children in trouble, and I used that purposely. It's children in trouble across multiple domains, not just parent incarcerated, but families incarcerated without alcohol problems, drug problems, arrests, convictions. And I think this could be coordinated in two ways. One is person based, that is using the children as the center really, which would then capture all the points of disadvantage with respect to that child and his or her family -- and, remember, complex family members that are moving in and out. And, secondly, place based, that is linking organizationally the crime, health, housing, poverty, education efforts. All these things I think holistically need to be integrated to deal with the problem.

So the specifics of this -- I'll leave it for Brookings to solve (laughter) and all of you. But hopefully I've presented you with a set of empirical and conceptual tools to be able to think this through more effectively.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. LAUB: Rob, I think you purposely went over a bit because you didn't want me to ask you any questions.

MR. SAMPSON: Oh, no.

MR. LAUB: So, I'm just going to ask a couple and then we'll open it up for the audience. I want to push you a little bit on the last, second-to-last point about nonprofit organizations, and ask you what is it about those organizations that seem to be effective. You've referred to collective efficacy, but could it be more than that? Could it be that these organizations actually work with the police? Could it be that these organizations work with

kids? Or, could it be: all the above?

MR. SAMPSON: Yes. Well, I guess the easy answer is all the above, but let me not take the easy answer, and say that, first of all I think the social is important, the collective efficacy, the extent to which the residents are working together with the community organizations, I think is powerful. And many of the interventions I think, if I could put it this way, you know, it's kind of banal in terms of what somebody is doing.

We are talking about supervision of kids, mentoring, these are relatively small things, but when added up make a difference, and I think that's especially important for children in high-risk environments often where -- especially where you have a high proportion of the men who are not in the community through being jailed, incarcerated, higher mortality rates, and one of the things we see in high-poverty neighborhoods is, you know, differential sex ratios, it would be consistent with that.

So, the collective support and mentorship for kids I think is an important piece of it. As I noted, in the Sharkey Study, the nonprofits were involved in multiple things, it wasn't just one. So, it was job training for older kids, a mentorship and working with the police is, I think, an important component.

Now, I'm not sure we've done a great job of that in the U.S., and I think both sides had some problems with it. But I want to emphasize one other thing, that's the social. I also believe strongly that there's good evidence that physical infrastructure of communities matters too.

So, for example, the rehabilitation of the physical infrastructure and neighborhoods is important, something as simple as cleaning up vacant lots, putting in playground. There's a recent study out of Penn that showed, based on a randomized design, that cleaning up a vacant lot and, you know, putting in a park and a garden has all kinds of spillover effects.

Some people begin to think, well, this is now a safer space, or at least it's a place you can walk, and be, and then kids start to be in the environment, and play, and then

it becomes, self-reinforcing safety, and it showed it did have an effect. We don't often think about interventions like that as crime reduction, but I think, in part, they do. So, I would argue for the community organizations to have a fairly broad mandate.

I think the old way of thinking about it was purely just crime prevention, like neighborhood watch, right, you put a sign up: we are watching. I mean, that doesn't really do or mean anything.

MR. LAUB: Another question. Are there important gender differences by race? In other words, do Black girls and Black women fair as poorly as Black boys and Black men, with respect to concentrated and compounded adversity?

MR. SAMPSON: Yes. That's a good question. Now, it depends, I guess, on how you want to think about fair or worse. So, clearly with regard to things like violence that is the victimization by violence, we want to take something like homicide, death, mortality, if you want to take incarceration males have much higher rates. That's true of all races, so that's kind of a -- you have to think of that as a gender, main gender effect.

Now, the different question is, are there differential causes that get us there, and some of the recent work of Chetty has shown that, for example, in terms of intergenerational mobility, that the race differences are almost exclusively due to Black male, White male differences. That is to say once you condition on parental income Black females are doing as well as his White females in terms of intergenerational mobility.

But here, that's a different phenomenon. So, here we are talking about crime, incarceration, and deep poverty, and I didn't present it by gender, so I don't want to speak beyond the data, but my sense is, given the prevalence of differences that I think the problem is worse, mainly driven for Black men, driven by the intensity and the prevalence of the contact with the criminal justice system, but also some of these other adversities that I've talked about. So, for example just another one is the, you know, blood poisoning, Black boys are much likely -- more likely to be poisoned.

MR. LAUB: I'm going to email you my remaining questions, because I want



to open up things to the audience.

MR. SAMPSON: Oh!

MR. LAUB: So, questions from the audience, and I would ask that you wait for the microphone, and if you could, introduce yourself before you ask your question. So, there's one here, I think.

MS. RILEY: Hi. I'm Naomi Riley, from the American Enterprise Institute. There were three factors that you mentioned in your talk that make me wonder about the possibility of how feasible it is to reduce the number of kids in foster care. The first one you mentioned was, maybe Ron mentioned it, the very low percentage of family interventions that seemed to be effective. The second was how many relatives, how many members of extended family are also incarcerated or involved in the criminal justice system.

And I'm trying to remember what the third one is, but I'm just kind of wondering in terms of this idea of reducing the number of kids in care, whether that's feasible given the difficulty of providing services that allow kids to stay with their family, and also given that there may not be as many alternative, responsible or capable adults in the community or in their extended family who could be caring for them.

MR. LAUB: Can I just say, that I wonder if that would be a question better posed to the panelists where we'll be focusing on the issues of foster care. And I don't want to take privilege as the Moderator here, but I think in terms of that particular question, seems could be answered best by the panelists, and we could actually start with that after. Is that okay?

MS. RILEY: Sure.

MR. SAMPSON: I would just second it though. I mean in the sense that I think you're right that it's a real challenge because, you know, who's going to pick up the slack. You know, again it's analogous to the incarceration, well, too many kids in foster care, and there's just overlap, but then okay, if you don't you have to have an alternative and it seems to me anyway, but the panelists can talk about it that there doesn't seem to be, at

least in the present state with funding, the current administration, a viable strategy in place.

MR. LAUB: A question over here?

MR. FEINBERG: Charles Feinberg, Interfaith Action for Human Rights.

Professor Sampson, thank you very much for your presentation. It was really quite interesting and educational for me.

The thing I'd like to ask you though, is whether you in your -- I work in advocacy in this area on human rights issues regarding prisons, and there just seems to be this incredible gap between what people like yourself and your colleagues know, the facts that you talk about, and what the policymakers, the politicians actually know and what they act on.

Just for instance, the State of Maryland in its recent legislative session passed a comprehensive crime bill in which increased mandatory minimums both for felonies and misdemeanors, and this is just a few years after they had what they called a Joint Reinvestment Committee in order to save money, so they could put more money into services. And the chair of the Judiciary -- the Senate Judiciary Committee didn't even call a committee hearing so that, supposedly, expert witnesses could give a testimony.

So there's just -- and he was quoted in the papers saying: well, the only way we can reduce people from recidivating is just to keep them in jail longer.

And so, is there any attempt by you and your colleagues to try to get more information out in a consistent way to the policymakers, specifically to the politicians?

MR. SAMPSON: Well, I guess I could give you my positive and then cynical answer. Of which the positive is that, I mean I think social scientists, I think everyone in this room, everyone on the panel, this event, have tried, and have done a number of different things, whether it's through publications, briefings, op-eds, there's variance around, you know, in terms of academic researchers, how much they do that.

I think there's a lot that's been put out there that's very clear. Let me give you one example. I served on the National Academy of Sciences panel on the growth of

incarceration, causes and consequences, a major study, a consensus panel that went on for over two years, it had experts from across, you name the disciplines, and it was appointed by the National Academy of Sciences.

Jeremy Travis was the chair, along with Bruce Western, produced a report that just laid out a lot of these facts. I believe it had a positive impact, and I think that that kind of report -- and it's not the only one -- but there is evidence out there. That's the positive side.

The cynical side to me says, it's out there and that the things that you are describing is that there are many, I think in the policy world, that they don't want to know the answer, or they disregard it. And it's based more on a normative stance, decision on the appropriate response to crime, and it is independent of the evidence.

So, no amount of reports, no amount briefings can change that, that's just, in my view, the reality. So, I'm sorry to say that, but that's the reality.

MR. LAUB: Mark?

MR. MAUER: Yes, Marc Mauer with The Sentencing Project. Looking at Chicago has been a lot of concern in recent years, the rising rate of homicide after nearly two decades of decline, lots of debate about the causes of it. Just yesterday Attorney General Sessions says it's all the fault of the ACLU. It seems like it's sort of the policing argument he's giving. I'd be interested in your take on what we know, or what you suspect may be going on to explain these relatively short-term, but disturbing trends.

MR. SAMPSON: Sure. That's a good question, Chicago. So, yeah Chicago has been used as sort of a punching bag by the administration in terms of violence, what's happening there, the murder capital of the world, not just because I live there and wrote a book on it, but I need to defend Chicago a little bit.

It's not the murder capital if we calculate rates, which is fairly elementary, and the administration seems not to have been able to make that calculation. And it's actually not one of the highest rates of violence in the country at all, when you look at the

homicide rate per 100,000. That's one thing.

Secondly, the rate of violence was going down in Chicago, as it was in other cities, it did not decline at the same rate as Los Angeles, New York and others, and scholars are still trying to figure that out, and there's no clear -- you know, I don't have an answer to that, and I don't think anyone does quite yet.

But the recent spike in 2015-'16 correlated anyway with a lot of unrest in Chicago around police shootings, Laquan, and that was a very -- that year saw an incredible spike, but last year it came down, and this year it's down. So, my prediction is, I don't think that's a long-term thing, and there's a lot of work going on now in the police department, particularly work in specific communities, focusing on better police community relations, better use of technology in terms of, like solving crimes.

That's one indicator, for example, in terms of the number of crimes they are able actually to solve, that went way down, and those are the things they're addressing. So, I think that things are actually -- at least my prediction is going to plateau, and not continue to spiral out of control there.

But I think that, again, there has been this emphasis on, you know, the violence increase, and it was used, nationally there was an uptick, and in different cities you see it, but we are not in the world that we were in the 1990s in terms of the high rates of incarceration.

But just to go back to what I was saying before, especially with decarceration, we know, I mean it's a fact that has been demonstrated for decades, and that is recidivism. And we know that a certain proportion of released offenders are going to recidivate, so therefore there is going to be crime.

And that's why we need a plan to accompany decarceration, and the trumpeting of, you know, sort of success because there's decarceration, in my views is premature, and especially since, and it goes to the last point, as soon as we start to see this on a consistent basis, any kind of uptick, there will be a backlash, which is why policy has to

be, ex-ante, ready for this.

MR. LAUB: Do we have time for one more, timekeeper?

SPEAKER: You have one more minute.

MR. LAUB: Can you be brief, and can you be brief?

MR. GORDON: I can be brief. My name is Roger Gordon, and most recently I was the president of Defy Ventures, a prison-based entrepreneurship training program. My question is to go to decarceration, recidivism and undiagnosed mental health problems in communities of color, where these problems are most acute. So, what is the effect of undertreated schizophrenia and significant mental illness on collective efficacy, and in particular police community interaction?

MR. SAMPSON: That's a great question. I don't know the answer to it, specifically on schizophrenia. What I would say is, and I think some of, you know, the facts here are not all in, because I'm going to tie it to the opioid epidemic. Well, going back earlier, the institutionalization of the mentally ill, I think there's consensus, or at least good evidence that that's connected to homelessness.

And in this most recent area, I think we are seeing in a lot of cities, an increase in homelessness, and because of untreated mental health problems, substance abuse and addiction problems, and furthermore when you have the vulnerabilities among prisoners coming out, and we see this in, for example, Bruce Western's recent work on "Life in the Year After Prison" the connection of substance abuse problems, mental health, violence is huge.

And if you layer on that the opioid epidemic I think what we are seeing in a lot of communities is a lot of unraveling, and what I like about your question is that that sense of unraveling and disorder in communities is then, potentially, going to undermine the collective efficacy of the community, or perhaps the willingness of residents the motivation to actually do something about it, right.

It's going to lead to a sense of, you know, an overwhelming problem. So, I

think that has to be tackled, and I don't think at the Federal Government level it is at all being tackled in the way it should be.

MR. LAUB: Thanks, Rob. Please join me in thanking Robert Sampson.

(Applause)

We are now going to move to the panel portion of the event. You have full bios of each of the panelists in the materials that were handed out. So, I'm basically just going to introduce them by name, and with their affiliation, and then we are going to open things up.

So, to my immediate right is Kristin Turney, associate professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of California Irvine.

Next to her, is Brecht Donoghue, deputy associate administrator, Innovation and Research Division in the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, in the Department of Justice.

Youngmin Yi, a Ph.D. candidate in sociology and policy analysis and management at Cornell University.

And at the far right is JooYeun Chang, director of public policy at the Casey Family Programs.

Both Kristin and Min were co-authors of the paper; Kristin was the author of the paper on "Children of Incarcerated Parents," and Min was the co-author on the paper on "Foster Care."

So, each panelist is going to make a short presentation, and then we are going to have a bit of a Q&A, and then we'll open it back up to the audience.

So, Kristin, we'll start with you?

MS. TURNEY: Great. Thank you. I also want to start with three facts. I didn't see your slides ahead of time. The really three key facts about parental incarceration; so, first many children experience incarceration of a mother or a father.

So, for example, among children who were born around the turn of the

century in urban areas, about a third of them experience the incarceration of a father, and about a tenth of them experience the incarceration of a mother by the time they're teenagers.

Second, not all children have the same risks of experiencing parental incarceration. So, we know that already vulnerable children such as minority children and poor children are most likely to experience parental incarceration.

And third, we know that by and large parental incarceration has negative consequences for children's well-being, including their health, their educational outcomes, their behavioral outcomes, and their material hardship and deprivation that they experience.

These consequences persist even after taking into account other vulnerabilities that endanger these children such as family instability and poverty. In the policy brief John and Ron put forward three policy prescriptions that could help children of incarcerated parents.

So one, expanding the use of alternatives to incarceration; two, making it easier and less traumatic for children to visit their incarcerated parents; and three, creating school and community-based programs to help these children.

So, I agree that these three policies could go a long way toward reducing the harms experienced by children of incarcerated parents, and in particular I want to talk a little bit about limiting the use of cash bail as a promising pathway for ameliorating some of the disadvantages experienced by these children.

So more than 12 million individuals are admitted to jail each year in the United States, almost always for a short amount of time, three-fifths of individuals incarcerated in jail haven't been convicted of any crime. In my research with more than 120 fathers in Southern California, 120 jailed fathers and their family members, I find that even short-term stays in jail are quite consequential for the father's themselves and for their children.

During interviews with fathers who are in jail I learned that their time in jail,

even for the relatively short amount of time, impedes their economic opportunities. During jail incarceration fathers have few, if any, opportunities to earn income, and after jail incarceration fathers have difficulty finding employment.

They experience legal financial obligations, the fines and fees that are associated with their case that can even create a disincentive for employment in the formal labor market. I also learned that the economic consequences of jail incarceration don't end with the consequences for the incarcerated.

These consequences extend to their family members, their children, their current and former romantic partners, their mothers, and their siblings, especially their sisters, in part, because these men were often contributing economically to their families before their stay in jail, and in part because jail incarceration creates additional expenses.

So women in the study who were connected to jailed fathers talked about how jail incarceration was associated with an immediate decrease in their household income. Women in the study also talked about altering their employment patterns in response to the incarceration. So these women are left with parenting and household responsibilities that sometimes forced them to leave the formal labor market, or to reduce their hours of employment.

Third, the women talked about the expenses of maintaining contact with a jailed father, mothers and romantic partners spend quite a bit of money on care packages, collect calls and visitation. So, we know from other research that reduction in family income following incarceration is a key reason why children of incarcerated parents experience challenges to their well-being.

Limiting the use of cash bail would lead to reductions in the number of children who experience parental incarceration, so jail incarceration, which would mean fewer economic consequences for these children and their families, which would go a long way toward improving the lives of these vulnerable children.

Reducing cash bail is on the policy agenda in various locales across the



United States, and as changes begin to be implemented across counties it's a critical goal that these and other policy changes are rigorously evaluated.

So, understanding how these policy changes improve or don't improve the well-being of children, as well as understanding which children are most helped by these policy changes is really critical to reducing inequality across the life course.

MR. LAUB: Thank you. Brecht?

MS. DONOGHUE: Hi. Well, first I want to -- my name is Brecht Donoghue, again, I'm with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, which is part of the Department of Justice. I want to start by thanking Dr. Laub and Dr. Haskins for having me here today. I don't get out of the office that much, so it's exciting to here.

I'm retooling on the fly here a little bit about the remarks I want to make, but let me just start by telling you a little bit about my office in case some of you are not familiar with it, and what exactly it is we do.

OJJDP is charged with providing national leadership, coordination and resources to prevent and respond to juvenile delinquency and victimization, OJJDP's mission is to support the efforts of states, tribes and communities to develop and implement effective and equitable juvenile justice systems that enhance Public Safety, ensure youth are held appropriately accountable to both crime victims and communities, and empower youth to live productive and law-abiding lives.

We accomplish these goals by providing direct funding and resources to communities and organizations across the country as well as providing training and technical assistance to disseminate and promote evidence-based programs and practices. And our office also oversees data collections and research to monitor trends in the juvenile justice system, and assist the field in identifying what is and is not effective in preventing and intervening in juvenile delinquency and crime.

OJJDP focuses a significant part of our efforts in understanding and addressing the needs of children at high risk of either experiencing, or perpetrating crime

and violence, and obviously these two populations of youth we are discussing today are of great concern to our office.

We know from research that youth involved in foster care and those who experience the incarceration of a parent are among those most at risk for negative outcomes, and our office administers a number of programs designed to understand and address these risks.

I'm going to mention briefly just three of the programs that I think are particularly germane to the policy brief that we are talking about today, but we actually do so much work in this area that it was really hard for me to choose, and I was having other ideas popping into my head as I was listening to the presentations today.

But I will start by mentioning our mentoring programs, and we talked about community-based programs, OJJDP makes about \$90 million dollars in mentoring funds available to the nation every year. Obviously we know that the support of a caring individual in the children's life could have a profound impact on their well-being, and this is particularly true for children who are experiencing family instability.

We are focused on funding though high quality evidence-based mentoring, and so to that end, we are doing even more work to try to understand, specifically how mentoring can improve the lives of kids in foster care and children of incarcerated parents. And we have a number of ongoing evaluations, multi-site evaluations that actually are, with the randomized design looking to see what kind of impact we can have in those areas.

We also -- we also do work including Second Chance Act programs that include a mentoring component, specifically focused at mothers and fathers returning to the community from their secure confinement. And the thing I wanted to mention too, because again one of the things that sort of popped into my head as we were talking today, is thinking about how we are using our courts.

I do want to mention that OJJDP provides millions of dollars to support and promote the work of Court Appointed Special Advocates. This funding aids volunteers

across the country in ensuring that abused and neglected children have an adult in their lives, to ensure that they have high-quality representation in dependency courts that they have access to services they need in a safe, permanent home.

But I was also thinking, as folks were talking, about family drug courts, that's another area where we provide significant funding, and we are actually particularly interested in thinking about, with the opioid crisis, whether that that is effective intervention and could potentially keep both parents out of the system and getting the appropriate treatment they need, and also keep kids either in the homes, or reunify them as soon as possible.

And finally, I'll just mention again, I think John mentioned this at the beginning of the talk. OJJDP believes the key to measuring, monitoring and evaluating the impact of our efforts is high-quality juvenile justice data. To that end, OJJDP has launched the Juvenile Justice Model Data Project to help states and localities improve the quality and consistency of Juvenile Justice Data, and to increase the appropriate use of data in policy and practice decisions at the local, state, and national levels.

I think often it's easy for policymakers and the public to see presentations such as Dr. Sampson's today and think, all that data is out there and at our fingertips, and it's very easy for local programs to access, and for others to access. And the reality is that we have huge issues with juvenile justice data in this country, so we are trying to think about how we can help move the field as far as thinking about both collecting data, using data and sharing data.

With that, I'm going to stop talking because I only have like one minute left. And say that I'm just very excited for the discussion today.

MR. LAUB: Thank you. Youngmin?

MS. YI: Thanks everyone for joining us this afternoon. And I want to express my gratitude to Doctors Haskins and Laub for inviting me to be part of this conversation.

So, again, my name is Youngmin Yi, and I'm in the Department of Sociology at Cornell University. And I just want to take a couple of minutes to talk about the question of whether and how the foster care system might play a role in reducing justice system inequality.

So, my co-author and I argue that, yes it can. And I'm actually going to take a sociological and demographic approach to talking about this. So, why certain systems might work if we put it in the context of the life course, and the social systems within which these vulnerable youth operate.

So first, as was mentioned earlier, foster care is an experience that is unequally distributed across the child population in the United States. So, White children, approximately 5 percent of them will experience foster care placement at some point by the time they turn 18, but for Black children that risk is double that, so 10 percent of black children will experience foster-care placement over that period of their life's course, and for Native American children that that prevalence increased to 15 percent.

So, this is not a rare experience for children coming from communities that are already marginalized, and social groups that are already disproportionately disadvantaged within the context of U.S. social life.

Second, the children who end up in foster care are already extremely vulnerable and disadvantaged along a number of dimensions that may or may not have to do with their maltreatment, but may put them at higher risk of maltreatment. And so because of this they're at a particularly elevated risk of becoming involved in the criminal justice system over the course of their juvenile period, as well as -- as well as adulthood.

And so the foster care system, by making contact with these often hard-to-reach populations and families, is actually a very unique policy infrastructure, in that it sits at the intersection of this point of contact in which there are viable policy and programmatic levers that can not only prevent children's future maltreatment, but also, potentially, actively improve their outcomes with a big part of that being reducing their likelihood of engaging in

risky behaviors as well as getting involved in the criminal justice system later on.

And so I just want to point out that by focusing on the foster care system itself. My co-author and I aren't focusing on the earlier stages of the child welfare system at which they're getting reported screened in, and where maltreatment is being substantiated. So, contingent upon the decision already having been made that these children should be removed from the home for their safety, what can we do within the foster care system, specifically, to improve children's outcomes?

So, we itemize and go into detail about a couple -- an array of different interventions at different points of contact within the foster care system that we think might be especially effective in reducing these children's risk of criminal justice contact. But I want to hone in specifically on this one idea of social bonds, and the fact that these children though victimized in some way and disadvantaged are not -- do not exist in a vacuum.

So, they come from social support networks that may take a variety of different heterogeneous forms that may or may not include kin and non-kin, but they also are embedded, once they enter the foster care system, within hopefully a supportive network that at least can serve as a broker to access to resources.

So, I'm going to focus on two points of the foster care system quickly before we -- before I hand the mic over. But first I'll start at the tail end of the foster care system, so at the point at which children are aging out.

So, this is a vulnerable point in the life course for all youth really, because this is a point at which there are a lot of changes taking place, and young adults are expected to take on self-sufficiency and responsibility at this point.

This also is the point at which, in what was called the age-crime curve, and we have some people in the room who have done a lot of work on this issue. This is the point at which adolescents and young adults are at highest risk of engaging in criminal or risky behaviors, and getting caught up in the criminal justice system.

So, even though we know that the transition to adulthood is taking longer for

most young adults at this point, we are still expecting our most vulnerable young people to make that transition abruptly at the age of 18, and earlier than the modal young adult.

And so one thing we can think about is how the foster care system can adjust to make sure that that demand is not being made of these vulnerable youth, and extend foster care beyond the age of 18 so that these youth have access to the full suite of supports and services that were available to them prior.

And at the front end of the system I'll just highlight this idea of heterogeneous forms of social support. So, in social groups of color, and particularly economically disadvantaged communities, we know that somehow families and communities are making things work. So, that may mean that they are drawing upon relationships outside of the nuclear family, and extended family to fill in for care-giving responsibilities and socio-emotional and material resources.

So, one thing that we highlight in our article is that upon itemizing the possible permanency options for foster youth, we may want to encourage people to consider a broader swath of potential caregivers for permanent placements. And this may include individuals such as close neighborhoods, or family friends that provided consistent, stable and loving support or care to children of color, or socioeconomically disadvantaged children, or foster youth more generally, but may be ignored in current -- concurrent planning systems that exist within the foster care system.

This would allow us to connect them to the resources available within foster care, but minimally disruptive the social bonds that existed prior, and may be protective effects against higher risks of criminal justice.

So these are just a couple of pieces, but in short the foster care system, there are adjustments that can be made given the overlap in the populations between the foster care system and the criminal justice involved population later in life, and some adjustments that take into account these life course considerations, and social systemic considerations may allow foster care, instead of becoming a correlate of criminal justice

involvement, as the as was highlighted earlier, to becoming a point at which it's a disruption in the Foster Care to Prison Pipeline.

MR. LAUB: Thank you.

MS. CHANG: Good afternoon, everyone. Again, my name is JooYeun Chang, and I'm with Casey Family Programs. I usually tell people, before I start talking, that I come to this issue wearing multiple hats. I started my professional career as a Staff Attorney at the Children's Defense Fund, so I've been an advocate on behalf of children and the foster care system. I worked in the Policy Shop at Casey Family Programs, I've done philanthropy, I've served in the Children's Bureau, and so I've seen bureaucracy both good and bad, right. And now I'm back at the Foundation.

And I think, I just want to, kind of an addendum, I think, to a lot of things that I agree with what Youngmin just said about foster care being an important period in which we can help children. And I would only say that if children must be in foster care then we should absolutely make sure that we improve the services and supports we give them, to try and break that cycle between foster care, juvenile justice and the criminal justice system.

But my belief is that far too many children are in our foster care system today, but I'm hopeful that with the Family First Prevention Services Act, we are in an unprecedented period where we can, in fact, see a reduction in the number of children in foster care; but perhaps more importantly an opportunity for us to right so much of the historic inequities that we've seen through this system.

So, I want to start a little bit by talking about the history of child welfare. You know, we as a country, up until February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018, I would say, really only guaranteed funding for one thing and that's what we ended up seeing a lot of, right.

So, it was the one intervention that we said was the least desirable, perhaps the most traumatic for children, and that's foster care. We waited until children, where they had serious maltreatment issues, whether it was neglect or abuse, we traumatized kids who may have experienced the trauma of maltreatment further by removing them from the only

families and communities, schools that they have known, perhaps separating them from their siblings.

We place them, at best, in family settings, far too often we place them in multiple settings, and at worst we place them in congregate care settings that I argue, in many instances are no better than some of the jails and prisons that their uncles, and fathers, and mothers are in.

Now, I talk about the history of child welfare and in many other settings and what my argument is that the reason we have this history in child welfare is that we -- our system has been built on centuries of racism, classism and xenophobia that has really focused on rescuing children from what we consider to be bad people, right, and placing them in alternative families or institutions, instead of treating the underlying poverty, addiction, or mental illness that causes the vulnerabilities, and escalates to crisis.

Now, under the Family First Prevention Services Act, we have the ability to right that historic wrong, because for the first time Congress is guaranteeing funding, not only for foster care, but for prevention and early intervention.

Now, that's really exciting, but I do think there are some challenges that the child welfare systems in our country will have to address and overcome if we are going to realize the promise and the excitement of Family First.

One is that, as Ron mentioned, these systems are incredibly complex, and one of the things that people love to say about child welfare is that if you've seen one child welfare system, you've seen one child welfare system, right. And although I think that's true in many ways I argue there are lots of similarities across systems that we have to figure out ways to address.

One is that this is a system driven by the public perception that often doesn't understand the work that they do, right. So, they drive the narrative, the media often at the front of that about what the system is responsible for, what it defines as success, and the measures of lack of success. And one example that I have to talk about is that there is a



New England State that, for many years, had zero child fatalities as a result of abuse or neglect.

They were lauded for the great work, et cetera, et cetera. The first two child fatalities a few years ago, in the paper they were being described as a beleaguered child welfare system, that child welfare director was fired and a new one brought in. And we see the cycle happen over and over again in the system.

I think that our systems will be empowered to take advantage of the promise of Family First, they have to stay focused on the task at hand, not try to do everything for everyone, but take on the primary duties of ensuring that children who come to their attention are not abused and neglected again. That if they leave the foster care system, it is to a permanent home, and they're not cycling right back in.

We have to ensure that no matter what and how good foster care is, it is temporary, it is not a home that any of us would want -- a system that any of us would want our children to be raised in, and no child should be raised by a system. But for far too many kids it becomes their destination, and they end up aging out.

To me, and I was part of a system that fought to extend foster care to 21. What we have found in some of the studies is that all we do is extend negative outcomes until after 21, right? No child needs to grow up and age out of foster care; that should be a zero-sum game, right?

And then finally, I feel like we have to make sure that our workers are prepared, supported and given access to services and supports that we know will help our most vulnerable families.

MR. LAUB: Thank you. Thanks very much. So, I sent a final draft of the policy brief to a colleague and she thought it was great, except she felt that the brief did not pay enough attention to the role of poverty, which you mentioned, cash bail, and also the brief failed to talk about the insufficient things of the safety net.

And if you could think about poverty as a driver of incarceration, particularly

with respect to low-skilled individuals from poor neighborhoods, child welfare, a huge chunk of the system is made up of neglect, issues about housing, issues with respect to access to quality child care, which also could be linked to neglect.

And I guess the question for the panelists: are there ideas that we could move to action that could reduce poverty that would indirectly then help vulnerable children, either children of incarcerated parents or children in foster care?

You could be silent or we could just go to all them, and they'll ask the harder questions.

MS. YI: Can I start?

MR. LAUB: Sure.

MS. YI: So, I mainly actually want to look a little bit to the past, or recent, or current policies in place that have provided some hope. And I agree with the critique that -- at least in my chapter, that we weren't able to fully engage the question of whether there is an adequate safety net to work in collaboration with the child welfare system. And I think your points about stresses and demands on the child welfare system itself are well taken.

I mean, like thinking about the child not being in a vacuum, these policy systems don't exist in vacuums as well, and so if we are looking to connect foster youth to housing services, employment, transitions into higher education, that is not available to us if there isn't an infrastructure outside in the mainstream society that is available to these youth.

But a couple of things that seem to help are, for example, extending Medicaid access, or access to youth up to the age of 26, so that's one piece of the economic and security puzzle that gets addressed. If disadvantaged youth have access to care within the purview of the foster care system or attached to a primary caregiver.

And so, and another piece that I'll point to, is some work that's been done by other demographers looking at correlates of increases in foster care caseload during the 20th Century, or the last several decades.

And some of that was tied to maternal incarceration, some of that was also

tied to stringent work requirements in the 1996 Welfare Reform, right. So that, if you hit the parents with stringent -- for single mothers in particular -- with stringent requirements to cash assistance, and that's eating away a little bit more at their ability to provide quality care for their children, then that sets up a scenario for neglect.

And so I think that's not a hopeful point, but I'm more speaking to the fact that if we think about the ways in which these policy levers do affect the care-giving environment, or scenario for the most vulnerable children, but also their family systems, then I think there are some extensions and smaller tweaks that have seemed politically reachable in the past, that we could turn to for some ideas.

MS. CHANG: So, I have one idea that I think a couple of folks have talked about the opioid epidemic, and I think we can't separate the issues of poverty, and the impacts and our families with race and inequality, you know. Ron showed the chart that had a huge spike in the foster care numbers in the late '80s and early '90s; we believe that that was driven primarily by the crack cocaine epidemic.

What's interesting is, you look at the last couple of years and you see a very moderate increase in the number of foster care cases, and most child welfare leaders will tell you, if they have an increase it's primarily due to the opioid epidemic. And, you know, what we see or are too drastically different reactions to similar patterns of behavior by parents, right?

The crack cocaine epidemic, you remove children, place them into foster care often for life, and then we wonder why they have bad life outcomes. And the opioid epidemic, we have seen a different response by Congress, by legislators, by the press, and the public in general, much more how do we provide services, how do we intervene. I think that's a good change but we can't ignore the privilege that allowed a primarily-White middle-class, upper-class suburban phenomenon to receive a very different result.

And I think we have to use that privilege to try and make sure that our approach to serving families and meeting their needs, whether it's drug counseling,

intervention and services, is not limited to just this opioid epidemic, because it happens to impact this family. And in 40 to 80 percent of kids who come into foster care come in because their parent has a drug or alcohol problem.

We have to make sure that services are available to all families regardless of income, and so I think that is a poverty and race equity issue that we have to address.

MR. LAUB: Any other thoughts? Or should we go to my next question. So, just a fundamental question, do we have a good estimate of the degree of overlap between kids in foster care and kids you mentioned, maternal incarceration? Do we know the answer to that question, whether or not there's -- what the degree of overlap is?

MS. YI: Between parental incarceration and foster care?

MR. LAUB: Children in -- children in foster care.

MS. YI: I don't know one off the top of my head, but I have to say even the estimates of, like the Foster Care to Prison Pipeline, have really relied on local agencies' estimates, or a specific set or set of states. So, for example, that figure earlier looking at how, among youth aging out of care about half are ending up incarcerated in their early adulthood, that's actually from the Midwest Study, which is a survey of -- looking at foster youth within three states in the Midwest.

So, I think population level estimates are actually things that we are still getting our hands on at least on the child welfare side, and I don't actually know off the top of my head how much overlap has been estimated yet, in the agency estimates.

MR. LAUB: Do you want to address that?

MS. TURNEY: Yes. There is some, there is some population level estimates out there, and I don't know the number off the top of my head either, but certainly there's a correlation, and certainly that's -- and it goes both ways. So, I think the important thing to keep in mind, and this is sort of getting back to the key note is that these are really issues of compounded disadvantage.

And so we know that children who are in foster care compared to kids who

aren't placed in foster care, are more likely to have experienced the incarceration of a mother or a father, and conversely we also know that children who've experienced parental incarceration are going to be more likely to be placed in foster care.

I think the trick is sort of disentangling, sort of which comes first, and I don't even know, you know, like there's a lot of researchers really, including myself, really like to focus on sort of these causal things which comes first. Does parental incarceration cause these negative outcomes or, you know, or are they -- or are these negative outcomes caused by other things?

And, you know, and it's almost -- and we all -- we all do it, I do it, but it's a kind of a fruitless exercise, because the real world sort of happens, these things are happening together.

MR. LAUB: I was glad to hear Brecht mentioned data because I think it would be really interesting to take Sampson's map of -- the first map of the imprisonment concentrations and look at them, the children of incarceration spatial concentration, children in foster care, and see how they stack up, and maybe that's something you could bring back to your administrator --

MS. DONOGHUE: Yeah, I know, and they have to -- well, those are huge measuring issues. I mean right now we -- I mean I don't want to take us off track, but we have been doing some work around looking at the overlap between kids and juvenile justice system in child welfare, and even there you've got huge measurement issues when you start.

Again, it's the pathways issue too, because when you start to think about, are you talking about kids who, you know, its current involvement? Are you talking about, you know, starting at one system moving to the other?

And then when it actually -- when you start to broaden the scope of the lens of the time period you're looking at, you start to realize that, you know, it can -- you can make some assumptions. So, this was a juvenile justice kid who ended up in child welfare

will actually know if you go back.

So, all that to say, that is hard, and I think people make these assumptions about how, you know, it's out there, but everybody is collecting data all the time, but actually using it in a way that actually helps drive policy decisions, and even just helps programs figure out if they're effective, I mean it's a really -- it's a big hurdle.

MR. LAUB: And one last question. You mentioned the negative consequences for children of incarcerated parents they have the consequence of being in foster care. Are there any differences by gender? Or is it equally bad for boys and girls in both systems? Or both effects, I guess?

MS. TURNEY: So, I can start. So, there is some evidence, so sort of the best evidence out there does suggest that, at least with respect to paternal incarcerations, so the incarceration of a father seems that there is sort of emerging, consistent evidence that the consequences are stronger for boys.

And so that boys sort of losing a father to incarceration is more consequential than it is for girls, and there's been a few fairly rigorous studies that have shown that.

MR. TURNEY: With regards to --

MR. LAUB: Okay.

MS. TURNEY: I was just going to say that's consistent with broader literature on family instability as well, that sort of suggests that sort of boys are sort of more - more affected by things like divorce or separation of parents.

MS. YI: So, with the foster care system my understanding with population level estimates is that there aren't really gender differences with regards to the prevalence of, or the risk of being caught -- being involved in the foster care system, but if we think about the types of abuse and neglect and maltreatment that take place, those are highly gendered. So, sexual abuse is more prevalent among girls.

In terms of the consequences of system involvement in foster care

placement, I believe that girls seem to be fairing worse, particularly those who -- among those who are aging out of care.

MR. LAUB: Thank you. Should we start with your question, if you could repeat it for us? Do you want to wait for the mic? Go ahead.

MS. RILEY: I just wanted to ask, if the goal is reducing the number of kids in care, given what we've been talking about today in terms of the effects, not only of family poverty, and family problems, but also community-wide problems. And how do we go about reducing the number of kids in care, and that it seems to me there are often not many other adults in the community who might be capable taking care of these kids, given they are also involved in the criminal justice system.

But also given how few of the programs that are supposed to intervene and help the biological families, whether this is with substance abuse, or mental health issues, seem to be effective. And I was just wondering whether, if you might address that.

MS. CHANG: Well, I'm glad that Ron came back for this, the evidence-based expert. I mean, I'll be honest, there's no evidence to say foster care is an effective intervention, and yet we use it with great regularity for this population. I think that, yes, there's absolutely a shortage of evidence-based programs that we have -- we have available to date that show that we can prevent these families from coming into the system.

However, we have not consistently funded those programs either. I think that is why Family First is really an exciting piece of legislation, because you're not -- if you don't have a reliable source of funding there, it's very hard to either, create, install or spread evidence-based practices. But we do -- I think the challenge and the question you raised I think is a good one in that why aren't we spreading even the few things that we do know work.

The California Clearinghouse that Ron mentioned, they are a handful, but they are a handful and they're not often replicated, right. So, I think we do have to figure out what the challenge is for child welfare agencies and taking what we know works, but then

understanding, to John's point, under what circumstances do they work and how do we spread them. I think that's the challenge that child welfare agencies have faced. We have, Casey has been working with the 27 jurisdictions that have Title IV-E Waivers, where they have been tasked with implementing evidence-based programs.

And it's a struggle. And I think the challenge is that when you have a system that is under such heightened scrutiny, where there is the almost -- or what it feels like zero tolerance for mistakes, the process of installing evidence-based programs requires risk-taking, right. It requires a tolerance for things not working and then trying something out. That's really hard to do in the child welfare system.

And then finally, I would say I don't know that it's -- and perhaps Robert's data suggest otherwise, but I don't think we have an insufficient number of relatives or community members to take care of our children. We know that millions of kids stay out of the foster care system today because their relative caregivers step up and take care of them outside of the system entirely.

And I think the challenge is, how do we locate them? They may not be in the same neighborhood as a child, but they probably exist somewhere in that network. And how do we support them so that they can stay engaged and provide the support to the child?

MR. SAMPSON: John, can I add something to just -- first of all, I agree with everything you said, and it's an extremely important point, and the audience probably doesn't follow this stuff, so this is really a crucial moment. And not only everything you said, but the states that do this are required to follow evidence-based policy.

So, if they do that and use these very problems that you're talking about, and they are required to evaluate, so they have to evaluate to show what they're doing; if they do what they're supposed to, and what this really means is if HHS aggressively implements this program, and monitors it, and make sure the states do what they're supposed to do, we could have some real successes.



We will have a number of states that will do a good job, and we'll have some successes, and that's the way you start to build a set of programs that actually have been implemented in the real world, and work. That is the goal of this program.

MR. LAUB: Right, and I think that I would agree with that, and this is where I probably would -- I think normally I'm much more optimistic than Rob because he's an old curmudgeon, but I do think if you -- if you recall the New York Times editorial a few days ago, about what HHS has done for the teen pregnancy programs, and which evidence-based programs were being removed from their list of evidence-based programs, I do worry about that. But I take your point, and I think that that's hopeful. I mean the Chicago Cubs did win the World Series, so let's be hopeful there. (Laughter)

Yes, right here. Can you just state your name for us, and where you're from?

MR. ZILL: Nicolas Zill, Institute of Family Studies. I'd like to raise a type of prevention which has not been mentioned, and which is the subject for previous Brookings, and that has to do with unplanned pregnancies, and specifically the question: what should be done with parents who have been determined to be neglectful or abusive of children to prevent them from having future children who will enter into foster care and into the prison system? We are now extremely permissive about this. Should we be doing more to try to prevent further births to determine neglecting, abusive parents?

MR. LAUB: Panelists?

MS. DONOGHUE: I'm not going to --

SPEAKER: There's a (inaudible) in saying we should restrict them from having babies?

MS. DONOGHUE: This is so far out of my scope, I'm not, yeah, no.

MS. CHANG: I'm trying to find a diplomatic answer to your questions.

SPEAKER: How would it work?

MS. CHANG: So, I think every person should have the right to get the

family planning support and services that they want and they choose for themselves. I think the reality is -- I will, actually, you know, your comment strikes a chord in me, because when I was representing kids in foster care in Chicago, I remember one of the judges said, after the parent walked out, you know, she -- this parent had six children who had all come into the system, and she said -- this mother also happened to have a serious drug addiction problem, and underlying mental health conditions that really she was self-medicating.

And she said, you know, when are we going to just bring eugenics back and say, you know, these mothers shouldn't have any more kids? And, you know, it's part of the reason that I went into policy, and it's part of the reason I do the work that I do now. The reality is that these people are not any different from you or me.

They all have struggles as individuals, and as parents, and if we know that they have a mental health issue, or a substance abuse issue, I would rather focus on giving them the medical treatment and the services and supports they need so that they can provide and care for their children, as they can.

MR. LAUB: Yes, in the back there?

MS. BROOKINGS: Yes. Good afternoon. My name is Kanika Brookings, I'm a community activist, I'm also a clinical research study freelancer. I wanted to know, in these situations when the children are in the foster care homes, I work closely with some individuals who are foster caregivers, and oftentimes, like one lady in particular, she like does emergency, like, they can call her in the middle of the night. She'll go to the hospital and pick up a child that's been literally thrown out or severely mistreated.

Do we have any statistical data that shows how many of these children are mistreated, or are Runaways, or are just thrown out like trash? And also, do we have any statistical data on the success stories of these children that have been in foster care?

MS. YI: Well, I heard a piece that, and forgive me if I misheard you, so I heard a piece about whether we have the numbers on how many of these children in the foster care system have actually been maltreated, that was the first piece I think. And the

second piece I didn't quite hear.

MR. LAUB: Successful --

MS. YI: Success stories. Okay. I'll just speak briefly on the first piece, so I mean all of the kids who end up in foster care have proceeded through these earlier stages of child welfare system and Child protective services system contact, so at some point a caseworker has investigated the allegation of maltreatment, and either substantiated the maltreatment, or take -- remove the child from the home very often because they had a sibling, or another child in the house was maltreated.

So, that is relying on the caseworker's assessment of the maltreatment, and there is error around that. So, my understanding is that if we -- if we take the caseworker's assessment as fact, then all of the -- meant most of these children have been maltreated, but there's gray area around whether placement in the foster care system is the right response for that substantiation. I don't know if you wanted to comment further.

MS. CHANG: Yeah. I mean, I think Ron had on one of his earlier slides, kind of the number of kids who get brought to our attention through a hotline call to any of the state or local systems, that number is up in the five to six million every year, and there are about half of those kids who, once an investigation is done, someone says that there has in fact been some -- or a reason to investigate.

But the reality is that, you know, close to a million kids, there's some finding of abuse or neglect, and today roughly 40 percent of these kids receive no additional services, right. And that's primarily been driven by the fact that we don't -- we didn't have funding for preventive and early intervention services.

Again, we're hoping that Family First will change that dynamic. And as far as positive outcomes for young people who have experienced foster care. I mean the young people -- we work with a number of -- the Foundation I work for actually provides foster care for a handful of young people, often young adults, and I meet young adults every day who are incredibly strong and resilient, who have overcome incredible odds, to not only graduate

from high school and college, but often I think what's most impressive is that they come back into the child welfare system as professionals, as foster care workers, and social workers.

And so you're right to point out that it's not just a sad story, right, there are really incredibly amazing young people in the system.

MR. LAUB: I think we have time for one more, maybe two more.

MS. MOORE: Hi. I'm Ashleigh Moore. I'm a School Counselor. So, specifically talking, one of the common factors for all of these kids is that hopefully they're going to be in some sort of school or educational system wherever they are around the country. So, in terms of any recommendations either programmatic or policy-wise specific to schools or the education system sort of at large, more like at state level or programs like a local level. Any thoughts on that?

MS. TURNEY: Yeah. I can speak to that a little bit. You know, at the end of the day, there's not -- there's not, to my knowledge, rigorous evaluations of school-based programs designed -- that are designed to help children of incarcerated parents in particular. So, I don't think we have good sort of evidence in terms of what works and what doesn't work.

I do want to pull a little bit of a plug though. I was telling John about this program in L.A., it started out in Venice High School, and it's called POPS, Pains of the Prison System. I'm not sure if any of you have heard of it. It started at Venice High School, and has sort of been -- kind of making its way across the country.

And it's this great program where, during lunch hour, kids who've been -- teenagers, you know, high school students who've been affected by any sort of family member incarceration or -- sort of go to this space, and lunch is served, and every -- so this happens once a week and the students sort of, they get to share poetry, they get to share journals, they get to share their thoughts about how they've been affected by the criminal justice system, sort of, broadly.

And while there isn't any sort of evidence out there, I've been to this group a

couple of times, and it's amazing. And it's done great things for these youth, to really give them sort of a space, a safe space to be able to sort of talk through their experiences.

So, I think things like that, and I think for school counselors, and for teachers out there to sort of be aware that, you know, as you know students are coming to school with a lot of family complexity, whether it's incarceration, or foster care, or other types of family complexities.

And so I think the more that there's awareness among folks who are helping these kids, and sort of awareness of the challenges and the sort of the strengths and the resilience that these kids bring that can really be quite beneficial.

MS. DONOGHUE: Can I just add to that though?

MR. LAUB: Yes.

MS. DONOGHUE: So, I agree with everything you said, and I think the other thing that strikes me, I was thinking about this in getting ready for this talk is, we had a hosted a listening session a number of years ago, our agency, around the topic of children of incarcerated parents. And one of the things that was mentioned by kids who actually came who were -- you know, he had experienced parental incarceration, was this fear of sort of labeling.

And you know, we are looked at as -- you know, it's a risk factor, and thus its determinative, and we are going to end up in the system. And I think -- and then on the flip side, we actually have a study right now we are doing with a population of kids with parents that are incarcerated, so about 1,200 kids; 15 percent of the kids don't even know their parents in the system.

So, I think that we have to think about how to sort of balance that, and try not to be sort of, you know, putting kids on a path so that they feel like they're already, you know, they've already gone down that road.

So, that's why I actually thought Dr. Sampson's point about concentrating on neighborhoods is a really interesting thing. Because there, you know, it's a little less, you

know, targeted but at the same time, like you said, you've got these neighborhoods where city blocks, where you have such high rates of incarceration.

MR. LAUB: I'm afraid we are out of time. But I want to thank the panelists, and thank you all for coming. (Applause)

\* \* \* \* \*

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2020