Panelists:
Constitution D
Julia Kleinschmit
Kellee Thorburn McCrory
Brad Richardson

Please note: The following is a direct transcription and has not been edited.

Brad Richardson: Okay, I guess we will start, because I hear them starting next door, it must be time. As a reminder, there is audio for this session which will be digitally recorded so, and once formatted for accessibility, it will be made available through the Summit and know of written consent participants who ask questions or provide comments during the session will be giving their permission or consent to this recording. If you have any questions about this recording, please feel free to talk with one of the Summit's support staff who is sitting in the front row.

So, it's a small audience. It feels a little strange to be at a podium with such a small audience. So, I thought what I might do is take this little microphone and come to you and give you a little you know kind of the highlights of this. I've always wanted to try a presentation, where I give you like the abstract version, because I think people spend a lot of time, you know, you really file these things away in your brain, how of it do you remember in a week. So, if I give you the five-minute version, some people might choose to leave then and then the longer version that tells sort of the details and we can have some questions.

So, I am Brad Richardson. Kellee and Julia, of course they are not here, so for those of you who like to come just to hear the last speaker in the panel, it's your lucky day. I've been working with two demonstration programs. It's a little odd to call them demonstration programs since they've been in existence for about seven years. There are still demonstration programs we're still fine-tuning them. So, what I am here to talk about are really three things. One is the Sioux City project, which is designed to reduce disproportionality among Native Americans in the Woodbury County, Iowa area.

And the second topic is our MYFI or Minority Youth & Families Initiative in Des Moines designed to do something similar for African American children and families in the Polk County area. And then there has been some publications on looking at disproportionality at the front end of the system. Some of those authors who are supposed to be speaking yesterday, not sure they are here today, but articles first authored by -- first authored articles by Drake and others, Fred Wulczyn, Elizabeth Bartholet. And so, fairly prominent researchers suggesting that at least what has been interpreted in the field as it's all poverty and not racism in the system of identification at least.

So, I've got a couple of views on that too. So, I thought that I just kind of quickly go through the two projects and tell you what we've been doing. I've got a bunch of slides I

suppose it would help me to keep on track if I follow them instead of going off the grid. I kind of like going off the grid here, but we'll get through those, because I'm sure the third part is really the most interesting anyway.

Just a little background and to put things in perspective what my pictures are telling you here are that the National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice is located in the School of Social Work at the University of Iowa. Within that is the DMC Resource Center, which is funded by Juvenile Justice Planning in the state and also by the Department of Human Services. So, it works in both Juvenile Justice and child welfare, I am focusing today mostly on the child welfare side of things, but of course, you know, there is some overlap.

These are buildings on the left, actually that building has been raised and we're in a little one story now, but this one has character so I am keeping it. And then that used to be a sanatorium and you should have heard my door slam. On the right is our office in Des Moines, not the tower but the smaller one in the foreground. So, we knew that Julia wasn't coming and this was the session, so we get down to Kellee and then Sunday we found out that Kellee wasn't coming, here we get down to me. And so, this is really the opening slide now.

So little context, the National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice started in 1977. And in 2009 -- we had a gap from 2000 until 2009 we were not funded by the Children's Bureau as a National Resource Center. And then in 2009, we came back into the next as a National Resource Center and In-Home Services or for In-Home Services. So, it's a little odd, because sometimes people think they were the new kids on the block and you can tell I am not new kid anymore. So, it's always kind of interesting how that plays out.

I am the I guess lead person for the Research and Evaluation division. And we have some information education, training and technical assistance, a lot of cultural competence in family development training that we do. Other people do those things. Within Research and Evaluation, we have the DMC Resource Center and the MYFI project resides there. We also have an Iowa Center for Evaluation Research, which is about five years ago the College of Public Health has to take on their Research and Evaluation Center. So, now we do the public health research and evaluation, which is an interesting mix, because it gives us kind of a public health orientation to some of the issues.

Everything that I know is on this website. So, maybe not quite, but I kind of use it as a library. You can see the bottom tab here. This is DMC Resource Center. It has a wealth of the information. So, all of the data, conference information, there is a list of things. So, if you can find your way to that website, the DMC Resource Center is just full of lots of things. The old tricky part is we like to pull tilde in the address, so it's www.uiowa.edu/~nrcfcp and these things are clickable on the left. And this is our National Resource Center for In-Home Services website, completely separate website and fully authorized by the Children's Bureau.

So, this was actually Kellee's part. So, I am transitioning over to introducing myself at this point. These are the things I was going to cover, the practices, the scorecard. One of the things we've been trying to do is recruit foster families, have shorter-term placements out-of-the-home where placement has to be made, try to develop something that might be called wrap around or family support so that there doesn't have to be an out-of-home placement first place. We've also looked at community collaboration, because that seems to be an area where we've seen, I don't think we have data, but I'm going to invoke Malcolm Gladwell's Blink here that it seems to me, you know, has an expert in the field that community collaboration around these issues is very important and that having general awareness is important. And so, there are a lot nay-sayers about undoing racism, about community trainings, about conferences. And I, you know, I think that there is a lot of value in those things and then some more information on what the numbers tell us, so let's start with, 2000 – roughly 2000 data.

This is where things stood. This is from Bob Hill, when he looked at foster care placements and he was looking at, you know, children of color. So, anytime you do that of course, you know, the numbers are affected by every group being thrown in there compared to white, but this is what he had. And so, what I did was I looked at Iowa which is, was not as bad as some, 3.76 for a disproportionality ratio, but I went back and I took Polk County and Woodbury County when we started working in those two sites and calculated what the rate would be and for Polk County it was 5.5 and Woodbury County it was 6.8, so pretty bad. We had a couple of places, couple of counties that were even higher. If you look at, oh let's say Fort Dodge, Iowa in 2005 their arrest rate for African Americans, their disproportionality rate was close to 9. And we had another place, I think it was Dubuque, which only had about 265 African American youth and their disproportionality rate at arrest was somewhere around 12.

So in 2003, when we were getting the child welfare redesign going, we started looking at okay what's the case mix. So, we kind of took a Public Health approach to this. And we looked at the population distribution in Iowa is you know 88% white and then we kind of tracked it through the system. So, this was a very early approach to looking at disproportionality. So, the first one is population. The next one is, the next bar is investigations. And there are two that I wanted to track, because they are relevant to today.

The top, kind of dark blue is Native American and I'm not really good with color. I think that that's sort of a reddish color above the blue one and that's African American. So, at investigation, compared to population you can see Native American and African American percentage starts to grow. Then we look at the -- skip the third one, go to the fourth one, that's confirmed and the fifth one is founded. So, if you put those two together that would be substantiated, starts to get a lot bigger. And now removal, for African American and Native American you can see that removal when you compare that last column to the first column gets to be huge.

Now, I have issues with comparing to the percent of population, because it's what statisticians would refer to as a biased estimator. And so I tried to use relative rates where possible, the rate per thousand over the rate per thousand, so African American rate per thousand compared to white rate per thousand rather than compare the percent of population. It is okay to do that in a locality. The problem is that you can't compare to anywhere else if you use the rate compared to the percent population. And the easy explanation is suppose you are in California where a third of the population is minority that can only be over represented two more times. If you go to Iowa, where the minority population is I don't know, 5%, 8% so I'm going to let's say 5%, because I can do the math, so it's 5% non-white. The over representation can be 20% and so it's not in the same, it's not standardized, so that's why we want to use the rate per thousand.

So, here is Sioux City with the child welfare redesign based on those data that I was showing you. We began working there developing a lot of community input. There was a year-long planning process before we implemented. And we had representation from large contingent of it was called as Community Initiative for Native Children and Families came to the table. There had been marches. We called them Recover Our Children marches in the street. This was pre-2005, so about 2003 and 2004 as we're getting started.

So, here is kind of a quick history of how things developed. The Indian Education Center began the CINCF group and then the marches began in '03. We had the Iowa Indian Child Welfare Act which was passed and later overturned by our Supreme Court, but it was more stringent than the Federal Law. The DHS Child Welfare Redesign went into effect in about 2005 I believe began being written in 2003, which gave rise to the Minority Youth and Families Initiative and put it into legislation.

In 2006, the Casey Family Alliance through some conversations and have people decided that Sioux City was a promising practice and they want to come in and see what's going on, there were four places around the country and so, they got involved and started providing technical assistance and also provided a little bit of funding for a community advocate. And another highlight in Sioux City was that in 2008 the community leaders got together and became one of the Georgetown crossover sites say build checks training and where people began to recognize the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice are that far part we should work together. 2009, the Breakthrough Series Collaboration came in and we are just completing work, I think September 26th will be the last learning session. We'll try to continue that work on. And that's going on in eight other sites, not the MYFI sites, but it would build on the reputation of MYFI.

So, here is some of the measures that we're looking at. We've got the race equity scorecard, out-of-homecare from the state data system. We've had a quick compliance reviews and we've also conducted summer interviews with former clients, also with workers, community members. We do a conference each summer in Sioux City focusing on raising awareness about disproportionality. We used a Disproportionality Diagnostic Tool from NAPCWA to help highlight some of the differences between the community

and child welfare system. We looked at Out-Of-Home versus Family Centered Practice and also System Involvement Voluntary Services.

So just as a little background, here is the population that we use for the race equity scorecard. And how many are familiar with race equity scorecard? Okay. It is a fairly complicated spreadsheet with a number of tabs. It looks at the substantiations, so tracks decision points through the system and looks at disproportionality at each of those decision points. So, I'm just going to look today primarily at the out-of-home placements and that's the big one, but I will circle back to substantiation because of the current literature.

So here is what we're looking at in terms of the number of children in first placements. You can see that from '05 and I'm looking at the right hand side, from '05 to '10 you've had some variation in population, but basically you see that it kind of goes up and then down and then up and then down, so it's not been, you know, what you want to see, is like, it starts high and it gets less and the thing is things just don't work like that. For white children, and this is something that I am always -- I have kind of seen that when we started these things that seems like a lot of times that when rates start to go down they go down faster for white than they do for the population that we're actually working in. And when things start to go back up, they kind of go up for the group who are working with and they go up slower for white. I don't know what to make of that exactly.

But you can see for number of children in first placement on the right that it went up until '07 and then started coming down and then in '10 it dropped fairly dramatically. If you turn these into rates per thousand to give you some idea of the trend here, you're going to see we started out in state fiscal year '05 for Native American, the disproportionality rate was 6.8. And then it went down, the kind of state run, you know, in the fours, in 2009 it went up and '10 it went up. I remember the white rate dropped dramatically, so when you're looking at relative rates and this is one thing that I think it is important to look at is not only the relative rate but the actual rate per thousand, because sometimes we miss things when we just look at this.

Julia likes to engage in audience and have discussions about things and she was going to be talking about this part and you are certainly free to chime in. Let me go back to this slide, the 133 goes to 124, but the relative rate still goes up, because 473 went to 350. So, it's not so much that things were actually getting worse which is what this would make it look like. What happened was that the white rate dropped so much that left the Native American rate higher. There is a discussion there. We should come back to that one. So, let me get through these.

What you can see from these if you study them long enough there is a lot of numbers there, but you can see that out-of-home placement for Native American, American Indian over here is going down. Family Centered Services on the right for American Indian is going up. It goes up some for all cases and out-of-home placement also goes up, but it's inverse for Native American. I think those two make the point that we were data-driven, outcomes oriented and all that stuff we're supposed to be.

So, there are a lot of things happening. It's not just one, you know, MYFI is not just, you know, one intervention. It's multiple interventions. There is a native unit that was developed out of the planning process in 2004 and that put in place two liaisons, who would go out-of-the-home, native unit supervisors, so there was actually a unit separated out at DHS. There were four social workers assigned to the unit and child protection workers who were given cultural competence training, kept in the loop about what was going on with MYFI, so there was a shift there. Subsequently, the state has gone to a centralized intake. So, the child protection workers are now in Des Moines on the phone and then they report back to the service area. So, there has been a change there and will have to see what happens with that.

There is a quote at the bottom from one of the participants in the program. I have to say there was a lot of animosity early on, the native community did not like DHS and that's why the Recover Our Children Marches and there, you know, there is a lot of mistrust and so when they came to the planning sessions, they are like really, okay, so then they kept coming though and when their input showed up as part of the redesign and as part of the MYFI plan, I think it changed a lot of things.

One of the things that has changed in the recent past is that any child self-identified is considered native and so gets the same service. There is a huge emphasis on working with the tribes and the slide I showed with all the names of the tribes, I think at last count there were about 42 represented in Sioux City, which is I mean is a huge number for a city of, you know, 100,000 people or less. Everybody likes the flex ones and we have some of those flexible resource dollar pool is, you know, for $300 you get a lot. I know that it's difficult. You have to fight with accountants, all kinds of things, but you know, in study after study, I don't know, you know, family preservation programs, maybe some of the first ones that founded, you know, for a small amount of money people really get excited about that and liked the program.

These are some of the other partners and that's one of the things about Sioux City is that the interagency, the breaking down of silos is really evident there. And the annual conference really helps to highlight that. So, when the County Attorney and the Chief Judge and the Police Department, the Chief, the Captain, the Juvenile Court Services Chief, the Service Area Manager for the Department of Human Services, when they all show up for that, you know, that means something.

This is sort of a network analysis, not the usual network analysis that we do, but we use this as a way of kind of looking at who was connected and so this was a tool and this was part of the alliance involvement in Sioux City. And you will see the bottom is supposed to be like a railroad track of racism and oppression and that's what all of this was built on and so we're trying to break that down and so here is kind of where we are today and actually 4E access for tribes has happened so that one would have strong lines and would not be, the yellow ones were supposed to be the goals for the future. And we've -- I guess we are down to one track on the racism and oppression train track.

So, another thing that we did was we used the NAPCWA tool and actually this was a pilot site. And I'm not going to make you go through all these numbers, but what this is, is there is a society system and individual kind of screen for ratings on a number of questions. And if you go through and look at each one of these and I think these slides are going to be available, so you can if you're really interested in going back and tracking this you can. But what tended to happen in many of these domains was that, in the pilot was a small number of people, so initial and follow up had a larger and probably a little more valid.

But what we saw was that DHS in the beginning rated things pretty highly and then as time went on they kind of got an idea that maybe they weren't so high. And the community people rated things as little bit lower and they kind of came up. So, there is sort of coming together trying to meet in the middle. The community still rates things as lower than DHS. So, DHS things are all that the community site maybe not so much. Four Directions is a community center. If you've ever been to NICWA conference you might have heard of Frank LaMere.

I love doing presentations with Frank, because he always brings things together at the end. I don't have him to that this time. He is great at kind of setting through things and then coming up with, you know, the parole, and he does that, you know, everyday in his work. And so he is -- he runs the Four Directions Center, does parenting classes and works with the community and is really a kind of an outreach worker for DHS without being an outreach worker for DHS. This is another Julia remnant. She liked this book and so I wanted to recommend it, Keepers of the Children and it's also something that she used in the parenting classes. Okay, so, and this where Frank takes over and talks about the Kids Who Makes You Cry. I am not going to make you cry.

All right. Let's go two hours and 15 minutes east to Des Moines and okay, so the slides, that's the formal story. I got to tell you Des Moines has not been a straight path. We started by handing over the MYFI project to a local agency to put workers out in the community and then two. And the first worker was male and we got feedback, you know, we've got this young guy, tall good looking African American guy wandering about the African American community, knocking on doors, going to see, you know, moms and stuff. And people started saying, you know, this is kind of uncomfortable.

So, he was teamed up with a female, worked a lot better, so. One of the things we were looking at, you know, there is this issue of race matching and can that reduce disproportionality and somehow it was overlooked, maybe gender is also an important piece of all this. So, as that went on, DHS became dissatisfied with this agency and then pulled the contract back and then gave it to another agency. And about a year, less than a year ago that contract was pulled back and now they're going to start a new planning process, which I think is a good thing, because what's going on now is they are saying that these culturally competent and improved practices have now become part of the standard set of services that they provide. And so everybody gets the new and improved stuff which is wrong is the word that comes, but it's just inconsistent with what we were trying to do which was to be culturally competent and target services for specific

population and their specific needs to say that now, you know, or we just do that across the board, maybe.

Okay, so one of the things in Des Moines that is going on, continues to go on, is the CPPC project or Community Partnership for Protecting Children. And that is really at the community level and back in about 1991 or '90, we started something called Patch which was a British version of social service delivery, basically Patch does means neighborhood. And the Clark Foundation came in and started this CPPC in Linn County, Iowa and it has spread and so now it has circled back to helping in the area of disproportionality reduction, particularly in the Polk County or Des Moines area.

And like Sioux City there, you know, there is a collaboration among many in Des Moines between agencies, families and CPPC is sort of at the heart of this making it go forward at this point, you probably recognize some of those initiatives, making connections, model courts or the Court Improvement Project. So, where are we? This is at the family level. I did this for families because usually, some good percentage over time, our kids get removed so you have -- so there is a family level and then there is individual level, so I did both.

And for the family level, you see the relative rate for African American is 2.55. I remember when we started it was over five. And if you look at individuals it's 2.28. So, at this point and if you believe the research on disproportionality coming out that's you know, 73% more for African American in terms of maltreatment, where you know if you take that part out, .73, .28, you know, we're approaching zero on that. So, there are two primary practices I think why we need MYFI again, not my slide.

MYFI has set the foundation for a lot of these other things to develop and that maybe the most important part of it. So, we've had the you know the alliance I was talking about coming in, the Breakthrough Series, the Crossover Project; those kinds of things don't happen if you don't have, you know, if you don't have some energy momentum going forward. So, these are some other reasons why it's needed. The family team meeting and the Pre-Removal Conference are at the heart of what they are doing right now. And so what are they about?

Well, the Pre-Removal Conference really started from our County Attorney recognizing that out-of-home placements happened between 9 and 5. And he thought, under how eminent that risk is if it only happens between 9 and 5, so there will be some that are happening at 9 PM or not. So, we started having meetings with, I mean, there are some but the large majority happened during business hours. So, he decided to start something called the Pre-Removal Conference where you bring people in, have a discussion, the County Attorney would be there, has become more or less a mediation about what can be done and if there needs to be a removal of family come along and the kid transitions to kin for a certain period of time. But there are also some other things that can be talked about and become something like a family team meeting where you discuss other ways that you know, of moms abusing substances. Well maybe, if you want to do that, we can

figure something else out, so that when she is using the child has some place else to be, you know, those are separate issues.

So, I think it's helpful and it kind of reduces the need for going to court. We also talk about keeping children in the home, and if there is an out-of-home placement or someone else is going to watch the children, you know, how that's going to end, what's the end game on this, how is reunification going to take place. And these are some of the things that result from the PRC. The family team meetings, you probably, most everybody is familiar with family team meetings or family unity model or family group decision making or whatever you call, bringing in all of the informal supports and the formal supports to address the needs. And we are not a differential response state, but there are elements of it and so family team meetings are open to any family, so you can have voluntary cases that come before DHS and they can have family team meetings.

Kind of background on the family team decision making, the family team meetings are facilitated by people that have to go through a certain level of training. I have kind of looked at fidelity to the model and that's not always the best, you know, people, there is a time crunch. Family team meetings should be done correctly, take some time, so I don't know what you do about that. There is some that do a really good job and then some people just get in a hurry.

One of the things we tracked early on was that, this is the North Carolina Family Assessment System domains and we've -- I was looking at the, remember the community liaisons that were going. I had them doing initial assessment using NCFAS. And then I had DHS workers who were part of the intake process do the NCFAS and then I compared the two. And I found differences particularly in home environment, I remember the home environment assessment from the community workers much higher and much less of a concern than they were for the DHS workers sitting in the offices that there is a I don't know how that there is some published reports on that.

I think there are a couple of other things like parent capabilities higher among the community workers. DHS does a survey at the end to find out how people, how well they liked the family team meetings, pretty high. And I am sure if anyone that's been around family team meetings, you know, that's been through that see the stuff happening, it can be really touching when it goes right and people come together. And this is another quote about getting what they needed. And the social workers as well have expressed just I guess satisfaction. This person says they were pleased with the engagement efforts and team formation. The two hour time investment resulting in family being more informed, resulting in fewer questions of me early in the case, so not only does it make everyone feel better, but there is a cost effective element to it.

One of the things that was very helpful from this project was just putting together a resource guide for what's available in the community, be surprised at how that can help. All right, now we did undoing racism. There is lot of small print there. I think most are familiar with the undoing racism at this point. And I have, and we keep updating the same because it keeps changing. There is one for Woodbury County; there is one for

Polk County, but I have a practice guide and it's posted on our website and while these things are targeted to Sioux City and Des Moines, they could be helpful in other places. And the posting is probably a PDF, but it's in the public domain. So, if someone wanted to use it to start something they could.

These are some of the findings from the family team meetings in Des Moines just from the case workers. One of the things that we're working on now is finding the dads to be involved, only 33% of these include fathers. The average meeting size is kind of small, and then there was a cost calculation that was done of showing this, saved $15,812 per case, I can't vouch for that but I like it, that's a good number. This is just kind of background slide for me. There is, I think we're coming to the point in the slides where I want to talk a little about the recent research that's going on. And so, I did a little calculation on a matchbook cover. I used the 4.9 from Woodbury County when we started, so disproportionality rate 4.9. And assume that the difference is 73% based on the National Incidence Study, 4. So, our total now is the 4.68 and the 1.73, that's the total pie. And now we divided back in and we get the differential for child abuse neglect is 35% of the total.

So, that is at the front end. And the research that's out there is solely focused on the front end of the system, doesn't go beyond, it doesn't address foster care. The systemic part of this is still 65% of the total. So, if I'm looking, and this is in out-of-home placement, so if I just, in other words if I take out the 73%, okay I'll give you the 73%, I still have in the system 65% accounting for the disproportionality. When I was working in the Juvenile Justice area, we're just getting started, and I was going out to these places that had relative rates of eights and nines and fives and sixes and you know, I would ask community groups about okay, so the African American kids are committing more crimes. How much more? Two times, three times, four times and they, I don't know, maybe double or 2-3 times more.

Okay, so then, so here is your rate. It's seven. So, you think we can get it down then maybe to three, and we'll say, we'll call it good. And they would be shocked to see that it's that much higher. And then they would say, maybe we do have an issue. Okay, so this is the higher number. This is when you are at 7.9. So, 7.9 plus your 1.73, that's your total. Now you divide that back in and partition it in two. The differential in child abuse and neglect is now 23% of the total, okay. So, that's the difference in maltreatment. I am still left with 77% of the total due to institutional racism. And I am sure that these authors would love to be here. I don't know that anyone is here to have a point, counter point on this, but it's an interesting thesis.

And in fact when I read through the articles, I found that Brett Drake and Melissa Johnson-Reid write that when they went through it's not poverty either, because when they adjusted for the inflation, they said that doesn't account for it. And so, as I've gone through their work, I am not sure what it is that they are saying really. I know that they're using rates and they're not using individual level data, so there is no multi-varied analysis and I think the only way we get to separating out the effect of race, poverty whatever is to use multi-varied analysis, we have to.

There is a point in here about the Hispanic paradox that I completely don't understand, but that paradox seems to support their conclusion rather than refute the conclusion that there is not race bias. So, Hispanics don't suffer as much as African Americans, but they have the same level of poverty and therefore it supports that poverty causes the difference, and yeah, so I am not following that logic. Also, one of the things from the Juvenile Justice work that I did I found that we have a heck of a hard time on the Feds give us 600,000 a year for the state, Research Center gives 100,000 a year, I don't think we can affect poverty. And so, poverty is not actionable and we have to fix what we can fix which is practice and the system.

And they only look at the front end, so they're not looking at the decision points. So, if you look at the race equity scorecard, you'll see differences as you go through and those help you target where in the system and to say that pediatricians and school social workers and school nurses are just doing their job and they are not racist in their referrals and that substantiation is not affected by race. Okay, fine, we really don't know anyway, because you don't know about the reports coming in; you only know about substantiation.

Once you get there, way out to do is track the decision points through and you find in Juvenile Justice that and I think the majority of states, disproportionality had been getting worse as you went through the system. And in recent years that has changed because we've been focusing on the front door of the detention center, when pushing the system back toward the front. Okay, so now the arrest rates, the disproportionality arrest for Juvenile Justice kids, through the roof in fact in Iowa is getting worse, but all of the other decision points are coming down almost to one.

I'm not sure what we're going to do about the arrest one, but the other one seemed to be getting better. I did a little analysis of this with the Juvenile Detention Center instead of DHS involvement, the same analysis would be appropriate to do here, but you really have to do, you know, multi-varied somebody out of you will do a regression equation using individual level data. Structural equation modeling maybe down the road to really test theory, but at a minimum this is pretty simple to do. And I took entrance into the Juvenile Detention Center and I looked at I think it was I used poverty rates by census tracks in Des Moines. I was looking at how much of it is poverty and how much of it is race, can I make race go away.

And so when I entered poverty and then I entered race, I found that, between the two I think they explained about 46% of the variants and whether or not a kid was locked up. And it was split about half between poverty and about an half race. Then I took a bunch of other variables, everything else I had in the dataset and I put it in there, it didn't budge. It remained about 46%, in fact, you know, with some error made it worse in some case, but about 46% explained variation and about half of that was due to poverty and about half of it due to race, unmitigated by anything else I could throw at it.

So, you know, this is the test that you ought to do. Does it go through poverty if that's the case? Then the race to DHS involvement will zero out with poverty. So, I guess maybe the onuses on me to make that happen. We need individual level data. The rate data, I don't know who forgot to read, Robinson 1950 on the Ecological Fallacy; it's fascinating reading. You can't draw individual level conclusions from aggregate data. And I think we are at question and answer.

Female Speaker 1: I'm going to ask, where does the race equity scorecard, where does that come from?
Brad Richardson: I just want to remind you that this is being valued okay, so you have these that might become.

Female Speaker 1: Okay. Where is the race equity scorecard come from? Where did you get that from?

Brad Richardson: It's a good question. I am going to give credit to Dennette Derezotes, when the Race Matters Consortium was going, we worked on it. It developed and I had some hand in it in developing and Dennette and Julia Kleinschmit kind of worked on that. The scorecard maybe also attributable to the Casey Family Alliance and the Center for the Study of Social Policy, I guess that's the Alliance. It's there is a publication and well, there is the recent Child Welfare League of America publication that documents it, but prior to that there was a special issue on disproportionality put out by the Child Welfare League and I believe that's maybe the first place where it's really well documented probably about 2008.

Female Speaker 1: I have a confusion about whether or not the definition of institutional racism contains poverty for minorities.

Brad Richardson: I am not sure.

Female Speaker 1: My questions is, when I am thinking of institutional racism, the definition of poverty applying to the minority groups in my head is implied even though I realize poverty is more than racism. What I am saying is that we have Caucasian Americans who are poor, but based on numbers and based on the experience, poverty is to me is a component of institutional racism. How do you separate the two?

Brad Richardson: Well, if I go back to my definition half an hour back here was this definition if you get disproportionate results then that's my definition of institutional racism. So, if poverty is higher among a certain group that would be institutionalized out-of-home placement. I don't know I guess it's gone cradle now, cradle to prison pipeline and all of those decision points. So, if there is a race difference and you can't make that go away or explain it by something else then I think that's institutional racism.

Female Speaker 1: And that's true of the Hispanic paradox as well, because…

Brad Richardson: I am confused by that.

Female Speaker 1: Well, it is confusing.

Brad Richardson: I am confused of the idea of Hispanic paradox. I only came across that recently and maybe, you know, I just don't understand. But as I recall, the conclusion was that, because Hispanics were similarly situated to African Americans in terms of poverty, but that their rates were lower, so it's just a culturally protective factor and that's the Hispanic paradox. To me that would refute that poverty is, you know, this whole cause. So, I just, you know, I need to do more study or something, because I don't get it.

Female Speaker 2: I don't know if you can address this or not, but I just -- going back to the family team meetings and the low involvement of fathers, do you have any sense of what's behind that, whether it's the fathers or families or the workers not doing much to get the fathers, I mean, can you address that?

Brad Richardson: Well, I know that we have one issue which is, you know, fathers being in prison, so that takes some percentage. And then there are absentee fathers and how much effort you go into, you know, you put into tracking them down, that's another issue now, and then there is -- those are probably the primary ones, but I do have a sense that we need to you know redouble, triple whatever, quadruple our efforts to get fathers involved and that's kind of the next step as we do this planning for the next wave of MYFI in Des Moines. I think that's one of the things so it's that will be a center piece.

Female Speaker 2: I wanted to ask I know there are different partners within the institutional racism part of it, because we obviously have the courts and we have the agencies as well as the community. And I was wondering if in your studies, in both Des Moines and in Woodbury County area, if that impact, if there was a difference in impact based upon say, the way DHS looked at racism versus how the courts looked at racism.

Brad Richardson: Well, that's a loaded question. What comes to mind is, you know, there is the institutional level; there is also the individual level and I think those things interact. And it kind of depends. I mean there was a County Attorney, still is County Attorney in Woodbury County who was really of the mind that you need to you know save kids from their families and that didn't seem at all racist to him. What comes to mind is the implicit association test and how the subconscious affects some of the decision making and we don't even know when, you know, when we're doing something that is race biased.

And so I think we really need to take a look at our systems, but individuals really need to take a look at their own decision making processes and there are some judges that will do that. We have a judge in Waterloo with the Breakthrough Series collaboration that's asking attorneys if they have talked about certain questions. And so, she has taken that on as one of her PDSAs. So, there are some judges who are out there doing, you know, trying to push things and there are others of course that you know, this is the way we do it, this is the way we've always done it. And so, in any community, I think it's -- there are individual and joint effects of these different actors and different systems and where

quite ways out from really sorting that out, but I know that people make decisions. They make pass judgment and at the moment, it doesn't seem biased and when you step back and go, wait a minute.

Female Speaker 2: Could you just go over those two pies, the difference between two pies that you showed? Yeah.

Brad Richardson: Hopefully, does this work?

Female Speaker 2: Yeah.

Brad Richardson: Okay. So this one, what I did was I used the 4.9% relative rate for foster care. So, I take my 4.9 and add 1.73. All right, I pulled up my spreadsheet. I have actual data now that I made up. So, the 1.73 represents the assumed disparity in child abuse and neglect maltreatment. And the 4.9 is my total variation at foster care, so if I partition that out, 1.73 that leaves 3.17, which is not accounted for by the differential in child abuse and neglect. So, now if I just create percentages out of those, I get 35% for the 1.73, which is the differential of child abuse and neglect and 64.69% is the remaining 3.17, which is the difference between the abuse and neglect, disproportionality and the total foster care disproportionality. So, it divides out to 35% for child abuse and neglect, 65% for something else that I am calling systemic factors. And then when I went on to this one it became a more dramatic. So, as your disproportionality in foster care gets greater that 0.73 accounts for less and less of the total pie. And so, if I am using a total of 7.6, now I end up with 22.76% for the difference in child abuse and neglect and whopping 77% for institutional factors.

Female Speaker 2: So, let me just take a stab at seeing if I am right in understanding what you just said. Are you saying then that there is you are assuming a disparity in maltreatment between African Americans and whites, is that it and that what you are looking at is sort of beyond that one to take that out?

Brad Richardson: Yes.

Female Speaker 2: There is a disparity between African American and whites in foster care, and that so you are assuming that those are institutional factors that are creating that, did I get that right?

Brad Richardson: Those factors are unaccounted for by the difference in the child abuse neglect rate, so that's what left over.

Female Speaker 2: Okay.

Brad Richardson: So as that -- if you are looking at foster care as that rate grows beyond 73%.

Female Speaker 2: Okay.

Brad Richardson: That's beyond the maltreatment differential and is attributed to I just said systemic factors, I don't know what those are.

Female Speaker 2: Okay.

Brad Richardson: Something else.

Female Speaker 2: Okay, so but you are not making a statement in terms of what causes the differentiation in child abuse -- in the maltreatment and neglect. You're just talking about, sort of, we got that factor.

Brad Richardson: Beyond.

Female Speaker 2: Beyond that, you know the other things, kind of unexplained, so we are looking at institutional factors.

Brad Richardson: Right.

Female Speaker 2: Okay great thanks.

Brad Richardson: Yeah. So that way we can all be right. They can say 73% higher, and okay we'll go with that and that was the story about engaging community groups about the difference in the rates for African American arrest, is that, okay we'll give you that it should be, you know, twice as high, what about this other stuff. One more question, going? Okay thanks for coming.