



# Addressing Inequities In Child Welfare

---

Anita P. Barbee, Ph.D., MSSW  
Center for Family and Community Well-Being  
Kent School of Social Work  
University of Louisville  
Presentation Version of Slides



## CPM Implementation Support Team

*Welcomes Supervisors: our front line leaders!*

---

CPM: Designed to counteract systemic and structural inequities. It is a comprehensive intervention on two levels: the **family** practice level and the **system** level.



# Agenda

---

1. Disproportionality in Central Valley counties

2. How to have courageous conversations using some guiding questions

3. How to address systemic racism in

---

child welfare

# **Part I:**

# **Disproportionality in Central Valley counties**

---

# What is a Disproportionality Index? (DI)

---

- It is a number that indicates the relative representation of one group of children (for example children documented as Black) as compared to another group (for example children documented as White) in a specified metric of involvement with the child welfare system. Two of those metrics are:
  - In a 12-month period, Entry into Foster Care for more than 8 days
  - On a specified date, being in a placement episode (In Care)

# Disproportionality Index

## (continued)

---

- The calculation of that number begins with the calculation of a rate in care (per 1,000) for each group.
  - For example if there are 10,000 children in the population and 400 In Care, the rate would be  $(400/10,000 \times 1,000)$  40 per thousand.
  - Another group might have 25,000 children in the population and 500 In Care, the rate would be  $(500/25,000 \times 1,000)$  20 per thousand.
- The DI then would be calculated as  $40/20 = 2.0$ .
  - The group with 400 In Care would be In Care at a rate twice of that for the group with 500 In Care even though the absolute number is higher.
  - Any number higher than 1.0 indicates that it is a group with a higher participation rate than the other.
  - A DI of 3.0 would indicate a rate that is three times the other, a DI of 4.0 would indicate a rate that is four times the other, etc.

# What does it mean that data is masked?

---

- Numbers that are sufficiently small (10 or less) are vulnerable to enabling the community to become aware of a family's child's involvement in the CW system.
- Thus any data set containing a number of 10 or less does not identify the exact number.
- Not having a number disables the ability to calculate participation per thousand and thus a DI.
- In the following charts Madera and Mariposa had numbers masked. In order to have a participation rate and an index assumed numbers were supplied for the formulas.
- For Madera, the number supplied for Black Children was 9. In previous periods the number had ranged from 20 to 28 so 9 is not unlikely.
- For Mariposa, the number supplied for Black Children was 1. The number supplied for White Children was 10. This provides the most optimistic DI.

# National DIs

---

- Non-Hispanic White children made up 52% of the population of children in 2017 and 47% of children entering foster care in 2017 were White making their DI = .9
- Black children made up 13.8% of the population of children in 2017 and 21% of children entering foster care in 2017 were Black making their DI = 1.5





| 2019            | Population of Black Children | Black Children Entries to Foster Care | Population of All Children | All Children Entries to Foster Care | Population of White Children | White Children Entries to Foster Care | Black Children Entries to Foster Care: Rate per 1,000 | All Children Entries to Foster Care: Rate per 1,000 | White Children Entries to Foster Care: Rate per 1,000 | DI: Black Children vs. All Children | DI: Black Children vs. White Children |
|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Fresno          | 13,455                       | 153                                   | 281,014                    | 1,303                               | 60,495                       | 224                                   | 11.4  | 4.6   | 3.7   | 2.5                                 | 3.1                                   |
| Kern            | 13,708                       | 94                                    | 252,977                    | 864                                 | 68,651                       | 269                                   | 6.9   | 3.4   | 3.9   | 2.0                                 | 1.8                                   |
| Kings           | 1,717                        | 24                                    | 43,977                     | 221                                 | 11,547                       | 60                                    | 14.0  | 5.0   | 5.2   | 2.8                                 | 2.7                                   |
| Madera (9)      | 699                          | Masked                                | 41,235                     | 205                                 | 9,185                        | 35                                    | 12.9  | 5.0   | 3.8   | 2.6                                 | 3.4                                   |
| Mariposa (1)    | 17                           | Masked                                | 2,507                      | 35                                  | 1,811                        | 21                                    | 58.8  | 14.0  | 11.6  | 4.2                                 | 5.1                                   |
| Merced          | 1,963                        | 34                                    | 79,847                     | 331                                 | 16,543                       | 85                                    | 17.3  | 4.1   | 5.1   | 4.2                                 | 3.4                                   |
| San Joaquin     | 12,775                       | 104                                   | 195,068                    | 515                                 | 46,577                       | 121                                   | 8.1   | 2.6   | 2.6   | 3.1                                 | 3.1                                   |
| San Luis Obispo | 496                          | 11                                    | 49,559                     | 299                                 | 27,720                       | 174                                   | 22.2  | 6.0   | 6.3   | 3.7                                 | 3.5                                   |
| Santa Barbara   | 1,148                        | 13                                    | 99,782                     | 341                                 | 30,810                       | 92                                    | 11.3  | 3.4   | 3.0   | 3.3                                 | 3.8                                   |
| Stanislaus      | 3,800                        | 87                                    | 149,638                    | 795                                 | 48,888                       | 316                                   | 22.9  | 5.3   | 6.5   | 4.3                                 | 3.5                                   |
| Tulare          | 1,536                        | 48                                    | 141,302                    | 1,066                               | 30,387                       | 273                                   | 31.3  | 7.5   | 9.0   | 4.1                                 | 3.5                                   |
| Ventura         | 2,591                        | 16                                    | 197,106                    | 555                                 | 65,151                       | 127                                   | 6.2   | 2.8   | 1.9   | 2.2                                 | 3.2                                   |
| California      | 491,044                      | 4,981                                 | 9,061,651                  | 28,407                              | 2,619,219                    | 6,684                                 | 10.1  | 3.1   | 2.6   | 3.2                                 | 4.0                                   |

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2019 Quarter 4 Extract

Webster, D., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Wiegmann, W., Saika, G., Chambers, J., Hammond, I., Williams, C., Miramontes, A., Ayat, N., Sandoval, A., Benton, C., Hoerl, C., McMillen, B., Wade, B., Yee, H., Flamson, T., Hunt, J., Carpenter, W., Casillas, E., & Gonzalez, A. (2020). CCWIP reports. Retrieved June 7, 2020, from University of California at Berkeley California Child Welfare Indicators Project website. URL: <https://ccwip.berkeley.edu/>



| July 1, 2019    | Population of Black Children | Black Children in Care | Population of All Children | All Children in Care | Population of White Children | White Children in Care | Black Children in Care: Rate per 1,000 | All Children in Care: Rate per 1,000 | White Children in Care: Rate per 1,000 | DI: Black Children vs. All Children | DI: Black Children vs. White Children |
|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Fresno          | 13,455                       | 313                    | 281,014                    | 2,200                | 60,495                       | 337                    | 23.3                                   | 7.8                                  | 5.6                                    | 3.0                                 | 4.2                                   |
| Kern            | 13,708                       | 208                    | 252,977                    | 1,450                | 68,651                       | 496                    | 15.2                                   | 5.7                                  | 7.2                                    | 2.6                                 | 2.1                                   |
| Kings           | 1,717                        | 37                     | 43,977                     | 277                  | 11,547                       | 58                     | 21.5                                   | 6.3                                  | 5.0                                    | 3.4                                 | 4.3                                   |
| Madera (9)      | 699                          | Masked                 | 41,235                     | 280                  | 9,185                        | 61                     | 12.9                                   | 6.8                                  | 6.6                                    | 1.9                                 | 1.9                                   |
| Mariposa (1)    | 17                           | Masked                 | 2,507                      | 20                   | 1,811                        | Masked                 | 58.8                                   | 8.0                                  | 5.5                                    | 7.4                                 | 10.7                                  |
| Merced          | 1,963                        | 64                     | 79,847                     | 498                  | 16,543                       | 147                    | 32.6                                   | 6.2                                  | 8.9                                    | 5.2                                 | 3.7                                   |
| San Joaquin     | 12,775                       | 289                    | 195,068                    | 1,241                | 46,577                       | 277                    | 22.6                                   | 6.4                                  | 5.9                                    | 3.6                                 | 3.8                                   |
| San Luis Obispo | 496                          | 11                     | 49,559                     | 299                  | 27,720                       | 174                    | 22.2                                   | 6.0                                  | 6.3                                    | 3.7                                 | 3.5                                   |
| Santa Barbara   | 1,148                        | 13                     | 99,782                     | 341                  | 30,810                       | 92                     | 11.3                                   | 3.4                                  | 3.0                                    | 3.3                                 | 3.8                                   |
| Stanislaus      | 3,800                        | 87                     | 149,638                    | 795                  | 48,888                       | 316                    | 22.9                                   | 5.3                                  | 6.5                                    | 4.3                                 | 3.5                                   |
| Tulare          | 1,536                        | 48                     | 141,302                    | 1,066                | 30,387                       | 273                    | 31.3                                   | 7.5                                  | 9.0                                    | 4.1                                 | 3.5                                   |
| Ventura         | 2,591                        | 16                     | 197,106                    | 555                  | 65,151                       | 127                    | 6.2                                    | 2.8                                  | 1.9                                    | 2.2                                 | 3.2                                   |
| California      | 491,044                      | 10,765                 | 9,061,651                  | 51,431               | 2,619,219                    | 11,360                 | 21.9                                   | 5.7                                  | 4.3                                    | 3.9                                 | 5.1                                   |

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2019 Quarter 4 Extract

Webster, D., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Wiegmann, W., Saika, G., Chambers, J., Hammond, I., Williams, C., Miramontes, A., Ayat, N., Sandoval, A., Benton, C., Hoerl, C., McMillen, B., Wade, B., Yee, H., Flamson, T., Hunt, J., Carpenter, W., Casillas, E., & Gonzalez, A. (2020). CCWIP reports. Retrieved June 7, 2020, from University of California at Berkeley California Child Welfare Indicators Project website. URL: <https://ccwip.berkeley.edu/>

# Conversation- Zoom Groups By County

---

- What do you think is driving the high disproportionality/disparity rates in your county?
- What is your county doing currently to address this issue?
- What ideas do you have for moving forward to reduce these disparate outcomes for Black children in your county?



# Part II: Courageous Conversations

---

# Courageous Conversations

(Singleton & Linton, 2007; Singleton, 2013)

---

- It is helpful to reflect on the *Four Agreements of Courageous Conversations* prior to meeting with partners and to review these four agreements with the team, preferably before courageous conversations ensue.
  - Review at beginning of the conversation and review if a discussion becomes tense or gets derailed due to discomfort of partners.
    - **Stay engaged:** This means “remaining morally, emotionally, intellectually, and socially involved in the dialogue.”
    - **Experience discomfort:** This norm acknowledges that discomfort is inevitable, especially in dialogue about race, and that participants make a commitment to bring issues into the open. Talking about these issues does not create divisiveness. The divisiveness already exists in society and in our systems. It is through dialogue, even when uncomfortable, that healing and change begin.
    - **Speak your truth:** This means being open about thoughts and feelings and not just saying what you think others want to hear.
    - **Expect, respect and accept non-closure:** This means everyone is asked to “hang out in uncertainty” and not rush to quick solutions, especially in relation to racial understanding, which requires ongoing dialogue.
-

# Courageous Conversations

---

- Who is most effective partner to facilitate racial equity discussions?
  - Generally, the person with positional leadership in partnership with a BIPOC
  - Sometimes it may be best to have a racial equity ally to initiate the topic (e.g. especially if the group is mostly White)
- Where is the racial equity discussion most ideally situated on a meeting agenda (e.g. discussion of organizational culture and climate or disproportionality)?
- If there is resistance from partners or colleagues, address the resistance in the context of the discussion by posing a coaching/observation question. One potential question to pose is, *“I am hearing that the team may not feel ready to further explore how racial equity impacts the families you serve. Yet our common ground is that we all want families to thrive and reach their potential. What one next step could we take together to continue moving forward on this important issue?”*

Cross-County Zoom Groups Discuss A Question:  
 Look at Handout. Discuss the Question assigned to your Group  
 Then we will report out

---

1. Group 1: How well do you believe your program demonstrates a commitment to diversity for the workforce and for the families you serve?
2. **Group 2: How does your practice model—and your other practice supports—intentionally address the principles, values, and skills the workforce needs to improve outcomes for Black children in your child welfare system?**
3. Group 3: On a scale of 1 to 10—with 1 being not at all and 10 being always—to what degree does your leadership decision-making include an examination of the positive and negative implications of a decision on the racial/ethnic groups your program serves?

# Discussion Questions

---

4. Group 4: If I were to walk into your program's office tomorrow morning and be a quiet observer, what would I see or hear that would show me that social work values and social justice are present in your daily work?

**5. Group 5: What are the strengths and possible areas for growth related to race and ethnicity dynamics in your workplace?**

6. Group 6: What strategies has your program taken within the past three years to address implicit bias and the experiences of microaggressions within your workplace for racially/ethnically diverse staff? What success have these strategies had on recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce?

**7. Group 7: Which internal and external partners does your program consider as an ally in addressing disparities in your system and the other systems that serve the same families? Who else could you partner with?**

8. Group 8: How recently have you examined your data by race and ethnicity and by various decision points along the continuum (such as decisions to screen-in a referral, accepted reports, response path selection, substantiations, or placement entries)? What did you learn and how have you applied those lessons learned thus far?

---



# Discussion Questions

---

9. Group 9: How are racial equity issues intentionally integrated in the various learning opportunities, trainings, and professional development activities in your program?

**10. Group 10: In what ways do discussions about racial equity and cultural responsiveness appear when your program is conducting reflective supervision, group consultations, and team decision-making protocols?**

11. Group 11: What organizational structures has your program put in place to monitor the parameters and procedures that guide development of leaders and promotional opportunities?

# **Part III: Addressing systemic racism in child welfare**

---

# Zoom Group Discussion 3

---

- How does the current civil unrest and quest for social justice intersect with your efforts to make child welfare more just?
- Do these efforts affect systemic racism inherent in the child welfare system?
- What do you hope your agency does to better meet the needs of Black, Indigenous and Latinx families and children you serve?

**Stay tuned for more  
information about the  
“*CPM for Supervisors*”  
*Webinar series!***

