INTRODUCTION

Exciting to see Course and FMC

Both Hugely Important

- Child Welfare needs transformational change
- For that need change mindset of many; Media essential
- Who else will “speak truth to power”? Speak for Kids?

Your Task Hugely Challenging

- Story: Daniel & my first meeting: RD story covering: Need to understand it my way, Invite to RD conf followed....
- CAP message to students: Children the hardest disempowered group to represent – for you hardest perhaps to know the “right” policy
- You will find:
  - Policy: Wildly different ideas and claims re BIC
  - Research: Similar problems; some good and some bad; great you are recognizing significance of Social Science but must learn to distinguish
  - Many in Ch Welfare world are targeting you, trying to “educate” you: FMC not alone recognizing potential of media; Policy Advocacy
groups are committed to manipulating Media to serve their purposes:

- Many such I profoundly disagree with are very sophisticated, make Media key part of their strategy
- Edna McConnell Clark in IFPS and Casey Alliance in RD (note Annie E. Casey funder for this course; also Stuart Fnd)

You need:

- Probe Deeply to find “right” facts and policy
- If just listen superficially will hear the dominant Child Welfare Orthodox view – profoundly wrong leading in wrong Policy Directions
- Need to learn to listen to Emily Putnam-Hornstein, also to Brett Drake, but not all “leading lights”

MY TOPIC:

- Helps illustrate the challenge: Dominant “Child Welfare” Position often, in my view, Anti-Child
- “Creating a Child-Friendly Child Welfare System”: Deliberately provocative
  - System claims to be child-friendly, that BIC guiding principle
  - But actually regularly values Adult Rights over Child

More specifically: Role of Research:

- Striking Amount of Research
- Striking potential to inform Policy
- But generally biased; serving Fam Pres, Adult-oriented Agenda, not BIC

POLICY: See NOBODY’S CHILDREN

Child Maltreatment a major problem; ramifications for kids are lifelong emotional and physical

Good interventions

- Anti-poverty
Early targeted support (eg HV see Daro later)
Coercive intervention once serious CAN: earlier, more definitive, more TPR & Adoption

Problematic Policy: Dominant Family Preservation Priority in face of serious CAN: Doesn’t work well; ½ to 2/3 kids suffer ongoing CAN

Again see NC; a huge topic; can talk Q&A

RESEARCH: See P&P article

Focus today: Research MISUSE Problems

Good Research (see Emily P-H) Too Often Ignored
Bad Research Regularly Promulgated & Used

“Bad Research” Definition

Research that doesn’t evaluate BIC
Research that simply serves predetermined Family Preservation Policy Agenda
  - Designed to Vindicate that Agenda
  - Rather than genuinely Evaluate it

Research that asks Narrow Qs, Wrong Qs, EG:
  - How does this further Fam Pres?
  - As vs How does this serve BIC? Does more FP actually serve/disserve BIC?

Research that gives Misleading, even Dishonest Answers

BAD RESEARCH EXAMPLES: Just RD & P&P today

RACIAL DISPROPORTIONALITY MOVEMENT – Perhaps most significant recent example of Egregious Research Misuse, in service of one of latest iterations of Fam Pres Agenda:

EB work: Article, RD Conference; Article title – The RD Movement: False Fact & Dangerous Directions
Huge recent Mvmt promoted by “Casey Alliance” & most of Child Welfare Establishment (CWLA, ABA Center Children&Law)

Systematic indoctrination of Media part of Mvmt Strategy, with significant success: many articles adopting the RD Mvmt “racial discrimination” line

Goal: Reduce Removal of Black Kids to Population %

Based on Claim: Removal constitutes Race Discrim vs Parents bc CAN rates the same

Disc Claim based primarily on One Research Report: NIS-3

NIS-3 did indeed make this claim: CAN rates the Same, therefore Disc by System likely

BUT the claim WAS NOT TRUE; NIS-3 authors had no evidence rates the same

Enterprising Social Scientist Brett Drake (see Course later) dug out the facts hidden in enormous Appendix by time of our RD Conference:
  - Rates not the same, but different by factor similar to official rates
  - Just not big enough sample for Stat Sig difference finding

BUT NIS-3 said the same, no difference, & thus Disc; didn’t say no sig difference; no fn, no Appendix till later; absence of stat sig provides no basis for claiming No Difference and thus Disc
  - Deliberate Dishonesty?
  - At minimum: Sophisticated social scientists put out grossly misleading NIS-3, which sophisticated policy-makers used endlessly to promote policy based on claim of Same Malt Rates
  - While ignoring lots of other evidence that Black Malt Rates likely Higher than White

Mvmt succeeded in misleading Policy Makers & Press

NET: Not enough for Press to try to push for “change;” Must be RIGHT on Facts and Policy; and resist deliberate manipulation, by dominant forces in field
EARLY PREVENTION & PROTECTION: POLICIES & RESEARCH

Net for me of RD Debate, my work/article, & our RD Conference: Recognize too much CAN and try to address Early:

- Supportive Prevention
- Coercive Intervention

P&P Workshop held last Spring: NET:

- Many exciting Initiatives BUT ALSO
- Fam Pres Ideology – Parental Autonomy -- dominates both Policy & Research, limits Reform Potential

Positive:

- Exciting Program Initiatives:
  - Public Health Approach: Early Universal Support for Parents, with more Targeted for most at-risk
  - Family Drug Courts that reach Substance-Exposed Infants (SEI) (Sacramento CA program)

- Exciting Research: Emily Putnam-Hornstein & Barbara Needell of USC & UC Berkeley:
  - Predictive Capacity
  - Failure of Current Protective

Negative: How Family Pres Ideology limits Reform Potential; Some Specifics:

- Early HV: YES POTENTIAL BUT: Only reaches roughly 2/3; no real research on risky 1/3; no thought re Mandatory – ask Daro; but see visionary Henry Kempe 1976 quoted P&P calling for Mandatory like Compulsory Education

- Family Drug Courts: YES POTENTIAL BUT
  - Over time the dual promise (Parents & Kids) became one: Parents & Family Preservation: ask Judge Edwards
  - Almost no reach to SEI, the infants: And when focus: Sacramento Program:
• Policy emphasis: keeping all at home;
• Research focus: Fam Pres success; BIC??

CONCLUSION:

■ Policy shld move in more child-friendly direction
■ Research also: so illuminates issues RELEVANT to BIC for Policy Makers
■ YOU: Tough job probing in depth beyond the policy conclusions and research you will be fed by Child Welfare Establishment
■ WATCH FOR FUTURE: DR (Differential Response) big now and likely bigger if RD defeated: No evidence better for Kids than Services within Coercive CPS system