



DR = Disproportionality Rate. This expresses the degree to which a population's rate of representation, at the several decision points or stages in child welfare services, is out of alignment with its proportion of the total population—with 1 being in alignment (i.e., the same as in the population), the involvement can be greater (more than 1) or lesser (less than 1). For example, a DR rate of 3.2 means that a group is represented at 3.2 times what would be expected given its share of the overall population. A DR rate of .75 means that the group's participation is three-quarters what one would expect it to be, given its share of the overall population.

1. Reports: This section shows the numbers and rates at which mandated and other reporters contact CWS with concerns of possible abuse or neglect. For example, in 2015, of 2,858 referrals to CWS with such concerns, 769, or 26.9%, involved AI/AN children; 1,664 (or 58.2%) involved White children. AI/AN children represent 7% of the total Humboldt County child population. Reports of possible child abuse or neglect are made regarding AI/AN families at a disproportionality rate (DR) of 3.8, meaning that such reports are made at over three times what would be expected given the population. White children are represented in the overall population at 77% in Humboldt County. With reports of abuse or neglect involving White children at 58.2%, the data shows that they are under-represented at this stage, with a DR rate of .76. Note that the rates for AI/AN children rose over the three years, while rates for White children decreased slightly during the same time period.
2. Screened in: This is the rate at which referrals regarding possible abuse or neglect of AI/AN children are found to meet the requirements to be screened in and assigned for investigation in Humboldt County. For 2015, 242 of the 918 referrals assigned for investigation involved AI/AN children, or 26.4%, which is a disproportionality rate of 3.8 times what would be expected. It has held steady at that rate over the three years. However, one must note that since the rate of initial reports is over three times higher than the population rate, that disproportion is compounded when screened-in and assigned-for-investigation referrals are also disproportionate. The screened-in rate for White children has also remained steady during the three years, at around three-quarters of what would be expected given the population. For the three years of reports made regarding AI/AN children, the average screen-in rate is 26%. For White children, the average screen-in rate over the three years is 61.3%.
3. Substantiations: This is the rate at which the assigned investigations result in a finding that the allegation of abuse or neglect is substantiated at the conclusion of the investigation. For 2015, 63 (26.2%) of the 240 investigations resulting in substantiated abuse or neglect involved AI/AN children in Humboldt County, for a disproportionality rate of 3.7. Note that the DR rate has varied from 3.7 to 5.0 over the last three years. Also keep in mind that this disproportion is compounded by disproportion in referrals and disproportion in assigned-for-investigation. Investigated reports of White children are under-represented in the findings of substantiation, with DR rates between .49–.84 for this three-year period. Looking at the relationship between investigations and substantiations within each population group over the three years, 27.9% of the investigations involving AI/AN families resulted in substantiations, and 23.7% for White families.
4. Family Maintenance (FM): We wanted to ascertain the rate at which substantiated investigations resulted in cases being opened for Family Maintenance services where the family would receive services to maintain the child safely in the home (no removal). To keep families together and provide active efforts to prevent removal as required by ICWA, we would expect to see a high rate of these case openings for AI/AN families, and we did. In this case we see the disproportionality as a positive, for families to receive the help needed to provide safe and stable care. For 2015, 37 of the 98 cases opened for FM services in Humboldt County involved AI/AN children, or 37.8%, a disproportionality rate of 5.4 times what would be expected based on population. Also, however, note that the assignments of cases to

FM in 2015 dropped to by a third of what it had been for each of the two previous years, both for AI/AN cases and the total number of assignments, for which we have no explanation and possibly could be related to data or practice issues. White children are under-represented in case openings for FM, with DR rates roughly matching those seen for White children in the other decision points shown thus far.

5. Placed first-time: This is the rate at which children are removed from their homes and placed into some form of substitute care, either on an emergency basis or during/at conclusion of an investigation. During 2015, 36 AI/AN children were removed under such circumstances, out of a total for Humboldt County of 170. This is 21.2%, at a disproportionality rate of 3.0. Note that this is very close to the substantiation disproportionality rate. Also note that over the three years the rate dropped for AI/AN children each of the three years, starting with a rate of 4.9 in 2013. In first-time placements out-of-home, the under-representation of White children continues at the same rates as previously discussed.

Year	Children in placement at any time during year (6)		Placed w/ relative (7)		Of those exiting care, exits due to family reunification (8)	
	AI/AN	White	AI/AN	White	AI/AN	White
2013	112/285	132/285	67/112	50/132	35/48	47/76
	39.3%	46.3%	59.8%	37.9%	73%	61.8%
	Pop 7%	Pop 77%				
	DR 5.6	DR .60				
2014	129/322	159/322	74/129	54/159	22/41	37/77
	40.1%	49.4%	57.4%	34%	53.7%	48.1%
	Pop 7%	Pop 77%				
	DR 5.3	DR .64				
2015	131/367	194/367	76/131	79/194	28/69	38/90
	35.7%	52.9%	58%	40.7%	40.6%	42.2%
	Pop 7%	Pop 77%				
	DR 5.1	DR .69				

6. In Placement: This measure is the total number of children in care at any point during the calendar year, including children newly-placed during the year and children who exit care at any point during the year, as well as children who are in care for all twelve months of the year. In other words, this is not a length-of-stay measure. However, if AI/AN children remain in care for longer periods than other children, we often see their numbers accumulate upward in this measure, which is the case here. For 2015, a total of 367 children were in care during the year, of whom 131 were AI/AN children, or 35.7%, just over five times the number which can be accounted for by their prevalence in the population of Humboldt County. Note that the disproportionality rate for AI/AN children is down from the previous two years (5.6 and 5.3 respectively). Also note that the overall number of children in care has increased from year to year. DR rates for White children have increased slightly over the three years, between .60 and .69; but is still well below the 77% which would be in alignment with their population numbers. One additional note: In 2015 Humboldt County CWS had 11 AI/AN licensed foster care homes with 10 AI/AN children in foster care. The total number of all children in licensed foster care homes in Humboldt County was 89. The number of AI/AN licensed foster care providers is relatively low for a population of this size, even with large numbers of AI/AN children in relative care.

7. Placed with relative: In this measure we were interested in finding how many of the children in out-of-home care were placed in environments which would likely be most conducive to continued family engagement and reunification. In this measure we are looking only at children and their placement type; there is no measure of disproportionality for this. The numbers for AI/AN children placed in relative care are in a range from 57.4% to 59.8% over the three years. This represents good efforts to find and place children with their family and shows alignment with the intent of the Indian Child Welfare Act. White children are placed in family settings at significantly lower rates than AI/AN children overall (34% to 40.1% of White children in care), but there are indications that the rate for this population may be trending upwards.
8. Exits due to family reunification: In this measure we look at the numbers of children in each population who are successfully reunited with their families after having been in out-of-home placement. For example, in 2013 there were 48 total AI/AN children who exited care with 35 reunified with their birth family or custodian. Again we see that the numbers vary by year, with between 40.6% and 73% for AI/AN children exiting during the year due to family reunification with AI/AN figures staying just above or similar to those for White children during the same time period. One important note is the rate of exits due to family reunification has been decreasing steadily each year since 2013 for both populations.

Year	Of cases closed during the year with children at home, number of re-openings since closure (9)		Terminations of parental rights (10)		Adoptions (11)	
	AI/AN	All	AI/AN	White	AI/AN	White
2013	2/63	5/167	8/28	18/28	3/20	12/20
	3.2%	3%	28.6%	64.3%	15%	60%
			Pop 7%	Pop 77%	Pop 7%	Pop 77%
			DR 4.1	DR .84	DR 2.1	DR .78
2014	0/41	2/148	8/33	25/33	7/37	26/37
	0%	1.4%	24.2%	75.8%	18.9%	70.3%
			Pop 7%	Pop 77%	Pop 7%	Pop 77%
			DR 3.5	DR .98	DR 2.7	DR .91
2015	0/76	0/192	5/46	36/46	18/46	27/46
	0%	0%	10.9%	78.3%	39.1%	58.7%
			Pop 7%	Pop 77%	Pop 7%	Pop 77%
			DR 1.6	DR 1.0	DR 5.6	DR .76

9. The occurrence of case re-openings involving children who were either maintained in their homes or reunified with their families at the time of case closure is impressively low. We found that of cases closed in 2010 with children at home the re-openings in the five years since are 6/135 (4.4%) for all children and 3/59 (5%) for AI/AN children. Of cases closed in 2011, 2/111 (1.8%) of all have re-opened and 0/32 (0%) involving AI/AN children have re-opened. Of 2012 case closings, only one has re-opened, and it involved an AI/AN child. In 2013 only two cases reopened and none in 2014 and 2015.
10. Termination of parental rights: This data looks at the number of court approved termination of parental rights petitions granted in each of the three years. While termination of parental rights is used to make a child legally-free for adoption, many tribes in the Humboldt County service area and elsewhere have indicated they rarely, if ever, support termination of parental rights for their tribal parents and instead prefer to pursue other forms of permanent placement when a child cannot be returned home successfully. California also has a state law that allows state courts to utilize and approve tribal customary adoptions in state court that are performed by tribes. Tribal customary

adoptions typically do not terminate parental rights when placing a child for adoption. In 2013 and 2014 the number of parents of AI/AN children that had their parental rights terminated was 8 in both years 2013 and 2014 and 5 in 2015. This represented 28.6% and 24.2% respectively of the total number of termination of parental rights petitions granted in 2013 and 2014. The number dropped over half in 2015 to 10.9%. It is not known to what extent tribal customary adoption played a role in the decrease during 2015 or if the numbers in 2013 and 2014 reflected larger numbers of parents from tribes outside Humboldt County where conventional adoption with termination of parental rights was used. Parents of White children that had their parental rights terminated were 64.3% to 78.3% of the total number of termination of parental rights, numbers closer to their population rates.

11. Adoptions: The completed adoptions of AI/AN children in Humboldt County facilitated by CWS grew dramatically over the three year period starting in 2013 comprising 15% of the adoptions and growing to 39.1% by 2015. This increased the DR for AI/AN children who were adopted from 2.1 in 2013 to 5.6 in 2015. Adoptions of White children grew in 2013 (60%) and 2014 (70.3%) and then declined in 2015 (58.7%). While the overall number of adoptions was relatively small, it should be noted that the numbers grew significantly from 2013 to 2015. The specific reasons for the increase is unknown, but certainly AI/AN children were among the children who saw the greatest increases.

Total Open Family Maintenance and Family Reunification Cases and Average Length of Stay for AI/AN and White children

Total Open FM Cases and Duration of Time Open In Days (12)	White		AI/AN		Total	
	Cases	Average Length of Stay (ALOS)	Cases	Average Length of Stay (ALOS)	Cases	Average Length of Stay (ALOS)
04/30/2013	67	775.9	41	928.9	118	815.7
04/30/2014	69	596.3	30	848.8	116	671.3
04/30/2015	64	486.6	68	727.8	144	596.2
04/30/2016	39	443.5	42	602.9	93	504.7

Total Open FR Cases and Duration of Time Open In Days (12)	White		AI/AN		Total	
	Cases	Average Length of Stay (ALOS)	Cases	Average Length of Stay (ALOS)	Cases	Average Length of Stay (ALOS)
04/30/2013	61	778.6	49	986.9	121	889.4
04/30/2014	69	827.3	66	983.3	151	883.6
04/30/2015	110	643.6	72	736.6	202	678.3
04/30/2016	143	453.2	60	621.5	216	495.4

Total Open PP Cases and Duration of Time Open (in days)	White		NA/AN		Total	
	Cases	Average Length of Stay (ALOS)	Cases	Average Length of Stay (ALOS)	Cases	Average Length of Stay (ALOS)
04/30/2013	154	1832.6	121	1915.8	305	1898.8
04/30/2014	162	1673.2	122	1737.0	315	1720.1
04/30/2015	163	1399.9	116	1710.8	307	1551.4
04/30/2016	138	1202.9	89	1595.9	253	1364.2

12. Open Family Maintenance, Family Reunification, and Permanency Planning Cases Average Length of Stay: These charts answer the question, “What is the average length of stay for AI/AN and White children who are in Family Maintenance and Family Reunification cases.” The available data provides a snapshot of the length of stay for open cases of these types at four different time periods between 2013 and 2016. In each service category and during each time period AI/AN children have been in care for considerably more time than their White counterparts. While the overall numbers of AI/AN families in family maintenance and family reunification are high, which can indicate the commitment of CWS to ensure that children are not removed or return home, the number of days in care is between 2-3 years in most cases. This is generally considered an extraordinary length of time to be in care, especially in family maintenance cases, so there is a question about the reasons for these long stays and what can be done to shorten the length of stay in care for AI/AN children. It



should also be noted that the average length of stay as Permanency Planning case for each population has decreased each time period, although the rate of decrease has been over two times higher for White (34.4%) as compared to AI/AN children (16.7%).

Reports of Child Abuse or Neglect in Humboldt County, By Type of Reporter, 2015

Population	Coun- selor (M)	Relative	CWS staff (M)	Friend	Govt agency (M)	No relation	Land- lord	Police (M)	Med- ical (M)	Neigh- bor	Other Profess (M)	School (M)	Unknown	Total
AI/AN	46	64	21	11	33	32	4	27	27	11	223	92	39	769
	6%	8.3%	2.7%	1.4%	4.2%	4.2%	.5%	3.5%	3.5%	1.4%	29%	12%	5.1%	100%
White	144	137	30	36	72	97	3	60	82	54	422	192	72	1664
	8.7%	8.2%	1.8%	2.2%	4.3%	5.8%	.2%	3.6%	4.9%	3.2%	25.4%	11.5%	4.3%	100%

(M) = Mandated Reporter.

In this analysis we wanted to see who makes reports of child abuse or neglect in Humboldt County, to see what differences there might be between reports involving AI/AN and White families, looking at the most recent year. The data shows little variation between who reports regarding White and AI/AN families. 377 of the 769 reports involving AI/AN families were made by mandated reporters (49%). For White families, 844 of the 1269 reports were made by mandated reporters (56.6%).

Reports and Substantiations of Child Abuse or Neglect Involving Children in Humboldt County by Allegation Type, 2013-2015 Combined

Population	Stage	At-risk due to sibling being harmed	Caretaker incapacity	Emotional abuse	General neglect	Physical abuse	Severe neglect	Sexual abuse	Total
AI/AN	Reports	28 (1.1%)	4 (.16%)	318 (13%)	1357 (55.4%)	450 (18.4%)	42 (1.7%)	248 (10.1%)	2450 (100%)
	Substantiations	6 (2.8%)	1 (.5%)	19 (9%)	152 (71.7%)	19 (9%)	17 (8%)	11 (5.2%)	212 (100%)
	Substantiation rate	21.4%	25%	6%	11.2%	4.2%	40.5%	4.4%	8.7%
White	Reports	58 (.9%)	27 (.4%)	990 (14.9%)	3663 (55.3%)	1207 (18.2%)	99 (1.5%)	582 (8.8%)	4916 (100%)
	Substantiations	8 (1.9%)	10 (2.4%)	38 (9%)	310 (73.8%)	33 (7.9%)	18 (4.3%)	10 (2.4%)	420 (100%)
	Substantiation rate	13.8%	37%	3.8%	8.5%	2.7%	18.1%	1.7%	8.5%

For this analysis we get a clear picture of child abuse/neglect reports, substantiations by type of allegation, and substantiation rates in a comparison of the experience of AI/AN and White children over the most recent three-year period (2013-2015). The “Reports” and “Substantiations” rows show the types of allegations and the percentage each allegation type is of the total reports and substantiations for each population. The substantiation rate answers the question “of the reports in this allegation type, what percentage were substantiated?” We did not find great variance between the populations in percentages of reports by allegation and percentages of substantiated reports by allegation, but there was some significant rate differences between the populations in substantiation rates for different allegation categories. AI/AN families have significantly higher substantiation rates for “at risk due to sibling being harmed,” general neglect,” and “severe neglect.” White families only have significantly higher rates of substantiation for “caretaker incapacity.” However, the numbers in several of these categories are small and percentages and rates can change significantly with only a change of a few reports or substantiations, so care must be exercised in developing too strong of conclusion in these areas. The largest allegation type, “General neglect,” comprises 72% - 74% of substantiations for both population groups. Substantiation rates are particularly low for both populations for “physical abuse,” “emotional abuse,” and “sexual abuse,” which might reflect the complexities of investigating and “proving” these allegations, but nonetheless is concerning and would benefit from further analysis.