UCLA
Other Recent Work

Title

LGBTQ Youth of Color Impacted by the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems: A Research Agenda

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6jf587wr

Authors

Conron, Kerith J.
Wilson, Bianca D.M.

Publication Date

2019-06-01

Data Availability

The data associated with this publication are not available for this reason: Licensing Restrictions

LGBTQ YOUTH OF COLOR IMPACTED BY THE CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS
A Research Agenda

June 2019

Kerith J. Conron
Bianca D.M. Wilson

School of Law
Williams Institute

UCLA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORS

Kerith J. Conron, Blachford-Cooper Research Director and Distinguished Scholar, The Williams Institute, School of Law, University of California, Los Angeles

Bianca D.M. Wilson, Rabbi Barbara Zacky Senior Scholar of Public Policy, The Williams Institute, School of Law, University of California, Los Angeles

With writings by the following contributors, in order of appearance:

Nikki Jones, Associate Professor, Department of African American Studies, University of California, Berkeley
Deszeree Thomas, PhD candidate in Childhood Studies, Rutgers University
Mariella I. Arredondo, Research Associate, Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL), Indiana Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC), Indiana University
Mario I. Suárez, Assistant Professor, School for Teacher Education and Leadership, Utah State University
Lance Keene, PhD Candidate, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago
Joss Greene, PhD candidate in Sociology, Columbia University
Jessica Elm, Oneida Nation, Stockbridge-Munsee Band of the Mohicans; Post-doctoral scholar, Center for American Indian Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University
Harold E. Briggs, Pauline M. Berger Professor of Family and Child Welfare, School of Social Work, University of Georgia
Kimberly Hoyt, Senior Research Associate and Director, Kenny A. v. Deal Consent Decree Monitoring Project, Center for State and Local Finance, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University
Angela Irvine, Founder and Principal, Ceres Policy Research
Sid Jordan, Ph.D. student, Department of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles
Danielle Soto, Associate Director & Senior Researcher, Research & Action Center, Impact Justice

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

The Williams Institute is committed to the highest standard of independent inquiry, academic excellence, and rigor. Research findings and conclusions are never altered to accommodate other interests, including those of funders, other organizations, or government bodies and officials.

SUGGESTED CITATIONS

Report: Conron, K. J. & Wilson, B. D. M. (Eds.) (2019). *A Research Agenda to Reduce System Involvement and Promote Positive Outcomes with LGBTQ Youth of Color Impacted by the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.

For individual chapters: Chapter Author(s) (2019). Title of chapter. In K. J. Conron & B. D. M. Wilson (Eds.), *A Research Agenda to Reduce System Involvement and Promote Positive Outcomes with LGBTQ Youth of Color Impacted by the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems* (pp. xx-yy). Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.

Example: Jones, N. (2019). On Black Feminist Thought. In K. J. Conron & B. D. M. Wilson (Eds.), *A Research Agenda to Reduce System Involvement and Promote Positive Outcomes with LGBTQ Youth of Color Impacted by the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems* (pp. 13-15). Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Bianca D.M. Wilson and Kerith J. Conron

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) youth of color (YOC) are overrepresented in two major systems that represent government and community response to crises—child welfare and juvenile justice (Huggins-Hoyt, Briggs, Mowbray, & Allen, 2019; Irvine, Angela & Canfield, 2016; Wilson et al., 2017; Wilson & Kastanis, 2015). Moreover, sexual minority girls of color are especially overrepresented in both systems. Using an intersectionality lens (Bowleg, 2008; Crenshaw, 1991; Wilson & Harper, 2012) and a critical public health approach (Bunton & Wills, 2004), we would expect that system-involved youth who are both LGBTQ and a racial or ethnic minority would experience both similar and unique structural factors leading to differential rates of involvement with and emancipation from these systems compared to other youth. We have attempted to consider multiple forms of inequality and structural drivers in both the convening that led to the development of this report, as well as in the report itself.

This report is a collection of working papers focused on understanding what we know and what we need to better understand about the lives and outcomes of system-involved youth who are both LGBTQ and racial/ethnic minorities. The working papers evolved out of *The Intersectional Convening on LGBTQ Youth of Color in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems* held at UCLA School of Law to identify gaps in knowledge related to LGBTQ youth of color in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems and to recommend areas of future research. The convening of senior and rising scholars was organized by the Williams Institute, and supported by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Palette Fund, to develop a research-based and data-driven blueprint for action by scholars who are primarily LGBTQ and/or people of color themselves. As part of the blueprint setting process, a secondary aim was to form a community of scholars who would collaborate on research to reduce contact with the child welfare and juvenile justice systems and to promote positive outcomes (e.g., permanency, employment, mental well-being) among those who are system-involved. Additionally, once the working papers were completed, the editors of the working paper collection worked with LGBTQ youth of color so that they could share their feedback on the report findings and recommendations, which we then incorporated.

Here we summarize the main findings and recommendations for future research based on the scholars' reviews of the empirical literatures and discussions at the convening. Overall, youth who participated in the feedback sessions agreed with the scholars' statements about what the empirical research demonstrates and what might need to be addressed next. They emphasized several of the main points, and also added a few unique points, which are described in full in the youth response section and integrated into the main findings and recommendations below.

MAIN FINDINGS

- Structural racism and LGBTQ stigma likely increase risk of system-involvement for LGBTQ youth of color through a variety of mechanisms, including:

  - historic and contemporary policies (e.g., forced cultural assimilation of American Indian children, policies that promote racial segregation and concentrated poverty)

  - prejudice towards racial/ethnic minority youth that "adultifies" youth of color and views

them as threatening versus as children who are deserving of protection and care

- o family rejection and conflict

- o differential school-based discipline targeting LGBTQ youth of color and discrimination against them, particularly within K-12 educational settings

- o growing up in "low opportunity" neighborhoods as youth of color

- o disproportionate targeting by police as LGBTQ youth of color

- o homelessness and poverty, that are a consequence of the mechanisms described above, coupled with lack of access to jobs, that lead to survival crimes

- o a lack of adequate access to competent community-based resources, including mental health, health, and social services prepared to support LGBTQ youth of color in managing stigma-related stress and overcoming structural disadvantage

- LGBTQ youth of color appear to stay longer in child welfare and juvenile justice systems and to be at elevated risk of discrimination and violence once system-involved compared to other groups of youth.

- Little else is known about the experiences, needs, or preferences of LGBTQ youth of color in these systems, as well as in related systems, including education, homeless services, and health care, and inclusive of mental health care within all systems.

- Importantly, little is known about how to prevent harm and promote positive outcomes for LGBTQ youth of color once system-involved, including how to reduce violence perpetrated against youth by staff and other adults involved in these systems, and access to employment and safe, affordable housing, and support for decision-making once emancipated from them.

- Gaps in child welfare and juvenile justice data systems inhibit the development of knowledge about LGBTQ youth at entrance, during, and after system involvement, and impede monitoring over time.

OVERARCHING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

- Build on the collective knowledge of LGBTQ youth of color. Youth produce knowledge about how to navigate various institutional settings, for example, in conversations with one another about staying safe in certain settings or access resources. These conversations and everyday actions, including acts of resistance and forms of expressive culture, are sites of knowledge production from which researchers can learn more about the lives of youth, and from which researchers and young people can work together to address structural inequities and take action to reform systems.

- Use a range of epistemological and methodological frameworks and data collection methods to address gaps in knowledge, particularly:

- o Participatory research models that promote youth-led problem definition, increase the capacities of youth, include them in the paid workforce, and give rise to solutions that promote social and/or system change.

- o Ensure that data on the race/ethnicity of youth and their families are accurate and complete.

- Include measures of sexual orientation, gender identity, sex assigned at birth, and gender expression (SOGIE) in child welfare and juvenile justice data collection systems to enable the tracking and reporting of outcomes for LGBTQ youth of color.

  - Train staff on how to collect these demographic data using self-report measures and on the importance of maintaining confidentiality.

  - Study pioneering systems that are collecting SOGIE data and learn from their experiences. Develop and disseminate best practices for SOGIE data collection within these systems.

- Monitor outcomes for system-involved youth by SOGIE and race/ethnicity, along with other key demographic factors.

- Study outcomes and experiences for LGBTQ youth of color who are enmeshed in multiple systems, particularly child welfare and juvenile justice, but also homeless services and the educational system.

- Identify and evaluate adaptations of promising practices to reduce risk of system involvement and to promote positive outcomes once youth of color who are LGBTQ are system-involved, including mental health services that promote healing. Examples include: restorative justice practices versus zero tolerance policies in schools, community capacity building versus policing, and kin placement, coupled with family acceptance therapy, versus group home placement.

- Review existing policies and programs aimed at reducing racial disparities in child welfare and juvenile justice for opportunities to expand and integrate the specific needs of LGBTQ youth of color.

- Challenge and critically examine common assumptions made about family rejection and acceptance among families of color as the primary pathway by which LGBTQ youth of color end up overrepresented in child welfare, homelessness, and incarcerated versus structural disadvantage as the root cause.

- Evaluate existing LGBTQ-related trainings and develop new models of training and technical assistance that reach workers in a range of job functions, from administrators through front-line staff, and all systems that serve or impact youth. All training should be reviewed in relation to their interrogation of systemic bias and discrimination with regards to race/ethnicity and SOGIE.

  - Study impacts of long-term coaching and continuous monitoring and intervention that are needed to support system change.

REFERENCES

Bowleg, L. (2008). When Black + Lesbian + Woman ≠ Black Lesbian Woman: The Methodological Challenges of Qualitative and Quantitative Intersectionality Research. Sex Roles, 59(5), 312-325. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9400-z

Bunton, R. & Wills, J. (2004). 25 years of critical public health. Critical Public Health, 14(2), 79-80. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/09581590412331290576

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. Stanford Law Review, 43(6), 1241-1299. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Huggins-Hoyt, K. Y., Briggs, H. E., Mowbray, O., & Allen, J. L. (2019). Privatization, racial disproportionality and disparity in child welfare: Outcomes for foster children of color. Children and Youth Services Review, 99, 125-131. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.01.041

Irvine, A. & Canfield, A. (2019). The Overrepresentation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Questioning, Gender Nonconforming and Transgender Youth within the Child Welfare to Juvenile Justice Crossover Population. Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law, 24(2), 243-261. Retrieved from: https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/ajgsp24&i=253

Wilson, B. D. M. (2019, February 15). LGBTQ Youth in State Systems: what if an intersectional lens led to an "additive oppressions" model? Presented at the Expert Meeting on Understanding the Effects of Intersectionality on Sexual and Gender Minorities, The Keck Center of the National Academies, Washington, DC. Retrieved from: http://sites.nationalacademies.org/dbasse/cpop/dbasse_190803

Wilson, B. D. M. & Harper, G. W. (2012). Race and Ethnicity among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Communities. In C. J. Patterson & A. R. D'Augelli (Eds.), Handbook of Psychology and Sexual Orientation (pp. 281-296). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, B. D. M., Jordan, S. P., Meyer, I. H., Flores, A. R., Stemple, L., & Herman, J. L. (2017). Disproportionality and Disparities among Sexual Minority Youth in Custody. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 46(7), 1547-1561. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0632-5

Wilson, B. D. M. & Kastanis, A. A. (2015). Sexual and Gender Minority Disproportionality and Disparities in Child Welfare: A Population-based Study. Children and Youth Services Review, 58, 11-17. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.08.016

INTRODUCTION

Kerith J. Conron and Bianca D.M. Wilson

On December 4, 2017, *The Intersectional Convening on LGBTQ Youth of Color in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems* was held at UCLA School of Law to identify gaps in knowledge related to LGBTQ youth of color in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems and to recommend areas of future research to address these knowledge gaps. The convening was organized by the Williams Institute, and supported by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Palette Fund, to develop a research-based and data-driven blueprint for action by scholars who are primarily LGBTQ people of color themselves. As part of the blueprint setting process, a secondary aim was to form a community of scholars who will collaborate on research to reduce youth contact with the child welfare and juvenile justice systems and to promote positive outcomes (e.g., permanency, employment, mental well-being) among those who are system-involved. Both the Williams Institute and the Annie E. Casey Foundation are committed to research that informs public policy and advocacy, systems reform, and community action.

Intersectionality informed our approach to planning the convening and identifying the set of papers to include. With this framework in mind, we prioritized on representing the perspectives of scholars who identified as LGBTQ and/or as people of color in leading roles for defining the problems to study and interpreting the existing scientific literatures. Further, we focused on the myriad ways that multiple marginalized social statuses may create risks to involvement and barriers to transitioning out of child welfare and juvenile justice systems, including the impact of single and multiple forms of oppression (sexism, racism, heterosexism, anti-trans bias) and the relevance of varying levels of connection to communities that share identities and cultures (Wilson, 2019; Wilson & Harper, 2012). We also drew on the frameworks driving critical public health research (Bunton & Willis, 2004) by acknowledging the roles that politics and social status have on the assumptions made about the causes of inequities that LGBTQ youth of color experience. We aimed to produce a review of existing research that asked new questions about what is known and not yet understood.

A total of 15 researchers (see Appendix A. Participant Bios), including the convening organizers, Kerith Conron and Bianca Wilson, five senior and eight rising scholars participated in the day-long convening. Rising scholars were selected through a competitive application process by a committee that prioritized a demonstrated commitment to LGBTQ youth of color through scholarship and service and interest in contributing to scholarship on child welfare and juvenile justice. The selection committee also prioritized representation of LGBTQ people of color, disciplinary diversity, early career status in their respective fields, and representation across regions of the U.S.

The convening began with brief introductions followed by four one-hour work sessions (see Appendix A. Meeting Agenda). All sessions included time for 10-minute scholar presentations and group discussion.

To facilitate relationship-building and to exchange knowledge, scholars were asked to prepare a brief talk for the convening on a topic about which they were likely to contribute to the post-convening report.

The last working session featured invited guest speakers, Bill Bettencourt (Senior Fellow, Center for the Study of Social Policy), Khush Cooper (CEO, Khush Cooper & Associates), and Shannan Wilber (Youth Policy Director, National Center for Lesbian Rights), with expertise in public policy, social services, and implementation science who joined the meeting by video to provide perspectives on how to make the group's work useful in applied and policy arenas.

The final hour of the meeting was dedicated to discussing priorities related to the report itself and next steps for the community of scholars. As far as short-term next steps, the group agreed to a timeline for report development and release. With regards to long term goals, the group was in favor of a small grants program to foster research opportunities for rising scholars related to gaps identified by the report. They also supported forming a listserv or other workspace platform to facilitate information sharing and dialogue.

Throughout the meeting, multiple areas of potential focus were discussed and debated, including:

1. Defining the community and populations of interest, and considering whether different subpopulations among LGBTQ youth of color needed to be (or could be given the limitations of the literatures) addressed separately;

2. Possible models of services and interventions, like those included in the special issue of Child Welfare (Poirier & Shelton (Eds.), 2018), that could be highlighted in terms of research and evaluation needs;

3. Identifying the levels of analysis of root causes and risk factors related to system entry, including psychological, interpersonal, and structural;

4. Concerns over the ways current public and scientific discourses about LGBTQ youth of color and vulnerability focus on family rejection versus structural disadvantage, despite research showing considerable variability in acceptance among families of color (Conron et al., 2015; James et al., 2016; Koken, Bimbi, & Parsons, 2009; Ryan et al., 2010), and a lack of attention to examples of affirmation among communities of color;

5. Distinguishing the systems that youth interact with, including those focused primarily on supports and prevention, such as education, libraries, parks and recreation, and those focused on treatment and crisis, such as child welfare, criminalization, public benefits;

6. Identifying the various theories and frameworks behind many of our perspectives, including Black feminist thought, intersectionality, action research, indigenous epistemologies, social determinants of health, child development, etc.; and,

7. Examining the roles of different methodologies, with significant time spent discussing the possibilities and limitations of participatory models of research.

Acknowledging that not all topics could be addressed within the set of working papers, the scholars who participated in the convening each selected a focus most directly linked to their current areas of research and related to the root causes to entry, experiences within and barriers to exiting child welfare and juvenile incarceration systems. For each topic, the scholars aimed to summarize what is known in key areas of research related to system-involved LGBTQ youth of color, highlight new topics of inquiry, and identify needed next steps in research. The writings were structured as separate brief (one to three page) working papers. The editors of the set of working papers, Kerith Conron and Bianca Wilson, wrote this Introduction to detail the background and processes of the overall project and prepared the Executive Summary reflecting unique takeaways from the collection, dialogue at the convening, and integrated additional key points from youth feedback sessions.

REFERENCES

Bunton, R. & Wills, J. (2004). 25 years of critical public health. *Critical Public Health, 14*(2), 79-80. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/09581590412331290576

Conron, K., Wilson, J., Cahill, S., Flaherty, J., Tamanaha, M., & Bradford, J. (2015). *Our Health Matters: Mental Health, Risk, and Resilience among LGBTQ Youth of Color Who Live, Work, or Play in Boston*. Boston, MA: The Fenway Institute. Retrieved from: https://cdn2.hubspot.net/hubfs/308746/com2395-ourHealthMatters-report_v5-small.pdf?t=1444898437715

James, S. E., Herman, J. L., Rankin, S., Keisling, M., Mottet, L., & Anaf, M. (2016, December). *The Report*

of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey. Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality. Retrieved from: http://www.ustranssurvey.org/reports/

Koken, J. A., Bimbi, D. S., & Parsons, J. T. (2009). Experiences of familial acceptance–rejection among transwomen of color. In (pp. 853-860): American Psychological Association. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017198.

Poirier, J. & Shelton, J. (Eds.) (2018). Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity/Expression, and Child Welfare [Special issue]. *Child Welfare Journal of Policy, Practice and Program, 96*(1-2).

Ryan, C., Russell, S. T., Huebner, D., Diaz, R., & Sanchez, J. (2010). Family Acceptance in Adolescence and the Health of LGBT Young Adults. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing, 23*(4), 205-213. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6171.2010.00246.x

Wilson, B. D. M. (2019, February 15). *LGBTQ Youth in State Systems: what if an intersectional lens led to an "additive oppressions" model?* Presented at the Expert Meeting on Understanding the Effects of Intersectionality on Sexual and Gender Minorities, The Keck Center of the National Academies, Washington, DC. Retrieved from: http://sites.nationalacademies.org/dbasse/cpop/dbasse_190803

Wilson, B. D. M. & Harper, G. W. (2012). Race and Ethnicity among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Communities. In C. J. Patterson & A. R. D'Augelli (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology and Sexual Orientation* (pp. 281-296). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

I. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

ON BLACK FEMINIST THOUGHT

Nikki Jones
Associate Professor, Department of African American Studies, University of California, Berkeley

What theoretical frameworks allow us to make the most sense of the lives of lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, transgender, and gender nonconforming (LGBQT-GNC) youth of color who are vastly overrepresented in the system? A Black feminist lens allows for the interrogation of intersecting systems of power relations. As an analytical framework, it helps us explain how vulnerability is structured in the lives of youth and, in turn, illuminates ideal sites of intervention.

What is Black feminist thought?

Black feminist thought (BFT) refers to the collective wisdom of Black women. This wisdom is reflected in written text, oral tradition, and expressive art. Black feminist thought reflects a way of knowing that emphasizes the importance of standpoint. As a way of knowing, a *Black feminist epistemology* (BFE) begins with the understanding that valid and important forms of knowledge are produced at the level of experience and expression (Collins, 2000, p. 252).

Key characteristics of Black feminist epistemology, as described by Collins (2000), include:

The value of the lived experience

BFT emerges from the lessons Black women have learned through navigating systems of power, exploitation, and oppression in their daily lives. Historically, "Black womanhood" in BFT has not explicitly articulated inclusion of trans masculine people assigned female at birth or transgender women, but we make that explicit inclusion here. The wisdom gained from these experiences is distinct from more traditional forms of knowledge. This distinction between wisdom and knowledge is central to BFE. Knowledge can be gained from formal education, but wisdom is gained from experience and struggle. When it comes to the experiences of LGBQT-GNC youth in the child welfare or juvenile justice system, we are clearly at the beginning of learning what we need to know from their experiences navigating these systems. Future research in this area should center the lived experiences of LGBQT-GNC and should build on the collective wisdom of the population.

The importance of dialogue

A BFE values dialogue as a site of knowledge production. We come to know what we know through conversation with others who share our experience, as well as those who exist outside of our experience. Knowledge is not a lone pursuit, nor is it primarily deductive. Rather, knowledge is produced in dialogue with others. Adherence to the principle that knowledge is produced and reflected in various ways is consequential for how we go about examining the social world and explaining social phenomena. From this perspective, "music, literature, daily conversations, and everyday behavior" are important sites of knowledge production. LGBQT-GNC youth produce knowledge about how to navigate various institutional settings, for example, in conversations with one another about stay safe in certain settings or access resources. These conversations and everyday actions, including acts of resistance and forms of expressive culture, are sites of knowledge

production from which researchers can learn more about the lives of LGBQT-GNC youth.

An ethic of caring

An ethic of caring (for members of our community, for participants in our research projects, for marginalized communities, and so on) is central to a BFE. BFE does not privilege reason (or "objectivity") detached from one's personality and emotion. Who we are and how we feel about the work we do matter. The back-and-forth between emotion and reason is an important and valued site of knowledge production and this should be reflected in all stages of the research process. This tenet of BFE suggests that we should center the work of those who have actual investments in the ultimate wellbeing of LGBQT-GNC youth, instead of privileging those who claim to do research with LGBQT-GNC youth in these state systems but have no actual investment in their ultimate wellbeing.

An ethic of personal responsibility

A BFE calls for an ethic of personal responsibility. For researchers, this means that they are always asking the question: to whom am I accountable?

Finally, a BFE asks us to consider what is at stake in any research project, from the development of research questions, research design, choice of methods, and frameworks for analysis.

How does a BFE shape our choices as researchers?

Research Questions: A BFE is not a form of bias; it is also not limited to the study of Black people alone. As other epistemologies do (e.g., Positivistic Science), a BFE determines "which questions merit investigation, which interpretive frameworks will be used to analyze findings, and to what use my ensuing knowledge will be put" (Collins, 2000, p. 252).

Methods: Whether or not a project uses quantitative or qualitative methods (or a mixture of the two) depends on the research question. A BFE might cue you in to the fact that the method you need to answer the question you pose does not yet exist. Your project may require the development of a new method. It may require developing new ways of collecting, analyzing and representing data and research findings.

As an epistemology that values lived experience, dialogue, and expressive forms of culture, a BFE lends itself well to qualitative projects that allow for 1) a researcher to spend time with respondents and 2) allow researchers to get as close as possible to the site of knowledge production (e.g., using direct or participant observation; in-depth interviews; focus groups, etc.) as possible. Ethnographic methods, for example, require you to get close to people, to focus in on interaction, the turn-by-turn, the call and the response, the action and the reaction. Ethnography is dynamic as a method, as is social life, as is the history and lives of Black people and other marginalized groups.

A BFE can also inform the development of quantitative research methods, including survey and demographic methods, by shaping the original research question(s), the choice of interpretative/analytical framework (e.g., Intersectionality) and the representation (and dissemination) of research findings. A challenge for quantitative projects is to avoid reducing the lived experience of categorical variables (e.g., race, gender, class, sexuality) to variables alone, which has been a frequent occurrence in social science literature defined as "intersectional."

REFERENCES

Collins, P. H. (2000). Black Feminist Epistemology. In *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (pp. 251-271). New York, NY: Routledge.

ON CHILDHOOD STUDIES

Deszeree Thomas
PhD candidate in Childhood Studies, Rutgers University

What is Childhood Studies?

Childhood is commonly defined by age. Context aside, it is widely accepted that a child or childhood is a person or a period of life that happens before the age of 18. However, age alone does not determine who gets to be a child (James and James (2008); Gittins (2008); James (2009). According to Childhood Studies, childhood is a social and cultural construct (James & Prout, 1991; Qvortup, 2011; Norozi & Moen, 2016; Gittins, 2008).

Childhood Studies is a multidisciplinary field of study that contests the dominant narratives of a universal, developmental-centered childhood and interrogates social hierarchy ingrained in age-based assumptions. Traditionally, childhood was viewed from a developmental perspective (Woodhead, 2009) and associated with the notions of becoming, i.e. "…an adult in the making who is lacking universal skills and features of the adult that they will become (Uprichard, 2008, p. 34)." Childhood Studies disrupts this way of thinking by positioning children as social actors separate and apart from adults and seeing them as people worthy of study "…in their own right and not just receptacles of adult teaching" (James, 2009, p. 34).

What are the key characteristics of Childhood Studies epistemology?

Social construction of childhood

The social construction of childhood, "refers to the understanding that childhood is not a natural process rather it is society which decides when a child is a child and when a child becomes an adult (Norozi & Moen, 2016, p. 79)." Childhood is a set of interpretations, social beliefs, expectations, and social meanings that vary with time and context (Norozi and Moen 2016; James & Prout, 1991; James & James, 2012; Qvortup, 2011). Childhood is "…a concept that lies at the intersection of multiple frames of reference, context-specific definitions of childhood…" (Pasura et al., 2012, p. 200). Cook (2002, p. 1) reminds us to interrogate "the politics of [the] representations [of children] by scrutinizing the connection between portrayals of children and childhood and the exercise of power."

Constructions of childhood have evolved over time. Beliefs about childhood innocence and the need for protection are a prevailing dominant cultural view of childhood. However, Robinson (2002, p. 418) notes that, "the dominant discourse of childhood perpetuates white, Western and middle-class values…". Further, as Ocen (2015, p. 1592) observes, childhood is racialized and that "as a result of these constructs and their attendant stereotypes, Black children often experience significant discrimination and mistreatment" from non-familial adults, who, ironically, are responsible for the safety, education, and well-being of children. In fact, many researchers have argued that the assumptions of childhood innocence and a need for protection are far from a reality for Black children (Goff et al., 2014); Agyepong (2018); Bush (2010); Rijos (2011); Glennon (2016); Ocen (2015); Meiners (2016).

Both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems were founded to create unique spaces to protect and rehabilitate children, European immigrant and working-class Whites deemed worthy of saving

from their families (Platt, 2009; Agyepong, 2008). Within those systems, LGBTQ children of color have been invisible or not viewed as children (Babin, 2009; Robinson, 2002). In the end, these children are at risk for being excluded from least restrictive interventions or being punished because of their race-ethnicity, sexuality and/or gender identity and expression.

For LGBTQ children of color, their marginalized sexual orientation, gender identity and/or expression, and race-ethnicity exposes them to additional systemic risks. LGBTQ youth of color are overrepresented in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems (CAP & MAP, 2016). They are more at-risk for entering the school-to-prison pipeline and more likely to be detained for non-serious offenses (Glennon, 2016). Mountz, 2010, p. 36) found "strong parallels between the child welfare system and the juvenile justice system indicate that many of the stereotypes, biases, discriminatory practices, and structural barriers that shape the lives and experiences of LGBTQ youth are shared across both systems..." For instance, LGBTQ youth are considered deviants (Glennon, 2015). Often, they are viewed as potential offenders not in need of protection or viewed as sexualized victims (Mountz, 2010). In fact, Pearson (2014, p. 55) argued that "LGBT children are not conceptually considered children in a way that would create a moral imperative for society to prevent harms visited on them." Instead, research has shown that they are treated punitively.

Agency

Childhood Studies contests the ideas of viewing children in relation to adults and advances the notion that children are social actors separate and apart from adults (James & James, 2008) and are capable of constructing their own experiences and impacting environments (Uprichard, 2008). According to James (2009, p. 44) "...agency as an attribute of an individual child. It is something that they may or may not choose to exercise." Drawing on Mayall (2002, p. 21) "...the agent is someone who does something with other people, and in doing so, makes things happen, thereby contributing to wider processes of social and cultural reproduction (James, 2009, p. 41)." For example, James (2009, p. 38) citing Mayall (2002, p. 21) states that children as social agents are "...people who, through their own individual actions, can make a difference 'to a relationship, a decision, to the workings of a set of social assumptions or constraints."

An agentic view of the child positions youth with influence, choice, and empowerment. Philadelphia received the True Colors Fund True Community Award in 2018 for its efforts to end LGBTQ youth homelessness. A Young Adult Leadership Committee is a part of the model to ensure youth perspectives are incorporated into the committee's work. Another example is treating youth as co-researchers. Researchers for Fair Policing is an adult and youth research team working to share the experiences and recommendations of young people involved with police in New York City. RYSE social youth justice development program partnered with LGBTQ youth to study school safety and climate issues at Richmond High School in Richmond.

How can Childhood Studies be used to understand and explore child welfare and juvenile justice system experiences and to formulate strategies (practice and policy) to improve outcomes for LGBTQ youth of color?

Conduct Youth Participatory Action Research with LGBTQ youth of color in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems to obtain solutions to problems they identified. Research that captures or

involves youth voices is limited. One example includes a participatory action research project with former LGBTQ foster youth in Los Angeles (Mountz et al., 2018).

Evaluate how youth are constructed and what discourse is being used—While not specifically raising the issue within the child welfare and juvenile justice systems (Talburt, 2004), implores adults working with LGBT youth to be mindful of the discourse they use and ideas they construct of normative LGBT youth development. Talbert (2004) argues these adult-made representations influence youth experiences and ultimately outcomes for LGBT youth. Straubhaar and Portes (2017, p. 266) remind us that the notions of social construction are not only external to the child but also involves internal meaning making where "…children interpret and understand their own experiences in a way that shapes their understandings of childhood" and their sense of themselves.

Conduct research on efforts to engage LGBTQ youth in developing policies or partnering with researchers to examine issues that impact and/or matter to them. Research is needed to assess how inclusive practices impact youth individually, collectively and systemically. Additionally, partnering with youth in research diversifies "what we know", disrupts dominant narratives regarding LGBTQ youth of color, and deepens our understanding their experiences.

Invest in staff development opportunities—Childhood should be incorporated in professional development opportunities for policy makers, lawyers, executives, judges, probation officers, social workers and cases managers that work with and make decisions that impact LGBTQ children of color. Being aware of the history of social construction of childhood within the child welfare and juvenile justice systems should be informative and provide insight into how and why the system operates like it does and create opportunities to better promote positive outcomes for LGBTQ youth of color.

Develop ways in which youth can participate—Programs should develop sustaining infrastructures that enable youth to participate in addressing challenges that they face and to provide feedback on policies, performance improvement strategies and/or service delivery options.

REFERENCES

Agyepong, T. E. (2018). *The Criminalization of Black Children: Race, Gender, and Delinquency in Chicago's Juvenile Justice System, 1899–1945*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Babin, C. A. (2009). *Sexual Minority Youth Curriculum for Child Welfare Professionals.* (Masters Thesis), California State University, Long Beach, Department of Social Work, Long Beach, CA. Retrieved from: https://pqdtopen.proquest.com/pubnum/1472307.html (UMI No. 1472307)

Bush, W. S. (2010). *Who Gets a Childhood?: Race and Juvenile Justice in Twentieth-century Texas*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Center for American Progress & Movement Advancement Project. (2016, February). *Unjust: How the Broken Criminal Justice System Fails LGBT People*. Denver, CO: Movement Advancement Project. Retrieved from: http://www.lgbtmap.org/criminal-justice

Cook, D. T. (2002). Introduction: Interrogating Symbolic Childhood. In D. T. Cook (Ed.), *Symbolic Childhood* (pp. 1-14). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Cook, D. T. (2018). The mire of its own construction? Childhood studies and the "crisis" at the Mexico-U.S. border. *Childhood, 26*(1), 3-7. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0907568218814594

Felner, J. K., Dudley, T. D., & Ramirez-Valles, J. (2018). "Anywhere but here": Querying spatial stigma as a social determinant of health among youth of color accessing LGBTQ services in Chicago's

Boystown. *Social Science & Medicine, 213*, 181-189. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j. socscimed.2018.08.001

Gittins, D. (2009). The Historical Construction of Childhood. In M. J. Kehily (Ed.), *An Introduction to Childhood Studies* (pp. 35-49). Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Glennon, T. (2016). The Developmental Perspective and Intersectionality. *Temple Law Review, 88*, 929-942. Retrieved from: https://www.templelawreview.org/lawreview/assets/uploads/2016/08/Glennon-88-Temp.-L.-Rev.-929.pdf

Goff, P. A., Jackson, M. C., Di Leone, B. A. L., Culotta, C. M., & DiTomasso, N. A. (2014). The Essence of Innocence: Consequences of Dehumanizing Black Children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(4), 526-545. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035663

Graham, M. & Bruce, E. (2006). "Seen and Not Heard" Sociological Approaches to Childhood: Black Children, Agency and Implications for Child Welfare. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 33*(4), 51-67. Retrieved from: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol33/iss4/6/

James, A. (2009). Agency. In J. Qvortrup, W. A. Corsaro, & M.-S. Honig (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies* (pp. 34-45). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

James, A. & James, A. L. (2012). *Key Concepts in Childhood Studies*. London: SAGE.

Konstantoni, K. & Emejulu, A. (2017). When intersectionality met childhood studies: the dilemmas of a travelling concept. *Children's Geographies, 15*(1), 6-22. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2016.1249824

Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race and Family Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lopez, V. (2017). *Complicated Lives: Girls, Parents, Drugs, and Juvenile Justice*. Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Mayall, B. (2000). The sociology of childhood in relation to children's rights. *The International Journal of Children's Rights, 8*(3), 243-259. Retrieved from: https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/intjchrb8&i=253

McLaughlin, C. (2018). 'They don't look like children': child asylum-seekers, the Dubs amendment and the politics of childhood. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 44*(11), 1757-1773. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1417027

Meiners, E. R. (2016). *For the Children?: Protecting Innocence in a Carceral State*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Mountz, S. (2011). Revolving Doors: LGBTQ Youth at the Interface of the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems. *LGBTQ Policy Journal at the Harvard Kennedy School, 1*(2010-2011), 29-45. Retrieved from: http://lgbtq.hkspublications.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/20/2015/10/LGBT_3-14-11_Final.pdf

Mountz, S., Capous-Desyllas, M., & Pourciau, E. (2018). "Because We're Fighting to Be Ourselves:" Voices from Former Foster Youth who are Transgender and Gender Expansive. *Child Welfare, 96*(1), 103-125.

Norozi, S. A. & Moen, T. (2016). Childhood as a Social Construction. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 6*(2), 75-80. Retrieved from: http://www.mcser.org/journal/index.php/jesr/article/viewFile/9151/8837

Ocen, P. A. (2015). (E)Racing Childhood: Examining the Racialized Construction of Childhood and Innocence in the Treatment of Sexually Exploited Minors. *UCLA Law Review, 62*(6), 1568-1640. Retrieved from: http://www.mcser.org/journal/index.php/jesr/article/viewFile/9151/8837

Pasura, D., Jones, A. D., Hafner, J. A. H., Maharaj, P. E., Nathaniel-DeCaires, K., & Johnson,

E. J. (2012). Competing meanings of childhood and the social construction of child sexual abuse in the Caribbean. *Childhood, 20*(2), 200-214. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0907568212462255

Pearson, K. H. (2014). The Sacra of LGBT Childhood. *Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice, 21*(7), 54-67. Retrieved from: http://www.mcser.org/journal/index.php/jesr/article/viewFile/9151/8837

Platt, A. M. & Chávez-García, M. (2009). *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Prout, A. & James, A. (1991). A New Paradigm for the Sociology of Childhood? Provenance, Promise and Problems. In A. Prout & A. James (Eds.), *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Children* (pp. 7-34). London: Falmer Press.

Qvortrup, J. (1987). Introduction. *International Journal of Sociology, 17*(3), 3-37. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/15579336.1987.11769932

Qvortrup, J. (2011). Childhood as a Structural Form. In J. Qvortrup, W. A. Corsaro, & M. Honig (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies* (pp. 21-33). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Rios, V. M. (2011). *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Robinson, K. H. (2002). Making the Invisible Visible: Gay and Lesbian Issues in Early Childhood Education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 3*(3), 415-434. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.2304/ciec.2002.3.3.8

Singh, A. & Gupta, D. (2011). Contexts of childhood and play: Exploring parental perceptions. *Childhood, 19*(2), 235-250. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0907568211413941

Straubhaar, R. & Portes, P. R. (2016). The social construction of Latino childhood in the New South. *Global Studies of Childhood, 7*(3), 266-277. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/2043610616671068

Talburt, S. (2004). Constructions of LGBT Youth: Opening Up Subject Positions. *Theory Into Practice, 43*(2), 116-121. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4302_4

Uprichard, E. (2008). Children as 'Being and Becomings': Children, Childhood and Temporality. *Children & Society, 22*(4), 303-313. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2007.00110.x

Vanderbeck, R. M. (2008). Inner-City Children, Country Summers: Narrating American Childhood and the Geographies of Whiteness. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 40*(5), 1132-1150. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1068/a39192

Winkler, E. (2012). *Learning Race, Learning Place: Shaping Racial Identities and Ideas in African American Childhoods*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Woodhead, M. (2009). Child Development and the Development of Childhood. In J. Qvortrup, W. A. Corsaro, & M.-S. Honig (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Childhood Studies* (pp. 46-61). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

II. ECOLOGICAL DETERMINANTS OF CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE INVOLVEMENT

K-12 SCHOOLING

Mariella I. Arredondo
Research Associate, Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL), Indiana Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC), Indiana University

Mario I. Suárez
Assistant Professor, School for Teacher Education and Leadership, Utah State University

Research has established that school-related factors are pathways to juvenile delinquency; punitive and exclusionary discipline tactics are associated with increased risk for students. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) students are disproportionately suspended and expelled in comparison with their heterosexual and gender conforming peers (Snapp, & Russell, 2016; Burdge, Hyemingway, & Licona, 2014; Himmlestein & Bruckner, 2011; Snapp, Hoenig, Fields, & Russell, 2015; GLSEN, 2016). Results from the National Center for Transgender Equality's 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey showed that compared to the overall population, transgender/gender nonconforming adults of color were more likely to be physically attacked, be expelled from school, to be disciplined for fighting back against bullies, and to drop out of school (James et al., 2016). Nearly 75% of transgender/gender nonconforming Latinx and Black adult respondents who were "out" or were perceived as transgender, and 90% of American Indian and Alaska Natives, experienced some form of mistreatment while attending K-12 schools - mostly from peers and school faculty (James, et al. 2016). Risk of exclusion, leading to juvenile justice involvement is high. Sixty-one percent of LGBTQ youth in juvenile justice detention facilities reported being expelled or suspended from school the year prior to entering juvenile justice custody, which is far above the occurrence (<8%) among all school-enrolled youth (Sedlac & McPherson, 2010, p. 44).

Recent studies show that LGBTQ youth are not only more likely to experience exclusionary discipline at school, but they appear to be sanctioned more harshly than heterosexual teens for the same behavior and are at an increased risk for juvenile justice involvement (Poteat, Scheer, & Chong, 2016). Patterns framed within this research identify differential treatment by institution agents as the more consequential source of disparities (Piquero, 2008; Gregory, Skiba, Noguera, 2010). Recent qualitative studies provide further insight into the differential treatment and emergent themes from the literature (Snapp, Hoeing, Fields, & Russell, 2015; Bellinger, Darcangelo, Horn, Meiners, & Schreiber, 2016; Chmieleski, Belmonte, Stoudt & Fine, 2016; Kosciw, Greytak, Giga, Villenas, & Danischewski, 2016), show that LGBTQ students report that they are often disciplined as a result of their own victimization, either due to fighting back, skipping school out of fear, or when part of an altercation because they were being attacked. Same-sex public display of affection (PDA) is also punished more harshly or in a way that heterosexual PDA is not (Snapp, Hoeing, Fields, & Russell, 2015). Even for students not "out" in their schools, nonconforming gender expression marks students as targets of special scrutiny; e.g. girls not presented in sufficiently "feminine" ways reported being treated as threatening, findings reflected in the literature on the behavioral sanctions imposed upon "loud" or "defiant" Black girls (Morris, 2016; Morris & Perry, 2017). For boys, more "feminine" gender expression has been shown to yield social sanctions from peers (Pascoe, 2007) and higher rates of victimization

(Toomey & Russell, 2016). Additionally, LGBTQ youth who report a high level of harassment and school victimization because of their sexual orientation, also report a lower GPA compared to those who report low levels of victimization (Kosciw, Greytak, Palmer, & Boesen, 2014; Wilsinson & Pearson, 2015).

Given that LGBTQ youth of color, particularly girls, are grossly overrepresented among incarcerated youth (Hunt and Moodie-Mills, 2012; Majd, Marsaker, and Reyes, 2009; CAP, MAP, Youth First, 2017; Wilson et al., 2017) generalizable, population-based research is needed to understand the role of education on the trajectory to incarceration among this group and to assess the educational needs of incarcerated and child welfare-involved LGBTQ youth who are invisible within adolescent health surveillance systems (e.g., Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS), Monitoring the Future). The YRBSS, one of the largest and more important adolescent health surveillance systems, does not collect information about suspensions or expulsions (Arredondo, Gray, Russell, Skiba & Snapp, 2016; Wimberly, 2015) and, at the time of report writing, did not systematically collect information about youth who identify as transgender and gender nonconforming respondents (Palmer & Greytak, 2017). It is also unclear whether marginalized youth are adequately covered by the current sampling frames (e.g., public middle and high schools and households) for most adolescent population surveillance systems.) The Center for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) division of School and Adolescent Health has not conducted a survey of youth enrolled in therapeutic schools, where LGBTQ youth are likely overrepresented, since 1998 (see Grunbaum et al., 1999).. A survey of youth in therapeutic schools is needed and should include measures to identify LGBTQ youth.

Large-scale, nationally-representative surveys of LGBTQ youth of color in the criminal justice and child welfare systems could fill important gaps. Such surveys could borrow items from existing National Center for Education Statistics' instruments and incorporate Sexual Orientation Gender Identity (SOGI) items. This new survey could identify youth who identify as transgender and gender expansive/nonconforming or gendered youth by including a series of questions that ask youth about their sex assigned at birth, their gender identity, the gender they currently live in their day-to-day (see Bauer, Braimoh, Scheim, & Dharma, 2017), as well as questions that capture respondents' desire to be in a different body or have different genitalia, and address societal perceptions based on expression, clothing, haircut, etc. (see TransPULSE Project, 2012). For younger children, images of people perceived to be boys, girls, or androgynous individuals could likely contribute to appropriate identification. The survey would go beyond the "two-step" approach where respondents identify their sex assigned at birth first, then their current gender identity second (The GenIUSS Group, 2014). Measures need to be understood consistently by all respondents, and this would support including youth who may identify as intersex, gender non-binary, and gender nonconforming (see The GenIUSS Group, 2014, Chapter 4). In addition, there are federal and state data (Wimberly, 2015) that could be mined to understand the relationship between youth experiences and educational outcomes by sexual orientation or gender identity. These include the U.S. Department of Education's Civil Rights Data Collection, School Crime Supplement (SCS) to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), and the School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) (Arredondo et al., 2016).

As educational researchers continue to work with LGBTQ youth of color (YOC) in the criminal justice and child welfare systems, several recommendations have been made. For example, Love (2017) recommends using a "Black ratchet imagination framework" in working with Black queer youth that embraces "messiness" both in data collection and analysis. That is, Love (2017) refers to this

"messiness" as having the researcher understand that the context of studies of Blackness and queerness can result in non-generalizable findings, as working with queer youth of color is itself a very fluid community. Mayo (2017) recommends that researchers place queer and trans youth at the center of the research and that the researcher be cognizant of how the youth chooses to identify. Community-based participatory research (CBPR), with its focus on collaborating with the community as full and equal partners in all phases of the research process, makes it an attractive model that places the LGBTQ YOC population front and center. Horn and Russell (2017) identify the critical need to use intersectional frameworks to address SOGI issues in education. People are not just LGBTQ. The way in which people identify and understand themselves in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, ability, religion, etc., as well as how society perceives and understands them in relation to these factors matters for youth in society. Overall, it is important to understand that often findings might not be generalizable, as context of each group is different, while also utilizing findings to encourage policy changes that impact LGBTQ YOC (Poteat, Yoshikawa, Calzo, Russell, & Horn, 2017; Tierney & Ward, 2017; Mayo, 2017).

Recommendations

Research

- Improve data availability through collaborations beyond the educational system -- gather data about school discipline, bullying and harassment and consequences of school discipline in surveys that already gather information about sexual orientation and gender identity.

- Evaluate the effectiveness of anti-bullying programs that encompass sexual identity and gender identity and expression.

- Conduct research that distinguishes between subpopulations of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth.

Policy

- Extend federal non-discrimination civil rights protections to sexual orientation and gender identity by resubmitting and passing the Student Non-Discrimination Act (SNDA) and evaluate its impact.

- Develop and evaluate state, school, and district policies and practices that support the establishment of safe and supportive environments for LGBTQ students and evaluate their impact. These policy-based approaches should focus on changing the policies that guide school and district responses to behaviors (Cornell & Lovegrove, 2015).

Program Based Approaches and Training

- Implement and evaluate program-based approaches that offer alternatives to exclusionary discipline and evaluate their impact in relation to both SOGI and race-ethnicity. Program based approaches can include but are not limited to: a) Positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), b) restorative practices (RPs), including peer courts and mediation circles, c) social-emotional learning (SEL), d) My Teacher Project (MTP), and e) response to intervention (RTI). (See Welsh & Little, 2018, for a description and evaluation of these programs).

- Provide and evaluate the impact of sustained anti-bias training for teachers, staff, and administrators. To be effective, such training must be customized to meet the needs of the

particular group (Anand & Winters, 2008), and should implement cooperative learning strategies to foster positive peer influences (Paluck & Green, 2009).

REFERENCES

Anand, R. & Winters, M.-F. (2008). A Retrospective View of Corporate Diversity Training From 1964 to the Present. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7*(3), 356-372. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.34251673

Arredondo, M., Gray, C., Russell, S., Skiba, R., & Snapp, S. (2016, March). *Documenting Disparities for LGBT Students: Expanding the Collection and Reporting of Data on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity*. Bloomington, IN: The Equity Project at Indiana University. Retrieved from: http://www.indiana.edu/~atlantic/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/SOGI-Brief-Final.pdf

Bauer, G. R., Braimoh, J., Scheim, A. I., & Dharma, C. (2017). Transgender-inclusive measures of sex/gender for population surveys: Mixed-methods evaluation and recommendations. *PLOS ONE, 12*(5), e0178043. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178043

Bellinger, L. B., Darcangelo, N., Horn, S. S., Meiners, E. R., & S., S. (2016). Ecologies of School Discipline for Queer Youth: What Listening to Queer Youth Teaches Us About Transforming School Discipline. In R. Skiba, K. Mediratta, & M. K. Rausch (Eds.), *Inequality in School Discipline: Research and Practice to Reduce Disparities* (pp. 135-152). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burdge, H., Hyemingway, Z. T., & Licona, A. C. (2014). *Gender Nonconforming Youth: Discipline Disparities, School Push-out, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline*. San Francisco CA: Gay-Straight Alliance Network and Tucson, AZ: Crossroads Collaborative at the University of Arizona. Retrieved from: https://gsanetwork.org/Pushout-Report

Center for American Progress, Movement Advancement Project, & Youth First. (2017). *Unjust: LGBTQ Youth Incarcerated in the Juvenile Justice System*. Retrieved from: https://lgbtmap.org/file/lgbtq-incarcerated-youth.pdf

Cornell, D. & Lovegrove, P. (2015). Student threat assessment as a method of reducing student suspensions. In D. J. Losen (Ed.), *Closing the school discipline gap: Equitable remedies for excessive exclusion* (pp. 180-191). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

GLSEN. (2016). *Educational Exclusion: Drop Out, Push Out, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline among LGBTQ Youth*. New York, NY: GLSEN. Retrieved from: https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/Educational%20Exclusion_Report_6-28-16_v4_WEB_READY_PDF.pdf

Grunbaum, J. A., Kann, L., Kinchen, S. A., Ross, J. G., Gowda, V. R., Collins, J. L., & Kolbe, L. J. (1999). Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance -- National Alternative High School Youth Risk Behavior Survey, United States, 1998. *MMWR Surveillance Summaries, 48*(SS07), 1-44. Retrieved from: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss4807a1.htm

Horn, S. S. & Russell, S. T. (2016). Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and School: Learning from the Past, Envisioning the Future. In S. T. Russell & S. S. Horn (Eds.), *Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Schooling: The Nexus of Research, Practice, and Policy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hunt, J. & Moodie–Mills, A. C. (2012). *The Unfair Criminalization of Gay and Transgender Youth: An Overview of the Experiences of LGBT Youth in the Juvenile Justice System*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from: http://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2012/06/pdf/juvenile_justice.pdf

James, S. E., Herman, J. L., Rankin, S., Keisling, M., Mottet, L., & Anaf, M. (2016, December). *The Report of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey*. Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality.

Retrieved from: http://www.ustranssurvey.org/reports/

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Giga, N. M., Villenas, C., & Danischewski, D. J. (2016). *The 2015 National School Climate Survey: the Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Youth in Our Nation's Schools*. New York, NY: GLSEN. Retrieved from: https://www.glsen.org/article/2015-national-school-climate-survey

Love, B. L. (2017). A Ratchet Lens: Black Queer Youth, Agency, Hip Hop, and the Black Ratchet Imagination. *Educational Researcher, 46*(9), 539-547. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17736520

Majd, K., Marksamer, J., & Reyes, C. (2009). *Hidden Injustice: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth in Juvenile Courts*. Washington, DC: Legal Services for Children, National Juvenile Defender Center, and National Center for Lesbian Rights. Retrieved from: http://www.nclrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/hidden_injustice.pdf

Mayo, C. (2017). Queer and Trans Youth, Relational Subjectivity, and Uncertain Possibilities: Challenging Research in Complicated Contexts. *Educational Researcher, 46*(9), 530-538. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17738737

Morris, E. W. & Perry, B. L. (2017). Girls Behaving Badly? Race, Gender, and Subjective Evaluation in the Discipline of African American Girls. *Sociology of Education, 90*(2), 127-148. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040717694876

Morris, M. W. (2016). *Pushout: The Criminalization of Black Girls in Schools*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Palmer, N. A. & Greytak, E. A. (2017). LGBTQ Student Victimization and Its Relationship to School Discipline and Justice System Involvement. *Criminal Justice Review, 42*(2), 163-187. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016817704698

Paluck, E. L. & Green, D. P. (2008). Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*(1), 339-367. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607

Poteat, V. P., Yoshikawa, H., Calzo, J. P., Russell, S. T., & Horn, S. (2017). Gay-Straight Alliances as Settings for Youth Inclusion and Development: Future Conceptual and Methodological Directions for Research on These and Other Student Groups in Schools. *Educational Researcher, 46*(9), 508-516. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17738760

Sedlak, A. J. & McPherson, K. (2010). *Survey of Youth in Residential Placement: Youth's Needs and Services*. Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc. Retrieved from: https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/grants/227660.pdf

Snapp, S. D., Hoenig, J. M., Fields, A., & Russell, S. T. (2014). Messy, Butch, and Queer: LGBTQ Youth and the School-to-Prison Pipeline. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 30*(1), 57-82. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558414557625

Snapp, S. D., Russell, S. T., Arredondo, M., & Skiba, R. (2016). A Right to Disclose: LGBTQ Youth Representation in Data, Science, and Policy. In S. S. Horn, M. D. Ruck, & L. S. Liben (Eds.), *Advances in Child Development and Behavior* (Vol. 50, pp. 135-159): JAI.

The GenIUSS Group. (2014). *Best Practices for Asking Questions to Identify Transgender and Other Gender Minority Respondents on Population-Based Surveys*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from: https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/geniuss-report-sep-2014.pdf

Tierney, W. G. & Ward, J. D. (2017). Coming Out and Leaving Home: A Policy and Research Agenda for LGBT Homeless Students. *Educational Researcher, 46*(9), 498-507. Retrieved from: https://doi.

org/10.3102/0013189X17733964

TransPULSE Project. (2012). *2009 TransPULSE Provincial Survey*. Retrieved from: http://transpulseproject.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Trans-PULSE-survey-information-only-copy-2012.pdf

Welsh, R. O. & Little, S. (2018). The School Discipline Dilemma: A Comprehensive Review of Disparities and Alternative Approaches. *Review of Educational Research, 88*(5), 752-794. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318791582

Wilkinson, L. & Pearson, J. (2015). LGBTQ Student Achievement and Educational Attainment. In *LGBTQ Issues in Education* (pp. 121-140). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Wilson, B. D. M., Jordan, S. P., Meyer, I. H., Flores, A. R., Stemple, L., & Herman, J. L. (2017). Disproportionality and Disparities among Sexual Minority Youth in Custody. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 46*(7), 1547-1561. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0632-5

Wimberly, G. L. (2015). Use of Large-Scale Data Sets and LGBTQ Education. In G. L. Wimberly (Ed.), *LGBTQ Issues in Education* (pp. 175-218). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

NEIGHBORHOOD/COMMUNITY

Lance Keene
PhD Candidate, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago

The United States (U.S.) juvenile justice (JJ) and child welfare (CW) systems are institutions putatively, "…predicated on a theory of rehabilitation and concern for protecting juveniles and society" (Marrett, 2017, p. 351), yet have frequently been cited for institutional racism in their practices and policies pertaining to the treatment of youth of color in both contexts. Nationally, African-American youth are disproportionately represented in the U.S. child welfare system (Ards et al. 2003; Watt & Kim, 2019). Latinx youth, also are underrepresented in these systems in some states and overrepresented in others (Arroyo et al., 2019; Summers, 2015). African-American and Native-American children are both uniformly overrepresented (Harris & Hackett, 2008). Owing to these disproportionalities, racial disparities in the CW system intensify the deeper that youth progress within the system (Harris & Hackett, 2008). At each consecutive 'decision point,' youth of color are represented in progressively higher percentages compared to their white counterparts (Harris & Hackett, 2008). For example, youth of color are disproportionately more likely to be represented among investigative referrals, placement in out-of-home care versus receiving in-home services, experiencing longer lengths of stay, and experiencing a longer wait for adoption (Harris & Hackett, 2008). Taken together, youth of color populations, are more likely to remain in foster care, versus being adopted than their White counterparts (Hill, 2004; Garcia, 2009).

Notably, similar disparities concerning youth of color are observed within the JJ system. Differences in punitive treatment of youth of color compared to White youth persist (see Fader, Kurlychek, & Morgan, 2014; Bishop, Leiber, & Johnson, 2010). Youth of color are arrested, detained, petitioned to juvenile court, and adjudicated as delinquent, disproportionate to their numbers in the population (Bishop, 2010). Although JJ and CW scholars highlight racial and ethnic disparities, and increasingly recognize the importance of neighborhood and community-level factors in increasing the likelihood of youth involvement in both (e.g., police harassment and misconduct, stop-and-frisk, and school zero tolerance policies), current studies are less attentive to the experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) youth of color from similar neighborhoods, who often move through these systems at similar or greater rates than their non-LGBTQ counterparts (Snapp et al. 2015; Hunt & Moodie-Mills, 2012). Indeed, at the neighborhood-level, current CW and JJ literature does not investigate the additional challenges CW and JJ systems present for already marginalized youth, like LGBTQ youth of color (Majd, Marksamer, & Reyes, 2009). Additional research on the role of sexual orientation and gender identity expression in relation to the risk of JJ/CW involvement among youth of color is needed.

Studies demonstrate that LGBTQ youth of color, particularly those inhabiting neighborhoods and communities of relatively low-socioeconomic status, bear a substantial burden in negotiating economic, health, and social disparities (Rosentel et al., 2019; White Hughto et al., 2016; Macapagal et al., 2016). Consequently, LGBTQ youth of color, whether CW and JJ system-involved or not, are more likely to negotiate neighborhood inequality compared to their white LGBTQ counterparts (Bailey, 2014; Konrad, 2014; Osypuk et al., 2009; Acevedo-Garcia et al., 2008). Notably, studies exploring the disproportionate representation of people of color in CW and JJ systems suggest the need for addressing the role of neighborhood characteristics (Graif, Gladfelter, & Matthews, 2013; Rodriguez,

2013; Boyd, 2013). The prevalence of residential segregation, limited opportunity, and poverty, within neighborhoods of color, due to histories of entrenched and institutionalized racial inequality (e.g., racialized housing restrictions, uneven investment across neighborhoods, higher concentration of law enforcement resources in communities of color) have the potential to increase the likelihood of CW and JJ system involvement for youth of color (Hill, 2004; Roh & Robinson, 2009; Boyd, 2013). Multiple studies demonstrate that youth of color encounters with law enforcement—including LGBTQ youth of color—heighten the risk of potential CW and/or JJ system involvement. Moreover, these studies also illuminate the potential chain-reaction, i.e., the long-term effects that juvenile or criminal justice system contact can have for LGBTQ youth of color (see Panfill & Miller, 2014; Brewster & Hereth, 2013; Snapp et al., 2015; Panfil, 2018; Struening, 2016). A small body of scholarship at the intersection of community-based policing and the punishment of sexual and gender non-conforming people, argues for queering normative approaches to punishment, as part of a larger anti-oppressive strategy to undo the ongoing social harms connected to the prevailing punitive model of policing. Notably, these more theoretical and intervention-focused investigations are attentive to the importance of neighborhoods and community contexts, addressing how these geographies of punishment are often racialized, organized to disproportionately impact the lives of LGBTQ youth of color and people of color, more generally (Shabazz, 2015; Jones-Brown, 2000; Amnesty International, 2006; Kaba et al., 2010).

While linkages between neighborhood disadvantage and disproportionate minority contact with law enforcement and child welfare have been established (see Rodriguez, 2013), less well-understood are the lived experiences of LGBTQ youth of color who may be system-involved, or who may be exposed to them. For LGBTQ youth of color, a handful of studies indicate that neighborhoods and community contexts can significantly shape the nature of their interactions with both. Interactions with law enforcement, for instance, appear to have a profound impact on the developmental trajectories of sexual and gender minority youth of color (Snapp & Russell, 2016). Alongside their categorization as racial-ethnic minorities, their non-normative gender and sexual presentations may register them as deviant (Snapp et al., 2015). The result often is law enforcement habitually pursuing punitive modes of intervention such as detention or arrest, rather than privileging alternative placement or treatment options (Conner, 2016). These approaches appear to have substantial and deleterious implications for system-involvement and LGBTQ youth of color development over time (Snapp et al., 2015). The experience of system-involvement for LGBTQ youth of color within CW and JJ systems who may reside in or come from low-opportunity neighborhoods, where the likelihood of punitive institutional responses may be heightened, remains underexamined in the literature.

At the neighborhood level, LGBTQ youth of color, whether system-involved or not, are intersectionally marginalized, and negotiate racial, gender, and sexual difference. This marginal social and structural location means that they are disproportionately likely to be exposed to multiple forms of violence (i.e., interpersonal, structural, institutional), harassment, detention, arrest, chronic homelessness, unemployment, and hunger (Bailey, 2014; Estrada & Marksamer, 2006; Conner, 2016). In this context, youth guiding themselves, and each other, through these challenges, often bear the burden of doing so with limited access to competent social service institutions positioned to address their unique needs and strengths as racial, sexual, and gender minority youth (Rosentel et al., 2019; Bailey, 2013). Existing LGBTQ-serving institutions may not be as accessible to youth, and in some instances, could do more harm than good (see Daniel-McCarter, 2012; Reck, 2009; Rosenberg, 2017). Some research has specifically observed the criminalization of LGBTQ YOC within LGBTQ contexts—the racialized

policing strategies organized to discriminate against LGBTQ YOC, largely in White middle and upper-middle class 'homonormative' LGBTQ communities—and this may both reduce LGBTQ youth of color access to LGBTQ community-based support and resources, as well as to present additional structural barriers to health care (e.g., HIV and STI testing, mental health care, LGBTQ youth programs) (Daniel-McCarter, 2012; Duggan, 2002; Rosentel et al., 2019). Without access to resources and support, trajectories of risk may remain in motion, including housing instability, criminalization, school drop-out/push-out, unemployment, substance use, and engaging in sex work or survival sex, that appear to influence well-being well into young adulthood (Nolan, 2006; Van Leeuwen et al., 2006). A lack of LGBTQ-serving mental health services located within communities results in the juvenile justice system operating as the de facto mental health system (Majd, Marksamer, & Reyes, 2009). Looking at where and what services for LGBTQ youth of color are located may be generative both for research and practice.

A small, but growing literature identifies some ways in which to begin thinking about assisting LGBTQ youth of color in navigating and coping with neighborhood adversity, whether youth are system-involved or not. Foremost, research on LGBTQ house and ball communities documents how these indigenous LGBTQ kinship structures can provide LGBTQ youth of color with necessary assistance as they negotiate challenges related to their housing, employment, and health needs (e.g., mental, physical, and social-emotional) (Bailey, 2014). Generating robust partnerships between social service organizations and gay "houses" and "families" that are created by and for LGBTQ youth of color may serve as a mutually beneficial strategy, for communities and organizations, for generating additional practice and research knowledge about how to best support LGBTQ youth of color who negotiate challenging neighborhood contexts and potential involvement in the CW and JJ systems.

REFERENCES

Acevedo-Garcia, D., Osypuk, T. L., McArdle, N., & Williams, D. R. (2008). Toward A Policy-Relevant Analysis Of Geographic And Racial/Ethnic Disparities In Child Health. *Health Affairs, 27*(2), 321-333. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.27.2.321

Amnesty International. (2006). *Stonewalled, Still Demanding Respect: Police Abuses Against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People in the USA*. Washington, DC: Amnesty International. Retrieved from: https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/72000/amr510012006en.pdf

Ards, S. D., Myers, S. L., Malkis, A., Sugrue, E., & Zhou, L. (2003). Racial disproportionality in reported and substantiated child abuse and neglect: An examination of systematic bias. *Children and Youth Services Review, 25*(5-6), 375-392. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0190-7409(03)00027-6

Arroyo, J., Zsembik, B., & Peek, C. W. (2019). Ain't nobody got time for dad? Racial-ethnic disproportionalities in child welfare casework practice with nonresident fathers. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 93*, 182-196. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.03.014

Bailey, M. M. (2013). *Butch queens up in pumps: Gender, performance, and ballroom culture in Detroit*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Bailey, M. M. (2014). Engendering Space: Ballroom Culture and the Spatial Practice of Possibility in Detroit. *Gender, Place & Culture, 21*(4), 489-507. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2013.786688

Bishop, D. M. (2005). The Role of Race and Ethnicity in Juvenile Justice Processing. In D. F. Hawkins & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our Children, Their Children: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Differences in*

American Juvenile Justice. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bishop, D. M., Leiber, M., & Johnson, J. (2010). Contexts of Decision Making in the Juvenile Justice System: An Organizational Approach to Understanding Minority Overrepresentation. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 8*(3), 213-233. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204009361177

Boyd, R. (2014). African American Disproportionality and Disparity in Child Welfare: Toward a Comprehensive Conceptual Framework. *Children and Youth Services Review, 37*, 15-27. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2013.11.013

Brewster, S. & Hereth, J. (2013). Chain Reaction: A Youth-driven, Multimedia Storytelling Project Promoting Alternatives to Calling the Police. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 29*(2), 26-34. Retrieved from: http://journal.jctonline.org/index.php/jct/article/view/470

Daniel-McCarter, O. (2012). Us vs. Them! Gays and the Criminalization of Queer Youth of Color in Chicago. *Children's Legal Rights Journal, 32*(1), 5-17. Retrieved from: https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/clrj32&i=11

Duggan, L. (2002). The New Homonormativity: The Sexual Politics of Neoliberalism. In R. Castronovo & D. D. Nelson (Eds.), *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics* (pp. 175-194). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Estrada, R. & Marksamer, J. (2006). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Young People in State Custody: Making the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems Safe for All Youth Through Litigation, Advocacy, and Education. *Temple Law Review, 79*, 415.

Fader, J. J., Kurlychek, M. C., & Morgan, K. A. (2014). The color of juvenile justice: Racial disparities in dispositional decisions. *Social Science Research, 44*, 126-140. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.11.006

Garcia, A. (2009). Contextual pathways to Latino child welfare involvement: A theoretical model located in the intersections of place, culture, and socio-structural factors. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*(12), 1240-1250. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2009.05.009

Graif, C., Gladfelter, A. S., & Matthews, S. A. (2014). Urban Poverty and Neighborhood Effects on Crime: Incorporating Spatial and Network Perspectives. *Sociology Compass, 8*(9), 1140-1155. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12199

Harris, M. S. & Hackett, W. (2008). Decision points in child welfare: An action research model to address disproportionality. *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*(2), 199-215. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.09.006

Hill, R. B. (2004). Institutional Racism in Child Welfare. *Race and Society, 7*(1), 17-33. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.racsoc.2004.11.004

Hunt, J. & Moodie–Mills, A. C. (2012). *The Unfair Criminalization of Gay and Transgender Youth: An Overview of the Experiences of LGBT Youth in the Juvenile Justice System*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from: http://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2012/06/pdf/juvenile_justice.pdf

Hunter, M. A. & Robinson, Z. F. (2016). The Sociology of Urban Black America. *Annual Review of Sociology, 42*(1), 385-405. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-081715-074356

Jones-Brown, D. D. (2000). Debunking the Myth of Officer Friendly: How African American Males Experience Community Policing. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 16*(2), 209-229. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986200016002006

Kaba, E. M., Mathew, J. C., & Haines, N. (2010). *Something is wrong: Exploring the roots of youth violence*.

Chicago, IL: Project NIA. Retrieved from: http://www.project-nia.org/docs/Something_Is_ Wrong-Curriculum.pdf

Konrad, C. L. (2014). This is where we live: queering poor urban spaces in literature of black gay men. *Gender, Place & Culture, 21*(3), 337-352. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/096636 9X.2013.781014

Macapagal, K., Bhatia, R., & Greene, G. J. (2016). Differences in Healthcare Access, Use, and Experiences Within a Community Sample of Racially Diverse Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning Emerging Adults. *LGBT Health, 3*(6), 434-442. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2015.0124

Majd, K., Marksamer, J., & Reyes, C. (2009). *Hidden Injustice: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth in Juvenile Courts*. Washington, DC: Legal Services for Children, National Juvenile Defender Center, and National Center for Lesbian Rights. Retrieved from: http://www. nclrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/hidden_injustice.pdf

Marrett, S. (2017). Beyond Rehabilitation: Constitutional Violations Associated with the Isolation and Discrimination of Transgender Youth in the Juvenile Justice System. *Boston College Law Review, 58*, 351-378. Retrieved from: http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/bclr/vol58/iss1/10/

Nolan, T. C. (2006). Outcomes for a Transitional Living Program Serving LGBTQ Youth in New York City. *Child Welfare, 85*(2), 385-406.

Osypuk, T. L., Galea, S., McArdle, N., & Acevedo-Garcia, D. (2009). Quantifying Separate and Unequal: Racial-Ethnic Distributions of Neighborhood Poverty in Metropolitan America. *Urban Affairs Review, 45*(1), 25-65. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087408331119

Panfil, V. R. (2018). LGBTQ Populations of Color, Crime, and Justice. In R. Martínez, M. E. Hollis, & J. I. Stowell (Eds.), *The Handbook of Race, Ethnicity, Crime, and Justice* (pp. 415-433). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Panfil, V. R. & Miller, J. (2014). Beyond the straight and narrow: The import of queer criminology for criminology and criminal justice. *The Criminologist: The Official Newsletter of the American Society of Criminology, 39*(4), 1-8.

Reck, J. (2009). Homeless Gay and Transgender Youth of Color in San Francisco: "No One Likes Street Kids"—Even in the Castro. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 6*(2-3), 223-242. Retrieved from: https://doi. org/10.1080/19361650903013519

Rodriguez, N. (2011). Concentrated Disadvantage and the Incarceration of Youth: Examining How Context Affects Juvenile Justice. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 50*(2), 189-215. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427811425538

Roh, S. & Robinson, M. (2009). A Geographic Approach to Racial Profiling: The Microanalysis and Macroanalysis of Racial Disparity in Traffic Stops. *Police Quarterly, 12*(2), 137-169. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611109332422

Rosenberg, R. (2017). The Whiteness of Gay Urban Belonging: Criminalizing LGBTQ Youth of Color in Queer Spaces of Care. *Urban Geography, 38*(1), 137-148. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.108 0/02723638.2016.1239498

Rosentel, K., VandeVusse, A., & Hill, B. J. (2019). Racial and Socioeconomic Inequity in the Spatial Distribution of LGBTQ Human Services: an Exploratory Analysis of LGBTQ Services in Chicago. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-019-0374-0

Schmidt, J., Cunningham, M., Dalton, L. D., Powers, L. E., Geenen, S., & Orozco, C. G. (2013). Assessing Restrictiveness: A Closer Look at the Foster Care Placements and Perceptions of Youth With

and Without Disabilities Aging Out of Care. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 7*(5), 586-609. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2013.845644

Shabazz, R. (2015). *Spatializing Blackness: Architectures of Confinement and Black Masculinity in Chicago*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Snapp, S. D., Hoenig, J. M., Fields, A., & Russell, S. T. (2014). Messy, Butch, and Queer: LGBTQ Youth and the School-to-Prison Pipeline. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 30*(1), 57-82. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558414557625

Snapp, S. D. & Russell, S. T. (2016). Discipline Disparities for LGBTQ Youth: Challenges that Perpetuate Disparities and Strategies to Overcome Them. In R. J. Skiba, K. Mediratta, & M. K. Rausch (Eds.), *Inequality in School Discipline: Research and Practice to Reduce Disparities* (pp. 207-223). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan US.

Struening, K. (2016). Walking While Wearing a Dress: Prostitution Loitering Ordinances and the Policing of Christopher Street. *Stanford Journal of Criminal Law and Policy, 3*(2), 16-54. Retrieved from: https://law.stanford.edu/publications/walking-while-wearing-a-dress-prostitution-loitering-ordinances-and-the-policing-of-christopher-street/

Summers, A. (2015, June). *Disproportionality Rates for Children of Color in Foster Care (Fiscal Year 2013). Technical Assistance Bulletin*. Retrieved from: https://www.ncjfcj.org/sites/default/files/NCJFCJ%202013%20Dispro%20TAB%20Final.pdf

Van Leeuwen, J. M., Boyle, S., Salomonsen-Sautel, S., Baker, D. N., Garcia, J. T., Hoffman, A., & Hopfer, C. J. (2006). Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Homeless Youth: An Eight-city Public Health Perspective. *Child Welfare, 85*(2), 151-170.

Watt, T. & Kim, S. (2019). Race/ethnicity and foster youth outcomes: An examination of disproportionality using the national youth in transition database. *Children and Youth Services Review, 102*, 251-258. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.05.017

White Hughto, J. M., Murchison, G. R., Clark, K., Pachankis, J. E., & Reisner, S. L. (2016). Geographic and Individual Differences in Healthcare Access for U.S. Transgender Adults: A Multilevel Analysis. *LGBT Health, 3*(6), 424-433. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1089/lgbt.2016.0044

HOMELESSNESS

Joss Greene
PhD candidate in Sociology, Columbia University

Research on homeless youth and young adults routinely shows that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) youth and youth of color experience homelessness at higher rates than their representation in the youth population at large. A precise estimate of the proportion of youth experiencing homelessness who are LGBTQ does not exist but estimates using probability sampling strategies range from 10-43% (Wilson et al., 2016). High rates of LGBTQ youth homelessness have been observed when comparing rates of homelessness in the general population as well; for example, a representative sample of Massachusetts high school students in 2005 and 2007 found that 25% of lesbian and gay public high school students were homeless, as compared to 3% of straight high school students (Corliss, Goodenow, Nichols, & Austin, 2011). In other words, lesbian and gay students were 13 times more likely to be homeless than their straight peers. A 2017 survey of homeless youth in San Francisco found that 49% of homeless youth identified as LGBTQ and 10% identified as transgender (Applied Survey Research, 2017, p. 13). Recent studies of homeless youth in Los Angeles and San Francisco have also shown that youth of color are overrepresented in the homeless youth population. A 2010 survey of homeless youth in Hollywood found disproportionate homelessness among African American youth: 42% of homeless youth were African American -- a rate similar to the proportion (47%) of homeless adults who are African American, but vastly different from the 9.3% of African Americans in the Los Angeles population overall, according to Census data (Rabinovitz et al., 2010, p. 17-18). A 2017 San Francisco survey of homeless youth found that youth in the sample were 26% African American, 29% Latino, and 26% white, while the city population was 6% African Americans, 15% Latino, and 49% white (Applied Survey Research, 2017, p. 14).

The National Alliance to End Homelessness argues that youth become homeless because of family breakdown or system failure (National Alliance to End Homelessness, 2009). This framework helps explain specific ways that LGBTQ youth of color become homeless. LGBTQ youth often leave their family homes because their families kick them out or ask them to leave based on their identities (Cray, Miller, and Durso, 2013). A 2011 survey of homeless youth in California found that between 25 and 40 percent of LGBT homeless youth left home due to conflicts with family members over their identity (Hyatt, 2011). A 2014 survey of youth homelessness providers estimated that 55.3% of LGBQ and 67.1% of trans youth were homeless because they had been forced out or had run away from their families due to conflicts over their identities (Choi et al., 2015). LGBTQ youth, like other youth, also experience trauma in families of origin, like childhood sexual abuse and abuse related to parental substance use that may lead them to choose to leave home (Ream & Forge, 2014; Rosario, Schrinshaw, and Hunter, 2012). When family conflict leads to homelessness, this has dramatic impacts on young people's lives. The Equality Project argues that homelessness due to family rejection is "the greatest predictor of future involvement with the juvenile justice system for LGBT youth" (Majd, Marksamer, & Reyes, 2009).

Family conflict is a major driver of homelessness for LGBTQ youth of color, but not the sole factor. The social safety net programs LGBTQ youth turn to after leaving their families of origin can cause them additional harm and ultimately drive them to homelessness. LGBTQ youth face discrimination in foster care and shelters (Ream & Forge, 2014). A lack of cultural competency, harassment, and

abuse can create a hostile environment for LGBTQ youth who then choose to run away rather than experience unfair treatment (Cray, Miller, & Durst, 2013).

Given that most LGBTQ homeless youth are youth of color, it is also important to consider how structural racism shapes pathways to homelessness. On average, youth of color in the United States grow up in families, neighborhoods, and schools with fewer resources than their white peers, and are likelier to be excluded from stable employment opportunities (Lurie & Schuster, 2015). Once homeless, LGBTQ youth of color must contend with discrimination, victimization and harassment based on their race and sexual orientation or gender identity, which researchers have concluded means that they have an "even greater chance of experiencing undue hardship and emotional distress" (Page, 2017, p. 35). And yet, little research specifically examines the experiences of homeless LGBTQ youth of color or compares these experiences to those of white LGBTQ youth and straight youth of color. There is an empirical gap to be filled concerning the experiences of and pathways to homelessness for LGBTQ youth of color, and how these differ from white LGBTQ youth and straight youth of color. Researchers might also study individual and collective strategies, like alternative family structures and resource sharing, that LGBTQ youth of color deploy to manage the challenges of homelessness and pursue stability.

Life on the streets is incredibly stressful and challenging. LGBTQ homeless youth often experience victimization, struggles to meet their basic needs, and criminal punishment for actual or perceived involvement in street economies (Gwadz et al., 2009; Institute of Medicine and National Research Council, 2013). Youth of color face high rates of police profiling in general, especially when they are perceived as gender-nonconforming (BreakOUT! & Streetwise and Safe, 2015; Ventimiglia, 2012). Youth of color also seem to be more involved in street economies than their white peers, specifically survival sex work (Dank et al., 2015). This pattern carries over to racial differences in the adult population. A 2017 analysis of the *National Transgender Discrimination Survey* found that Black trans and gender-nonconforming people were four times likelier to engage in survival sex than white people who shared their gender identity (Kattari & Begun, 2017). Involvement in street economies can lead to interpersonal victimization, which may contribute to the fact that youth of color and trans people appear to experience more hate violence on the street than white and cisgender people (Ventimiglia, 2012).

Furthermore, when LGBTQ youth of color turn to organizations for support, they can find themselves victimized and neglected by the very organizations meant to serve them (Iman et al., 2009; Torres & Paz, 2012). Race and gender-bias, harassment, and physical violence within these organization lead some LGBTQ youth of color to opt out of these organizations and choose the "relative safety of the streets" (Ream & Forge, 2014, p. 11). Michelle Page observes that the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act of 1974, the federal statute that provides funding at the state and local level based on compliance with its regulations for addressing youth homelessness, does not require race, gender, or sexuality sensitivity training as part of its staff training provisions (Page, 2017). In the absence of mandated training, perhaps it is not surprising that LGBTQ youth of color in one study reported biased treatment from foster parents, group home supervisors, case workers, and shelter staff ranging from verbal abuse to physical and sexual assault (Ventimiglia, 2012). LGBTQ youth in this study also report being attacked by other residents in housing programs, with staff ignoring or condoning the attacks and sometimes even calling the police to arrest the LGBTQ victim (Ventimiglia, 2012). According to a 2009 Chicago-based participatory action research project, youth in the sex trade and street

economies experienced regular institutional violence when they reached out to state institutions (Torres & Paz, 2012). In this project, LGBTQ youth of color experienced the highest percentage of "bad encounters" with institutions supposed to help them. The most commonly reported "bad encounters" occurred in hospitals and from the police. In hospitals, transgender youth were turned away for unjust reasons without referrals or assistance (for instance, because an ID photo did not resemble someone's appearance) and physically harmed by staff (Torres & Paz, 2012).

Even when organizations are working hard to serve LGBTQ youth, structural barriers can create challenges. According to a national survey of homeless youth providers, the largest perceived barriers to serving LGBTQ youth were: a lack of funding specifically for LGBTQ youth, a lack of community support and lack of relationship with organizations doing similar work, and a lack of information on how to serve these youth (Choi et al., 2015). Scholars have shown that social support networks can reduce victimization on the street (McCarthy, Hagan, & Martin, 2002). Future research might document the strategies LGBTQ youth of color engage in for self-protection, including the ways they build trusting relationships and social support networks to diminish their vulnerability to harm. Researchers could also work with homeless LGBTQ youth of color to identify service organizations they find helpful and the reasons why they find these organizations beneficial. By highlighting best practices that other organizations could emulate, researchers could reduce the gap between available services and beneficial services for homeless LGBTQ youth of color.

Recommendations for future research

- Study the experiences of and pathways to homelessness for LGBTQ youth of color specifically, and the ways these differ from white LGBTQ youth and straight youth of color.

- Document the strategies LGBTQ youth of color engage in for self-protection, including the ways they build trusting relationships and social support networks to diminish their vulnerability to harm.

- Partner with homeless LGBTQ youth of color to identify service organizations they find helpful and the reasons why they find these organizations beneficial.

REFERENCES

Applied Survey Research. (2017). *San Francisco 2017 Homeless Unique Youth Count & Survey: Comprehensive Report*. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Retrieved from: http://hsh.sfgov.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/2017-Youth-PIT-Final-Report-6.21.17.pdf

BreakOUT! & Streetwise and Safe. (2015). *Get Yr Rights: A Toolkit for LGBTQTS Youth and LGBTQTS Youth-Serving Organizations*. New Orleans, LA: BreakOUT! and New York, NY: Streetwise and Safe. Retrieved from: http://www.youthbreakout.org/2015/02/07/get-yr-rights-toolkit/

Choi, S. K., Wilson, B. D. M., Shelton, J., & Gates, G. (2015). *Serving Our Youth 2015: The Needs and Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning Youth Experiencing Homelessness*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from: https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Serving-Our-Youth-June-2015.pdf

Corliss, H. L., Goodenow, C. S., Nichols, L., & Austin, S. B. (2011). High Burden of Homelessness Among Sexual-Minority Adolescents: Findings From a Representative Massachusetts High School Sample. *American Journal of Public Health, 101*(9), 1683-1689. Retrieved from: https://doi.

org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300155

Cray, A., Miller, K., & Durso, L. E. (2013). *Seeking Shelter: The Experiences and Unmet Needs of LGBT Homeless Youth*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from: https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbt/reports/2013/09/26/75746/seeking-shelter-the-experiences-and-unmet-needs-of-lgbt-homeless-youth/

Dank, M., Yahner, J., Madden, K., Bañuelos, I., Yu, L., Ritchie, A., Mora, M., & Conner, B. (2015). *Surviving the Streets of New York: Experiences of LGBTQ Youth, YMSM, and YWSW Engaged in Survival Sex*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.urban.org/research/publication/surviving-streets-new-york-experiences-lgbtq-youth-ymsm-and-ywsw-engaged-survival-sex

Gwadz, M. V., Gostnell, K., Smolenski, C., Willis, B., Nish, D., Nolan, T. C., Tharaken, M., & Ritchie, A. S. (2009). The Initiation of Homeless Youth Into the Street Economy. *Journal of Adolescence, 32*(2), 357-377. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.01.004

Iman, J., Fullwood, C., Paz, N., W, D., & Hassan, S. (2009). *Girls Do What They Have To Do To Survive: Illuminating Methods Used by Girls in the Sex Trade and Street Economy to Fight Back and Heal*. Chicago, IL: Young Women's Empowerment Project. Retrieved from: http://www.nswp.org/resource/girls-do-what-they-have-do-survive-illuminating-methods-used-girls-the-sex-trade-and-street

Institute of Medicine & National Research Council. (2013). *Confronting Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Sex Trafficking of Minors in the United States*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Kattari, S. K. & Begun, S. (2016). On the Margins of Marginalized: Transgender Homelessness and Survival Sex. *Affilia, 32*(1), 92-103. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109916651904

Lurie, K. & Schuster, B. (2015). *Discrimination at the Margins: The Intersectionality of Homelessness & Other Marginalized Groups*. Seattle, WA: Seattle University School of Law Homeless Rights Advocacy Project. Retrieved from: https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/hrap/8/

McCarthy, B., Hagan, J., & Martin, M. J. (2002). In and Out of Harm's Way: Violent Victimization and the Social Capital of Fictive Street Families. *Criminology, 40*(4), 831-866. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2002.tb00975.x

Page, M. (2017). Forgotten Youth: Homeless LGBT Youth of Color and the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. *Northwestern Journal of Law and Social Policy, 12*(2), 17-45. Retrieved from: https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/njlsp/vol12/iss2/2/

Ream, G. L. & Forge, N. R. (2014). Homeless Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) Youth in New York City: Insights from the Field. *Child Welfare, 93*(2), 7-22.

Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E. W., & Hunter, J. (2012). Risk Factors for Homelessness Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youths: A Developmental Milestone Approach. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*(1), 186-193. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.09.016

Torres, C. A. & Paz, N. (2012). *Denied Help! How Youth in the Sex Trade & Street Economy Are Turned Away from Systems Meant to Help Us and What We Are Doing to Fight Back.* Chicago, IL: Young Women's Empowerment Project. Retrieved from: https://ywepchicago.files.wordpress.com/2012/09/bad-encounter-line-report-2012.pdf

Ventimiglia, N. (2012). LGBT Selective Victimization: Unprotected Youth on the Streets Homelessness. *Journal of Law in Society, 13*, 439-454.

Wilson, B. D. M. & Choi, S. K. (2016). Data Collection: The role of data collection and defining the issue of youth homelessness. In C. Price, C. Wheeler, J. Shelton, & M. Maury (Eds.), *At the Intersections: A Collaborative Report on LGBTQ Homelessness*. New York, NY and Washington, DC: True Colors Fund and the National LGBTQ Task Force.

POLICING

Joss Greene
PhD candidate in Sociology, Columbia University

In 2014 and 2015, police killings of Mike Brown, Eric Garner, and Freddie Gray brought national attention to racial profiling and police use of force. An emerging body of research takes an intersectional approach to examine the racial and gendered experiences of policing. This emerging scholarship suggests cisgender and transgender women of color experience police discrimination and police violence at levels observed among Black men (Ritchie, 2017; Woods et al., 2013). Centering women and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) people of color sheds light on understudied experiences, and more deeply reveals how racialized gender and sexual variance is punished. In other words, focusing on the experiences of LGBTQ people of color within the criminal justice system can show how policing policies are informed by and may reproduce inequality regarding race, gender, and sexuality (Richie, 2005).

Life for LGBTQ youth of color, especially life on the streets, is shaped by the regular presence of law enforcement. Research suggests that youth of color experience police profiling, discriminatory arrests, harassment, and abuse in their contact with police (BreakOUT! & Streetwise and Safe, 2015; Stout, Fine, & Fox, 2011). LGBTQ people experience specific kinds of harms from police officers, including profiling for prostitution, homophobic and transphobic slurs, harassment regarding identity documents, and punishment for violating laws against "public decency" (Amnesty International, 2005; BreakOUT! & Streetwise and Safe, 2015; Dwyer, 2009; Himmelstein & Brückner, 2011; Lambda Legal, 2014; Mallory, Hasenbush, & Sears, 2015; Stoudt, Fine, & Fox, 2011). Therefore, while relatively little research has focused specifically on the ways policing shapes daily life for LGBTQ youth of color, we can expect that experiences with policing would be particularly acute for people caught at this nexus.

Indeed, what research has been done shows that LGBTQ people of color face extremely high levels of policing. A New Orleans study found that LGBTQ people of color were 3 to 4 times more likely to be approached, harassed, or asked for a sexual favor by police (BreakOUT! & National Council on Crime and Deliquency, 2014). This same study found that 42% of LGBTQ people of color had called the police for assistance and were themselves arrested when the police arrived; no white respondents reported this experience (BreakOUT! & National Council on Crime and Deliquency, 2014). Transgender people of color were more than twice as likely as non-trans people of color to have been called a slur by the police, and five times as likely to be asked by the police for a sexual favor (BreakOUT! & National Council on Crime and Deliquency, 2014). A study of New York City youth who had engaged in survival sex work also found high rates of policing within their majority (95%) people of color sample: 70% of their respondents had been arrested and 19% experienced police contact a couple of times a week (Dank et al., 2015). In gay enclaves, LGBTQ youth of color may also find themselves facing "community policing," whereby white gay residents develop cooperative relationships with law enforcement to exclude LGBTQ youth of color from their spaces (Rosenberg, 2017). This research suggests that LGBTQ youth of color and police interactions can be studied in several ways: frequency of contact, type of contact, and spatially. Further research is needed to document specifically what policing of LGBTQ youth of color looks like, how this compares to the policing of other groups, how it is experienced, and its long-term impacts.

There are also many sites of intervention for people seeking to reduce LGBTQ youth of color's

exposure to policing. Activists have challenged the presence of police in social service organizations (Brooks & Kaba, 2017; Conner, 2015) and have also supported young people in organizing against police departments in their cities (BreakOUT! & Streetwise and Safe, 2015). Researchers have also considered two commonly suggested police reforms: cultural competency training and efforts to improve police and community relations. It has been suggested that "special topics" trainings, including gender and LGBT relations or race and ethic relations, must not be treated as an "add-on" to general training, but should instead be integrated into all aspects of police training (Corsianos, 2011). Trainings are said to "be likely to not only help officers do their jobs more effectively, but... also likely result in higher levels of tolerance and acceptance of all LGBT individuals" (Mallory, Hasenbush, & Sears, 2015). Although cultural competency trainings are widely employed, there is not conclusive evidence that these trainings change police conduct or the negative impact of policing in the lives of targeted communities. Empirical research is, therefore, necessary to determine whether cultural competency training is achieving its desired effects. Another reform receiving considerable attention is improving police-community relations. A study of a LGBT liaison program found that participating nonprofit partners believed the police were limited in what they could do, and that liaison police officers felt they were unable to change the police department culture (McCandless, 2017). Scholars have studied youth-police dialogues around racial profiling (Giwa, James, Anucha, & Schwartz, 2014) and youth-police dialogues around the targeting of LGBTQ youth (Queens Youth Justice Center, 2015). Yet, these studies do not show that such dialogues lessen the policing or police violence that these groups experience. New efforts to improve law enforcement should be tested so potential benefit and limitations can be discovered.

To understand the experiences of LGBTQ youth of color with juvenile justice involvement at a structural level, it may be helpful for scholars to think critically about the framework they are employing for thinking about law enforcement. Within a liberal law reform analysis of policing, the police maintain law, order, and the collective interests of society. Problems with policing can be addressed through training, better supervision, and community policing (Akbar, 2018). Within the Movement for Black Lives (M4BL) policy platform, policing and incarceration are studied as historically and persistently violent means of racist control and exclusion. Therefore, instead of seeking to reform the police, the M4BL platform calls to "end the war on Black people" by shrinking law enforcement and shifting resources into social programs led by communities of color (The Movement for Black Lives, 2016). Some research supports the assertion that stronger communities can create safety and order without policing and incarceration. Sociologist Patrick Sharkey argues that the 1990's decline in violent crime in New York City, often attributed to aggressive policing and incarceration, is at least partly due to community organizing that transformed urban neighborhoods (Sharkey, 2018). Researchers may contribute to this emerging body scholarship by examining community practices for producing safety and wellness, and by studying the ways patterns of law enforcement activity experienced by LGBTQ youth of color relate to structures of racial and gender inequality.

Recommendations for future research

- Study LGBTQ youth of color and police interactions can be studied in several ways: frequency of contact, type of contact, and spatially.
- Document specifically what policing of LGBTQ youth of color looks like, how this compares to the policing of other groups, how it is experienced, and its long-term impacts.

- Evaluate the impact of cultural competency training and youth-police dialogues on the experiences and impact of policing on the lives of LGBTQ youth of color.

- Document community practices for producing safety and wellness.

- Studying how law enforcement practices experienced by LGBTQ youth of color relate to structures of racial and gender inequality.

REFERENCES

Akbar, A. (2018). Toward a Radical Imagination of Law. *New York University Law Review, 93*(3), 405-479. Retrieved from: https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=3061917

Amnesty International. (2005). *USA: Stonewalled: Police Abuse and Misconduct Against LGBT People in the United States*. Washington, DC: Amnesty International. Retrieved from: https://www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/84000/amr511222005en.pdf

Applied Survey Research. (2017). *San Francisco 2017 Homeless Unique Youth Count & Survey: Comprehensive Report*. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing. Retrieved from: http://hsh.sfgov.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/2017-Youth-PIT-Final-Report-6.21.17.pdf

BreakOUT! & National Council on Crime and Deliquency. (2014). *We Deserve Better: A Report on Policing in New Orleans By and For Queer and Trans Youth of Color*. New Orleans, LA: BreakOUT! Retrieved from: https://issuu.com/youthbreakout/docs/we_deserve_better_report

BreakOUT! & Streetwise and Safe. (2015). *Get Yr Rights: A Toolkit for LGBTQTS Youth and LGBTQTS Youth-Serving Organizations*. New Orleans, LA: BreakOUT! and New York, NY: Streetwise and Safe. Retrieved from: http://www.youthbreakout.org/2015/02/07/get-yr-rights-toolkit/

Brooks, L. & Kaba, M. (2017). *Whose Security is it Anyway? A Toolkit to Address Institutional Violence in Nonprofit Organizations*. Retrieved from: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/whosesecurity

Conner, B. M. (2015). Salvaging "Safe Spaces": Toward Model Standards for LGBTQ Youth-serving Professionals Encountering Law Enforcement. *Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law, 24*(2), 199-241.

Corsianos, M. (2011). Responding to officers' gendered experiences through community policing and improving police accountability to citizens. *Contemporary Justice Review, 14*(1), 7-20. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2011.541074

Dank, M., Yu, L., Yahner, J., Pelletier, E., Mora, M., & Conner, B. (2015). *Locked In: Interactions with the Criminal Justice and Child Welfare Systems for LGBTQ Youth, YMSM, and YWSW who Engage in Survival Sex*. New York, NY: Urban Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.urban.org/research/publication/locked-interactions-criminal-justice-and-child-welfare-systems-lgbtq-youth-ymsm-and-ywsw-who-engage-survival-sex

Durso, L. E. & Gates, G. (2012). *Serving Our Youth: Findings from a National Survey of Service Providers Working with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth Who Are Homeless or At Risk of Becoming Homeless*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from: https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Durso-Gates-LGBT-Homeless-Youth-Survey-July-2012.pdf

Dwyer, A. (2009). Identifiable, Queer, and Risky: The Role of the Body in Policing Experiences for LGBT Young People. *Proceedings of the 2009 Australian and New Zealand Critical Criminology Conference*, 8-9 July 2009, Melbourne, Victoria.

Giwa, S., James, C. E., Anucha, U., & Schwartz, K. (2014). Community Policing—A Shared Responsibility:

A Voice-Centered Relational Method Analysis of a Police/Youth-of-Color Dialogue. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 12*(3), 218-245. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/15377938.2013.837856

Himmelstein, K. E. & Bruckner, H. (2011). Criminal-Justice and School Sanctions Against Nonheterosexual Youth: A National Longitudinal Study. *Pediatrics, 127*(1), 49-57. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-2306

Hunt, J. & Moddie-Mills, A. C. (2012). *The Unfair Criminalization of Gay and Transgender Youth: An Overview of the Experiences of LGBT Youth in the Juvenile Justice System*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from: https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbt/reports/2012/06/29/11730/the-unfair-criminalization-of-gay-and-transgender-youth/

Hyatt, S. (2011). *Struggling to Survive: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer/Questioning Homeless Youth on the Streets of California*. Sacramento, CA: California Homeless Youth Project. Retrieved from: https://vawnet.org/material/struggling-survive-lesbian-gay-bisexual-transgender-and-queerquestioning-homeless-youth

Majd, K., Marksamer, J., & Reyes, C. (2009). *Hidden Injustice: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth in Juvenile Courts*. Washington, DC: Legal Services for Children, National Juvenile Defender Center, and National Center for Lesbian Rights. Retrieved from: http://www.nclrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/hidden_injustice.pdf

Mallory, C., Hasenbush, A., & Sears, B. (2015). *Discrimination and Harassment by Law Enforcement Officers in the LGBT Community*. Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from: https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/research/violence-crime/discrimination-and-harassment-by-law-enforcement-officers-in-the-lgbt-community/

McCandless, S. (2018). LGBT Homeless Youth and Policing. *Public Integrity, 20*(6), 558-570. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2017.1402738

National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2009). *New Funding for Homeless Youth Services and Housing: Guide to Community Planners and Youth Advocates*. Retrieved from: http://www.manynet.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/youth_homelessness_prevention_and_rehousing.pdf

Queens Neighborhood Youth Justice Council. (2015). *Bridging the Gap: Strengthening LGBTQ Youth and Police Relations*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation. Retrieved from: https://www.courtinnovation.org/publications/bridging-gap-strengthening-lgbtq-youth-and-police-relations

Rabinovitz, S., Desai, M., Schneir, A., & Clark, L. (2010). *No Way Home: Understanding the Needs and Experiences of Homeless Youth in Hollywood*. Los Angeles, CA: Hollywood Homeless Youth Partnership. Retrieved from: http://hhyp.org/downloads/HHYP_TCE_Report_11-17-10.pdf

Richie, B. (2005). Queering Antiprison Work: African American Lesbians in the Juvenile Justice System. In J. Sadbury (Ed.), *Global Lockdown: Race, Gender, and the Prison-Industrial Complex*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ritchie, A. (2017). *Invisible No More: Police Violence Against Black Women and Women of Color*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Rosenberg, R. (2017). The Whiteness of Gay Urban Belonging: Criminalizing LGBTQ Youth of Color in Queer Spaces of Care. *Urban Geography, 38*(1), 137-148. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2016.1239498

Sharkey, P. (2018). *Uneasy Peace: The Great Crime Decline, the Renewal of City Life, and the Next War on Violence*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Stoudt, B. G., Fine, M., & Fox, M. (2011). Growing Up Policed in the Age of Aggressive Policing Policies. *New York Law School Law Review, 56*, 1331-1370.

The Movement for Black Lives. (2016). *A Vision for Black Lives: Policy Demands for Black Power, Freedom & Justice*. Retrieved from: https://policy.m4bl.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/20160726-m4bl-Vision-Booklet-V3.pdf

Woods, J. B., Galvan, F. H., Bazargan, M., Herman, J. L., & Chen, Y.-T. (2013). Latina Transgender Women's Interactions with Law Enforcement in Los Angeles County. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 7*(4), 379-391. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pat025

THE ROLE OF THE "STATE" AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE: THE AMERICAN INDIAN EXPERIENCE

Jessica Elm
Oneida Nation, Stockbridge-Munsee Band of the Mohicans
Post-doctoral scholar, Center for American Indian Health, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University

Young people who enter the child welfare or juvenile justice system generally become the responsibility of "the state[1]." For American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN) tribal nations, and their children and families, relationships with U.S. government systems are deeply complex, involving a long history of human rights violations (e.g., removal from home lands to reservation bounds (Jackson, 1830), congressional acts terminating federal recognition of tribal nations (Wilkins & Stark, 2011)). From 1879 to the 1960s, cultural genocide and forced assimilation involved shipping AIAN children to far-off boarding schools and white adoptive homes (Coleman, 1993; George, 1997). In boarding schools, indoctrination into Christianity and European American values and culture involved cutting of long hair, wearing of military-style clothing, and forbidding of Native languages and protective spiritual practices (Adams, 1995; Coleman, 1993; George, 1997; Nabokov, 1991). Students also survived severe corporal punishment and systematic sexual abuse (Cross, Earle, & Simmons, 2000). By the 1970s, up to 25-35% of all AIAN children were in foster or adoptive homes or in boarding school (Indian Child Welfare Program, 1974).

> *"...I almost cry too. so please try and send for me. I am willing to come back ... I want to get out of here soon. I don't like it up here. It no good for me. So do your best ... I like to get out of here ... Do your best mother! Please! ... Answer right away" – letter from Gatson, Indian boarding school student (Child, 2000).*

Fortunately, a new era of tribal self-determination led to the passage of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 which reasserted the rights of tribes as nations. Only then did unethical adoptions and foster care placements begin to slow. However, distal effects of colonization and assimilative policies continue to reverberate across individual, family, community, and structural levels (Brave Heart, 1998; Evans-Campbell, 2008; Gracey & King 2009; Graham, 2008; Walls & Whitbeck, 2012). Tribes continue to struggle to reassert their rights and jurisdiction, largely due to lack of resources.

For young system-involved two-spirits[2] and their families, separation from family and community can compound existing effects of historical- and contemporary trauma, loss, and grief and increase risk for poor mental health and substance misuse (Bigfoot, et al., 2005; Lacey, 2013; Walls & Whitbeck, 2012). Foster and institutionalized two-spirits face contradicting value systems. On one hand,

---

[1] Jurisdiction varies for tribes and is based on factors including the state where the tribe is located and where a delinquent act is committed, among others. Although tribes have the right to jurisdiction in most cases, the lack of infrastructure and capacity remains a major barrier for many tribes.

[2] Two-spirit is a contemporary, inclusive term referring to AIANs who express non-binary gender and/or sexual minority identities and associated roles in Indigenous ways. Some AIANs alternatively identify as LGBTQ rather than two-spirit.

traditional Indigenous worldviews include high regard for child, family, and community caretaking, meaningful roles for all people, including those who are two-spirit, and community-based resolution to delinquency (Carpenter, 2011; Center for Native American Youth, 2018; Garrett, et al., 2014). This is in harsh contrast with colonial-rooted laws and values that convey messages of unworthiness based on national, tribal, racial, ethnic, sexual, and gender identities (Carpenter, 2011; Lacey, 2013; Seelau, 2012).

An estimated 24% of justice-system involved AIAN youth identify as sexual minorities (Irvine, 2010) and 23% of AIAN youth in child welfare are sexual and gender minorities (Wilson, 2018). Despite these high proportions, empirical research with system-involved two-spirit youth is extremely sparse. Reliable research is needed to understand and reduce child welfare and juvenile justice two-spirit disparities. A community-driven approach that recognizes the historically traumatic events that continue to impact AIAN children, families, and communities is necessary. Prevention and treatment services research should identify antecedents to system involvement (e.g., disproportionate police contact) and how to best serve families so youth are not removed or detained. For two-spirits who are system involved, their voices need to be uplifted through qualitative research and longitudinal data collection is needed to understand the impacts of system involvement. Lastly, research to support expansion of evidence-based frameworks that culturally adapt existing programs and progress in the development of trauma-informed institutions is needed.

REFERENCES

Adams, D. W. (1995). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875–1928*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Bigfoot, D. S., Crofoot, T., Cross, T. L., Fox, K., Hicks, S., Red Horse, J., Jones, L., & Trope, J. (2005). *Impacts of Child Maltreatment in Indian Country: Preserving the Seventh Generation through Policies, Programs, and Funding Streams*. Portland, OR: NICWA.

Brave Heart, M. Y. H. (1998). The return to the sacred path: Healing the historical trauma and historical unresolved grief response among the Lakota through a psychoeducational group intervention. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 68*(3), 287-305. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/00377319809517532

Carpenter, R. M. (2011). Womanish Men and Manlike Women. In S. Slater & F. A. Yarbrough (Eds.), *Gender and Sexuality in Indigenous North America, 1400-1850* (pp. 146-164). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Center for Native American Youth. (2018, November). *Generation Indigenous: The State of Native Youth 2018*. Washington, DC: Center for Native American Youth at The Aspen Institute. Retrieved from: http://www.cnay.org/docs/CNAY_AR2018_FINAL_Web_110618.pdf

Child, B. J. (2000). *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900-1940*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Coleman, M. (1993). *American Indian Children at School, 1850-1930*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.

Cross, T. A., Earle, K. A., & Simmons, D. (2000). Child abuse and neglect in Indian country: Policy issues. *Families in Society, 81*(1), 49-58.

Evans-Campbell, T. (2008). Historical Trauma in American Indian/Native Alaska Communities: A Multilevel Framework for Exploring Impacts on Individuals, Families, and Communities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*(3), 316-338. Retrieved from: https://doi.

org/10.1177/0886260507312290

Garrett, M. T., Parrish, M., Williams, C., Grayshield, L., Portman, T. A. A., Torres Rivera, E., & Maynard, E. (2014). Invited Commentary: Fostering Resilience Among Native American Youth Through Therapeutic Intervention. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 43*(3), 470-490. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0020-8

George, L. J. (1997). Why the Need for the Indian Child Welfare Act? *Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 5*(3-4), 165-175. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1300/J285v05n03_04

Gracey, M. & King, M. (2009). Indigenous health part 1: determinants and disease patterns. *The Lancet, 374*(9683), 65-75. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60914-4

Graham, L. (2008). Reparations, Self-Determination and the Seventh Generation. *Harvard Human Rights Journal, 21*, 47-104. Retrieved from: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1126774

Indian Child Welfare Program: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Senate, 93rd Cong. 15 (1974) (Testimony of William Byler).

Irvine, A. (2010). "We've Had Three of Them": Addressing the Invisibility of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Gender Nonconforming Youths in the Juvenile Justice System. *Columbia Journal of Gender and Law, 19*(3).

Jackson, A. (1830). *President Jackson's message to congress "On Indian Removal"*. Records of the United States Senate, Record Group 46, 1789-1990; National Archives: Washington, DC Retrieved from: https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=25.

Lacey, C. (2013). *Racial disparities and the juvenile justice system: A legacy of trauma*. Los Angeles, CA, and Durham, NC: National Center for Child Traumatic Stress. Retrieved from: https://www.nctsn.org/sites/default/files/resources//racial_disparities_and_juvenile_justice_system_legacy_of_trauma.pdf

Seelau, R. (2012). Regaining Control Over the Children: Reversing the Legacy of Assimilative Policies in Education, Child Welfare, and Juvenile Justice that Targeted Native American Youth. *American Indian Law Review, 37*(1), 63-108. Retrieved from: https://digitalcommons.law.ou.edu/ailr/vol37/iss1/3/

Walls, M. L. & Whitbeck, L. B. (2012). The Intergenerational Effects of Relocation Policies on Indigenous Families. *Journal of Family Issues, 33*(9), 1272-1293. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X12447178

Wilkins, D. E. & Stark, H. K. (2011). *American Indian Politics and the American Political System* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Wilson, B. D. M. (2018). *Unpublished analysis of the Los Angeles Foster Youth Study data*. The Williams Institute. Los Angeles, CA.

III. LGBTQ YOUTH OF COLOR IN SYSTEMS

CHILD WELFARE

Harold E. Briggs
Pauline M. Berger Professor of Family and Child Welfare, School of Social Work, University of Georgia

Kimberly Hoyt
Senior Research Associate and Director, Kenny A. v. Deal Consent Decree Monitoring Project, Center for State and Local Finance, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University

The United States child welfare system operates within federal, state, and local/county/tribal governmental jurisdictions. It is the preeminent institution that addresses and seeks to preserve the safety and wellbeing of children, as well as to ensure children (ages 0 – 18 years) achieve permanency (permanently living in a family-like setting). It seeks to achieve its aims by providing services that include: protection/investigation, family preservation, foster care, and adoption (Briar-Lawson, McCarthy, & Dickinson, 2013; Costin, Karger, & Stoesz, 1996; Hoyt, 2017; Pecora, 2000; Whitelaw-Downs, Moore, McFadden, Michaud, & Costin, 2004). As of September 30, 2017, there were 442,995 children in foster care (Children's Bureau, 2018). Of this number, 24% were 14 years of age and 52% were male. By race, 44% were White, 23% Black or African American, 21% Hispanic (of any race), 7% identified as belonging to two or more races, 2% American Indian/Alaskan Native, 1% Asian, and <1% Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander. While the child welfare (CW) and juvenile justice (JJ) systems consistently provide population and racial disproportionality statistics for youth served in these respective jurisdictions, regrettably, there is a paucity of epidemiological and program statistics for specific subgroups, such as youth with dual-status or dually-involved [youth involved in both child welfare and juvenile justice systems]. However, studies have estimated that approximately 30% of children in the child welfare (CW) system subsequently become involved in the juvenile justice (JJ) system as well (Smith, Ireland, & Thornberry, 2005; Vidal et al., 2017); and "anywhere from 9% to 29% of maltreated youth become arrested as juveniles" (Smith, Thornberry, & New York State Univ. System, 1995; Tam, Abrams, Freisthler, & Ryan, 2016, p. 61; Widom, Maxfield, & Department of Justice, 2001). Another study found that child welfare youth are at greater risk of becoming involved in juvenile justice than the general youth population by 47% (Marshall & Haight, 2014; Ryan & Testa, 2005); and youth of color, especially African American youth, are disproportionately involved in both systems (Center for the Study of Social Policy, 2009; Herz et al., 2012; Huang, Ryan, & Herz, 2012; Ryan & Testa, 2005).

Although few studies have examined outcomes for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth in child welfare, LGBT youth who are also ethnic minorities are at risk of poor outcomes due to a range of intersecting vulnerabilities including (Logie, James, Tharao, & Loutfy, 2011):

- racism
- sexism
- gender identity/sexual orientation
- poverty/socioeconomic class
- history of child abuse and victimization
- system dysfunctions (e.g., longer placement stays)
- exposure to adversity while in systems of care

- psychiatric vulnerabilities during and following child welfare care

Experiences in the Child Welfare System

Youth involved in child welfare or dually involved in child welfare and juvenile justice are more likely to have increased educational, health (physical, mental, sexual), social, legal, and economic challenges than their non-system involved counterparts (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2013; Herz, Ryan, & Bilchik, 2010). These youth often repeat grades, experiment with drugs and alcohol, engage in criminal activities, engage in risky sexual activities, have early pregnancies, run away, are sexually trafficked, become homeless, and become incarcerated (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2013; Courtney & Skyles, 2003; Dworsky, Napolitano, & Courtney, 2013; Dworsky et al., 2010; Herz et al., 2012; Marshall & Haight, 2014; Poirier et al., 2018). Youth of color involved with the child welfare system also experience longer stays in care, placement instability, achieve positive permanency less, and experience more congregate care vs. residential settings, more re-entries or recidivism, and subsequent victimization while in care, increased cross-over between systems (Harris, 2014; Herz et al., 2012; Marshall & Haight, 2014; Roberts, 2002). Additionally, numerous studies have found that LGBTQ foster youth experience:

- increased placement disruptions,
- a lack of appropriate permanency options,
- missed or unidentified needs,
- re-victimization by peers, foster parents, and child welfare and juvenile justice system staff,
- increased isolation, rejection, stigmatization, and harassment,
- a lack of emotional support and acceptance,
- exacerbated mental health challenges,
- gaps in services,
- disparate treatment and double standards,
- homelessness or couch surfing
- lack of affirmation, experiences of misgendering and erasure of their sexual identities
- fewer connections with supportive adults and opportunities to build social capital (Erney & Weber, 2017; McCormick, Schmidt, & Terrazas, 2017; McCormick, Schmidt, & Terrazas, 2016; Poirier et al., 2018; Shelton, Poirer, Wheeler, & Abramovich, 2017; Shpiegel & Simmel, 2016; Wilson & Kastanis, 2015)

Longer-term effects of child welfare involvement

Studies of adults who were involved with child welfare as children indicate increased risk of unemployment, poverty, and receipt of public assistance benefits, as well as perpetration of child maltreatment and domestic violence, compared to the general population (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2013; Colman, Mitchell-Herzfeld, Kim, & Shady, 2010; Zielinski, 2009); however, these trajectories were both likely set in motion prior to system involvement and may also have been exacerbated by such involvement.

Research by Shpiegel and Simmel (2016) found that sexual minority youth exhibited poorer outcomes compared to their heterosexual counterparts in areas such as education, employment, housing, and finances after system involvement. Harris et al. (2009) highlighted stark racial difference in White and African American alumni of foster care. White alumni reported outcomes consistent with financial

wellbeing and wealth generation. Alternatively, the African American foster care alumni had less education and higher rates of unemployment and homelessness. To date, research on recipients of the Annie E. Casey Foundation Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative highlight an uneven outcome achievement experience for LGBTQ youth, especially youth of color compared to their straight and cisgender youth counterparts in key areas such as permanency, housing, social capital, financial resources, and physical health outcomes. Also, Washburn & Carr (2017) and Dettlaff, Washburn, Carr, and Vogel (2018) found that female LGB were more likely to have depression in Wave 1, trauma and depression in Wave 2, and by Wave 3, were likely to report substance use disorder, depression, and exposure to trauma at higher levels than were observed among non-LGB White and youth of color groups.

Interventions and promising practices

The recent increased focus in research for system-involved LGBTQ youth, in particular, LGBTQ youth of color, is an area with many opportunities to conduct model development research, implementation science, and best practice research. For example, the Georgia Parent Support Network attempts to provide sexual and gender minority youth refuge in a family- and youth- informed system of care that includes their voice in the care and supports they receive. An evaluation study of this model could be useful.

A multilevel, evidenced-based method that has been used widely in child welfare is the Task Centered Practice (TCP) approach. It has a wide-ranging application across levels of direct, agency, family, and community practice (Tolson, Garvin, & Reid, 2003) and Briggs (1994: 2009; with McBeath & Ausenberg, 2010). TCP is a proven technology that Briggs, Hoyt, and Mowbray (2018) are seeking to use in a pilot interagency task centered practice research study following their proposed clinical assessment study. Their goal is to ascertain the lived system experiences of child welfare involved youth of color, child welfare worker, and child welfare program managers in private and public systems of care in states with high and low racial disproportionate minority contact. The task-centered model is an evidence-based practice model that is driven by affirming client voice and empowerment. The model has been used across a diverse client population, problem areas and settings (Tolson, Reid, & Garvin, 2003). "Change occurs through the use of tasks...Tasks can be developed from an array of practice approaches, as well as from problem solving activities with clients" (Tolson, Reid, & Gravin, 2003, p. 4). It is flexible and can be used in combination with other approaches. In their proposed assessment study, the study authors seek to assess the sociocultural and other smaller system factors that would mitigate delinquency behaviors, trauma, behavioral health, and psychiatric disorder manifestations among LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ child welfare involved youth across race.

The Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative Opportunities Passport Program data is the most comprehensive source available on LGBTQ youth in foster care to date (Poirier et al., 2018). While these data are longitudinal across 17 state or county sites and collected twice a year, it is not yet generalizable for national estimates and outcome reporting. Thus, a major barrier to the study of outcomes for LGBTQ youth of color has been a gap in state, tribal, and federal child welfare data. A federal rule previously required the *Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System* (AFCARS) to include data on the sexual orientation of children, foster parent(s), and adoptive parent(s) or legal guardian(s); and also "whether there is family conflict related to the child's sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression as a child and family circumstance at removal reported when a child is

removed from the home" (Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System, 2017, p. 90526). However, the implementation of that rule has been delayed and it is now not clear that these data elements will still be required. Once AFCARS begins to collect these data, as well as demographic data about sexual orientation, gender identity, assigned sex at birth, and gender expression, opportunities to study the usefulness of TCP, and other innovations, in monitoring and improving outcomes for the LGBTQ youth of color population will emerge.

REFERENCES

Administration for Children and Families. (2011). *Information Memorandum ACYF-CB-IM-11-03*. Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from: https://www.acf. hhs.gov/sites/default/files/cb/im1103.pdf

Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System, 45 C.F.R. § 1355.44 (2017).

Briar-Lawson, K., McCarthy, M., & Dickinson, N. (2013). *The Children's Bureau: Shaping a Century of Child Welfare Practices, Programs, and Policies*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Briggs, H. E. (1994). From Foster Care to Foster Parent Adoptions in an Inner City Setting. *Research on Social Work Practice, 4*, 497-509.

Center for the Study of Social Policy. (2009). *Race Equity Review: Findings From a Qualitative Analysis of Racial Disproportionality and Disparity for Black Children and Families in Michigan's Child Welfare Systems.* Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy. Retrieved from: https://www. cssp.org/publications/child-welfare/institutional-analysis/race-equity-review-findings-from-a-qualitative-analysis-of-racial-disproportionality-and-disparity-for-african-american-children-and-families-in-michigans-child-welfare-system.pdf

Child Welfare Information Gateway. (2013). *Long-Term Consequences of Child Abuse and Neglect*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare Information Gateway. Retrieved from: https://www. childwelfare.gov/pubs/factsheets/long-term-consequences/

Children's Bureau. (2018). *AFCARS Report #25*. Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families. Retrieved from: https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/cb/afcarsreport25.pdf

Colman, R. A., Mitchell-Herzfeld, S., Kim, D. H., & Shady, T. A. (2010). From Delinquency to the Perpetration of Child Maltreatment: Examining the Early Adult Criminal Justice and Child Welfare Involvement of Youth Released From Juvenile Justice Facilities. *Children and Youth Services Review, 32*(10), 1410-1417. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j. childyouth.2010.06.010

Costin, L. B., Karger, H. J., & Stoesz, D. (1996). *The Politics of Child Abuse in America*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Courtney, M. & Skyles, A. (2003). Racial Disproportionality in the Child Welfare System. *Children and Youth Services Review, 25*(5), 355-358. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0190-7409(03)00025-2

Currie, J. & Spatz Widom, C. (2010). Long-Term Consequences of Child Abuse and Neglect on Adult Economic Well-Being. *Child Maltreatment, 15*(2), 111-120. Retrieved from: https://doi. org/10.1177/1077559509355316

Dettlaff, A. J. & Washburn, M. (2016). *Sexual Minority Youth in the Child Welfare System: Prevalence, Characteristics and Risk*. Forthcoming.

Dettlaff, A. J., Washburn, M., Carr, L. C., & Vogel, A. N. (2018). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) youth within in welfare: Prevalence, risk and outcomes. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 80*, 183-193. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2018.03.009

Development Services Group Inc. (2014). *LGBTQ Youths in the Juvenile Justice System: Literature Review*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved from: https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/LGBTQYouthsintheJuvenileJusticeSystem.pdf

Dworsky, A., Napolitano, L., & Courtney, M. (2013). Homelessness During the Transition from Foster Care to Adulthood. *American Journal of Public Health, 103 Suppl 2*, S318-323. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301455

Dworsky, A., White, C. R., O'Brien, K., Pecora, P., Courtney, M., Kessler, R., Sampson, N., & Hwang, I. (2010). Racial and Ethnic Differences in the Outcomes of Former Foster Youth. *Children and Youth Services Review, 32*(6), 902-912. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.03.001

Erney, R. & Weber, K. (2018). Not all Children are Straight and White: Strategies for Serving Youth of Color in Out-of-Home care who Identify as LGBTQ. *Child Welfare, 96*(2), 151-177.

Harris, M. S. (2014). *Racial Disproportionality in Child Welfare*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Herz, D., Lee, P., Lutz, L., Stewart, M., Tuell, J., & Wiig, J. (2012). *Addressing the Needs of Multi-system Youth: Strengthening the Connection Between Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice*. Washington, DC: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform. Retrieved from: https://neglected-delinquent.ed.gov/resource/addressing-needs-multi-system-youth-strengthening-connection-between-child-welfare-and

Hoyt, K. Y. (2017). *Foster Care, Public Good, and Privatization: A Comparative Secondary Analysis of Child Welfare Performance Outcomes.* (Ph. D. Doctoral Dissertation), School of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens, GA. Retrieved from: http://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/hoyt_kimberly_y_201705_phd.pdf

Huang, H., Ryan, J. P., & Herz, D. (2012). The Journey of Dually-involved Youth: The Description and Prediction of Rereporting and Recidivism. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*(1), 254-260. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.10.021

Hunt, J. & Moddie-Mills, A. C. (2012). *The Unfair Criminalization of Gay and Transgender Youth: An Overview of the Experiences of LGBT Youth in the Juvenile Justice System*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from: https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/lgbt/reports/2012/06/29/11730/the-unfair-criminalization-of-gay-and-transgender-youth/

Jacobs, J. & Freundlich, M. (2006). Achieving Permanency for LGBTQ Youth. *Child Welfare, 85*(2), 299-316.

Logie, C. H., James, L., Tharao, W., & Loutfy, M. R. (2011). HIV, Gender, Race, Sexual Orientation, and Sex Work: A Qualitative Study of Intersectional Stigma Experienced by HIV-positive Women in Ontario, Canada. *PLoS Med, 8*(11), e1001124. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001124

Majd, K., Marksamer, J., & Reyes, C. (2009). *Hidden Injustice: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth in Juvenile Courts*. Washington, DC: Legal Services for Children, National Juvenile Defender Center, and National Center for Lesbian Rights. Retrieved from: http://www.nclrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/hidden_injustice.pdf

Marshall, J. M. & Haight, W. L. (2014). Understanding Racial Disproportionality Affecting African American Youth Who Cross Over From the Child Welfare to the Juvenile Justice System: Communication, Power, Race and Social Class. *Children and Youth Services Review, 42*, 82-90. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.03.017

Martin, M., Down, L., & Erney, R. (2016). *Out of the Shadows: Supporting LGBTQ Youth in Child Welfare Through Cross-system Collaboration*. Washington, DC: Center for the Study for Social Policy.

Retrieved from: https://www.cssp.org/pages/out-of-the-shadows-supporting-lgbtq-youth-in-child-welfare-through-cross-system-collaboration

McCormick, A., Schmidt, K., & Terrazas, S. (2017). LGBTQ Youth in the Child Welfare System: An Overview of Research, Practice, and Policy. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 11*(1), 27-39. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2016.1221368

McCormick, A., Schmidt, K., & Terrazas, S. R. (2016). Foster family acceptance: Understanding the role of foster family acceptance in the lives of LGBTQ youth. *Children and Youth Services Review, 61*, 69-74. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.12.005

Pecora, P. J. (2000). *The Child Welfare Challenge: Policy, Practice, and Research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Poirier, J. M., Wilkie, S., Sepulveda, K., & Uruchima, T. (2018). Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative: Experiences and Outcomes of Youth who are LGBTQ. *Child Welfare, 96*(1), 1-26.

Roberts, D. E. (2002). *Shattered Bonds: The Color of Child Welfare*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Ryan, J. P. & Testa, M. F. (2005). Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Delinquency: Investigating the Role of Placement and Placement Instability. *Children and Youth Services Review, 27*(3), 227-249. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2004.05.007

Shelton, J., Poirier, J. M., Wheeler, C., & Abramovich, A. (2018). Reversing Erasure of Youth and Young Adults Who are LGBTQ and Access Homelessness Services: Asking about Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Pronouns. *Child Welfare, 96*(2), 1-28.

Shpiegel, S. & Simmel, C. (2016). Functional Outcomes Among Sexual Minority Youth Emancipating From the Child Welfare System. *Children and Youth Services Review, 61*, 101-108. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.12.012

Smith, C. & Thornberry, T. P. (1995). *The Relationship Between Childhood Maltreatment and Adolescent Involvement in Delinquency. Working Paper No. 17*. Albany, NY: New York State University System.

Smith, C. A., Ireland, T. O., & Thornberry, T. P. (2005). Adolescent maltreatment and its impact on young adult antisocial behavior. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 29*(10), 1099-1119. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2005.02.011

Tam, C. C., Abrams, L. S., Freisthler, B., & Ryan, J. P. (2016). Juvenile Justice Sentencing: Do Gender and Child Welfare Involvement Matter? *Children and Youth Services Review, 64*, 60-65. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.02.028

Tolson, E. R., Reid, W. J., & Garvin, C. D. (2003). *Generalist Practice: A Task-Centered Approach*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Valentino, A. (2011). Part 1: LGBTQ Youth in the Juvenile Justice System. *Children's Rights Litigation, 13*(4), 20-23.

Vidal, S., Prince, D., Connell, C. M., Caron, C. M., Kaufman, J. S., & Tebes, J. K. (2017). Maltreatment, Family Environment, and Social Risk Factors: Determinants of the Child Welfare to Juvenile Justice Transition Among Maltreated Children and Adolescents. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 63*, 7-18. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2016.11.013

Washburn, M. & Carr, C. L.). *LGB Youth in Child Welfare: Prevalence, Characteristics, and Risk*. Houston, TX: University of Houston School of Social Work.

Whitelaw-Downs, S., Moore, E., McFadden, E. J., Michaud, S. M., & Costin, L. B. (2004). *Child welfare and family services: Policies and practice* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

Widom, C. S. & Maxfield, M. G. (2001). *An Update on the "Cycle of Violence." Research in Brief*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Wilson, B. D. M. & Kastanis, A. A. (2015). Sexual and Gender Minority Disproportionality and Disparities in Child Welfare: A Population-based Study. *Children and Youth Services Review, 58*, 11-17. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.08.016

Zielinski, D. S. (2009). Child Maltreatment and Adult Socioeconomic Well-being. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 33*(10), 666-678. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2009.09.001

JUVENILE JUSTICE

Angela Irvine
Founder and Principal, Ceres Policy Research

Sid Jordan
PhD student, Department of Social Welfare, University of California, Los Angeles

Danielle Soto
Associate Director & Senior Researcher, Research & Action Center, Impact Justice

An estimated 48,000 young people are living in juvenile detention facilities on a given day in the U.S. and more than 884,000 cases are adjudicated in juvenile courts each year (Sickmund et al., 2017; Sickmund, et al., 2018). Although youth incarceration is often characterized as a last resort intervention required for public safety, the vast majority of youth detentions results from non-violent offenses (Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2018). Advocacy efforts for system reforms have contributed to the significant reduction in the number of young people involved in the system over the past 15 years, yet the *proportion of youth of color* in the system has continued to increase (Butts, 2016; Davis, Irvine, & Ziedenberg, 2014; Mariscal & Bell, 2010l W. Haywood Burns Institute, 2016). Black youth are grossly overrepresented -- comprising nearly 42% of the 2015 youth detention population compared to an estimated 16.5% of youth ages 10-17 in the general population (Sickmund et al., 2017). The proportion of girls involved in the juvenile justice system has also continued to rise, and although girls are less likely than boys to be arrested, they are more likely to be detained for less serious offenses (Puzzachera & Ehrmann, 2018).

Research related to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) youth in the juvenile justice system reveals overrepresentation, disproportionate sanctioning, and mistreatment (CAP & MAP, 2016; Irvine and Canfield, 2017). An estimated 20% of youth in detention are LGBTQ compared to just 6% of youth in the general population (Irvine & Canfield, 2017; see also Wilson et al., 2017; Majd, Marksamer, & Reyes, 2009). In a 2012 survey of youth in detention, nearly 40% of self-identified girls were LGB and LGB youth overall were 2-3 times more likely to indicate durations of detention of a year or more (Wilson et al., 2017). The extant research has focused primarily on LGB youth and points to differential sanctioning: LGB youth are more likely than non-LGB youth to be arrested and detained for status offences (e.g. running away, truancy) and other survival strategies, such as selling sex or drugs (Irvine, 2010; Irvine & Canfield, 2017; also Conover-Williams, 2014). Much less is known about the experiences of trans youth, although existing evidence suggests they are overrepresented in detention settings (Irvine & Canfield, 2017).

Youth incarceration is linked to numerous negative short-to-long term outcomes include inequities in education, employment, and health, including premature death (Aalsma et al., 2016; Barnert et al., 2018; Holman & Ziedenberg, 2006; Stokes et al. 2015;). Incarceration can exacerbate mental health problems that are known to disproportionately impact LGBTQ youth, including suicidal ideation and self-harm behaviors (Stokes et al. 2015). Placement in secure facilities may compound harms experienced by LGBTQ youth in schools, at home, and in their communities, including incubated patterns of bias and stereotyping by staff and peers, social and physical isolation, disproportionate sanctions and punishment, medical neglect, and sexual and physical violence (Feinstein, Greenblatt, Hass, Kohn, & Rana, 2001; Holsinger & Hodge, 2014; Majd et al., 2009; Mountz, 2016; Pasko, 2010-

2011; Wilson et al., 2017; Woronoff, Estrada, Sommer, & Marzullo, 2006). Needs assessments and treatment plans rarely take into account how a young person's gender or sexuality may be relevant to placements and programming (Garnette et al., 2010). LGBTQ youth may be punished for expressing their gender or for consensual sexual contact, a pattern that almost exclusively targets LGBTQ youth due to gender-specific housing models and pervasive and often racialized homophobia. For example, researchers find that in girls' facilities, LGBTQ youth are often perceived and monitored by staff as being sexually "predatory" which could increase sex offense charges (Holsinger & Hodge, 2016; Mountz, 2016; Pasko, 2010; Snapp, et al., 2015; Sickmund, 2004).

Outside of secure facilities, LGBTQ youth involved in the juvenile justice system also face challenges. Judges and probation officers often refer youth to programming and out-of-home placements designed for "boys" and "girls" based on their sex assigned at birth rather than: 1) questioning why programming is segregated by birth sex, and, 2) if required to choose, failing to ask youth where they would prefer to be (Irvine et al., forthcoming; Garnette et al., 2010). Additionally, program and group home staff may perpetuate isolation and enact stigma and further harm by, for example, refusing access to appropriate clothing or failing to refer to youth by their preferred name and pronoun (Majd et al., 2009).

Additional research is warranted to better understand how racial inequities, as well as discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity or expression (SOGIE) and other factors (including mental health and disabilities), intersect in shaping the sequalae of arrest, sentencing, placement, and treatment of LGBTQ youth of color (YOC). When researchers gather data on SOGIE, the tendency is to analyze race-ethnicity as a control variable rather than looking at patterns jointly by SOGIE and race-ethnicity. This practice overlooks racism in examining the inequities and experiences of system-involved LGBTQ youth of color. Likewise, research on racial inequities in the juvenile justice system rarely engages the experiences of LGBTQ youth as relevant in understanding patterns of inequitable treatment and in informing advocacy responses. This can produce and reinforce assumptions that youth of color are heterosexual and gender conforming and that LGBTQ and gender nonconforming youth are white, contributing to practices that do not take into account the experiences or needs of LGBTQ YOC. Recent studies that examine both race/ethnicity and SOGIE find that 85-90% of system-involved youth who identify as LGBTQ are youth of color (Irvine, 2010; Irvine & Canfield, 2017; Irvine et al., 2017). In multiple independent studies, LGBTQ youth of color consistently report particularly pervasive and sexualized patterns of discrimination, profiling, and violence by law enforcement and juvenile justice authorities (BreakOUT! & Streetwise and Safe, 2015; Dank et. al., 2016; Graham, 2014; Majd et al., 2009; and Mountz, 2017).

Recommendations

A better understanding of how to engage the perspectives of LGBTQ youth of color who have been impacted by the juvenile justice system. Little is known about whether juvenile justice and prevention programs that involve young people in advisory roles are effectively engaging LGBTQ youth of color. Qualitative research is needed to better understand the dynamics and mechanisms that enable and inhibit LGBTQ YOC from participating and taking leadership in these settings. Further, research is needed to understand the quality of youth experiences participating in advisory councils, including the extent to which these programs enable meaningful decision-making or provide oversight powers.

A better understanding of inequities experienced by LGBTQ youth of color at various decision-making points from contact with law enforcement through reentry. Further research is needed to understand LGBTQ YOC experiences of arrests, diversion, adjudication, sentencing, placement decisions, length of stay, treatment in confinement, and reentry and to advance policies and practices that address their specific needs. Publicly available deidentified administrative data allows researchers to identify inequities across race at different decision-points of criminal legal processing (e.g. arrest, diversion, placements, length of confinement). However, data about the SOGIE of youth entering the system is not broadly required or consistently collected. Further, not all jurisdictions report ethnicity, which renders Latinx youth invisible as well. It is imperative that these forms of data are collected to examine how race-ethnicity and SOGIE intersect in contributing to vulnerabilities to criminalization and disproportionate sanctioning at various points of contact and with diverse authorities, including sanctioning while detained. As Snapp and colleagues (2015) argue, it is crucial that system actors provide meaningful and protected opportunities for youth to disclose and discuss their gender and sexual identities on their own terms. Researchers and LGBTQ youth impacted by the juvenile justice system can partner to characterize safe and affirming conditions for asking about gender and sexuality identities, and to ensure that policies and practices of data collection are accurate, relevant, and confidential.

A better understanding of a range of experience among LGBTQ youth of color impacted by the juvenile justice system. Researchers suggest that in girls' detention facilities, LGBTQ youth of color may be stereotyped as more aggressive and violent, able to "handle" rougher treatment, more defiant or pathological when compared to non-LGBTQ or white girls. Additional research is warranted to understand the extent to which these or other prejudicial beliefs contribute to the mistreatment of LGBTQ youth of color in boys' detention facilities, as well as how a two-gender detention system imposes gender norms and stereotypes on young people broadly. Yet, bias may only be one contributing factor in understanding differential experiences and sanctioning, including longer periods of detention; additional research should consider how to address factors such as family support, safe and affirming options for release placement, and programs that can address the specific needs of LGBTQ youth of color without criminal sanctioning.

Evidence on decriminalization and decarceration strategies that are attentive to the needs of LGBTQ YOC. System-involved youth often indicate significant unmet health needs rooted in histories of trauma; yet even one day in juvenile detention may exacerbate these health needs and contribute to economic disenfranchisement and educational inequities. For LGBTQ youth of color, system reforms such as non-discrimination policies or training juvenile justice authorities (e.g. law enforcement, judges, attorneys, probation and detention staff) may offer vital forms of harm reduction and should also be evaluated. At the same time, such reforms do not address structural factors that make secure and disciplinary detentions environments incompatible with the needs of vulnerable young people. Many black feminist scholars and others describe the U.S. prison system as inherently violent and have advanced calls for its abolition (Davis, 2003; Gilmore, 2007; Richie, 2012).

Researchers must focus on serious efforts to prevent LGBTQ youth of color from entering the justice system while avoiding strategies that may make LGBTQ youth more vulnerable. Alternatives to incarceration that rely on mandated family therapies, electronic monitoring, and home confinement may pose additional risks for young people experiencing violence at home and should be evaluated in relation to LGBTQ young people. Evaluations of LGBTQ-specific prevention programs, pre-arrest

diversion strategies, decriminalizing survival strategies, and community-based non-residential alternatives to adjudication and confinement that can meaningfully address the needs of LGBTQ youth of color are all needed. Examples of programs developing such strategies include the Office of Youth Diversion and Development in Los Angeles, the RYSE Center in Richmond, CA, the Young Women's Freedom Center in San Francisco, and One Circle Foundation, a national organization that trains justice stakeholders across the country. Further, researchers and LGBTQ YOC can partner in developing and evaluating programs that teach young people about their legal rights and build their advocacy skills, including working with legal counsel to hold systems accountable for discrimination. Examples of such programs include the Urban Justice Center's Peter Cicchino Youth Project and the Know Your Rights National Network piloted by Streetwise and Safe and BreakOUT!

REFERENCES

Aalsma, M. C., Lau, K. S. L., Perkins, A. J., Schwartz, K., Tu, W., Wiehe, S. E., Monahan, P., & Rosenman, M. B. (2016). Mortality of Youth Offenders Along a Continuum of Justice System Involvement. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 50*(3), 303-310. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2015.08.030

Barnert, E. S., Abrams, L. S., Tesema, L., Dudovitz, R., Nelson, B. B., Coker, T., Bath, E., Biely, C., Li, N., & Chung, P. J. (2018). Child incarceration and long-term adult health outcomes: a longitudinal study. *International Journal of Prisoner Health, 14*(1), 26-33. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPH-09-2016-0052

Belknap, J., Holsinger, K., & Little, J. (2014). Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youth in Juvenile Facilities. In D. Peterson & V. R. Panfil (Eds.), *Handbook of LGBT Communities, Crime, and Justice* (pp. 207-228). New York, NY: Springer.

BreakOUT! & Streetwise and Safe. (2015). *Get Yr Rights: A Toolkit for LGBTQTS Youth and LGBTQTS Youth-Serving Organizations*. New Orleans, LA: BreakOUT! : and New York, NY: Streetwise and Safe. Retrieved from: http://www.youthbreakout.org/2015/02/07/get-yr-rights-toolkit/

Butts, J. A. (2016). Racial Disparities Persist in Juvenile Court Placements. *Research and Evaluation DataBits, 2016*(2), John Jay College of Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation Center. Retrieved from: https://johnjayrec.nyc/2016/10/24/databit201602/

Center for American Progress & Movement Advancement Project. (2016, February). *Unjust: How the Broken Criminal Justice System Fails LGBT People*. Denver, CO: Movement Advancement Project. Retrieved from: http://www.lgbtmap.org/criminal-justice

Conover-Williams, M. (2014). The Queer Delinquent: Impacts of Risk and Protective Factors on Sexual Minority Juvenile Offending in the US. In D. Peterson & V. R. Panfil (Eds.), *Handbook of LGBT Communities, Crime, and Justice* (pp. 449-472). New York, NY: Springer.

Dank, M., Yahner, J., Madden, K., Bañuelos, I., Yu, L., Ritchie, A., Mora, M., & Conner, B. (2015). *Surviving the Streets of New York: Experiences of LGBTQ Youth, YMSM, and YWSW Engaged in Survival Sex*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.urban.org/research/publication/surviving-streets-new-york-experiences-lgbtq-youth-ymsm-and-ywsw-engaged-survival-sex

Davis, A., Irvine, A., & Ziedenberg, J. (2014). *Stakeholders' Views on the Movement to Reduce Youth Incarceration*. Oakland, CA: National Council on Crime & Deliquency. Retrieved from: http://nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/deincarceration-summary-report.pdf

Davis, A. Y. (2003). *Are Prisons Obsolete?* New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.

Garnette, L., Irvine, A., Reyes, C., & Wilber, S. (2011). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT)

Youth. In F. T. Sherman & F. H. Jacobs (Eds.), *Juvenile Justice: Advancing Research, Policy, and Practice*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Gilmore, R. W. (2007). *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Graham, L. F. (2014). Navigating Community Institutions: Black Transgender Women's Experiences in Schools, the Criminal Justice System, and Churches. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 11*(4), 274-287. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-014-0144-y

Himmelstein, K. E. & Bruckner, H. (2011). Criminal-Justice & School Sanctions Against Nonheterosexual Youth: A National Longitudinal Study. *Pediatrics, 127*(1), 49-57. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2009-2306

Holman, B. & Ziedenberg, J. (2006). *The Dangers of Detention: The Impact of Incarcerating Youth in Detention and Other Secure Facilities*. Washington, DC: Justice Policy Institute. Retrieved from: http://www.justicepolicy.org/research/1978

Holsinger, K. & Hodge, J. P. (2014). The Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Girls in Juvenile Justice Systems. *Feminist Criminology, 11*(1), 23-47. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085114557071

Irvine, A. (2010). "We've Had Three of Them": Addressing the Invisibility of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Gender Nonconforming Youths in the Juvenile Justice System. *Columbia Journal of Gender and Law, 19*(3).

Irvine, A. & Canfield, A. (2017). Reflections on New National Data on LGBQ/GNCT Youth In the Justice System. *LGBTQ Policy Journal at the Harvard Kennedy School, VII*, 27-36. Retrieved from: http://lgbtq.hkspublications.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/20/2017/06/LGBTQ-2017-interior-final.pdf

Irvine, A. & Jones, N. (2018). "Taking the 'Girl' out of Gender-Specific Programming in the Juvenile Justice System.". *Annual Review of Criminology*, Forthcoming.

Irvine, A., Wilber, S., & Canfield, A. (2017). *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Questioning, and/or Gender Nonconforming and Transgender Girls and Boys in the California Juvenile Justice System: A Practice Guide*. Oakland, CA: Impact Justice and the National Center for Lesbian Rights. Retrieved from: http://impactjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/CPOC-Practice-Guide_Final.pdf

Majd, K., Marksamer, J., & Reyes, C. (2009). *Hidden Injustice: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth in Juvenile Courts*. Washington, DC: Legal Services for Children, National Juvenile Defender Center, and National Center for Lesbian Rights. Retrieved from: http://www.nclrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/hidden_injustice.pdf

Mariscal, R. & Bell, J. (2011). Race, Ethnicity and Ancestry in Juvenile Justice. In F. T. Sherman & F. H. Jacobs (Eds.), *Juvenile Justice: Advancing Research, Policy, and Practice* (pp. 111-130). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Mountz, S. E. (2016). That's the Sound of the Police: State-Sanctioned Violence and Resistance Among LGBT Young People Previously Incarcerated in Girls' Juvenile Justice Facilities. *Affilia, 31*(3), 287-302. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109916641161

Palmer, N. A. & Greytak, E. A. (2017). LGBTQ Student Victimization and Its Relationship to School Discipline and Justice System Involvement. *Criminal Justice Review, 42*(2), 163-187. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016817704698

Pasko, L. (2010). Setting the Record "Straight": Girls, Sexuality, and the Juvenile Correctional System. *Social Justice, 37*(1), 7-26. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41336933

Puzzanchera, C. & Ehrmann, S. (2018). *Spotlight on Girls in the Juvenile Justice System*. Washington, DC:

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved from: https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/snapshots/DataSnapshot_GIRLS2015.pdf

Puzzanchera, C. & Hockenberry, S. (2018). *Characteristics of Delinquency Cases Handled in Juvenile Court 2015*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved from: https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/snapshots/DataSnapshot_JCS2015.pdf

Richie, B. E. (2012). *Arrested Justice: Black Women, Violence, and America's Prison Nation*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Sickmund, M., Sladky, A., & Kang, W. (2018). *Easy Access to Juvenile Court Statistics: 1985-2015*. Retrieved from: https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezajcs/

Sickmund, M., Sladky, T. J., Kang, W., & Puzzanchera, C. (2017). *Easy Access to the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement*. Retrieved from: https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezacjrp/

Snapp, S. D., Hoenig, J. M., Fields, A., & Russell, S. T. (2014). Messy, Butch, and Queer: LGBTQ Youth and the School-to-Prison Pipeline. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 30*(1), 57-82. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558414557625

Snapp, S. D., Russell, S. T., Arredondo, M., & Skiba, R. (2016). A Right to Disclose: LGBTQ Youth Representation in Data, Science, and Policy. In S. S. Horn, M. D. Ruck, & L. S. Liben (Eds.), *Advances in Child Development and Behavior* (Vol. 50, pp. 135-159): JAI.

Stokes, M. L., McCoy, K. P., Abram, K. M., Byck, G. R., & Teplin, L. A. (2015). Suicidal Ideation and Behavior in Youth in the Juvenile Justice System: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Correctional Health Care, 21*(3), 222-242. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1078345815587001

The W. Haywood Burns Institute. (2016). *Stemming the Rising Tide: Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Youth Incarceration & Strategies for Change*. Oakland, CA: The W. Haywood Burns Institute. Retrieved from: https://www.burnsinstitute.org/blog/new-bi-report-highlights-troubling-trends-in-youth-of-color-incarceration/

Wilson, B. D. M., Jordan, S. P., Meyer, I. H., Flores, A. R., Stemple, L., & Herman, J. L. (2017). Disproportionality and Disparities among Sexual Minority Youth in Custody. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 46*(7), 1547-1561. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0632-5

YOUTH RESPONSES:
FEEDBACK ON SCHOLARS' REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON LGBTQ YOUTH OF COLOR IN SYSTEMS

Kerith J. Conron

APPROACH

The group felt strongly that participatory approaches, which center LGBTQ youth of color in the work to understand and change the systems that impact their lives, was critical to advance structural change. Participatory research models are action-oriented methods of involving community members in research to understand their communities and to affect social change (Minkler, 2000, 2010; Torre et al., 2012, 2018). Participatory Action Research (PAR) has been used as a method to reduce health inequities by involving people from marginalized populations in the use of reflection, data collection, and action to improve their own health, and that of the community (Blair & Minkler, 2009; Fine et al., 2018; Petersen et al., 2007; Salvatore et al., 2009; Vasquez et al., 2007; Vasquez, Minkler, & Shepard, 2006).

Importantly, PAR can afford youth with opportunities to build developmental assets (Lerner, Almerigi, Theokas, & Lerner, 2005), including problem-solving skills and social competence, by learning how to conduct a group research project and how to disseminate findings to target audiences. Youth have been engaged in studies of asthma risk in Harlem, local food environments in San Francisco, and youth homelessness in Los Angeles (Garcia et al., 2014; Minkler, Vasquez, Tajik, & Petersen, 2008; Vasquez et al., 2007). Participatory models may be of particular value in improving outcomes for system-involved LGBTQ youth of color, or at risk of such involvement, because the practice empowers youth (versus adults) to define problems, which, eventually, will suggest solutions to reform problematic systems that may not yet have been considered by others. Supporting youth in defining problems also allows youth to address their priorities first (Torre et al., 2018; Frost, Fine, Torre, & Cabana, 2019). We encourage youth-adult collaborations to outline challenges and key issues (e.g., housing stability, power differentials) that should be considered related to doing participatory research with system-involved and formerly involved LGBTQ youth of color.

Given our commitment to integrating youth into the knowledge generation process, we obtained feedback from LGBTQ youth of color on a summary of report findings and recommendations. While this approach is by no means participatory in that we did not include youth in the project conceptualization and implementation process, we view this effort as an improvement over producing a report about youth without any effort to integrate youth voices. We encourage funders and scholars to budget (money, time, staffing) for collaboration with LGBTQ youth of color in future research. We further encourage the development of youth advisory boards that include LGBTQ youth of color within child welfare and juvenile justice agencies and recommend scholarly attention to implementation issues, especially as related to issues of power and safety.

Desired characteristics for youth feedback participants included: being a LGBTQ youth of color age 13-25, direct experience with the child welfare and/or juvenile justice systems, or at-risk of such contact due to experiences of family rejection, housing instability, and/or residence in high poverty areas.

Youth were recruited via youth-serving organizations through the networks of convening members. Feedback was obtained from 28 LGBTQ youth, most of whom were ages 18 to 25, Black, Latinx, and/or multiracial, and who had direct experience with child welfare, justice systems, and/or homeless services via an anonymous, online focus group platform (two groups) and by video conference (one group) using a discussion guide (see Appendix B. Youth Feedback Recruitment and Discussion Guide). At all three youth programs, groups of eligible youth who were willing and interested in providing feedback were organized by an adult staff member based at the program. In one instance, Kerith Conron video-conferenced with the youth to describe the report, feedback activity, and to answer questions, then an adult program staff led the group through the online feedback process. The second online feedback session was led by María Elena Torre. The third feedback session was conducted via a video conference by Kerith Conron. Youth-serving organizations that assisted in recruiting youth received an honorarium. Youth received a $50 gift card as a thank you for their time and effort. This activity was deemed exempt as human subjects research by the UCLA North General Institutional Review Board (NGIRB).

Overall, youth who participated in the feedback sessions agreed with our statements about what the empirical research demonstrates and what might need to be addressed next. They emphasized several of the main points, expanded on several, and added unique points that were integrated directly into the Executive Summary. All youth feedback are described below through a combination of summary by the author and via direct quotes from the youth themselves. Readers are reminded that most of the youth who provided feedback were young adults (18 to 25 years old). It is very likely that younger youth (13 to 17 years old) would have different or additional feedback.

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Youth, across all feedback sessions, consistently expressed a desire for respect, genuine care, and inclusion in research and service-oriented decision-making. One stated, "Ask the LGBTQ youth of color what they want to change, and what help they think they need. They are experts of their situation." Another said, "Let me lead my solution and give me allies to support me and also help me critically think it out, so it won't just benefit me, but all."

In addition to the importance of treating youth as actors with agency to change their lives, three themes emerged across youth feedback sessions that were not clearly integrated in the prior iteration of the Executive Summary: 1) the importance of stable housing, 2) mental health and mental health care, and 3) support for independent living. Youth also made connections between structural conditions, lived experience, and services that mapped onto scholar discussions, and to our written literature reviews, but that we failed to make explicit in our draft Executive Summary. Consequently, we made mental health and housing more prominent across main findings and recommendations and added these bullet points to the Executive Summary about contributors to the overrepresentation of LGBTQ youth of color in state systems:

- homelessness and poverty, that are a consequence of the mechanisms described above, coupled with lack of access to jobs, that lead to survival crimes

- a lack of adequate access to competent community-based resources, including mental health, health, and social services prepared to support LGBTQ youth of color in managing stigma-related stress and overcoming structural disadvantage and that employ LGBTQ people of color

When asked, "What should be done to keep LGBTQ youth of color out of child welfare and juvenile justice systems?" some youth proposed systems changes related to school-based discipline and policing that included: "[t]ransformative justice-based interventions in schools rather than punitive ones, greater use of "[s]ocial workers and de-escalators, not police," and "a public initiative to stop the over policing of LGBTQI youth of color." Many described a desire for support, acceptance, and safe places "for LGBTQ youth of color to express themselves" or "a place to go or talk to" and might include "non-state support systems like queer family/house structures." Several voiced a need for additional resources, particularly for LGBTQ youth programs in communities of color, and "more safety nets for queer and trans youth of color."

Some indicated a desire for programs that utilize positive youth development approaches in the way that they described how they wanted to be supported. One youth said, "Give them the correct support. Find out what these youth of color are passionate about and open up pathways. Show them what needs to be done to get where they want to and help them. Provide structured programing that can help gear them for employed life as well as, incentives to work, such as paid internships, paid work scholarships for schooling. etc." Another young person voiced similar feelings, "They should hear out the LGBTQ kids, youth of color, and actually trust what their saying. And push what their saying to the next level and create a safe space, and provide opportunities to sustain ourselves." Another observed a need to "open up career opportunities for people … to step up, do something for their communities."

When we noted that little is known about how to prevent harm and promote positive outcomes for LGBTQ youth of color once system-involved, including experiences of violence, one youth commented, "They [youth] need a space where they can talk about assault within these systems." One youth commented, "When we identify 'good outcomes' for youth of color let's be intentional with what we think 'good' looks like. Stability and happiness should be staples in this conversation, but also empower those who cannot or will not take the typical route (etc., college)." Others spoke about the need for attentive case managers and mentorship to support them in "developing survival skills" when transitioning from highly structured environments with little personal control or into stable housing by showing youth how to "lay down a couple damn bricks to start [their] own pathway." Consequently, we expanded our statement about what is not known about how to prevent harm and promote positive outcomes for LGBTQ youth of color once system-involved to include how to reduce violence perpetrated against youth by staff and other adults involved in these systems, and access to employment and safe, affordable housing, and support for decision-making once emancipated from them.

When asked to comment on our list of proposed research activities, including partnering with youth on research, one youth stated, "I agree with all of this because it's true… nobody ever come ask us how we feel and what's going on." Another advised, "respect the youth, treat them like adults not youth. We are the experts in our communities." Others addressed the importance of paid work. One youth said, "Just want to explicitly state that we should be PAYING and financially backing the expertise of the LGBTQ youth of color involved, not just tokenizing or 'including' them."

A couple of youth had suggestions about research methodology and questions, including one who recommended that researchers obtain "…oral histories or life stories from youth so you can keep their lives in context. Because we live such intersectional lives many factors combine and create situations

of violence or cycles of trauma. These larger stories would provide vital moments where things go completely wrong. Often it starts when families push them out or they feel they can't be themselves and begin to manifest symptoms on the outside." Another suggested, "Ask them if there was anything positive about their experiences ([e.g.,] companionship within these systems....)."

When asked to comment on our recommendations for research and evaluation activities within child welfare and juvenile justice systems, including SOGIE data collection and staff training, youth had the following comments and suggestions:

- Staff training, evaluation, and monitoring is needed so that staff approach youth with "understanding and curiosity and not disgust."

- One youth stated, "The discrimination, I think, is the biggest issue. I know from personal experience that quite a few child welfare representative[s] are not very welcoming to LGBTQ+ youth of color. So, making sure that agents are always being watched."

- Staff training is needed related to SOGIE data collection, including, youth noted, on the importance of maintaining confidentiality to avoid "outing" youth.

- Another commented, "Their needs to be more empowerment and support of LGBTQ youth of color with lived experience. They should be the ones getting paid to train providers, staff, etc., and then the rest of the community. Support community initiatives that are from folks directly impacted."

- Employ staff with lived experience of systems ("hiring people that comes from the struggles") and include LGBTQ youth of color on hiring committees.

REFERENCES

Blair, T. & Minkler, M. (2009). Participatory Action Research With Older Adults: Key Principles in Practice. The Gerontologist, 49(5), 651-662. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnp049

Fine, M., Torre, M. E., Frost, D. M., & Cabana, A. L. (2018). Queer Solidarities: New Activisms Erupting at the Intersection of Structural Precarity and Radical Misrecognition. Journal of Social and Political Psychology; Vol 6, No 2 (2018). Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v6i2.905

Frost, D. M., Fine, M., Torre, M. E., & Cabana, A. (2019). Minority Stress, Activism, and Health in the Context of Economic Precarity: Results from a National Participatory Action Survey of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Gender Non-Conforming Youth. American Journal of Community Psychology, 0(0). Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12326

Garcia, A. P., Minkler, M., Cardenas, Z., Grills, C., & Porter, C. (2014). Engaging Homeless Youth in Community-Based Participatory Research: A Case Study From Skid Row, Los Angeles. Health Promotion Practice, 15(1), 18-27. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839912472904

Lerner, R. M., Almerigi, J. B., Theokas, C., & Lerner, J. V. (2005). Positive Youth Development: A View of the Issues. The Journal of Early Adolescence, 25(1), 10-16. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431604273211

Minkler, M. (2000). Using Participatory Action Research to Build Healthy Communities. Public Health Rep, 115(2-3), 191-197.

Minkler, M. (2010). Linking Science and Policy Through Community-Based Participatory Research to Study and Address Health Disparities. American Journal of Public Health, 100(S1), S81-S87.

Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.165720

Minkler, M., Vásquez, V. B., Tajik, M., & Petersen, D. (2008). Promoting Environmental Justice Through Community-Based Participatory Research: The Role of Community and Partnership Capacity. Health Education & Behavior, 35(1), 119-137. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198106287692

Petersen, D. M., Minkler, M., Vásquez, V. B., Kegler, M. C., Malcoe, L. H., & Whitecrow, S. (2007). Using Community-Based Participatory Research to Shape Policy and Prevent Lead Exposure Among Native American Children. Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action, 1(3), 249-256. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2007.0028

Salvatore, A. L., Chevrier, J., Bradman, A., Camacho, J., López, J., Kavanagh-Baird, G., Minkler, M., & Eskenazi, B. (2009). A Community-Based Participatory Worksite Intervention to Reduce Pesticide Exposures to Farmworkers and Their Families. American Journal of Public Health, 99(S3), S578-S581. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.149146

Torre, M., Fine, M., Stoudt, B., & Fox, M. (2012). Critical participatory action research as public science. In P. Camic & H. Cooper (Eds.), The handbook of qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design, 2nd edition (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Torre, M. E., Fine, M., Cabana, A., Frost, D., Avery, S., Fowler-Chapman, T., & What's Your Issue? Youth Research Collective. (2018). Radical Wills (and Won'ts): Critical Participatory Inqueery. In S. Talburt (Ed.), Youth Sexualities: Public Feelings and Contemporary Cultural Politics (Vol. 2, pp. 169-191). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Vásquez, V. B., Lanza, D., Hennessey-Lavery, S., Facente, S., Halpin, H. A., & Minkler, M. (2007). Addressing Food Security Through Public Policy Action in a Community-Based Participatory Research Partnership. Health Promotion Practice, 8(4), 342-349. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839906298501

Vásquez, V. B., Minkler, M., & Shepard, P. (2006). Promoting environmental health policy through community based participatory research: a case study from Harlem, New York. Journal of urban health: bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 83(1), 101-110. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-005-9010-9

APPENDIX A. INTERSECTIONAL CONVENING ON LGBTQ YOUTH OF COLOR IN CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS

PARTICIPANT BIOS

Mariella I. Arredondo is Research Associate for the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) at the Indiana Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC), Indiana University. As an education equity expert, Dr. Arredondo's current work focuses on supporting school districts in the state of Indiana systemically target issues of racial/ethnic disparities in school exclusion and special education identification and placement. Previously, Dr. Arredondo served as Associate Director of the Equity Project where she worked on the Discipline Disparities Research-to-Practice Collaborative project funded by The Atlantic Philanthropies and Open Society Foundations. This was a high-profile project that contributed important scholarship in the area of education equity and resulted in the publication of a Briefing Paper Series comprised of five research briefs that described 1) evidence-based and promising interventions for reducing disparities in discipline, 2) policy recommendations for reducing disparities, 3) new and emerging research in disparities in school exclusion, 4) the difficulty in acknowledging race and ways in addressing racial discipline disparities; and 5) the importance of expanding the collection and reporting of data on sexual orientation and gender identity**.** This Briefing Series was released as part of a Congressional briefing *Eliminating Disparities in School Discipline: What Works,* in collaboration with the Congressional Black Caucus Education and Labor Task Force and Senator Christopher Murphy (D- CT), at the Rayburn Building in Washington, D.C. In addition to Senator Murphy, two other Congressional representatives attended and spoke at the briefing. Mariella earned her Ph.D. degree in Educational Leadership Policy Studies with a concentration in International Comparative Education from Indiana University- Bloomington. Mariella is currently pursuing a research agenda concentrating on the intersectionality of race, ethnicity, gender and sexual orientation in disparities in school discipline and academic outcomes. She is an avid traveler, nature lover, and enjoys art (in its many manifestations).

Harold E. Briggs is the Pauline M. Berger Professor of Family and Child Welfare at the School of Social Work, University of Georgia. Dr. Briggs has worked extensively on how mental health, substance abuse treatment, and child welfare systems service providers include adult consumer, youth, and family voice and use evidence to improve child, adult, and family well-being. Dr. Briggs has been involved in partnerships integrating academic, community and system change efforts that have strategically benefited community-based organizations serving people of color and university settings. Dr. Briggs seeks to lead and partner with faculty, students, civic, philanthropy, business, and grassroots community groups and other interprofessional stakeholders to advance child welfare, health disparities and behavioral health knowledge that furthers reduction in inequalities, promote well-being and human potential. He is an advocate for civil and human rights, economic and community development, and resilient family life. Through good works and an equal justice

foundation, he forges strategic alliances. Through these partnerships he seeks to increase the School of Social Work's rank and distinction as a world-class center of learning, grant funded scientific developments and grand challenges research to achieve positive social changes, racial respect and uplift, broadly defined.

Kerith J. Conron is the Blachford-Cooper Distinguished Scholar and Research Director at the Williams Institute. She is a social and psychiatric epidemiologist whose work focuses on documenting and reducing health inequities that impact sexual and gender minority (LGBTQ) populations. Dr. Conron is committed to altering the landscape of adversity and opportunity for the most marginalized LGBTQ communities through collaborative activities that impact the social determinants of health. She has been supported by NIMHD to conduct community-based participatory research with LGBTQ youth of color and by NICHD to train scholars in LGBTQ population health research. She has been active in LGBT health for nearly 20 years — serving on the first Steering Committee of the National Coalition for LGBT Health and as the first coordinator of the Office of LGBT Health for the City of Boston. Dr. Conron earned her doctorate from the Harvard School of Public Health and MPH from the Boston University School of Public Health.

Jessica Elm is a citizen of the Oneida Nation, a descendant of the Stockbridge-Munsee Band of the Mohicans, and a post-doctoral scholar at Johns Hopkins, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Center for American Indian Health. She received her PhD from the School of Social Work, University of Washington (2018) and her MSW from UC Berkeley (2009). Jessica has over 10 years of working with tribal communities to address child welfare and health inequities. Her research areas include examination of cumulative stressor exposure across the life course of American Indians, the impact of stress on behavioral health; culturally-specific resilience, wellness, and protective effects; and use of data to improve tribal social and human services (e.g., child/family and health serving systems).

Deszeree Elis Thomas spent the last 20+ years in Philadelphia's child welfare and juvenile justice systems as an attorney, consultant and executive in the public and private sectors. Some of her key achievements include: developing and implementing complete child welfare system transformation called "Improving Outcomes for Children"; establishing the City's truancy and cross-over court practices; and conducting critical program evaluations involving gender specific programming for girls and evaluating the utilization of clinical polygraph examinations for youth in sex offender treatment programs. Deszeree received her Bachelor of Arts in Film Production from Howard University, her Juris Doctor/Master of Business Administration from Temple University and her Master of Science in Education from the University of Pennsylvania. Currently, Deszeree is finishing up her doctoral degree at Rutgers University. She is doing an ethnographic study of the Juvenile Law Center's Youth Advocate Programs: Juveniles for Justice and Youth Fostering Change. Her project focuses on race, space and the construction of childhood in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Known for her honest insight by peers in the field and the academy, Deszeree is

eager to transition from her role as a practitioner to a researcher-activist dedicated to challenging and diversifying the narratives of system involved youth of color and to developing and mentoring young professionals entering the field.

Joss Greene is a PhD candidate in Sociology at Columbia University. He conducts research on crime and punishment, classification, and intersections of race and gender. His most recent projects have explored the role of social service organizations in transgender people's reentry, and transgender experiences in the California prison systems.

Kimberly Hoyt received her social work PhD in May 2017 from the University of Georgia. She has ten years of post-MSW experience including foster care case management and her current work as a Senior Research Associate and Director of the Kenny A. v. Deal Consent Decree Monitoring Project in the Center for State and Local Finance of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University. She oversees case reviews and data collection, management and analysis for the Kenny A. project, which examines the compliance of the Fulton and DeKalb County Departments of Family and Children Services in Georgia with terms of a federal consent decree. Her research interests include child welfare research and policy analysis, social service system reform, program and economic evaluations of social services, the well-being of minority populations receiving social services, and professional development of minorities in academia. Her dissertation is titled "Foster care, public good, and privatization: A secondary comparative analysis of child welfare performance outcomes." Dr. Hoyt has published articles in journals such as Child Abuse & Neglect, Children and Youth Services Review, Research on Social Work Practice, Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work, Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, and Journal of Public Child Welfare; and has also sat on panels and lectured BSW and MSW students on topics such as "An Overview of the Child Welfare System", "Economic Class and Child Welfare", "Assessment and Treatment of Trauma in Children", and "Behavioral Methods in Social Work Practice. Dr. Hoyt has also earned a bachelor's and master's degree in social work from Georgia State University and a bachelor's degree in business administration from Kennesaw State University.

Angela Irvine is the Founder and Principal of Ceres Policy Research. She has more than 20 years' experience in education and social policy. Raised in Santa Cruz County, CA, Angela earned her BA from UC Berkeley in 1984, her secondary teaching credential from St. Mary's College of California in 1985, and her PhD in sociology from Northwestern University in 2002 while simultaneously serving as a National Science Fellow (NSF) in public policy and program evaluation. She has served as the principal investigator of a national study of youth deincarceration; a national study of lesbian, gay, bisexual, questioning, gender nonconforming and transgender (LGBQ/GNCT) young people in the youth justice system; a project to improve permanency for LGBT youth and youth of color within the criminal justice and youth justice systems; a survey of every detention

hall, ranch, and camp in California to understand statewide pathways into the youth justice system for LGBT young people; and a National Institute of Justice researcher-practitioner partnership grant in Santa Cruz County to determine whether structured decision-making instruments used by adult probation departments can lead to more equitable probation outcomes for Latinos and women. She worked for four years as the director of criminal justice research at the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and two years as a Vice President at Impact Justice. In 2017, she returned to Ceres to leverage her experience at national policy research companies to support the expanded influence of grass-roots organizations.

Nikki Jones is an associate professor in the Department of African American Studies at the University of California, Berkeley. She is also a faculty affiliate with the Center for the Study of Law and Society. Her areas of expertise include urban ethnography, race and ethnic relations and criminology and criminal justice, with a special emphasis on the intersection of race, gender, and justice. Professor Jones has published three books, including the sole-authored Between Good and Ghetto: African American Girls and Inner City Violence (2010), published in the Rutgers University Press Series in Childhood Studies (betweengoodandghetto.com). Her research appears in peer-reviewed journals in sociology, gender studies, and criminology. Jones' next book, based on several years of field research in a San Francisco neighborhood, examines how African American men with criminal histories change their lives, and their place in the neighborhood once they do. Her current research draws on the systematic analysis of video records that document routine encounters between police and civilians, including young Black men's frequent encounters with the police. Professor Jones is the past-Chair of the American Sociological Association's Race, Gender and Class Section (2012-13). She also serves on the editorial boards of the American Sociological Review and Gender & Society. Jones has received awards for her research and publications including the William T. Grant Award for Early Career Scholars (2007-12) and the New Scholar Award from the American Society of Criminology's Division on Women and Crime (2010) and Division on People of Color and Crime (2009). Before joining the faculty at Cal Professor Jones was on faculty in the Department of Sociology at UC-Santa Barbara (from 2004-2013). She earned her Ph.D. in Sociology and Criminology from the University of Pennsylvania.

Sid Jordan is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Social Welfare at the University of California, Los Angeles. Sid's areas of research include violence prevention, alternative justice models, trauma and health, and the well-being and self-determination of LGBTQ young people and trans people over the life course. Sid has extensive experience collaborating with LGBTQ youth organizers and working with health and human service organizations interested in increasing access to resources for LGBTQ people and communities. Sid earned a JD from the University of Victoria with a focus on international human rights.

Lance C. Keene is the 2018-19 Joint Dissertation Fellow at the Center for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture & Center for the Study of Gender and Sexuality, as well as a PhD Candidate at The University of Chicago in the School of Social Service Administration. Lance is a black queer scholar who combines qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate health, well-being, and lived experiences, of urban black gay and same-gender loving (SGL) youth. Lance's dissertation and evolving program of scholarship investigate the persistent structural disparities within urban communities that negatively impact the health and well-being of LGBTQ youth of color. Beyond the risk HIV/AIDS continues to pose to black gay and SGL youth, a relative paucity of targeted health enhancing opportunities for LGBTQ youth in or near urban low- income and/or racial-ethnic minority communities, may likewise contribute to involvement within child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Lance hopes that enhancing access to targeted community-based assets for LGBTQ youth of color, may serve to strengthen their health and well- being, and cultivate strategies that minimize exposure to child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

Jeffrey Poirier is a Senior Research Associate in the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Research, Evaluation, Evidence and Data Unit. Dr. Poirier works closely with the Foundation's Child Welfare Strategy Group, Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative, and Juvenile Justice Strategy Group. He serves as a thought partner, conceptualizing and managing research and evaluation investments. He also works on issues related to education and employment opportunities for opportunity youth and is co-leading Casey's role in the Adolescent Science Translation Funders Collaborative. Previously he was at the American Institutes for Research for more than 15 years where he conducted research and evaluation and synthesized research to develop products for the field. He also delivered training and technical assistance around the U.S. to improve outcomes for LGBTQ youth. His work has addressed issues related to adolescent development, behavioral health, child welfare, cultural and linguistic competence, education, homelessness, juvenile justice, and youth well-being. Dr. Poirier serves as an adjunct professorial lecturer in American University's Department of Public Administration and Policy. He has contributed to nine book chapters and seven journal articles, and co-authored dozens of technical reports and other products. He is also coeditor of a 2012 book, Improving Emotional and Behavioral Outcomes for LGBT Youth: A Guide for Professionals. He completed his undergraduate studies at the University of Pennsylvania and his graduate studies at The George Washington University.

Danielle Soto is the Associate Director & Senior Researcher of the Research & Action Center at Impact Justice. She has more than a decade of experience in research and analysis of adolescent well-being and risk, with a focus on gendered and racial/ethnic inequalities. She graduated Cum Laude with her Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology (Juvenile Delinquency emphasis) from the University of Montana, where she was a McNair Scholar. She received her master's degree and Ph.D. from Bowling Green State University in Sociology/Criminology. There she specialized in juvenile delinquency and minored in Family Studies and Quantitative Methods. Her master's thesis looked at sexual minority youth and delinquent offending, paying special attention to the impact of sexual

identity. Her dissertation examined Latino delinquency, looking at the differences in country-of-origin and generational status. After graduate school, Danielle spent four years as an Assistant Professor, where she served as an advisor/mentor for many campuses and community groups serving underrepresented students. Wanting to use her professional skills in research and analysis in an applied way, she made the transition to the non-profit arena. Recognizing that true justice requires attention paid to the intersections of race/ethnicity, sexuality and sexual identity, sex and gender expression, gender identity, and socioeconomic status, she frequently examines disparities in these areas. Danielle now lives in the Bay Area with her partner and their two cats.

Mario Itzel Suárez graduated in December 2018 with a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from Texas A&M University in the Department of Teaching, Learning and Culture. He is currently a postdoctoral researcher for the Education Research Center at Texas A&M University. He is a transgender man from the Texas-México border town of Eagle Pass, Texas and taught as a high school mathematics teacher in Austin ISD for 8 years. As the Gay Straight Alliance sponsor for his high school, he mentored LGBTQA+ students and became an advocate and voice for transgender employees for the Education Austin LGBTQ Committee. In addition, Mario was a member of the Austin ISD LGBTQ Advisory Committee, which consisted of members of the community, local organizations, law enforcement, parents, teachers, students, and staff that advised the district on issues that affected LGBTQA+ faculty, staff, and students. He has a Bachelor of Arts in Ethnic Studies and a Master of Arts in Mathematics Education from The University of Texas at Austin. Mario starts a new position this Fall 2019 as an Assistant Professor in the School for Teacher Education and Leadership in the Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services at Utah State University. His research focuses on critical queer race issues in education, curriculum studies, STEM persistence of marginalized students, and critical quantitative research methods.

María Elena Torre is the founding Director of The Public Science Project and faculty member in Critical Social Psychology and Urban education at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. She has been engaged in critical participatory action research nationally and internationally for more than 20 years with communities in neighborhoods, schools, prisons, and community-based organizations seeking structural justice. Her work introduced the concept of 'participatory contact zones' to collaborative research, and she continues to be interested in how democratic methodologies, radical inclusion, and a praxis of solidarity can inform a public science for the public good. María is an editor of *PAR Entremundos: A Pedagogy of the Américas* and an author of *Echoes of Brown: Youth Documenting and Performing the Legacy of Brown v. Board of Education* and *Changing Minds: The Impact of College on a Maximum Security Prison*, as well as over 50 peer-reviewed journal articles and chapters. She is a recipient of the American Psychological Association Division 35 Adolescent Girls Task Force Emerging Scientist, the Spencer Fellowship in Social Justice & Social Development in Educational Studies, and the Michele Alexander Award from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues of the American Psychological Association for Early Career Excellence in Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. María is presently serving on the New York City Mayoral Taskforce on School Discipline, and is co-leading "What's Your Issue?" a national participatory study with LGBTQ and gender expansive youth about their experiences of injustice, dreams, and desires.

Bianca D.M. Wilson is the Rabbi Barbara Zacky Senior Scholar of Public Policy at The Williams Institute and affiliated faculty with the UCLA California Center for Population Research. She earned a Ph.D. in Psychology from the Community and Prevention Research program at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) with a minor in Statistics, Methods, and Measurement, and received postdoctoral training at the UCSF Institute for Health Policy Studies and the UCSF Lesbian Health and Research Center through an Agency for Health Research and Quality (AHRQ) postdoctoral fellowship. She also served as member and chair of the American Psychological Association's Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Concerns. Her research focuses on the relationships between culture, oppression, and health, with an emphasis on racial and sexual and gender minorities. Her most current work focuses on LGBT economic instabilities and population research among foster youth, homeless youth, and youth in juvenile custody, with a focus on sampling, data collection, and assessing disproportionality in these systems.

Public Policy, Services and Implementation Science guest Speakers

Bill Bettencourt, MA
Senior Fellow, Center for the Study of Social Policy

Bill Bettencourt co-leads CSSP's get R.E.A.L initiative, which works to improve healthy sexual and identity development for system involved youth. The initiative includes site work in Allegheny County and in California as well managing a network of public and private sector members. Bettencourt has over 40 years of experience working in the social services field, spending more than 26 years with the City and County of San Francisco, the last four as the Director of Children and Family Services. He has also served as a Program Officer with the Stuart Foundation funding child welfare improvements in Washington State and California. As a Senior Consultant for The Annie E. Casey Foundation, he led the implementation of the Family to Family Initiative in 28 counties in California serving 80 percent of the children in foster care in the state. He also coordinated the work of Family to Family in Washington State and Alaska and led a national team focused on improving efforts in states and counties nationally to address racial disparities. He also led system improvement efforts in California aimed at improving outcomes for LGBTQ children, youth, and families involved with the child welfare system. He recently led CSSP's partnership with the University of Illinois, Chicago on work in California focused on improving services and outcomes for Latino and LGBTQ children and families involved with the child welfare system, a research project in Santa Clara and Fresno counties. Prior to joining the staff, he was a consultant on CSSP's Institutional Analysis team. He has served as an advisor to the Family Acceptance Project at San Francisco State University as well as on numerous boards and advisory councils. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree from San Francisco State University and his Masters' degree from the University of San Francisco.

Khush Cooper, MSW, PhD
CEO, Khush Cooper & Associates

Khush Cooper teaches "Being a Leader: An Ontological Phenomenological Approach" and "Public Policy for Children and Youth" at the UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs.

She received her M.S.W. and Ph.D. in Social Work from Luskin. As a social entrepreneur and specialist in the study and implementation of what's next for human services, Dr. Cooper uses long-standing relationships with policymakers, leading practitioners, and consumers to shield and guide California's organizations, both public and private, through reform initiatives. Starting out as a group home child care worker, Dr. Cooper has held the positions of house manager, foster care social worker, non-public school teacher, FFA Director, and Director of Research and Quality at the Gay and Lesbian Adolescent Social Services. Her firm, Khush Cooper and Associates, is currently conducting the first ever LGBTQ Youth Preparedness Scan for LA County which assesses all 11 county departments' capacity to properly serve LGBTQ children, youth and families in order to prevent future disproportionality of these youth in the child welfare system. KC&A also currently developing an e-learning platform, Implematix, to support foster care providers with AB 403 implementation. Other projects have included inventing a practical and staff-friendly system for performance management for foster care providers in California, initiating two of the multimillion-dollar federal Permanency Innovations Initiative grants in the country (the RISE Project, CAPP), and managing the implementation of three of the five statewide Residentially Based Services (RBS) demonstration projects in California. She is a founding board member of the LA LGBT Child Abuse Prevention Council and consults on a local, state and national level in the area of LGBT youth in systems.

Shannan Wilber, Esq.
Youth Policy Director, National Center for Lesbian Rights

Shannan joined NCLR in 2013 to direct and expand the impact of NCLR's Youth Project, reaching out to the most vulnerable LGBT youth across the country and working on their behalf to advance their safety, inclusion, and well-being. Early in her career, Shannan helped launch Legal Advocates for Children and Youth, a California-based agency that now serves hundreds of children a year in state court proceedings. Her experience representing individual children in juvenile court inspired her to join the Youth Law Center in 1992, where she engaged in policy advocacy and impact litigation to reform child welfare and juvenile justice systems for nine years. Between 2001 and 2012, Shannan served as the Executive Director of Legal Services for Children, a nonprofit law office in San Francisco that represents children in foster care, guardianship, education and immigration proceedings. She served for many years as a member of NCLR's Board of Directors and as co-counsel on cases protecting LGBT youth against forced institutionalization and cases asserting the rights of children. She also worked with NCLR and others to create professional standards governing the care of LGBT youth in state custody, and to launch the Equity Project, dedicated to ensuring equal and respectful treatment of LGBT youth in the juvenile justice system. Shannan received her B.A. from Michigan State University and her J.D. from Santa Clara University. She has received numerous awards and honors for her work, including the 2003 Livingston Hall Juvenile Justice Award from the American Bar Association and the 2004 Outstanding Legal Advocacy Award from the National Association of Counsel for Children.

MEETING AGENDA

December 4, 2017
8:45AM to 4PM

Purpose The primary aim of the convening is to identify gaps in knowledge and to generate a research blueprint for action. Our longer-term goal is to form a community of scholars who will collaborate on research to reduce contact with the child welfare and the juvenile justice systems and to promote positive outcomes (e.g., permanency) among those who are system-involved. The population emphases for the research blueprint and scholars community are people of color and who are LGBTQ (or other sexual and gender minorities), particularly those sitting at the intersection.

Attendees

Convening organizers: Kerith Conron and Bianca Wilson; Jeffrey Poirier, Annie E. Casey Foundation (remote)

Senior scholars: Mariella Arredondo, Harold Briggs, Angela Irvine, Nikki Jones, and María Elena Torre

Rising scholars: Jessica Elm, Joss Green, Kim Hoyt, Sid Jordan, Lance Kean, Danielle Soto, Mario Itzel Suárez, Deszeree Elis Thomas

Invited guest speakers: Bill Bettencourt, Khush Cooper, Shannan Wilbur (remote)

Schedule

8:45-9:00 Welcome (Kerith, Bianca, Jeff)

9:00-9:30 Introductions (all scholars; Jocelyn Samuels)

9:30-10:30 Adolescent Risk and Resilience (Kerith moderator)

- Danielle Soto, Senior Policy Analyst, Impact Justice, LGBQ/GNC "Delinquency": Pathways into the Juvenile Justice System
- Lance Keene, PhD candidate, University of Chicago, LGBTQ Youth of Color, Education, and Juvenile Justice
- Joss Greene, PhD candidate, Columbia University, LGBT Youth of Color: Experiences with Homelessness and Policing
- Jessica Elm, PhD candidate, University of Washington, Building Resilience & Buffering Behavioral Health Challenges among LGBTQ Two-Spirit American Indian Systems Involved Youth
- Deszeree Thomas, PhD candidate, Rutgers University, Childhood Studies: The Social Construction of Childhood within the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems and the Implications for LGBTQ Youth of Color

10:30-10:45 break

10:45-noon Theory and Methods; Child Welfare (Bianca moderator)

- Nikki Jones, Associate Professor, University of California, Berkeley, *Theoretical Frameworks*
- María Elena Torre, Founding Director, Public Science Project, *Critical Participatory Action Research*

- Kimberly Hoyt, Georgia State University, Project Manager, *Child Welfare & LGBTQ Youth of Color*
- Harold, Briggs, Professor, University of Georgia, Estimating the Isolation and Racial Disproportionate Burdens of LGBT Youth of Color

12:00-12:30 break

12:30-1:30 (working lunch) The Educational System and Juvenile Justice (Kerith, Bianca moderators)

Mariella Arredondo, Associate Director, Equity Project, Indiana University, *Exclusionary Discipline in the Educational System and LGBTQ Youth*

Mario Itzel Suárez, Texas A&M University, PhD student, What Current Surveys Tell Us about LGBTQ Youth in the Education System

Angela Irvine, Founder and Principal, Senior Fellow, Ceres Policy Research, Impact Justice, *How SOGIE System Data will Enhance our Understanding of Juvenile Justice Sequelae*

Sid Jordan, University of California, Los Angeles, PhD student, Zero Youth Detention: Centering LGBTQ Youth of Color in Efforts to Close Youth Prisons

1:30-1:45 break

1:45-2:45 Policy, Service, and Legal perspectives (Bill, Khush, Shannan; Bianca moderator)

2:45-3:00 break

3:00-4:00 Report Discussion, Next Steps, and Meeting Close (Kerith moderator)

APPENDIX B. YOUTH FEEDBACK RECRUITMENT AND DISCUSSION GUIDE

LGBTQ Youth of Color and Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems Feedback Project: What the Research Says, What's Missing, and What Researchers Should do Next

Dear Youth,

We are a group of LGBTQ adults of color (and some allies) who do research about communities, child welfare, juvenile justice, and public policy. We are trying to get more people to care about what is happening to LGBTQ youth of color (YOC) – especially those who have been involved with the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Our goal is to keep as many LGBTQ YOC as possible out of child welfare and juvenile justice systems. And, if LGBTQ YOC do go into these systems, our goal is that they have positive experiences and good outcomes after they leave.

We believe that research is a tool to draw attention to people and issues. We believe that research is a way to understand how to improve systems. So, we read as many research articles and reports about LGBTQ YOC and child welfare and juvenile justice as we could find. We met as a group and talked about what we found. We also talked about what we didn't find – what has not yet been studied and why. We brainstormed what research would be useful and how it should be conducted.

We wrote up a summary of what the research says and what is missing. We sometimes use the phrase, "we think," when there isn't much research on a topic. We also wrote out a list of research that we feel is needed. We would really appreciate your feedback on what we think the research says. We would also really appreciate your feedback on what we think is needed. All ideas are appreciated. You don't have to agree with anything we have said!

Our summary of the research and your feedback will be published as a report that comes out this month.

Sincerely,

Kerith Conron and Bianca Wilson, the Williams Institute at UCLA and on behalf of our colleagues across the country

Part 1. Pathways into Systems

FACT: There are more LGBTQ YOC in child welfare and juvenile justice systems than there should be given how many LGBTQ YOC there are in the United States.

WE THINK IT IS BECAUSE OF RACISM AND HOMOPHOBIA, BIPHOBIA, AND TRANSPHOBIA. SPECIFICALLY, LGBTQ YOC ARE:

- o rejected by families because they are LGBTQ
- o disciplined more in school because they are LGBTQ YOC
- o growing up in communities that are poorer than other communities because they are YOC
- o going to schools that don't have the resources that other schools have because they are YOC

QUESTION: Anything on this list that should be changed? What?

QUESTION: Anything missing from this list? What?

- o targeted by police because they are LGBTQ YOC
- o getting harsher sentences from the courts because they are LGBTQ YOC
- o not able to access youth programs that provide a welcoming, supportive place for LGBTQ YOC to be (and help when it is needed)
- o living in a country with public policies that took American Indian children from their families and tried to "make them white"
- o living in a country with public policies that made and keep communities of color poor

QUESTION: Anything on this list that should be changed? What?

QUESTION: Anything missing from this list? What?

Part 2. Solutions—How to Keep LGBTQ YOC Out of Systems

FACT: We do not know much about how to keep LGBTQ YOC out of child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

QUESTION: What should be done to keep LGBTQ YOC out of child welfare and juvenile justice systems?

Part 3. System Involvement

FACT: LGBTQ YOC stay longer in child welfare and juvenile justice systems than other youth.

FACT: We do not know much else about how LGBTQ YOC are doing in these systems because these systems do not collect information about sexual orientation and gender identity – the way that they do about age and race.

WHAT RESEARCHERS SHOULD STUDY:

1. LGBTQ YOC experiences in child welfare and juvenile justice systems, including experiences of violence
2. LGBTQ YOC experiences with homeless services
3. How LGBTQ YOC want to be treated and programs or resources they want when they are in child welfare and juvenile justice systems.
4. How to promote good outcomes for LGBTQ YOC when they are in child welfare and juvenile justice systems and when they leave them.

QUESTION: Any comments or suggestions?

Part 4. A Deeper Dive on Child Welfare

QUESTION: What are the most important issues facing LGBTQ YOC in the child welfare system?

QUESTION: What is needed in child welfare to support LGBTQ YOC in the system and afterwards?

Part 5. A Deeper Dive on Juvenile Justice

QUESTION: What are the most important issues facing LGBTQ YOC in the juvenile justice system, including the courts and detention facilities?

QUESTION: What is needed in juvenile justice to support LGBTQ YOC in the system and afterwards?

Part 6. What Researchers Should Do

WHAT RESEARCHERS SHOULD DO TO PROMOTE GOOD OUTCOMES FOR/WITH LGBTQ YOC:

1. Include youth as research partners to study their lives
2. Focus on the lived experiences of LGBTQ YOC and build on their collective wisdom.
3. Ask LGBTQ YOC how they navigate systems and the advice they give peers about how to navigate systems

QUESTION: Feedback on this list?

QUESTION: Anything that should be changed? Why?

1. Ask LGBTQ YOC how they stay safe in certain settings and how they access resources
2. Spend time with LGBTQ YOC to understand everyday acts of resistance
3. Spend time with LGBTQ YOC to understand forms of self-expression and community activities that generate pride and joy and a sense of connectedness

QUESTION: Feedback on this list?

QUESTION: Anything that should be changed? Why?

Part 7. What Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems Should Do

WHAT SYSTEMS SHOULD DO NEXT:

1. Collect information about sexual orientation, gender identity, sex assigned at birth, and gender expression from youth – just like age and race. Then, use this info to produce reports about how LGBTQ YOC are doing

QUESTION: Any comments on this? How do you think LGBTQ YOC would feel about being asked these questions when in the child welfare or juvenile justice system?

1. Train staff to improve how they treat and support LGBTQ YOC
2. See if programs that work for youth, in general, work for LGBTQ YOC, such as:

   ▪ kin/family placement versus placement in group homes (plus LGBTQ acceptance supports for kin)
   ▪ restorative justice versus zero tolerance policies in schools
   ▪ community-capacity building versus policing

QUESTION: Feedback on this list?

QUESTION: Anything that should be changed? Why?

Part 8. Wrap Up, Final Comments

We've reached the end of our questions.

QUESTION: Anything else that you would like to say about LGBTQ YOC and child welfare and juvenile justice systems?

QUESTION: Any comments about this feedback experience?

Thank You!

Thank you for your feedback! We will integrate youth feedback into the report. We will publish the report at the end of the month so you will get to see the whole thing when it's done.

We will send the report to organizations and researchers who work on child welfare and juvenile justice and encourage them to adopt our recommendations.