

**REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE ON THE  
KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE  
PAYMENT (KIN-GAP) PROGRAM**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Gray Davis, Governor**

**HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY  
Grantland Johnson, Secretary**

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
Rita Saenz, Director**

**REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE ON THE KINSHIP GUARDIANSHIP ASSISTANCE  
PAYMENT (KIN-GAP) PROGRAM**

**LEGISLATIVE MANDATE**

Assembly Bill 1111\* requires that two years after the implementation date, and again five years after the implementation date, the California Department of Social Services shall report to the Legislature information on the outcomes of the Kin-GAP Program. The report is to include all of the following: (1) the number and characteristics of the children who exited the child welfare system to the Kin-GAP Program, (2) the numbers and types of disruptions within the Kin-GAP Program, including subsequent substantiated child abuse reports, child welfare services, and cases where children return to foster care, (3) rates of Kin-GAP exits from foster care compared to relative adoption and return to parents. These reports are to be provided to the Legislature in 2002 and 2005.

\*Assembly Bill 1111 (Aroner) (Chapter 147, Statutes of 1999)

Additional copies of this report can be obtained from:

California Department of Social Services  
Child and Youth Permanency Branch  
744 P Street, Mail Station 19-67  
Sacramento, California 95814  
(916) 322-4228

## CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Background</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Findings</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>Conclusions</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Acknowledgement</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Tables 1 – 19</b> .....	<b>15- 33</b>

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to provide the Governor and the Legislature with information currently available regarding the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) Program and to respond to the report requirements of Assembly Bill 1111. Specifically, AB 1111 requires that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) report on the following three factors:

- (1) the number and characteristics of the children who exited the child welfare system to the Kin-GAP Program;
- (2) the numbers and types of disruptions to families receiving benefits of the Kin-GAP Program, including subsequent substantiated child abuse reports, child welfare services, and cases where children return to foster care; and
- (3) rates of Kin-GAP exits from foster care compared to relative adoption and return to parents.

The Kin-GAP Program is the result of a multi-year effort by major stakeholders to create a permanency option for children in appropriate, long-term foster care placements with relative caregivers. This program provides kin caregivers who are unable or unwilling to adopt the relative child(ren) placed in their care as a foster home with another cash benefit supported option for exiting the child welfare system, provided that permanent placement in the relative's home is in the best interests of the child.

Details regarding any limitations in the data available for purposes of this report are discussed in the body of the report. In addition, it should be noted that the Kin-GAP Program will require a longer period of implementation to draw meaningful inferences about outcomes and relationships between Kin-GAP and other permanency placement options such as adoption. The summary of CDSS' findings regarding the three reporting factors is as follows:

- (1) Between January 1, 2000 and July 1, 2001, 6,701 children in 26 counties exited the foster care system to Kin-GAP (Table 4). Over 20 percent (n=1,439) of children who exited to Kin-GAP had been in care with their current caregiver for more than 5 years and over 40 percent (n=2,814) for over 3 years (Table 6). Forty-one percent (n=2,746) of the children who exited foster care to Kin-GAP were age 6 to 10 and thirty-eight percent (n=2,516) were age 11 or older (Table 10).

The ethnicity of children exiting foster care to Kin-GAP to date generally reflects the demographics of long-term kinship care in California. Almost half (48%) of the foster children exiting foster care to Kin-GAP were African American and another third (35%) were Hispanic (Table 11). For the most part, the kinship placement just prior to foster care exit to Kin-GAP was most often the child's first (41%) or second (33%) placement in foster care (Table 9), illustrating the long-term nature and stability of most of these kinship homes.

(2) To date the number of substantiated referrals of children in a relative guardian's home receiving Kin-GAP and subsequent reentries to out-of-home care has been minimal. There were 110 substantiated referrals (1.6%) and 55 reentries into foster care (0.8%) from among the 6,701 children who exited foster care to Kin-GAP between January 1, 2000 and July 1, 2001 (Table 13). Most of the small number of substantiated referrals occurred within 9 months of foster care exit to Kin-GAP, with 69 percent occurring within the first 6 months and 85 percent occurring within 9 months (Table 14).

Twenty-six percent (n=29) of the total substantiated child welfare referrals involved general neglect, with caretaker absence / incapacity accounting for 25 percent (n=27). Physical abuse accounted for 22 percent (n=24) of substantiated referrals, sexual abuse 8 percent (n=9), and other categories 19 percent (n=21) (Table 15).

Most of the small numbers of foster care reentries to date also occurred fairly quickly, with 65 percent reentering foster care within 6 months and 93 percent within 9 months (Table 17). The largest proportion of reentries also involved child neglect, which accounted for about 40 percent (n=22) of reentries. Rates of reentry due to physical abuse (n=13) and sexual abuse (n=3) were similar to rates of substantiated allegations for these same categories. Foster care reentries also involved relinquishments (n=12), resulting from voluntary termination of the guardianship (termination of the guardianship will terminate eligibility for Kin-GAP), and law violations (n=4), where children were removed from the guardian's home because the child committed a crime and became a ward of the Juvenile Court (Table 18). Over half (51%) of children reentering foster care were age 11 or older when they had exited foster care to Kin-GAP (Table 19).

(3) The Kin-GAP Program requires a longer implementation period of time and data collection in order to draw meaningful inferences from comparisons between Kin-GAP and either reunification or adoption rates. These analyses will be a part of the report to the Legislature due in 2005.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The introduction of mandatory reporting laws and of expanded public awareness of child abuse have significantly increased the number of children entering foster care in the last few decades (Lindsey, 1994; Pelton, 1989), and there are currently an estimated 581,000 children in foster care in the United States (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001). As foster care placements have dramatically increased since the early 1980s, so has the number of children being cared for by their relatives (Goerge, Wulczyn, & Harden, 1995).

Due to reporting inconsistencies, the exact number of kinship foster placements in the United States is difficult to ascertain, though efforts are being made in this area. The federal Adoptions and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System estimates that nationwide, over 150,000 foster children reside with their relatives in formal out-of-home care (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001). On January 1, 2000, 44 percent of the 105,261 children in child welfare supervised foster care in California, or 46,579 children, resided with relative caregivers. In Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Francisco counties, where placement rates with kin are highest, kinship care accounted for more than 50 percent of all child placements (Needell et al., 2001). At the same time, fewer nonrelated foster homes are available (Chamberlain, Moreland, & Reid, 1992). The public has come to view kin as an important foster care placement resource for children (Child Welfare League of America, 1994), and states have introduced foster care payments to kinship caregivers (Courtney & Needell, 1997).

Study of this trend in California has revealed that children who reside with kinship caregivers have different placement histories than children residing in nonrelated foster care. In general, children residing with kin stay in care for longer periods of time, are less likely to experience placement shifts, and are less likely to reenter foster care following reunification (Needell et al., 2001). Thus, it would appear that kinship care represents a stable, permanent plan for a large number of children in out-of-home placement who might otherwise remain in the foster care system. However, placement permanency, in this case, does not include legal permanence through adoption due to the traditional reluctance of some kinship caregivers to adopt their family members (Thornton, 1991).

Although the use of legal guardianship as a permanency option has been available for many years (Simmons & Barth, 1995; Testa, in press), it has not been the preferred option for several reasons. Since Maas and Engler's pivotal (1959) study describing foster care drift and the legislative response contained in The Child Welfare and Adoption Assistance Act of 1980, permanency has been sought for foster children; yet permanency discussion and policy has largely been limited to either reunification with birth parents or adoption by another family (Simmons & Barth, 1995). Legal guardianship, while more permanent than long-term foster care, has typically been less appealing because of the relative ease with which it may be rescinded. In other words, it is not as legally permanent (for a more detailed discussion of the history of legal guardianship, see Taylor, 1935; Taylor, 1966; Weissman, 1964). Furthermore, relative legal guardians not remaining under the supervision of child welfare agencies have,

until recently, been ineligible for foster care payments, instead relying on the much lower AFDC/TANF payments (Gleeson & Hairston, 1999). However, the rise in the number of children placed with kin (Goerge et al., 1995; Needell et al., 2001; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001) and the reluctance of some of these caregivers to terminate parental rights by opting for adoption (Thornton, 1991) has brought this permanency option to the forefront.

There have been few outcome evaluations of subsidized guardianship in other states, the most comprehensive and rigorous having been conducted in Illinois. Using a randomized control design as part of the Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Evaluation, Testa and Cook (2001) found that the availability of subsidized guardianship substantially increases the rate of exit from foster care to legally permanent homes while not seriously diminishing the number of adoptions or reunifications, though the rate of adoption by kin would likely decrease slightly with the full-scale introduction of this program. However, a survey and administrative follow-up comparing a subsample of caregivers and children who received subsidized guardianship to those who received subsidized adoption found similar levels of permanency and child safety between the two groups.

## **BACKGROUND**

Due to changes in federal and state laws over the past decade, children in California's foster care system are most often placed in the homes of relatives and extended family members. The California Partnership for Children (Partnership) launched the California Kinship Care Initiative in the mid-1990s to identify and address issues and practices related to kinship care placements. The Center for Social Services Research at UC Berkeley collected relevant data, and then the Partnership convened focus groups of relative caregivers throughout the state to identify issues and barriers to permanency for children in relative placements. The County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) and the CDSS sponsored the California Policy Summit on Kinship Care in 1996 to address the issues and practices of kinship care placements. With this extensive information at hand, a Kinship Care Stakeholders group was convened to determine appropriate policy options to improve the assessment, services and exit opportunities for relative caregivers in the child welfare system.

The initial work of the Kinship Care Stakeholders group resulted in legislation establishing Kinship Adoption (Assembly Bill 1544, Chapter 793, Statutes of 1997) and providing for county Kinship Support Services Programs (AB 1163, Chapter 794, Statutes of 1997). The following year the Stakeholders group turned its attention to children for whom reunification was not possible and whose relative caregivers choose not to adopt their relative foster child for familial, cultural and/or financial reasons. After extensive discussion and research into the available legal and fiscal options, the group determined the most effective solution would be a standard guardianship augmented by a support payment---similar to the structure of the Adoption Assistance Payment program.

The enacting legislation, Senate Bill 1901 (Chapter 1055, Statutes of 1998), established the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) Program for relatives that take guardianship of dependent children in their care and eligible children that exit from the foster care system (dismiss dependency) to receive the basic foster care payment. Assembly Bill 1111 (Chapter 147, Statutes of 1999) delayed the implementation date for the Kin-GAP Program from June 1, 1999 until January 1, 2000; established the rate for the Kin-GAP Program at 100 percent of the basic foster care rate; and requires that two years after the implementation date, and again five years after the implementation date, CDSS shall report to the Legislature information on the outcomes of the Kin-GAP Program. Assembly Bill 2876 (Chapter 108, Statutes of 2000), clean-up legislation, exempted the Kin-GAP Program from provisions of the CalWORKs Program, with certain exceptions, and authorized recipients of Kin-GAP benefits to request and receive independent living services and to retain certain cash savings. Assembly Bill 429 (Chapter 111, Statutes of 2001), clean-up legislation, exempted the adult caregiver of recipients of Kin-GAP benefits from the Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS) fingerprinting requirement. However, a guardian who is also a recipient of CalWORKs benefits would be subject to the applicable SFIS requirements.

The Kin-GAP Program is intended to provide an option in a continuum of choices for the relative, the agency and the courts in order to provide the most appropriate permanency plan for foster children placed with relative caregivers. This must take place within the context of the best interests of the child, the relative's circumstances, and the child's long-term needs. Kin-GAP is an option for relative care permanent placements if the relative agrees and all of the following apply:

- ❑ reunification services have failed and the child will not return to the home of their birth parents;
- ❑ the child and the relative have a stable, ongoing relationship in the context of a well-functioning family;
- ❑ the relative has been identified as the most appropriate permanent placement for the child following a formal assessment;
- ❑ the relative is unwilling to move forward with adoption proceedings for personal, familial, cultural and/or financial reasons;
- ❑ the relative has made a permanent commitment to the child and the child is functioning optimally in the placement; and
- ❑ the family, relative or child has no need for ongoing supervision or supportive services from the local child welfare agency.

## **METHODOLOGY**

Under an ongoing interagency agreement with the California Department of Social Services, the Center for Social Services Research (CSSR) at UC Berkeley receives quarterly extracts of data from the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS). Researchers at CSSR reconfigure the data into a longitudinal format that can be used to measure outcomes achieved for children in the child welfare system.

Data for this report was drawn from the UC Berkeley CWS/CMS July 1, 2001 data extract.

When implementation of Kin-GAP began on January 1, 2000, the CWS/CMS data system was not configured to enable casework staff to clearly indicate that a child's case had been closed due to guardianship established under this program. Los Angeles County, the first county to implement Kin-GAP in substantial numbers, developed and employed a unique way of identifying Kin-GAP children in the CWS/CMS reporting system. Apart from Los Angeles County's improvised method of reporting Kin-GAP cases, a temporary field was created within CWS/CMS to identify and report Kin-GAP children (All County Letter 00-09), and California counties other than Los Angeles used this field. In 2001, appropriate permanent reporting fields were added to CWS/CMS to identify Kin-GAP children, however very few county staff were aware of this change during the period under review in this report. Because of these inconsistencies in data reporting, determination of the numbers and characteristics of children and caregivers who entered the Kin-GAP Program between January 1, 2000 and July 1, 2001 has been difficult, and must be considered an approximation.

## **FINDINGS**

### **1. Number and Characteristics of Children Exiting Foster Care to Kin-GAP**

Time Eligible Children. On January 1, 2000, 30,345 (65%) of the 46,579 children placed with kin had been with their current caregiver for at least 12 months, meeting the time eligibility requirement for Kin-GAP. Over 70 percent (73%) of these eligible children were less than 6 years of age upon first entering out-of-home care and only about seven percent were 11 years of age or older (Table 1). In contrast, about 40 percent of eligible children were 11 years of age or older on January 1, 2000 (Table 2). Similar to the general population of children in kinship care on January 1, 2000, almost half (48%) of the Kin-GAP time eligible children in kinship care were African-American, followed by children of Hispanic origin (32%), White (19%), Asian/other (1%), and (1%) Native American (Table 3).

Kin-GAP Entries. Between January 1, 2000 and July 1, 2001, 6,701 children in 26 counties exited the foster care system and entered the Kin-GAP Program (Table 4).<sup>1</sup> The overwhelming majority of these children resided in Los Angeles County (5,870, or 88%), which began utilizing the Kin-GAP Program for large numbers of eligible children in January, 2000 and continued to do so through July 1, 2001 (though the number of Kin-GAP exits from foster care began decreasing in the second quarter of 2001). Fresno (n=122), Kern (n=64), Sacramento (n=247), San Bernardino (n=100), and San Francisco (n=58) counties all began utilizing the Kin-GAP Program to exit children from foster care to Kin-GAP fairly steadily about midway through 2000, and children from these counties represent most of the Kin-GAP exits from foster care aside from Los Angeles.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note: the July 2001 column in Table 4 only includes exits until July 1, 2001.

As with the overall Kin-GAP time eligible population, almost 75 percent (73%) of children who exited foster care to Kin-GAP were less than 6 years of age when they first entered foster care and 6 percent were 11 years of age or older (Table 5). Most Kin-GAP recipients had been in care with their current caregiver for much longer than the required minimum one-year period. Over 20 percent (22%) of children who exited to Kin-GAP had been in care with their current caregiver for more than 5 years and over 40 percent (42%) for over 3 years, while only 23 percent had been with their current caregiver for less than 2 years (Table 6). Overall length of stay in foster care was even longer. Nearly 40 percent of children who exited to Kin-GAP had been in care (length of stay from entry into care to exit, regardless of the number of spells or placements) for five or more years and over 60 percent had been in care for more than three years (Table 7).

For most cases, the latest spell in foster care was also the only spell (80%) (Table 8) and the kinship placement just prior to exit to Kin-GAP was most often the first (41%) or second (33%) placement in the spell (Table 9), illustrating the long-term nature and stability of most of these kinship homes. Similarly, 79 percent of the children who exited foster care to Kin-GAP did so when they were 6 or older and 38 percent exited foster care to Kin-GAP when they were age 11 or older (Table 10). The ethnicity of children exiting foster care to Kin-GAP to date generally reflects the demographics of long-term kinship care in California. Almost half (48%) of the Kin-GAP recipients were African American and another third (35%) were Hispanic (Table 11). Children exiting foster care to Kin-GAP initially entered out-of-home care for reasons that are also reflective of the demographics of all children in long-term kinship care in California. Neglect was the overwhelming initial removal reason (83%), followed by physical abuse (9%), sexual abuse (3%), and other abuse (4%) (Table 12).

## **2. Numbers and Types of Reabuse and Reentry to the Child Welfare System**

The number of substantiated child welfare service referrals and subsequent reentries of Kin-GAP children to out-of-home care are minimal to date. The rates of substantiated referrals and reentry are heavily influenced by the large number of children from Los Angeles County (84% of substantiated referrals and reentries are from Los Angeles), thus these preliminary results should be viewed with caution and may not signal trends in the rest of the State. In sum, there were only 110 substantiated child welfare services referrals (1.6%) and 55 reentries into foster care (0.8%) among the 6,701 children who exited foster care to Kin-GAP between January 1, 2000 and July 1, 2001 (Table 13).

Most of the small number of new substantiated referrals occurred within 9 months of foster care exit to Kin-GAP, with almost 70 percent (69%) occurring within the first 6 months and 85 percent occurring within 9 months (Table 14). The largest proportion of substantiated referrals involved child neglect (n=29), with caretaker absence / incapacity accounting for 25 percent (n=27). Physical abuse accounted for 22 percent (n=24) of substantiated referrals, sexual abuse 8 percent (n=9), and other categories 19 percent (n=21) (Table 15). The distribution in the ages of children who had a new substantiated

referral was similar to the overall distribution in the ages of children who exited foster care to Kin-GAP (Table 16).

Most of the small number child welfare service/foster care reentries to date also occurred fairly quickly, with 65 percent reentering care within 6 months and 93 percent within 9 months (Table 17) of foster care exit to Kin-GAP. The largest proportion of reentries also involved child neglect, which accounted for about 40 percent of reentries (n=22). Reentry due to physical abuse (n=13, 24%) and sexual abuse (n=3, 5%) were similar to rates of substantiated allegations for these same categories. Foster care reentries also involved relinquishments (n=12, 22%), resulting from a caregiver's voluntary termination of the guardianship (termination of the guardianship will terminate eligibility for Kin-GAP) which happens most often when the children become teenagers; and a small percentage of law violations (n=4, 7%), where children were removed from the guardian's home because the child committed a crime and became a ward of the Juvenile Court (Table 18).

Over half (51%) of reentering children were age 11 or older when they had exited foster care to Kin-GAP (Table 19). Children who exited foster care to Kin-GAP when they were age 11 or older were statistically more likely to reenter foster care (chi-square = 4.22, df = 1, p=.04). There were no other clear differences between Kin-GAP recipients who reentered foster care when compared to those who did not reenter, though the small number of reentries severely limited the ability to detect such differences.

### **3. Rates of Exiting Foster Care to Kin-GAP Comparison to Reunification and Adoption Rates**

By July 1, 2001, Kin-GAP had not been implemented for a long enough time period to draw meaningful inferences about the possible comparisons between Kin-GAP and either reunification or adoption rates. These analyses will be a part of the report due in 2005. However, the data presented in this report suggests that most children entering Kin-GAP in the first 18 months of implementation were older children who had been in care for a considerable length of time.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The overall number of children in out-of-home placement decreased between January 1, 2000 and July 1, 2001, and this reduction appears to be at least partially a result of the 6,701 children who exited the foster care system to Kin-GAP. However, the demographic composition of children eligible for Kin-GAP on July 1, 2001 remains largely the same as the demographic composition of children eligible for Kin-GAP on January 1, 2000, suggesting the potential for continued exits of children from foster care to Kin-GAP in substantial numbers. On July 1, 2001, 22,683 (62%) of the 36,503 children in kin care were time eligible for Kin-GAP (i.e., placed with their current kin provider for at least 12 months), which is comparable to the 65 percent of time eligible

children in care on January 1, 2000. Time eligible children in care on these dates also had similar distributions of current age, age at entry, and ethnicity.

Kin-GAP is an innovative program with the potential to change how permanency is achieved for children removed from their birth parents and placed with relatives. Kin-GAP allows foster youth to safely gain legally recognized, ongoing stable homes within their own families without severing parental rights. Thus, comfortable custody arrangements that exist among kin can be bolstered legally through guardianship and financially through Kin-GAP without unnecessary public agency intrusions into family life. The added benefit, of course, is that decreased child welfare supervised caseload requirements can translate to substantial cost savings for the child welfare system.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Barbara Needell  
Aron Shlonsky  
Daniel Webster  
Seon Lee  
Michael Armijo  
Stephanie Cuccaro-Alamin

University of California, Berkeley  
School of Social Welfare  
Center for Social Services Research

The Performance Indicators Project at the Center for Social Services Research is  
funded by the  
California Department of Social Services,  
with additional support from the Stuart Foundation.

## REFERENCES

- Chamberlain, P., Moreland, S., & Reid, K. (1992). Enhanced services and stipends for foster parents: Effects on retention rates and outcomes for children. *Child Welfare, 71*, 387-401.
- Child Welfare League of America. (1994). *Kinship care: A natural bridge*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.
- Courtney, M. E., & Needell, B. (1997). Outcomes of kinship foster care: Lessons from California. In J. D. Berrick, R. P. Barth, & N. Gilbert (Eds.), *Child welfare research review* (Vol. 2, ). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gleeson, J. P., & Hairston, C. F. (1999). *Kinship care : improving practice through research*. Washington, DC: CWLA Press.
- Goerge, R. M., Wulczyn, F. H., & Harden, A. W. (1995). *An update from the multistate foster care data archive*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago.
- Lindsey, D. (1994). *The welfare of children*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maas, H. S., & Engler, R. E. (1959). *Children in need of parents*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., & Brookhart, A. (2001). *Performance indicators for child welfare services in California project*. <http://cssr.berkeley.edu>: Center for Social Services Research.
- Pelton, L. (1989). *For reasons of poverty: A critical analysis of the public child welfare system in the United States*. New York: Praeger.
- Simmons, B., & Barth, R. P. (1995). *Legal guardianship and child welfare in California: An empirically-based curriculum*. Berkeley: University of California Berkeley,.
- Taylor, H. (1935). *Law of guardian and ward*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, H. (1966). Guardianship or 'permanent placement' of children. *California Law Review, 54*, 741-747.
- Testa, M. (in press). Subsidized guardianship: Testing an idea whose time has finally come. *Social Work Research*.
- Testa, M. F., & Cook, R. (2001, Nov 2001). *The comparative safety, attachment, and well-being of children in kinship adoption, guardian, and foster homes*. Paper presented at the Association for Public Policy and Analysis and Management, Wash DC.
- Thornton, J. L. (1991). Permanency planning for children in kinship homes. *Child Welfare, 70*(5), 593-601.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, A. f. C. a. F. (2001). *The adoption and foster care analysis and reporting system (AFCARS) report*: Administration on Children, Youth, and Families.
- Weissman, I. (1964). Guardianship: Every child's right. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*(355), 141-139.

**Table 1.**  
**Age at First Entry to Care – Time Eligible**  
**Children in Kinship Care: January 1, 2000**  
**(n=30,345)**

Age	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
<1 yr	9280	30.6
1-5 yrs	12892	42.5
6-10 yrs	6055	20.0
11-15 yrs	2021	6.7
16-17 yrs	71	0.2
18+	1	0.0
Missing	25	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>30345</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\* Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 2.**  
**Current Age – Time Eligible Children in**  
**Kinship Care: January 1, 2000 (n=30,345)**

Age	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
1-5 yrs	7231	23.8
6-10 yrs	11001	36.3
11-15 yrs	9191	30.3
16+ yrs	2921	9.6
Missing	1	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>30345</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\* Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 3.**  
**Ethnicity of Time Eligible Children in**  
**Kinship Care: January 1, 2000 (n=30,345)**

Ethnicity	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
Black	14420	47.6
White	5658	18.7
Hispanic	9627	31.7
Asian/Oth.	333	1.1
Nat Amer	284	0.9
Missing	23	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>30345</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 4.**  
**Children Exiting to Kin-GAP by County January 1, 2000 Through July 1, 2001 (n=6,701)**

COUNTY	2000												2001							Total		
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul			
Alameda										1								1				2
Butte			3	4	2	1			3	3				1		2	1					20
Contra Costa						1				1					2	3	3	7	1			18
El Dorado										4												4
Fresno					1	1	8	29	18	8	14	9	4	10	8	6	3	2	1			122
Imperial		3					2	3		3												11
Kern					1		1	5	2		2	9	3	10	2	9	10	9	1			64
Lake												2	2									4
Los Angeles	238	368	545	440	707	754	441	365	248	265	262	186	237	190	190	153	186	80	15		5870	
Marin										2							1					3
Mendocino															2							2
Orange																	1	4				5
Placer										1				1				1				3
Plumas		3																				3
Riverside															1	2	9	4				16
Sacramento									28	38	7	55	13	22	14	13	21	36				247
San Bernardino								3	7	6	13	8	8	12	12	5	18	5	3			100
San Diego				1	2				1						3	9	4	12				32
San Francisco									7	10	6	6	11	4	3	3	2	6				58
San Joaquin																1						1
Santa Clara							4	17	1	2	2	2		2			2					32
Shasta					1	1	4	3			1		1					1				12
Stanislaus							2	6	3		1				2		4	5				23
Tulare			2	10	5	4		1					3		2	3	3	1	1			35
Ventura						1	1						2		4	3	2					13
Yolo																	1					1
<b>Total</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>760</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>19</b>		<b>6701</b>	

**Table 5.**  
**Age at First Entry to Foster Care: Children**  
**Exiting Foster Care to Kin-GAP (n=6,701)**

Age	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
<1 yr	2090	31.2
1-5 yrs	2816	42.0
6-10 yrs	1370	20.5
11-15 yrs	414	6.2
16-17 yrs	9	0.1
Missing	2	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>6701</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\* Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 6.**  
**Length of Stay in Placement With Relative**  
**Caregiver Prior to Exit from Foster Care to**  
**Kin-GAP (n=6,701)**

Stay in Placement	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
<2 yrs	1514	23.5
2-3 yrs	2203	34.3
4-5 yrs	1274	19.8
>5 yrs	1439	22.4
Missing	271	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>6701</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\* Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 7.**  
**Length of Stay in Foster Care (all placement spells) Prior to Exit from Foster Care to Kin-GAP (n=6,701)**

Stay in Foster Care	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
<2 yrs	643	9.6
2-3 yrs	1956	29.3
4-5 yrs	1428	21.4
>5 yrs	2650	39.7
Missing	24	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>6701</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\* Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 8.**  
**Number of Spells in Foster Care: Prior to**  
**Exit from Foster Care to Kin-GAP (n=6,701)**

Spells	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
1	5369	80.19
2	1103	16.47
3 or more	223	3.3
Missing	6	*
	6701	100.00

\* Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 9.**  
**Number of Placements in Spell Prior to Exit**  
**from Foster Care to Kin-GAP (n=6,701)**

# Placements	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
1	2755	41.2
2	2220	33.2
3	947	14.1
4	438	6.5
5 or more	335	5.0
Missing	6	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>6701</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\* Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 10.**  
**Age at Exit from Foster Care to Kin-GAP**  
**(n=6,701)**

Age	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
1-5 yrs	1439	21.5
6-10 yrs	2746	41.0
11-15 yrs	2096	31.3
16+ yrs	420	6.3
Total	6701	100.0

**Table 11.**  
**Ethnicity of Children Exiting Foster Care to**  
**Kin-GAP (n=6,701)**

Ethnicity	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
Black	3195	47.7
White	1034	15.5
Hispanic	2313	34.6
Asian	85	1.3
Nat Amer	65	1.0
Missing	9	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>6701</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\* Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 12.**  
**Initial Removal Reason: Children Exiting**  
**Foster Care to Kin-GAP (n=6,701)**

Removal Reason	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
Neglect	3279	83.4
Physical abuse	348	8.9
Sexual abuse	131	3.3
Other	172	4.4
Missing	2771	*
<b>Total</b>	<b>6701</b>	<b>100.00</b>

\* Missing values are shown but not used to calculate percentages

**Table 13.**  
**Substantiated Referrals and Reentries to Foster Care from Kin-GAP by County as of July 1, 2001 (n=6,701)**

County	Kin-GAP Children		Substantiated Referrals		Reentries to Care	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Alameda	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Butte	20	0.3	4	3.6	1	1.8
Contra Costa	18	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
El Dorado	4	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Fresno	122	1.8	4	3.6	4	7.3
Imperial	11	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Kern	64	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Lake	4	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Los Angeles	5870	87.6	92	83.6	46	83.6
Marin	3	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mendocino	2	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Orange	5	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Placer	3	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Plumas	3	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Riverside	16	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sacramento	247	3.7	1	0.9	1	1.8
San Bernardino	100	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
San Diego	32	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
San Francisco	58	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
San Joaquin	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Santa Clara	32	0.5	1	0.9	3	5.5
Shasta	12	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Stanislaus	23	0.3	4	3.6	0	0.0
Tulare	35	0.5	4	3.6	0	0.0
Ventura	13	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Yolo	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,701</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 14.**  
**Months From Exit: Foster Care to Kin-GAP**  
**to Substantiated Referral (n=110)**

Months	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
<1	2	1.8
1	13	11.8
2	15	13.6
3	8	7.3
4	17	15.5
5	9	8.2
6	12	10.9
7	8	7.3
8	8	7.3
9	2	1.8
10	5	4.6
11	5	4.6
12	2	1.8
13	2	1.8
14	0	0.0
15+	2	1.8
Total	110	100.0

**Table 15.**  
**Allegation Type: Substantiated Referrals**  
**While in Kin-GAP (n=110)**

<u>Allegation Type</u>	<u>Number of Children (Frequency)</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Caretaker		
Absence/Incapacity	27	24.5
Emotional Abuse	1	0.9
General Neglect	29	26.4
Physical Abuse	24	21.8
Sexual Abuse	9	8.2
At Risk, sibling abused	11	10.0
Substantial Risk	9	8.2
<u>Total</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>100.00</u>

**Table 16.**  
**Age of Children at Exit from Foster Care to**  
**Kin-GAP with Substantiated Referral**

Age in Years	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
1-5 yrs	22	20.0
6-10 yrs	45	40.9
11-15 yrs	38	34.6
16+ yrs	5	4.6
Total	110	100.0

**Table 17.**  
**Months from Exit from Foster Care to Kin-**  
**GAP to Reentry to Foster Care (n=55)**

Months	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
<1	2	3.6
1	3	5.5
2	11	20.0
3	7	12.7
4	3	5.5
5	2	3.6
6	8	14.6
7	2	3.6
8	7	12.7
9	6	10.9
10	0	0.0
11	1	1.8
12	1	1.8
13+	2	3.6
Total	55	100.0

**Table 18.**  
**Reason for Removal: Children who**  
**Reentered Foster Care from Kin-GAP (n=55)**

Removal Reason	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
Neglect	22	40.0
Physical Abuse	13	23.6
Sexual Abuse	3	5.5
Law Violation	4	7.3
Relinquishment	12	21.8
Other	1	1.8
Total	55	100.0

**Table 19.**  
**Age of Children: Exit from Foster Care to**  
**Kin-GAP and Reentered Foster Care**

Age in Years	Number of Children (Frequency)	Percent
1-5 yrs	7	12.7
6-10 yrs	20	36.4
11-15 yrs	22	40.0
16+ yrs	6	10.9
Total	55	100.00