

Final Report

**Young Adult Outcomes Associated with Out-of-Home Placement Experiences**

Lawrence M. Berger  
Maria Cancian  
Sarah Font  
Jennifer L. Noyes

September 2017

This report has been prepared as part of an interagency research agreement (Contract #437003-A17-0000918-000-01) between the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families (DCF) and the Institute for Research on Poverty (IRP) at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Any views expressed here are those of the authors, and may not reflect those of the sponsoring institutions. The authors thank Jane Smith and Lynn Wimer, IRP, for their expert advice and assistance in constructing the data file, and Wendy Henderson and HeeJin Kim, DCF, for their expert advice and support of this project.

## **Young Adult Outcomes Associated with Out-of-Home Placement Experiences**

A large and longstanding literature has documented a host of adverse socio-emotional, educational, and economic outcomes throughout the life course for individuals who experience out-of-home placement (OHP) at some point during childhood, with those who “age out” of care (reach the age of majority while still in OHP, rather than being reunified with their family or adopted) faring particularly poorly. Yet, current research has not established whether such adverse outcomes are a result of OHP (or aging out of OHP) itself, as opposed to resulting from pre-existing characteristics and experiences that are associated with both experiencing (or aging out of) OHP and exhibiting poor developmental outcomes in childhood and adulthood, independent of OHP. Understanding whether OHP or aging out of OHP causes poor outcomes is critical to informing policy responses aimed at reducing disparities in social and economic functioning of youths involved in the child welfare system.

Building on our previous analyses of educational outcomes for children in OHP, in this report, we assess whether associations between experiencing and aging out of OHP and poor developmental outcomes are likely due to OHP experiences themselves or to pre-existing characteristics and experiences of those who enter and age out of care. This study extends our earlier work in two primary ways. First, we focus on a wide range of young adult outcomes including social welfare benefit receipt, employment and earnings, early childbearing, incarceration, and education. Second, we focus not only on whether youths experienced OHP but, for those who did, the type of exit from care experienced, including reunification, adoption, aging out, and other types of exit.

As detailed below, we use data on youths observed between 2004 and 2015 drawn from the 2015 Multi-Sample Person File (MSPF) administrative data system to compare young adult

outcomes among (1) youths experiencing OHP and aging out of care, (2) youths experiencing OHP but not aging out of care, (3) youths experiencing child protective services (CPS) involvement but not OHP, and (4) other disadvantaged youths (those whose families received Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)/food stamps). Groups (3) and (4) are more similar to youths experiencing and aging out of OHP than are youths from more advantaged families. Youths experiencing care but not aging out of care are likely even more similar to youths who age out of care than are other youths. Yet, prior research has rarely leveraged these types of comparisons. Thus, our analyses shed new light on whether there are substantive and significant differences in outcomes among youths with varying levels of CPS involvement and OHP experiences, relative to one another as well as to other disadvantaged youths. Perhaps most notably, our report provides new knowledge of the social and economic prospects of youths who are likely to age out of care and additional evidence of whether OHP and aging out of OHP, per se, are likely to disrupt the developmental trajectories of children and youths from disadvantaged backgrounds. To the best of our knowledge, this is the largest sample used to date to study outcomes associated with aging out of OHP; it is also the first to compare youths who age out of OHP to those who experience OHP but do not age out.

## **BACKGROUND**

On any given day in the United States, roughly 430,000 children reside in foster care. Yet, the average number of children in care at a point in time obscures the dynamic nature of foster care placement. Indeed, in 2015, nearly 270,000 children entered and more than 243,000 children exited foster care (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016). Moreover, foster care placement is a much more common experience, particularly for racial/ethnic minority and low-income children, than is commonly recognized. Recent estimates suggest that, over the

course of childhood (from birth to age 18), 6 percent of all U.S. children and 12 percent of African American U.S. children will experience one or more foster care placements (Wildeman and Emanuel 2014).

Permanency is a top priority of the foster care system. That is, it is widely held that children have the right to a safe, stable, and permanent home, even when that home cannot be provided by their birth parents. The child welfare system prioritizes reunification with birth families for most children who have been removed from their homes, but many parents are unable or unwilling to meet the requirements for reunification. When reunification is not an option, an available relative may assume permanent custody, or children may be placed for adoption. The least optimal outcome, from the perspective of the child welfare system, is for a child to reach the age of majority without having obtained a permanent family (i.e., while still in the legal custody of the state); a process referred to as “aging out.” Surprisingly, despite strongly held beliefs about which permanency outcome is most optimal for children, there is little empirical research to determine the validity of such claims. Indeed, whereas decades of research have documented foster children’s poor life outcomes (Allen et al. 1997; Pilowsky and Wu 2006; Trout et al. 2008), it remains largely unknown whether one of the most prioritized objectives of foster care, permanency, matters for children’s long-term success.

Decades of research have established that not all families are equally positioned—for various individual and structural reasons—to support the development of children into well-adjusted adults. The mechanisms through which social and economic inequalities are reproduced across generations—including family structure (McLanahan and Percheski 2008), parental education (Monaghan 2017), income and wealth (Killewald, Pfeffer, and Schachner 2017), and neighborhood quality (Sharkey 2008)—are all areas in which families involved with the child

welfare system tend to be highly disadvantaged (Barth, Wildfire, and Green 2006; Coulton, Korbin, and Su 1999; Drake and Pandey 1996; Lindsey 1991; Sedlak et al. 2010). Yet, the disadvantages of children who spend time in foster care extend much further: most have been exposed to abuse or neglect (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016), and their families are disproportionately likely to have problems with substance abuse, mental health, and domestic violence (English, Thompson, and White 2015; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016; Zuravin and DePanfilis 1997).

In short, the totality of foster children's experiences would place them at significant risk for adverse life outcomes even if they had never entered foster care. Unsurprisingly, at the point of entering foster care, many have substantial physical, mental, and behavioral health needs (Steele and Buchi 2008). Given that most children, even those who age out of the child welfare system, do not spend the majority of their childhoods in foster care, the time children spend in foster care may be of relatively modest impact relative to the other challenges they have experienced. Perhaps, the primary impact of the foster care system rests not in bringing children into the system but, rather, determining when and to whom children exit care. In doing so, the foster care system may significantly influence the type of environment in which children grow up, and the types of supports they will have as they enter adulthood. Those who are returned home are likely to sustain earlier family relationships in an environment generally similar to that experienced prior to care, whereas those who are adopted or placed in permanent guardianship may have rather different experiences and opportunities than they otherwise would have. Children who remain in foster care until adulthood lack the potential benefits of a permanent legal family but may receive additional supports and services while in care. Youths aging out may also receive supports from the government to facilitate a successful transition to adulthood,

although existing descriptive evidence suggests that these children are highly at risk for adverse outcomes during this transition (Courtney et al. 2011; Pecora et al. 2006). Thus, children's trajectories may diverge not when they enter foster care, but rather when they exit.

Of the nearly 250,000 children who exited the foster care system in 2015, about half were reunified with their biological families (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016). Reunification is, as reiterated in numerous state and federal policies, the most preferred form of permanency. Reunification holds this position in public policy for a variety of reasons. Placement in OHP generally results from an assessment of a current or imminent risk to child safety. Unless parents voluntarily agree, a permanent removal must be determined necessary by the court and typically reflects the sustained failure of the parents to meet requirements for reunification. Moreover, without reunification as an option, foster care would serve a punitive rather than (or in addition to) a protective function. Ostensibly, children should also benefit from reunification because it preserves family bonds (Goldsmith, Oppenheim, and Wanlass 2004; Roberts 2012) and reunification reflects the preferences of children and their biological parents (Folman 1998; Whiting and Lee 2003). Yet, there is little evidence assessing the consequences of reunification for child well-being.

Children commonly enter foster care following experiences of neglect or abuse at the hands of their parents. These experiences harm children's development and inhibit secure parent-child attachments (Baer and Martinez 2006; Hildyard and Wolfe 2002). The environmental exposures that precede foster care, including child maltreatment, domestic violence, criminality, and substance abuse may facilitate the development of antisocial attitudes and behaviors (Felson and Lane 2009; Holt, Buckley, and Whelan 2008; Widom, Czaja, and DuMont 2015). Moreover, in a substantial proportion of cases, children are reunified only to be exposed to further harms.

Approximately 30 percent of children who reunify experience new maltreatment within three years (Connell et al. 2009), and 20 to 30 percent reenter foster care within five years (Brook and McDonald 2009; Wulczyn 2004). When a family cannot provide safety, support, and positive role models, the anticipated benefits of reunification may fail to materialize.

There are a range of issues considered in determining whether to separate a child from their parent(s), and maintain that separation. Yet, even if we consider only the best interests of the child, one must compare reunification not to an ideal family environment, but to the most probable alternative, which may include adoption, permanent guardianship, or aging out of care. Among these options, child welfare policy explicitly prioritizes adoption, followed by permanent guardianship, with aging out being a last resort. The approximately 22 percent of children exiting care who are adopted (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016) may experience comparatively high-quality environments. Adoptive parents differ from biological parents, both by self-selection and system design, in ways that are potentially relevant to child well-being. Adoptive parents tend to be more educationally and economically advantaged than biological parents (Kreider and Lofquist 2014). They must also undergo a lengthy screening process to determine their suitability and can be excluded on the basis of home safety, criminality, health problems, or other considerations (Child Welfare Information Gateway 2016). Although imperfect, the approval process for adoption should eliminate those least able to provide an appropriate home environment. Much of the prior research on adoptive families does not specifically focus on adoptions from foster care, but may nevertheless be informative. Studies have shown that the economic and behavior outcomes of adopted children are significantly affected by the socioeconomic attributes of their adoptive parents, net of biological parent traits (Plug and Vijverberg 2005; Sacerdote 2000, 2007). In addition, whereas adoption cannot, of

course, alter the genetic endowments children received from their birth parents, caregivers nevertheless influence children's health, socio-emotional development, and educational attainment by, for example, promoting cognitive and non-cognitive skill development, setting academic expectations, and being involved in schooling (Heckman 2008; Sandefur, Meier, and Campbell 2006). Of course, adoption is a selective process such that the children most likely to be adopted may be better situated for later success. Specifically, children adopted from foster care tend to be younger (and thus have greater opportunity for additional development) and less likely to have serious mental and behavioral health problems than other foster children (Snowden, Leon, and Sieracki 2008).

Permanent guardianship (and similar legal custody arrangements) is categorized as a form of permanency, but differs from adoption in that it does not require the termination of parental rights and is primarily restricted to children living with relatives (Child Welfare Information Gateway 2015). Guardianship is generally pursued when adoption is not feasible due to child or caregiver unwillingness, but is an increasingly common option for children in kinship arrangements, with about 15 percent of children exiting care being placed in a guardianship or custodial arrangement with a relative (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2016). Guardianships have an approval process that is similar to the approval process for becoming a kinship foster parent, including a home study and criminal and child protection background checks; however, the process is often less lengthy and intensive than that for adoption. Since 2008, guardianships have been eligible for financial subsidies similar to those provided for adoptions, the amount of which tends to mirror the foster care maintenance payment for which the child's foster parent would otherwise be eligible. Thus, children who emancipate from a relative foster placement and children placed in guardianship with a relative may have



similar experiences and outcomes. However, there has been little research on the characteristics of youth outcomes associated with guardianships.

Whereas the majority of children who experience foster care are reunified with their birth parents, adopted, or placed in guardianship, about 9 percent of foster care exits involve youths who emancipate from (age out of) foster care. The hardships faced by emancipated youths during the transition to adulthood are substantial: they experience high rates of poverty, homelessness, and criminal justice involvement, and relatively low educational and occupational attainment (Courtney et al. 2011; Pecora et al. 2006). Yet, those who enter foster care and ultimately age out are a distinct group of youths. On average, they entered foster care at an older age, and those who enter foster care in their teens tend to have higher levels of behavioral and emotional problems. As such, these youths may be at exacerbated risk of poor developmental outcomes during the transition to adulthood regardless of whether they age out of care. Thus, the extent to which aging out is, itself, likely to be a causal agent in long-term outcomes is not well understood.

There are, however, several reasons to suspect a causal link between aging out of foster care and a less successful transition to adulthood. Youths who age out of care have no legally or formally recognized family. Given that the family continues to serve as the primary social institution through which children and youths are socialized, including during the transition to adulthood (Furstenberg 2010), this may have considerable socio-emotional consequences, in addition to directly reducing economic support, and the transmission of social and human capital. Although there is vast heterogeneity in the quality of caregiving and level of family engagement for children who exit care in other ways and, indeed, for children who never experience care, children who age out of care are disproportionately likely to have no de facto family unit to

which to turn for advice, comfort, or support—or even with which to spend events and holidays. This may be both symbolically and transactionally meaningful for the successful transition to adulthood. Thus, we may expect aging out of care to be associated with poorer transitions to adulthood.

Of course, youths who age out of care may have family ties not recognized by the CPS system. Some research indicates that emancipated foster youths frequently return to live with their biological parents after leaving care (Collins, Paris, and Ward 2008), despite that the child welfare system deemed these families unsafe for reunification. This may occur because youths have nowhere else to go or because they continue to identify as a member of their birth family. In addition, despite not having been adopted by or placed in legal guardianship with their foster parents, some youths may nevertheless strongly identify with them and internalize their values and expectations. This may promote successful transitions to adulthood given that foster parents have higher incomes and education levels than birth parents (Dolan et al. 2011) and are also screened for physical and mental health (Child Welfare Information Gateway 2014). At the same time, foster parents, particularly those who choose not to adopt or take on legal guardianship of the youths in their care who are at risk of aging out, may not hold high expectations or feel ultimately responsible for the successes or failures of these youths. Prior research has shown that, although there is considerable heterogeneity in foster parents' commitment to foster children, on average, they express less commitment to those placed at an older age (Dozier and Lindhiem 2006), which is often the case for children who age out. Moreover, the permanency aspect of a legally and socially recognized family is arguably essential to its impact—parents and youths both have greater incentive to invest in relationships that are perceived as lasting commitments. Whether a youth is perceived as a family member is likely an important consideration for

whether they and their families have a shared set of positive expectations and norms (Schofield and Beek 2005). On the whole, this too suggests that aging out of care should be linked to poorer transitions to adulthood than other permanency arrangements.

Few studies have compared outcomes for youths with different foster care exit types. Existing research suggests that youths who reunify following foster care have equivalent or worse academic and behavioral outcomes than youths who are not reunified (Bellamy 2008; Biehal 2007; Taussig, Clyman, and Landsverk 2001), though perhaps better outcomes than those who age out of foster care (Lloyd and Barth 2011). However, these studies were based on small samples (range: 149–604 children) and relied on caregiver or self-reported outcomes rather than objective measures. Moreover, a review of the U.S. and U.K. studies focusing on reunification (Beihal 2007) concluded that there is no consistent evidence that reunification improves children's psychosocial outcomes. Importantly, however, most of the studies compared youths who had reunified to those whose fates had not yet been determined (were still in care).

Large-scale, longitudinal studies on the long-term outcomes of specific types of foster care exits are long overdue. To our knowledge, this is the first study to consider young adult outcomes as a function of whether former foster care children reunified, were adopted, were placed in guardianship, or aged out of care. Moreover, we also compare outcomes for these children to other groups of disadvantaged children, including those whose families had incomes low enough that they received SNAP, those who were investigated by CPS but not substantiated for maltreatment, and those who were substantiated for maltreatment but not placed in OHP. Our longitudinal MSPF sample allows us to observe the entire population of youths experiencing OHP, or the comparison group conditions, in Wisconsin during the study period.

## DATA AND SAMPLE

Our data are drawn from the 2015 MSPF, which we linked to Department of Public Instruction (DPI) data on high school graduation and college enrollment. The sample includes all persons who were between the ages of 8 and 13 in the year 2004 and met at least one of the following criteria prior to age 18: (1) was an eligible child on a SNAP case; (2) was an alleged or confirmed victim on a CPS case; or (3) was in OHP. Children who met these criteria between July 1, 2004, and their 18th birthday, and turned 18 at least 1 month prior to the end of 2015, were included. Persons who died prior to reaching age 18 were excluded. These criteria resulted in a sample size of 114,716 youths, although analysis samples for particular outcomes vary due to missing data. Where data are missing for particular outcomes is generally noted in the tables. The primary sources of missing information are unmatched SSNs or children who could not be linked to the DPI data.<sup>1</sup>

The sample can be divided into three mutually exclusive and exhaustive groups: those with SNAP but without CPS or OHP, those with CPS but without OHP, and those with OHP. The CPS but not OHP group was further broken down into two subgroups: those named only on unsubstantiated reports and those named on at least one substantiated report. The OHP group was divided by exit type, which was based on the reported reason for the subjects' last observed placement ending. The OHP groups were designated as: Aged Out, Adopted, Reunified, Other Permanency (e.g., guardianship), Detained, and AWOL (ran away) or Unknown. "Unknown"

---

<sup>1</sup>As discussed in the progress report and subsequent meeting with DCF staff, for about a third of children who appear in OHP (i.e., in WISACWIS with a spell placed in congregate, foster, or kinship care), we have not found a record of an investigation and substantiation. We hypothesize that this may be related to OHP placements due to children's behaviors, as Adoption and Foster Care Reporting System (AFCARS) data suggest about a third of cases are indicated as at least partly child-related.

means that the subject's last observed placement ended for a reason that was missing, ambiguous (e.g., "Other"), or was not indicative of an exit (e.g., "Caregiver requested change").

We consider a range of outcomes, including benefit receipt, earnings, teen parenthood, and incarceration in state prison. With regard to benefit receipt, receipt of TANF, MA, and SNAP was counted only if the subject was listed as an eligible adult on the case (e.g., we did not count subjects whose children were the eligible recipients and the subject was an ineligible primary person on the benefits case). With regard to earnings, only earnings reported to the Unemployment Insurance (UI) system and earned in adulthood (after reaching 18 years of age) were counted. Earnings were aggregated across all employers for persons with multiple jobs. Those with unmatched Social Security numbers (SSNs) in the MSPF were excluded from the earnings analyses, but retained for all other analyses.<sup>2</sup> Earnings are inflation-adjusted to 2015 dollar amounts. Early parenthood included all instances where the subject was named as the parent of a child when she was younger than 18 or younger than 21, and the difference in birthdates between parent and child was at least 12 and no more than 19 years. If a subject under age 12 was reported to be the parent of a child, this was assumed to be an error and was not counted. The MSPF draws information on parental status from benefit records (e.g., MA, TANF, SNAP), as well as from child support (KIDS) or CPS (Wisconsin's Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System, WiSACWIS) records. Incarceration episodes were counted if a subject had reached the age of 18 at the time of incarceration and was observed in state prison. Finally, we assess educational progress (drawn from DPI data) in terms of whether a youth has (a) completed high school and (b) enrolled in college.

---

<sup>2</sup>Those with an unmatched SSN means that they were not able to be linked to UI data and thus their wages (if existing) could not be identified; these are treated as missing, and different from those with zero reported wages.

## METHODS

For each outcome, we first show simple comparisons of proportions or means by sample group: SNAP, Unsubstantiated CPS, Substantiated CPS, Aged Out of Care, Adopted, Reunified, Other Permanency, Detained, and AWOL or Unknown. We focus primarily on differences between youths who aged out of care and each of the other groups of youths. We then estimate regression models—logit regressions for dichotomous outcomes and ordinary least squares regressions for continuous outcomes—which adjust for a range of characteristics that may be associated with both OHP experiences and with young adult outcomes. The controls include the youth’s sex and race/ethnicity, whether the youth received SSI at any point before reaching adulthood, whether the youth’s family received W-2 during the first five years of her life, whether her family received SNAP during the first five years of her life, whether her mother was incarcerated during the first five years of her life, how consistently her mother worked during the first five years of her life, her mother’s mean annual wages during the first five years of her life, whether she was a nonmarital birth, the number of children born to her mother, the number of men with whom her mother has children, whether there was a child support order on her behalf, her mother’s age at her birth, and the year of her birth. Finally, we control for county of residence in all models.

In addition to our full sample analyses, we have also conducted separate analyses for each of the five child welfare regions in Wisconsin. These analyses are identical to those for the full sample, with one notable difference: within-region cell sizes for the Adopted, Other Permanency, Detained, and AWOL/Unknown exit types were too small for separate analyses (see Appendix Table A1 for total number of cases in each group, by region) and were thus combined into a single group. As such, the region-specific analyses compare six, rather than

nine, groups: SNAP, Unsubstantiated CPS, Substantiated CPS, Aged Out of Care, Reunified, and Other Permanency. Results from the region-specific analyses are presented in Appendix Tables A2 through A13.

## **RESULTS**

### **Sample Demographics**

Table 1 presents information on key demographic characteristics of the samples and sample sizes. Relying on the MSPF data over a span of years provides sufficient sample size to support analysis comparing outcomes for youths who, for example, are reunified ( $N=4,358$ ) or who age out ( $N=1,451$ ), or are substantiated but not placed out of home ( $N=4,716$ ). On the whole, youths experiencing OHP, and especially those who do not exit to reunification, are more disadvantaged than the other youths in the sample in terms of maternal work, earnings, incarceration, and benefit receipt. These youths are also disproportionately black, as well as born outside of marriage and to mothers with multi-partner fertility. In addition, there is a noteworthy overrepresentation of females among CPS cases that did not experience OHP, while among those experiencing OHP, males are particularly overrepresented, relative to females, among those detained. Moreover, whites are underrepresented, and blacks overrepresented, among those detained and AWOL or of Unknown status.

### **SNAP and MA Receipt**

Table 2 shows simple (unadjusted) comparisons for receipt of SNAP and MA. The table shows both the percentage of each group that ever received each benefit as an adult, and the percentage of quarters as an adult that the benefit was received. Our sample includes youths who

**Table 1: Sample Characteristics**

	SNAP	UnsubCPS	SubCPS	AgedOut	Adopted	Reunified	Other Permanency	Detained	AWOL or Unknown
Female	0.48	0.56	0.71	0.50	0.46	0.41	0.50	0.18	0.54
White NH	0.53	0.57	0.62	0.52	0.54	0.59	0.51	0.29	0.35
Black NH	0.26	0.25	0.20	0.34	0.31	0.23	0.30	0.49	0.44
Hispanic (any race)	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.08
Asian	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01
American Indian	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.08
Multiracial	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.04
Race unknown	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Receiving SSI	0.07	0.12	0.12	0.33	0.14	0.22	0.19	0.34	0.21
Received W-2, age 0–5	0.47	0.54	0.54	0.68	0.76	0.60	0.75	0.72	0.73
Mother incarcerated, age 0–5	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03
Mother's mean annual wages, age 0–5	6746.80 (9437.87)	7404.74 (10791.41)	7916.84 (10524.53)	4884.60 (9774.95)	4615.76 (7107.26)	6643.66 (9835.70)	4406.20 (5961.67)	4957.71 (7931.35)	3855.22 (7880.42)
Mother's mean quarters worked, age 0–5	1.65 (1.43)	1.80 (1.41)	1.89 (1.42)	1.37 (1.28)	1.50 (1.18)	1.68 (1.37)	1.54 (1.25)	1.41 (1.30)	1.24 (1.21)
Nonmarital birth	0.45	0.52	0.49	0.63	0.70	0.57	0.69	0.72	0.71
Number of children to mother	3.52 (1.92)	3.61 (1.98)	3.40 (1.82)	3.96 (2.32)	4.14 (2.12)	3.64 (2.01)	4.02 (2.14)	3.97 (2.05)	4.29 (2.27)
Number of men with whom mother has children	1.28 (1.02)	1.61 (1.08)	1.55 (1.03)	1.78 (1.18)	1.91 (1.11)	1.71 (1.07)	1.98 (1.20)	1.80 (1.18)	1.87 (1.20)
Received SNAP, age 0–5	0.55	0.61	0.62	0.73	0.82	0.68	0.82	0.75	0.78
Child support order	0.58	0.68	0.70	0.78	0.85	0.78	0.80	0.83	0.71
Mother's age at child's birth	24.42 (5.90)	23.69 (5.76)	23.86 (5.85)	23.88 (6.20)	24.25 (6.15)	24.01 (5.98)	23.00 (5.67)	23.03 (6.44)	23.47 (6.03)
Born in 1991	0.09	0.08	0.11	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.07	0.13	0.12
Born in 1992	0.18	0.17	0.20	0.21	0.11	0.21	0.20	0.21	0.22
Born in 1993	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.22	0.14	0.20	0.19	0.21	0.21
Born in 1994	0.21	0.21	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.18	0.17
Born in 1995	0.21	0.22	0.20	0.19	0.32	0.19	0.23	0.20	0.16
Born in 1996	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.18	0.10	0.12	0.07	0.11
Observations	81,525	21,263	4,716	1,451	170	4,358	632	188	413

**Note:** 114,716 observations. Proportion or mean (and standard deviation) presented.



**Table 2: SNAP and MA Receipt, Simple Comparisons**

	SNAP			MA		
	Ever Received as an Adult %	Percent Adult Quarters Received		Ever Received as an Adult %	Percent Adult Quarters Received	
		M	SD		M	SD
SNAP	76.16	50.80	39.55	43.89	17.44	24.44
Unsubstantiated CPS	74.66	55.40	41.31	52.73	23.52	27.85
Substantiated CPS	75.40	56.16	41.11	58.59	28.31	29.88
Aged Out	85.87	67.06	37.01	74.98	39.13	31.50
Adopted	74.12	52.20	41.15	51.76	22.13	27.19
Reunified	85.13	65.86	37.99	57.53	24.71	27.90
Other Permanency	87.18	72.05	36.56	61.87	27.84	28.51
Detained	89.36	67.90	36.06	59.04	18.53	21.87
AWOL or Unknown	93.70	78.55	31.46	69.73	33.26	29.58
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+ae	+ace		+abcd	*	

\* Aged Out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>+</sup> Aged Out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>-</sup> Aged Out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>^</sup> Aged Out is significantly different from Unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>#</sup> Aged Out is significantly different from Substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged Out is significantly different from Adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged Out is significantly different from Reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged Out is significantly different from Other Permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged Out is significantly different from Detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged Out is significantly different from AWOL/Unknown at  $p < .01$ .

were ages 8 to 13 in 2004, who were observed from 4 to 28 quarters as an adult by the end of 2015.

Among those who received SNAP as children, but had no CPS involvement, 76 percent ever received SNAP (for an average of 51 percent of all adult quarters, including those who ever and never participated). Those who aged out had considerably higher SNAP usage as adults (86 percent ever received SNAP and average SNAP utilization for 67 percent of the quarters observed as adults). Their usage was greater than that of all non-OHP youths, as well as adopted youths, but similar to or less than that of other groups of youths experiencing OHP. MA receipt was also particularly common among youths who aged out. Fully 75 percent of such youths received MA and, on average, they received it for 39 percent of observed adult quarters. These were higher levels of utilization than for all other groups.

Regression results for SNAP and MA are presented in Table 3. Youths who aged out are three times more likely than those who received SNAP as children, but had no CPS involvement, to receive SNAP as an adult and, on average, receive it for 15 percentage points more adult quarters. Again, these are greater utilization rates than those of all non-OHP youths, as well as adopted youths; but, they are generally similar to those of OHP youths with other exit types. Youths who aged out are considerably more likely to receive MA and to receive it for a greater portion of adulthood than all other sample youths.

Region-specific analyses (see Appendix Tables A2 and A3) generally suggest the same pattern of results, though there is considerable variation in the magnitudes of the estimates, as well as fewer significant differences between youths who aged out of care and other OHP youths (which may reflect smaller cell sizes for the region-specific analyses).

**Table 3: SNAP and MA Receipt, Regression Results**

<i>N</i> =114,716	SNAP		MA	
	Ever Received as an Adult Logit - Odds Ratios	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS	Ever Received as an Adult Logit	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS
SNAP (reference group)				
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.56*** (0.14)	8.62*** (0.95)	1.40*** (0.09)	3.92*** (0.63)
Substantiated CPS	1.66*** (0.16)	10.89*** (1.05)	1.51*** (0.10)	5.97*** (0.70)
Aged Out	3.09*** (0.34)	15.15*** (1.18)	4.10*** (0.33)	18.28*** (0.78)
Adopted	1.02 (0.22)	-0.52 (2.73)	1.35 (0.23)	3.40 (1.82)
Reunified	3.10*** (0.22)	16.88*** (0.81)	2.00*** (0.10)	7.14*** (0.54)
Other Permanency	1.93*** (0.29)	13.19*** (1.55)	1.75*** (0.18)	6.53*** (1.03)
Detained	3.27*** (0.90)	11.89*** (2.58)	2.30*** (0.37)	2.71 (1.72)
AWOL or Unknown	5.26*** (1.22)	18.16*** (1.84)	2.32*** (0.29)	10.19*** (1.23)
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+ac	+a	*	*

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+ Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

- Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^ Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

# Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

## Earnings

Table 4 shows simple comparisons of earnings for our sample. Youths who Aged Out are less likely than all non-OHP youths and Adopted youths to have ever had earnings recorded in the Unemployment Insurance system. They were equally likely to have earnings as compared with either Reunified or “Other Permanency” (most frequently guardianship or long-term relative placement) youths, and more likely to have earnings than Detained or AWOL/Unknown youths. They also had lower average quarterly earnings and fewer quarters with earnings than all other youths except those who were Detained or AWOL/Unknown, compared to whom they fared better.

The regression results (Table 5) tell a somewhat different story. After adjusting for the covariates, youths who aged out had a similar or better likelihood of ever having had earnings than all of the other groups. Their quarterly earnings and quarters worked were similar to those of youths who were adopted or reunified. And, while they had lower average quarterly earnings and worked fewer quarters than all non-OHP youths, the magnitude of the gap is substantially smaller than apparent in the simple comparisons shown in Table 4. In other words, the gap in earnings outcomes is eliminated, or substantially mitigated, by accounting for differences in factors largely measured prior to entry to OHP, or otherwise independent of OHP.

The general pattern of results from the region-specific analyses (Appendix Tables A4 and A5) is consistent with those from the primary analyses, although there is variation in the magnitude and significance of the estimates.

**Table 4: Earnings, Simple Comparisons**

<i>n</i> =113,807	Earnings				
	Ever Earnings as Adult	Average Quarterly		Percent Adult Quarters Received	
		Earnings Ever Received as Adult			
		%	M	SD	M
SNAP	87.51	1706.84	1697.16	51.42	32.52
Unsubstantiated CPS	86.75	1497.06	1601.93	49.54	32.76
Substantiated CPS	88.25	1525.26	1543.86	51.22	32.51
Aged Out	82.60	886.78	1174.95	39.28	31.66
Adopted	90.59	1212.53	1243.22	48.43	29.98
Reunified	83.05	1053.53	1376.35	41.12	31.62
Other Permanency	84.94	1271.26	1485.23	46.09	32.51
Detained	64.36	416.78	860.65	21.11	25.53
AWOL or Unknown	73.12	523.83	890.48	28.12	28.32
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+ade		*		+acde

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>+</sup>Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>-</sup>Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>^</sup>Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>#</sup>Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Table 5: Earnings, Regression Results**

	Earnings		
	Average Quarterly		Percent Adult Quarters Received
	Ever Earnings as Adult Logit	Earnings Ever Received as Adult OLS	
SNAP (reference group)			
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.95 (0.08)	-286.56*** (43.69)	-2.88*** (0.85)
Substantiated CPS	0.95 (0.09)	-327.01*** (48.35)	-3.05** (0.95)
Aged Out	1.02 (0.10)	-621.96*** (53.93)	-6.85*** (1.06)
Adopted	1.57 (0.44)	-452.03*** (124.88)	-2.79 (2.44)
Reunified	0.79*** (0.05)	-646.85*** (37.26)	-8.61*** (0.73)
Other Permanency	0.93 (0.12)	-357.93*** (70.92)	-3.97** (1.39)
Detained	0.35*** (0.06)	-1031.71*** (117.93)	-22.93*** (2.31)
AWOL or Unknown	0.49*** (0.07)	-968.19*** (84.33)	-18.79*** (1.65)
Observations	113,807	113,807	113,807
<i>Significant Differences</i>	bde	+cde	+de

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+ Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

- Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^ Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

# Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

### **TANF Participation among Females**

Table 6 presents the percentage of females ever receiving TANF as an adult, and the percentage of adult quarters with any TANF receipt. We exclude males from these analyses given low rates of TANF eligibility and participation. Female youths who Aged Out of care had higher rates of TANF use than all non-OHP youths, but similar or lower rates than other OHP youths. They also had a higher percentage of quarters receiving TANF than non-OHP youths and Adopted youths.

The regression results, shown in Table 7, suggest a slightly more nuanced pattern. Youths who Aged Out of care had greater TANF use than the SNAP and Unsubstantiated CPS groups, but similar TANF use to the Substantiated, Adopted, Reunified, and Detained group. They had less TANF use than the AWOL/Unknown group. The region-specific analyses (Appendix Tables A6 and A7) again produced a generally consistent overall pattern, albeit with variation in the size and significance of the estimates.

### **Early Parenthood among Females**

Table 8 shows simple comparisons of teen and young adult parenthood for females in our sample. Because the MSPF draws parental status from program participation records, as well as child support enforcement records, we are more likely to capture births for mothers (e.g., if covered by MA), than for fathers, and therefore exclude males from these analyses. Female youths who Aged Out are more likely to have become mothers by age 18 or age 20 than those whose families received SNAP but who had no CPS involvement, as well as those who were investigated by CPS but Unsubstantiated. They had similar early parenthood rates as youths who were Substantiated but not in OHP, and those who experienced OHP but Reunified.

**Table 6: TANF Participation among Females**

	Ever Received as an Adult	Percent Adult Quarters Received	
	%	M	SD
SNAP	11.15	3.35	12.05
Unsubstantiated CPS	16.46	5.53	15.92
Substantiated CPS	17.52	5.69	15.88
Aged Out	25.28	8.74	18.33
Adopted	15.38	3.79	12.16
Reunified	23.61	7.35	17.45
Other Permanency	18.47	5.59	14.62
Detained	39.39	11.86	18.95
AWOL or Unknown	36.94	14.02	23.70
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+e		+ae

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>+</sup> Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>-</sup> Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>^</sup> Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>#</sup> Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .



**Table 7: TANF Participation among Females, Regression Results**

	Ever Received as an Adult Logit	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	2.17*** (0.29)	2.06*** (0.62)
Substantiated CPS	2.54*** (0.35)	2.70*** (0.65)
Aged Out	3.05*** (0.46)	3.99*** (0.72)
Adopted	1.92 (0.68)	-0.17 (1.52)
Reunified	3.62*** (0.44)	4.00*** (0.58)
Other Permanency	1.95*** (0.38)	0.98 (0.88)
Detained	5.92*** (2.43)	6.88** (2.27)
AWOL or Unknown	4.16*** (0.79)	7.52*** (1.00)
Observations	56,940	57,047
<i>Significant Differences</i>	<sub>-^</sub>	<sub>-^ce</sub>

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+ Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

- Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^ Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

# Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Table 8: Early Parenthood, Simple Comparisons**

	Mother by Age 18	Mother by Age 20
SNAP	6.12	16.07
Unsubstantiated CPS	10.87	25.23
Substantiated CPS	16.78	30.33
Aged Out	16.71	30.66
Adopted	3.85	21.79
Reunified	17.43	37.10
Other Permanency	9.24	24.20
Detained	9.09	33.33
AWOL or Unknown	21.62	51.80
<i>Significant Differences</i>	<sup>-^be</sup>	<sup>-^ac</sup>

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>+</sup>Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>-</sup>Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>^</sup>Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>#</sup>Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

The regression results (Table 9) suggest fewer differences between youths who Aged Out and other youths in our sample. Youths who Aged Out were more likely to have an early birth than those in the SNAP only and Unsubstantiated groups, but similarly or less likely than those in the Substantiated, Adopted, Reunified, Other Permanency, Detained, and AWOL/Unknown groups. Again, there were no major discrepancies between the pattern of overall results and the region-specific results (Appendix Tables A8 and A9).

### **Incarceration**

Tables 10 (simple comparisons) and 11 (regression results) present the findings from our analyses of incarceration in state prison as an adult. Given substantially different base rates of incarceration among males and females, we present these results separately by sex. The simple comparisons suggest that, in general, females who age out of OHP are more likely to be incarcerated in young adulthood than those in the SNAP group and those exiting OHP to Adoption; similarly likely as those involved with CPS but not placed in OHP; and less likely than those who were Detained or AWOL/Unknown. Males who Aged Out of care were more likely to be incarcerated than all non-OHP males, similarly likely to those who were Adopted, and less likely than those who Reunified, were Detained, or were AWOL/Unknown.

These patterns generally hold in the regression results. In general, both men and women who Aged Out of care had a greater likelihood of incarceration than non-OHP youths, but similar or lesser likelihoods of incarceration than other OHP youths. Because of very small sample sizes for females, we estimated region-specific analyses only for males. Even for males, limited sample sizes suggest caution in interpreting differences in estimates across regions. Nonetheless, there were no striking discrepancies between the full-sample and region-specific results.

**Table 9: Early Parenthood, Regression Results**

	Mother by Age 18 Logit	Mother by Age 20 Logit
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.78*** (0.27)	1.69*** (0.19)
Substantiated CPS	3.17*** (0.50)	2.25*** (0.26)
Aged Out	2.55*** (0.44)	1.97*** (0.26)
Adopted	0.56 (0.34)	1.24 (0.37)
Reunified	3.04*** (0.43)	2.86*** (0.29)
Other Permanency	1.24 (0.30)	1.34 (0.22)
Detained	1.05 (0.66)	1.98 (0.78)
AWOL or Unknown	2.91*** (0.62)	4.31*** (0.72)
Observations	56,463	57,047
<i>Significant Differences</i>		

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+ Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

- Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^ Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

# Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Table 10: Incarceration, Simple Comparisons**

	State Prison-Female	State Prison-Male
SNAP	0.15	3.83
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.52	7.56
Substantiated CPS	0.66	6.10
Aged Out	1.24	13.76
Adopted	0.00	6.52
Reunified	1.97	18.53
Other Permanency	1.59	11.01
Detained	24.24	59.35
AWOL or Unknown	6.31	34.55
Observations	57,047	57,669
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-ade	+bde

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+ Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

- Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^ Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

# Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Table 11: Incarceration, Regression Results**

	State Prison-Female Logit	State Prison-Male Logit
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	3.12** (1.29)	2.80*** (0.30)
Substantiated CPS	3.54** (1.59)	2.62*** (0.41)
Aged Out	5.58*** (2.80)	4.01*** (0.56)
Adopted	1.00 (.)	2.40* (1.06)
Reunified	10.73*** (4.10)	8.25*** (0.71)
Other Permanency	8.27*** (4.74)	3.10*** (0.63)
Detained	186.29*** (110.03)	41.95*** (8.22)
AWOL or Unknown	30.61*** (13.97)	13.59*** (2.52)
Observations	46,861	57,004
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-ade	-^bde

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+ Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

- Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^ Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

# Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

## Education

Table 12 shows simple comparisons of high school completion and college enrollment between groups.<sup>3</sup> Youths who Aged Out had very low overall rates of both, at 69 percent and 25 percent, respectively. Moreover, they were significantly less likely to complete high school or to attend college than all non-OHP youths, but more likely to do so than youths who Reunified.

The regression results, shown in Table 13, indicate that, after adjusting for the covariates, youths who Aged Out are less likely to complete high school or attend college than SNAP only, Adopted, or Other Permanency youths, but are no different than (Substantiated or Unsubstantiated) CPS involved youths. They are, however, more likely to complete high school or attend college than youths who Reunify, are Detained, or are AWOL/Unknown. Results from the region-specific analyses are quite consistent with those from the full sample analyses.

---

<sup>3</sup>Estimates are conditional on non-missing high school completion and college enrollment data and will be biased if, as might be expected, records are not missing at random. There are two reasons that a case may be missing from these data. First, there may be no matching DPI record for an MSPF case which, for example, occurs for 11 percent of the SNAP sample and 3 percent of the Aged Out sample. In this instance, if non-completers (or non-college enrollers) are disproportionately unmatched and a greater proportion of SNAP cases than aged-out cases are dropped due to no DPI match, this may contribute to the higher observed proportion of non-completers (or non-college enrollers) among youths who aged out. Second, some youths, including 7 percent of SNAP cases and 10 percent of Aged-Out cases, have matched MSPF and DPI data, but no information on high school completion in their DPI record. These cases are more prevalent in Milwaukee and a few other counties than statewide. We hypothesize that these cases transferred from standard public schools to choice schools before graduating and will seek to confirm this hypothesis with DPI.

**Table 12: Educational Progress, Simple Comparisons**

	Education	
	High School Completion (%)	College Enrollment (%)
SNAP	84.89	43.87
Unsubstantiated CPS	76.14	31.62
Substantiated CPS	77.30	31.75
Aged Out	68.70	24.50
Adopted	85.92	32.92
Reunified	58.22	18.65
Other Permanency	71.62	26.30
Detained	21.95	3.78
AWOL or Unknown	26.38	7.59
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+abde	+bde

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+ Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

- Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^ Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

# Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .



**Table 13: Educational Progress, Regression Results**

	Education	
	High School Completion (%)	College Enrollment (%)
	Logit	Logit
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.42*** (0.03)	0.40*** (0.03)
Substantiated CPS	0.38*** (0.03)	0.35*** (0.03)
Aged Out	0.38*** (0.03)	0.40*** (0.04)
Adopted	1.03 (0.26)	0.61** (0.11)
Reunified	0.20*** (0.01)	0.25*** (0.02)
Other Permanency	0.46*** (0.05)	0.43*** (0.05)
Detained	0.06*** (0.01)	0.06*** (0.02)
AWOL or Unknown	0.06*** (0.01)	0.09*** (0.02)
Observations	94,536	103,734
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-abde	-bde

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

-Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

#Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

## CONCLUSION

Despite concerns about the social, educational, and economic outcomes of youths who age out of care, they do not, on average, fare worse than youths who remained in home after CPS involvement or those who reunified. Notably, on several metrics, Aged Out youths have more favorable outcomes than Reunified youths. They are more likely to complete high school and enroll in college than Reunified youths, and less likely to have a child before age 18. At the same time, youths experiencing OHP and, on many metrics, CPS-involvement more generally, are at considerable risk of poor outcomes in young adulthood, across a host of domains. This implies that programs and services should target the larger group of youths experiencing OHP (or CPS involvement) rather than specifically focusing on those who age out or are at high risk thereof.

**Appendix Table A1: Sample Sizes for Region Analyses**

	SNAP	UnsubCPS	SubCPS	AgedOut	Adopted	Reunified	Other Permancency	Detained	AWOL or Unknown
Northeast	13,070	3,902	928	225	37	824	84	22	39
Northern	7,407	1,839	553	151	12	560	55	15	32
Southeast	38,211	9,660	2,017	711	65	1,379	320	77	227
Southern	12,144	3,414	693	191	27	865	77	58	83
Western	10,693	2,448	525	173	29	730	96	16	32

**Appendix Table A2: SNAP and MA Receipt, Simple Comparisons by Region**

	SNAP			MA		
	Ever Received as an Adult	Percent Adult Quarters Received		Ever Received as an Adult	Percent Adult Quarters Received	
	%	M	SD	%	M	SD
<b>Northeast Region</b>						
SNAP	71.16	42.94	38.42	37.85	14.24	22.63
Unsubstantiated CPS	66.81	45.52	40.98	46.51	19.94	26.65
Substantiated CPS	72.74	51.57	40.78	56.79	26.92	29.10
Aged Out	78.22	58.26	40.18	74.22	38.21	31.09
Adopted	67.57	44.24	39.79	32.43	11.73	19.47
Reunified	84.71	63.40	38.23	56.31	24.00	27.93
Other Permanency	86.90	68.39	36.01	55.95	25.36	28.76
Detained	81.82	57.64	39.39	54.55	18.63	21.78
AWOL or Unknown	92.31	71.02	34.74	58.97	28.40	29.55
<i>Significant Differences</i>	<sup>^e</sup>		<sup>-^</sup>	<sup>+abc</sup>		<sup>+abcd</sup>
<b>Northern Region</b>						
SNAP	73.11	43.88	37.84	42.18	16.30	23.66
Unsubstantiated CPS	71.51	50.24	40.50	51.11	22.69	27.56
Substantiated CPS	75.41	54.57	41.04	63.47	29.88	29.68
Aged Out	87.42	64.82	36.06	78.15	42.09	31.34
Adopted	75.00	45.61	38.98	50.00	25.64	33.63
Reunified	83.39	62.32	39.33	59.11	27.91	30.22
Other Permanency	80.00	68.58	41.44	65.45	30.31	29.15
Detained	86.67	52.46	37.89	46.67	14.07	24.61
AWOL or Unknown	87.50	71.66	33.78	75.00	36.23	27.07
<i>Significant Differences</i>	<sup>+</sup>		<sup>+</sup>	<sup>+b</sup>		<sup>+bd</sup>
<b>Southeast Region</b>						
SNAP	81.01	58.91	39.28	49.25	20.24	25.63
Unsubstantiated CPS	81.40	65.15	39.74	58.35	26.92	28.62
Substantiated CPS	78.43	61.84	40.81	60.93	30.60	30.75
Aged Out	89.45	74.40	34.13	77.36	40.78	31.72
Adopted	80.00	63.35	40.61	53.85	20.89	26.19
Reunified	88.61	73.20	35.53	60.84	26.95	28.66
Other Permanency	89.69	75.84	35.47	65.63	30.81	29.10
Detained	92.21	75.01	33.71	61.04	21.50	23.09
AWOL or Unknown	96.04	83.71	28.06	71.37	34.20	30.01
<i>Significant Differences</i>	<sup>+e</sup>		<sup>+e</sup>	<sup>+abcd</sup>		<sup>*</sup>

(table continues)

Appendix Table A2, continued

Appendix Table A2, continued

	SNAP			MA		
	Ever Received as an Adult	Percent Adult Quarters Received		Ever Received as an Adult	Percent Adult Quarters Received	
	%	M	SD	%	M	SD
<b>Southern Region</b>						
SNAP	73.10	45.75	38.86	39.37	15.09	23.11
Unsubstantiated CPS	70.18	48.64	40.92	47.54	19.95	26.27
Substantiated CPS	73.45	51.85	40.61	53.82	24.05	27.73
Aged Out	83.25	57.66	37.69	65.97	30.34	29.21
Adopted	62.96	42.85	43.98	66.67	30.66	27.70
Reunified	83.58	65.17	38.74	52.37	20.94	25.24
Other Permanency	87.01	69.95	36.42	53.25	19.82	23.90
Detained	89.66	66.59	35.49	62.07	16.28	19.79
AWOL or Unknown	93.98	76.96	30.96	67.47	30.56	28.73
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+e	-^e		+b	+bcd	
<b>Western Region</b>						
SNAP	70.57	41.98	38.10	38.47	14.80	23.08
Unsubstantiated CPS	69.24	46.02	40.53	48.90	21.43	27.39
Substantiated CPS	71.05	49.78	41.00	53.90	25.96	29.95
Aged Out	82.66	60.66	38.27	73.41	40.64	32.36
Adopted	79.31	48.80	39.20	58.62	28.77	31.37
Reunified	82.19	58.30	38.06	57.53	23.29	26.94
Other Permanency	83.33	66.26	37.12	59.38	25.14	28.17
Detained	87.50	67.04	38.61	56.25	16.44	21.31
AWOL or Unknown	84.38	62.20	40.70	71.88	36.54	31.68
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+	+		+b	+bcd	

\*Aged Out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+Aged Out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

-Aged Out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^Aged Out is significantly different from Unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

#Aged Out is significantly different from Substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged Out is significantly different from Adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged Out is significantly different from Reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged Out is significantly different from Other Permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged Out is significantly different from Detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged Out is significantly different from AWOL/Unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Appendix Table A3: SNAP and MA Receipt, Regression Results by Region**

	SNAP		MA	
	Ever Received as an Adult Logit	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS	Ever Received as an Adult Logit	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS
<b>Northeast Region (n=19,131)</b>				
SNAP (reference group)				
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.15 (0.23)	4.87* (2.33)	1.34* (0.19)	-0.23 (1.46)
Substantiated CPS	1.52* (0.32)	9.90*** (2.54)	1.59** (0.25)	3.12 (1.60)
Aged Out	1.87** (0.44)	12.47*** (2.92)	4.90*** (0.95)	17.76*** (1.83)
Reunified	2.49*** (0.41)	14.14*** (1.97)	1.97*** (0.24)	4.92*** (1.24)
Other Permanency	1.70* (0.45)	10.17** (3.13)	1.49* (0.29)	2.89 (1.97)
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-	-^	*	*
<b>Northern Region (n=10,624)</b>				
SNAP (reference group)				
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.11 (0.27)	4.72 (2.77)	1.24 (0.22)	2.81 (1.79)
Substantiated CPS	1.43 (0.37)	9.56** (3.04)	1.86** (0.37)	7.46*** (1.96)
Aged Out	3.93*** (1.24)	16.75*** (3.53)	4.76*** (1.17)	20.88*** (2.28)
Reunified	2.92*** (0.54)	16.02*** (2.24)	2.13*** (0.30)	10.02*** (1.44)
Other Permanency	1.55 (0.48)	10.62** (3.76)	1.94** (0.47)	8.44*** (2.42)
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+	-^	*	*
<b>Southeast Region (n=52,667)</b>				
SNAP (reference group)				
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.61** (0.27)	8.79*** (1.64)	1.40** (0.15)	4.72*** (1.16)
Substantiated CPS	1.38 (0.24)	9.11*** (1.78)	1.38** (0.16)	6.07*** (1.25)
Aged Out	2.75*** (0.53)	13.71*** (1.88)	3.65*** (0.48)	17.26*** (1.32)
Reunified	3.01*** (0.43)	15.45*** (1.50)	1.87*** (0.18)	7.06*** (1.05)
Other Permanency	2.36*** (0.47)	11.47*** (1.86)	1.79*** (0.22)	6.81*** (1.31)
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+	+	*	*

(table continues)

Appendix Table A3, continued

	SNAP		MA	
	Ever Received as an Adult Logit	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS	Ever Received as an Adult Logit	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS
<b>Southern Region (17,552)</b>				
SNAP (reference group)				
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.92*** (0.38)	11.29*** (2.16)	1.57*** (0.21)	5.35*** (1.36)
Substantiated CPS	2.08*** (0.45)	12.92*** (2.46)	1.62** (0.25)	6.47*** (1.55)
Aged Out	4.80*** (1.27)	16.79*** (2.97)	4.14*** (0.80)	16.17*** (1.87)
Reunified	3.57*** (0.57)	20.04*** (1.77)	2.13*** (0.24)	7.57*** (1.12)
Other Permanency	3.31*** (0.84)	17.62*** (2.61)	2.61*** (0.43)	8.13*** (1.65)
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+	-	+b	*
<b>Western Region (n=14,742)</b>				
SNAP (reference group)				
Unsubstantiated CPS	2.18*** (0.45)	10.47*** (2.45)	1.36* (0.21)	3.53* (1.56)
Substantiated CPS	2.33*** (0.55)	13.11*** (2.81)	1.31 (0.23)	4.89** (1.79)
Aged Out	4.26*** (1.20)	19.67*** (3.25)	4.15*** (0.91)	20.39*** (2.07)
Reunified	4.01*** (0.66)	17.91*** (1.97)	2.14*** (0.26)	5.50*** (1.25)
Other Permanency	2.88*** (0.79)	15.59*** (3.16)	2.11*** (0.42)	7.95*** (2.01)
<i>Significant Differences</i>	~^	~^	*	*

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at p&lt;.01.

†Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at p&lt;.01.

~Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at p&lt;.01.

^Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at p&lt;.01.

#Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at p&lt;.01.

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at p<.01.<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at p<.01.<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other at p<.01.<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at p<.01.<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at p<.01.

**Appendix Table A4: Earnings, Simple Comparisons by Region**

	Earnings				
	Ever Earnings as Adult %	Average Quarterly Earnings Ever Received as Adult		Percent Adult Quarters Received	
		M	SD	M	SD
Northeast Region (n=18,988)					
SNAP	89.87	1928.04	1803.63	55.35	32.28
Unsubstantiated CPS	90.17	1774.18	1741.25	55.45	32.84
Substantiated CPS	92.00	1757.74	1581.82	57.44	32.21
Aged Out	83.56	1033.38	1330.08	41.78	32.89
Adopted	91.89	1351.57	1583.38	47.81	31.38
Reunified	85.99	1140.14	1422.95	43.75	31.80
Other Permanency	83.33	1258.84	1702.87	43.47	34.51
Detained	86.36	821.63	1096.80	34.73	27.59
AWOL or Unknown	74.36	627.09	1045.62	30.50	32.60
Significant Differences	^#		+		+
Northern Region (n=10,570)					
SNAP	89.67	1970.05	1796.39	54.48	31.73
Unsubstantiated CPS	89.46	1793.01	1745.48	53.00	32.06
Substantiated CPS	88.46	1630.42	1619.78	51.35	32.39
Aged Out	86.67	1017.19	1171.00	42.23	30.90
Adopted	91.67	1731.65	1210.50	57.71	27.88
Reunified	83.54	1077.38	1370.73	40.95	31.45
Other Permanency	85.45	1341.23	1450.27	45.02	31.83
Detained	66.67	522.56	779.00	25.50	28.41
AWOL or Unknown	68.75	733.41	1077.89	29.06	27.31
Significant Differences			+		+
Southeast Region (n=52,204)					
SNAP	85.62	1487.97	1561.16	48.87	32.91
Unsubstantiated CPS	83.51	1230.84	1427.95	45.17	32.81
Substantiated CPS	86.64	1367.77	1501.18	48.73	32.67
Aged Out	81.27	798.22	1111.20	37.22	31.19
Adopted	84.62	932.50	1046.38	42.03	30.86
Reunified	80.04	955.40	1386.94	39.02	32.23
Other Permanency	84.01	1143.34	1337.86	46.47	32.63
Detained	49.35	191.03	630.41	12.31	17.76
AWOL or Unknown	71.81	421.73	826.23	25.91	27.00
Significant Differences	-#de		+bcde		+cde

(table continues)



Appendix Table A4, continued

Appendix Table A4, continued

	Earnings				
	Ever Earnings as Adult	Average Quarterly Earnings Ever Received as Adult		Percent Adult Quarters Received	
	%	M	SD	M	SD
<b>Southern Region (n=17,407)</b>					
SNAP	88.39	1795.38	1733.60	52.04	31.86
Unsubstantiated CPS	89.55	1650.97	1661.22	52.27	31.52
Substantiated CPS	88.35	1565.52	1530.42	51.14	31.35
Aged Out	83.16	861.56	1095.30	39.85	31.75
Adopted	96.30	1223.81	1145.04	51.04	29.47
Reunified	83.76	1071.74	1346.70	42.48	31.63
Other Permanency	88.31	1296.78	1525.32	45.31	30.04
Detained	70.69	381.95	776.23	23.08	28.17
AWOL or Unknown	75.90	681.80	935.45	32.89	31.61
<i>Significant Differences</i>	a		+d		+d
<b>Western Region (n=14,638)</b>					
SNAP	88.88	1935.72	1812.96	52.93	31.86
Unsubstantiated CPS	88	1658.21	1652.97	50.79	32.39
Substantiated CPS	87.35	1548.69	1509.93	49.60	32.71
Aged Out	82.66	974.18	1276.81	41.26	32.25
Adopted	96.55	1437.47	1197.46	57.32	25.49
Reunified	84.18	1101.28	1333.92	40.64	30.11
Other Permanency	86.46	1646.62	1687.09	48.34	33.07
Detained	81.25	973.65	1353.48	33.54	28.67
AWOL or Unknown	78.13	502.97	736.60	27.61	23.38
<i>Significant Differences</i>	a		+ce		+ae

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+ Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

- Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^ Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

# Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Appendix Table A5: Earnings, Regression Results by Region**

	Earnings		
	Ever Earnings as Adult Logit	Average Quarterly Earnings Ever Received as Adult OLS	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS
<b>Northeast Region (n=18,988)</b>			
SNAP (reference group)			
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.97 (0.20)	-203.71 (112.13)	-0.49 (2.05)
Substantiated CPS	1.18 (0.28)	-210.82 (122.57)	0.95 (2.24)
Aged Out	0.88 (0.22)	-606.61*** (140.54)	-6.46* (2.57)
Reunified	0.84 (0.15)	-655.39*** (94.79)	-7.84*** (1.73)
Other Permanency	0.64 (0.17)	-705.75*** (150.86)	-11.44*** (2.75)
<i>Significant Differences</i>		+	^#
<b>Northern Region (n=10,570)</b>			
SNAP (reference group)			
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.90 (0.21)	-157.17 (132.60)	-2.63 (2.40)
Substantiated CPS	0.73 (0.19)	-297.95* (145.34)	-4.42 (2.63)
Aged Out	1.11 (0.35)	-684.74*** (169.10)	-7.65* (3.06)
Reunified	0.72 (0.14)	-748.89*** (106.98)	-10.39*** (1.93)
Other Permanency	0.48* (0.14)	-652.39*** (179.29)	-12.48*** (3.24)
<i>Significant Differences</i>		._^	._^
<b>Southeast Region (n=52,204)</b>			
SNAP (reference group)			
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.88 (0.12)	-380.42*** (71.35)	-4.71** (1.52)
Substantiated CPS	0.95 (0.14)	-370.22*** (77.33)	-4.09* (1.65)
Aged Out	1.09 (0.17)	-567.45*** (81.55)	-6.29*** (1.74)
Reunified	0.79 (0.10)	-547.63*** (64.94)	-8.17*** (1.39)
Other Permanency	0.64** (0.09)	-653.26*** (80.46)	-11.08*** (1.72)
<i>Significant Differences</i>	c	+	-c

(table continues)

Appendix Table A5, continued

	Earnings		
	Ever Earnings as Adult Logit	Average Quarterly Earnings Ever Received as Adult OLS	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS
<b>Southern Region (n=17,407)</b>			
SNAP (reference group)			
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.17 (0.21)	-229.27* (100.85)	-1.68 (1.90)
Substantiated CPS	0.91 (0.19)	-352.38** (114.94)	-4.13 (2.16)
Aged Out	0.89 (0.22)	-757.55*** (138.31)	-8.92*** (2.60)
Reunified	0.83 (0.12)	-625.00*** (82.79)	-7.68*** (1.56)
Other Permanency	0.73 (0.15)	-743.20*** (121.33)	-12.50*** (2.28)
<i>Significant Differences</i>		+	-^
<b>Western Region (n=14,638)</b>			
SNAP (reference group)			
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.03 (0.22)	-266.54* (117.47)	-2.80 (2.13)
Substantiated CPS	0.91 (0.22)	-371.56** (135.08)	-4.46 (2.45)
Aged Out	1.04 (0.29)	-685.10*** (155.54)	-7.05* (2.82)
Reunified	0.87 (0.15)	-731.57*** (94.52)	-10.13*** (1.72)
Other Permanency	0.97 (0.27)	-475.03** (151.33)	-7.50** (2.75)
<i>Significant Differences</i>		-^	

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at p<.01.

+Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at p<.01.

-Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at p<.01.

^Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at p<.01.

#Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at p<.01.

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at p<.01.

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at p<.01.

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at p<.01.

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at p<.01.

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at p<.01.

**Appendix Table A6: TANF Participation among Females, by Region**

	Ever Received as an Adult	Percent Adult Quarters Received	
	%	M	SD
<b>Northeast Region</b>			
SNAP	6.00	1.15	6.02
Unsubstantiated CPS	10.96	2.36	8.50
Substantiated CPS	13.32	2.81	9.36
Aged Out	16.35	3.13	8.05
Adopted	6.67	0.74	2.87
Reunified	26.09	6.59	14.72
Other Permanency	17.95	5.08	13.28
Detained	33.33	4.76	8.25
AWOL or Unknown	31.25	8.23	15.13
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-	b	
<b>Northern Region</b>			
SNAP	5.01	0.86	4.76
Unsubstantiated CPS	8.94	1.87	7.85
Substantiated CPS	11.02	2.06	7.18
Aged Out	11.69	2.55	8.83
Adopted	22.22	1.86	3.72
Reunified	21.62	4.22	10.21
Other Permanency	13.79	3.21	10.47
Detained	0.00	0.00	0.00
AWOL or Unknown	35.29	8.65	16.15
<i>Significant Differences</i>	d		
<b>Southeast Region</b>			
SNAP	17.12	5.81	15.98
Unsubstantiated CPS	25.14	9.79	21.20
Substantiated CPS	25.95	10.09	21.24
Aged Out	33.33	13.12	22.28
Adopted	29.17	10.56	20.26
Reunified	27.86	11.55	23.15
Other Permanency	23.90	7.61	17.27
Detained	38.89	12.24	19.39
AWOL or Unknown	38.17	17.93	27.66
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+	^c	
<b>Southern Region</b>			
SNAP	8.17	1.89	8.12
Unsubstantiated CPS	10.85	2.72	9.90
Substantiated CPS	11.63	2.94	10.80
Aged Out	20.22	6.40	15.08
Adopted	5.56	0.56	2.36
Reunified	25.71	7.48	16.91
Other Permanency	10.53	3.37	11.54
Detained	50.00	15.77	23.63
AWOL or Unknown	38.10	9.15	15.44
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-	a	

(table continues)

Appendix Table A6, continued

Appendix Table A3, continued			
	Ever Received as an Adult	Percent Adult Quarters Received	
	%	M	SD
<b>Western Region</b>			
SNAP	3.58	0.54	3.58
Unsubstantiated CPS	5.23	0.83	4.14
Substantiated CPS	6.79	1.10	4.77
Aged Out	17.72	3.99	10.75
Adopted	8.33	0.35	1.20
Reunified	12.14	2.12	6.64
Other Permanency	10.20	2.59	8.67
Detained	50.00	15.38	21.76
AWOL or Unknown	31.25	6.20	12.20
Significant differences	^	a	

\* Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+ Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

- Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^ Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

# Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup> Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup> Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup> Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup> Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup> Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Appendix Table A7: TANF Participation among Females, Regression Results by Region**

	Ever Received as an Adult Logit	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS
<b>Northeast Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	2.88*** (0.88)	0.66 (0.88)
Substantiated CPS	3.33*** (1.07)	1.01 (0.92)
Aged Out	3.86*** (1.48)	1.28 (1.03)
Reunified	5.88*** (1.58)	4.34*** (0.80)
Other Permanency	3.85** (1.59)	2.51* (1.16)
Observations	9,458	9,533
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-	b
<b>Northern Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.78 (0.70)	1.47 (0.85)
Substantiated CPS	2.54* (1.05)	1.80* (0.89)
Aged Out	2.13 (1.07)	1.91 (1.02)
Reunified	4.37*** (1.50)	3.48*** (0.76)
Other Permanency	4.37** (2.03)	3.57*** (1.04)
Observations	5,170	5,193
<i>Significant Differences</i>		
<b>Southeast Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.49 (0.35)	1.17 (1.52)
Substantiated CPS	1.72* (0.42)	2.30 (1.56)
Aged Out	1.90* (0.48)	3.07 (1.65)
Reunified	1.84** (0.42)	3.30* (1.46)
Other Permanency	1.68* (0.41)	2.23 (1.62)
Observations	26,304	26,304
<i>Significant Differences</i>		

(table continues)

Appendix Table A7

	Ever Received as an Adult Logit	Percent Adult Quarters Received OLS
<b>Southern Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	3.11*** (0.88)	4.68*** (1.00)
Substantiated CPS	3.33*** (1.04)	4.89*** (1.06)
Aged Out	5.02*** (1.84)	7.01*** (1.25)
Reunified	6.19*** (1.56)	7.59*** (0.91)
Other Permanency	4.73*** (1.54)	5.98*** (1.16)
Observations	8,687	8,687
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-	-
<b>Western Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.01 (0.40)	-0.32 (0.47)
Substantiated CPS	1.26 (0.55)	-0.05 (0.51)
Aged Out	4.06** (1.85)	2.76*** (0.60)
Reunified	2.25* (0.81)	0.92* (0.42)
Other Permanency	2.95* (1.33)	2.04*** (0.58)
Observations	7,168	7,330
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+	+b

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

-Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

#Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Appendix Table A8: Early Parenthood, Simple Comparisons By Region**

	Mother by Age 18	Mother by Age 20
<b>Northeast Region</b>		
SNAP	5.02	14.55
Unsubstantiated CPS	10.86	25.47
Substantiated CPS	15.31	30.47
Aged Out	11.54	21.15
Adopted	0.00	13.33
Reunified	17.08	37.58
Other Permanency	12.82	33.33
Detained	0.00	0.00
AWOL or Unknown	18.75	62.50
<i>Significant Differences</i>	bde	ad
<b>Northern Region</b>		
SNAP	3.60	13.00
Unsubstantiated CPS	7.50	21.25
Substantiated CPS	12.86	24.67
Aged Out	7.79	16.88
Adopted	0.00	11.11
Reunified	18.47	45.95
Other Permanency	6.90	31.03
Detained	0.00	100.00
AWOL or Unknown	11.76	47.06
<i>Significant Differences</i>	b	b
<b>Southeast Region</b>		
SNAP	7.80	18.61
Unsubstantiated CPS	13.49	28.18
Substantiated CPS	22.98	35.75
Aged Out	21.60	34.13
Adopted	8.33	25.00
Reunified	20.73	36.82
Other Permanency	8.18	25.16
Detained	16.67	27.78
AWOL or Unknown	25.19	50.38
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-e	-^c
<b>Southern Region</b>		
SNAP	5.07	14.25
Unsubstantiated CPS	8.23	22.23
Substantiated CPS	8.98	22.24
Aged Out	17.98	32.58
Adopted	5.56	27.78
Reunified	17.24	37.93
Other Permanency	7.89	13.16
Detained	0.00	37.50
AWOL or Unknown	16.67	52.38
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-c	-d

(table continues)



Appendix Table A8, continued

	Mother by Age 18	Mother by Age 20
<b>Western Region</b>		
SNAP	4.35	12.94
Unsubstantiated CPS	7.02	20.69
Substantiated CPS	9.66	25.59
Aged Out	7.59	37.97
Adopted	0.00	25.00
Reunified	10.86	30.03
Other Permanency	12.24	18.37
Detained	0.00	50.00
AWOL or Unknown	18.75	56.25
<i>Significant Differences</i>	^	

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>+</sup>Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>-</sup>Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>^</sup>Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>#</sup>Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Appendix Table A9: Early Parenthood, Regression Results by Region**

	Mother by Age 20 Logit	Mother by Age 18 Logit
<b>Northeast Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	2.62** (0.96)	1.75* (0.48)
Substantiated CPS	4.07*** (1.54)	2.22** (0.63)
Aged Out	2.49* (1.12)	1.37 (0.47)
Reunified	3.52*** (1.18)	2.76*** (0.69)
Other Permanency	1.93 (0.98)	2.08* (0.74)
Observations	9,458	9,458
<i>Significant Differences</i>		
<b>Northern Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	2.07 (0.93)	1.92* (0.60)
Substantiated CPS	4.13** (1.91)	2.49** (0.81)
Aged Out	2.61 (1.57)	1.61 (0.67)
Reunified	4.96*** (1.96)	5.48*** (1.50)
Other Permanency	1.40 (0.91)	3.23** (1.22)
Observations	5,082	5,170
<i>Significant Differences</i>		
<b>Southeast Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.21 (0.34)	1.28 (0.27)
Substantiated CPS	2.54*** (0.72)	1.94** (0.42)
Aged Out	1.83* (0.54)	1.47 (0.33)
Reunified	2.09** (0.56)	1.94** (0.39)
Other Permanency	1.23 (0.37)	1.56* (0.34)
Observations	26,034 <sup>a</sup>	26,304
<i>Significant Differences</i>		

(table continues)

Appendix Table A9, continued

	Mother by Age 20 Logit	Mother by Age 18 Logit
<b>Southern Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.49 (0.51)	1.99** (0.49)
Substantiated CPS	1.64 (0.60)	1.93* (0.51)
Aged Out	3.46**f (1.41)	3.12*** (0.97)
Reunified	3.07*** (0.95)	3.76*** (0.84)
Other Permanency	1.50 (0.65)	2.87*** (0.82)
Observations	8,614	8,687
<i>Significant Differences</i>	— <sup>^</sup>	—
<b>Western Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	3.26** (1.22)	1.82* (0.48)
Substantiated CPS	4.70*** (1.89)	2.35** (0.67)
Aged Out	3.08* (1.59)	3.93*** (1.27)
Reunified	4.07*** (1.32)	2.68*** (0.64)
Other Permanency	3.99** (1.80)	2.10* (0.69)
Observations	7,275	7,275
<i>Significant Differences</i>		— <sup>^</sup>

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>+</sup>Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>-</sup>Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>^</sup>Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>#</sup>Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Appendix Table A10: Incarceration, Simple Comparisons**

	State Prison-Female	State Prison-Male
<b>Northeast Region</b>		
SNAP	0.10	2.09
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.42	3.62
Substantiated CPS	0.61	5.45
Aged Out	1.92	7.44
Adopted	0.00	9.09
Reunified	1.86	22.51
Other Permanency	2.56	17.78
Detained	33.33	42.11
AWOL or Unknown	6.25	39.13
<i>Significant Differences</i>		bde
<b>Northern Region</b>		
SNAP	0.06	0.88
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.38	2.50
Substantiated CPS	0.26	2.91
Aged Out	0.00	14.86
Adopted	0.00	0.00
Reunified	3.15	11.83
Other Permanency	0.00	7.69
Detained	0.00	46.15
AWOL or Unknown	5.88	33.33
<i>Significant Differences</i>	b	+a
<b>Southeast Region</b>		
SNAP	0.22	6.45
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.77	12.84
Substantiated CPS	0.97	10.74
Aged Out	1.60	19.35
Adopted	0.00	7.32
Reunified	1.66	24.74
Other Permanency	1.89	11.18
Detained	27.78	66.10
AWOL or Unknown	7.63	33.33
<i>Significant Differences</i>		+ade
<b>Southern Region</b>		
SNAP	0.14	1.85
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.05	2.99
Substantiated CPS	0.41	0.49
Aged Out	1.12	7.84
Adopted	0.00	0.00
Reunified	1.57	13.19
Other Permanency	0.00	12.82
Detained	12.50	58.00
AWOL or Unknown	4.76	36.59
<i>Significant Differences</i>		#ade

(table continues)

Appendix Table A10, continued

	State Prison-Female	State Prison-Male
<b>Western Region</b>		
SNAP	0.06	0.98
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.43	2.57
Substantiated CPS	0.26	0.70
Aged Out	0.00	7.45
Adopted	0.00	5.88
Reunified	2.24	14.63
Other Permanency	2.04	4.26
Detained	50.00	71.43
AWOL or Unknown	0.00	31.25
<i>Significant Differences</i>	<sup>b</sup>	<sup>d</sup>

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>+</sup>Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>-</sup>Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>^</sup>Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>#</sup>Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Appendix Table A11: Incarceration, Regression Results by Region**

	State Prison-Female Logit	State Prison-Male Logit
<b>Northeast Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	22.67*** (20.29)	1.90* (0.51)
Substantiated CPS	32.24*** (31.59)	3.13** (1.13)
Aged Out	72.23*** (75.69)	2.43* (0.96)
Reunified	49.85*** (37.65)	9.39*** (1.80)
Other Permanency	153.05*** (149.77)	12.72*** (3.72)
Observations	7,408	9,548
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-	bc
<b>Northern Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	2.79 (4.07)	2.36* (1.03)
Substantiated CPS	1.78 (3.08)	2.80 (1.64)
Aged Out	1.00 (.)	12.40*** (5.68)
Reunified	38.43** (46.36)	9.29*** (2.93)
Other Permanency	43.13* (71.84)	17.92*** (7.96)
Observations	3,122	4,982
<i>Significant Differences</i>	b	-^
<b>Southeast Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.94 (1.00)	3.24*** (0.53)
Substantiated CPS	1.07 (1.16)	3.03*** (0.64)
Aged Out	1.47 (1.63)	3.92*** (0.77)
Reunified	1.89 (2.01)	6.95*** (0.98)
Other Permanency	6.37 (6.65)	6.28*** (1.13)
Observations	24,865	26,119
<i>Significant Differences</i>	c	-c

(table continues)

Appendix Table A11, continued

	State Prison-Female Logit	State Prison-Male Logit
<b>Southern Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.12 (0.17)	1.60 (0.48)
Substantiated CPS	0.80 (1.01)	0.25 (0.26)
Aged Out	2.15 (2.99)	4.09** (1.80)
Reunified	2.83 (2.84)	6.52*** (1.38)
Other Permanency	6.68 (6.71)	18.99*** (4.91)
Observations	4,708	8,725
<i>Significant Differences</i>		-c
<b>Western Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	1.44 (2.03)	3.81*** (1.38)
Substantiated CPS	0.86 (1.45)	1.02 (1.07)
Aged Out	1.00 (.)	7.43*** (3.57)
Reunified	8.12 (10.28)	15.94*** (3.99)
Other Permanency	9.50 (14.09)	17.95*** (6.59)
Observations	2,894	7,255
<i>Significant Differences</i>		-

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

-Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

#Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other exit at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Appendix Table A12: Educational Progress, Simple Comparisons**

	Education	
	High School Completion (%)	College Enrollment (%)
<b>Northeast Region</b>		
SNAP	87.42	41.48
Unsubstantiated CPS	80.15	27.13
Substantiated CPS	82.41	26.94
Aged Out	75.76	23.15
Adopted	94.29	36.11
Reunified	54.70	14.02
Other Permanency	66.67	13.75
Detained	25.00	9.09
AWOL or Unknown	21.88	2.56
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-abde	-be
<b>Northern Region</b>		
SNAP	91.91	53.87
Unsubstantiated CPS	85.28	40.65
Substantiated CPS	82.41	40.08
Aged Out	78.01	34.01
Adopted	80.00	45.45
Reunified	63.54	24.72
Other Permanency	72.00	29.63
Detained	35.71	6.67
AWOL or Unknown	41.94	16.13
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-bde	-de
<b>Southeast Region</b>		
SNAP	79.00	38.31
Unsubstantiated CPS	66.31	26.67
Substantiated CPS	68.94	27.97
Aged Out	59.42	20.76
Adopted	81.63	26.67
Reunified	53.04	15.33
Other Permanency	68.50	23.57
Detained	22.73	4.05
AWOL or Unknown	21.76	5.58
<i>Significant Differences</i>	+ade	+bde
<b>Southern Region</b>		
SNAP	89.08	50.69
Unsubstantiated CPS	84.65	41.22
Substantiated CPS	83.86	40.27
Aged Out	77.01	30.65
Adopted	87.50	46.15
Reunified	56.85	20.15
Other Permanency	70.31	26.03
Detained	16.33	1.72
AWOL or Unknown	20.90	7.59
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-bde	-^bde

(table continues)



Appendix Table A12, continued

	Education	
	High School Completion (%)	College Enrollment (%)
<b>Western Region</b>		
SNAP	91.22	51.15
Unsubstantiated CPS	85.55	37.37
Substantiated CPS	83.87	34.45
Aged Out	76.88	26.32
Adopted	83.33	25.00
Reunified	68.48	23.65
Other Permanency	84.62	44.09
Detained	20.00	0.00
AWOL or Unknown	57.69	19.35
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-d	-^cd

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>+</sup>Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>-</sup>Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>^</sup>Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>#</sup>Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

**Appendix Table A13: Educational Progress, Regression Results by Region**

	Education	
	High School Completion (%)	College Enrollment (%)
	Logit	Logit
<b>Northeast Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.49*** (0.08)	0.47*** (0.09)
Substantiated CPS	0.54*** (0.10)	0.42*** (0.09)
Aged Out	0.56** (0.12)	0.54** (0.12)
Reunified	0.21*** (0.03)	0.29*** (0.05)
Other Permanency	0.23*** (0.05)	0.29*** (0.08)
Observations	16,211	17,515
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-bc	-b
<b>Northern Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.38*** (0.07)	0.49*** (0.10)
Substantiated CPS	0.27*** (0.06)	0.41*** (0.08)
Aged Out	0.29*** (0.07)	0.51** (0.12)
Reunified	0.15*** (0.02)	0.30*** (0.05)
Other Permanency	0.14*** (0.03)	0.30*** (0.08)
Observations	9,263	9,819
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-b	-
<b>Southeast Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.45*** (0.05)	0.35*** (0.05)
Substantiated CPS	0.40*** (0.05)	0.31*** (0.05)
Aged Out	0.40*** (0.06)	0.33*** (0.06)
Reunified	0.26*** (0.03)	0.23*** (0.03)
Other Permanency	0.28*** (0.04)	0.24*** (0.04)
Observations	41,103	46,648
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-bc	-c

(table continues)

Appendix Table A13, continued

	Education	
	High School Completion (%)	College Enrollment (%)
	Logit	Logit
<b>Southern Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.45*** (0.07)	0.41*** (0.07)
Substantiated CPS	0.40*** (0.07)	0.36*** (0.06)
Aged Out	0.38*** (0.08)	0.38*** (0.08)
Reunified	0.16*** (0.02)	0.21*** (0.03)
Other Permanency	0.10*** (0.02)	0.16*** (0.03)
Observations	15,142	16,186
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-c	-c
<b>Western Region</b>		
SNAP (reference group)		
Unsubstantiated CPS	0.37*** (0.07)	0.34*** (0.06)
Substantiated CPS	0.31*** (0.07)	0.27*** (0.05)
Aged Out	0.28*** (0.07)	0.33*** (0.08)
Reunified	0.19*** (0.03)	0.27*** (0.04)
Other Permanency	0.29*** (0.06)	0.43*** (0.09)
Observations	12,813	13,565
<i>Significant Differences</i>	-	-

\*Aged out is significantly different from ALL other groups at  $p < .01$ .

+Aged out is significantly different from non-OHP groups at  $p < .01$ .

-Aged out is significantly different from SNAP at  $p < .01$ .

^Aged out is significantly different from unsubstantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

#Aged out is significantly different from substantiated CPS at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>Aged out is significantly different from adopted at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>b</sup>Aged out is significantly different from reunified at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>c</sup>Aged out is significantly different from other permanency at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>d</sup>Aged out is significantly different from detained at  $p < .01$ .

<sup>e</sup>Aged out is significantly different from AWOL/unknown at  $p < .01$ .

## REFERENCES

- Allen, Reva I., Alex Westerfelt, Irving Piliavin, and Thomas P. McDonald. 1996. *Assessing the Long-Term Effects of Foster Care: A Research Synthesis*. MI: Child Welfare League of America Press. Retrieved January 28, 2015 (<http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED408036>).
- Baer, Judith C., and Colleen Daly Martinez. 2006. "Child Maltreatment and Insecure Attachment: A Meta-analysis." *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology* 24(3):187–97.
- Barth, Richard P., Judy Wildfire, and Rebecca L. Green. 2006. "Placement into Foster Care and the Interplay of Urbanicity, Child Behavior Problems, and Poverty." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 76(3):358–66.
- Bellamy, Jennifer L. 2008. "Behavioral Problems Following Reunification of Children in Long-Term Foster Care." *Children and Youth Services Review* 30(2):216–28.
- Biehal, Nina. 2007. "Reuniting Children with Their Families: Reconsidering the Evidence on Timing, Contact and Outcomes." *The British Journal of Social Work* 37(5):807–23.
- Brook, Jody and Tom McDonald. 2009. "The Impact of Parental Substance Abuse on the Stability of Family Reunifications from Foster Care." *Children and Youth Services Review* 31(2):193–98.
- Child Welfare Information Gateway. 2014. *Home Study Requirements for Prospective Foster Parents*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Child Welfare Information Gateway. 2015. *Kinship Guardianship as a Permanency Option*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Child Welfare Information Gateway. 2016. *Home Study Requirements for Prospective Parents in Domestic Adoption*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Collins, Mary Elizabeth, Ruth Paris, and Rolanda L. Ward. 2008. "The Permanence of Family Ties: Implications for Youth Transitioning from Foster Care." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 78(1):54–62.
- Connell, Christian M., et al. 2009. "Maltreatment Following Reunification: Predictors of Subsequent Child Protective Services Contact after Children Return Home." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 33(4):218–28.
- Coulton, Claudia J., Jill E. Korbin, and Marilyn Su. 1999. "Neighborhoods and Child Maltreatment: A Multi-Level Study." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 23(11):1019–40.
- Courtney, Mark E. et al. 2011. *Midwest Evaluation of Adult Functioning of Former Foster Youth: Outcomes at Age 26*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall, University of Chicago.

- Dolan, Melissa, Keith Smith, Cecilia Casanueva, and Heather Ringeisen. 2011. *NSCAW II Baseline Report: Introduction to NSCAW II Final Report, OPRE Report 2011-27a*. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Dozier, Mary and Oliver Lindhiem. 2006. "This Is My Child: Differences among Foster Parents in Commitment to Their Young Children." *Child Maltreatment* 11(4):338–45.
- Drake, Brett and Shanta Pandey. 1996. "Understanding the Relationship between Neighborhood Poverty and Specific Types of Child Maltreatment." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 20(11):1003–18.
- English, Diana J., Richard Thompson, and Catherine Roller White. 2015. "Predicting Risk of Entry into Foster Care from Early Childhood Experiences: A Survival Analysis Using LONGSCAN Data." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 45:57–67.
- Felson, Richard B. and Kelsea Jo Lane. 2009. "Social Learning, Sexual and Physical Abuse, and Adult Crime." *Aggressive Behavior* 35(6):489–501.
- Folman, Rosalind D. 1998. "‘I Was Taken’ How Children Experience Removal from Their Parents Preliminary to Placement into Foster Care." *Adoption Quarterly* 2(2):7–35.
- Furstenberg, Frank Jr. 2010. "On a New Schedule: Transitions to Adulthood and Family Change." *Future of Children* 20(1):67–87.
- Goldsmith, Douglas F., David Oppenheim, and Janine Wanlass. 2004. "Separation and Reunification: Using Attachment Theory and Research to Inform Decisions Affecting the Placements of Children in Foster Care." *Juvenile & Family Court Journal* 55:1.
- Heckman, James J. 2008. "Schools, Skills, and Synapses." *Economic Inquiry* 46(3):289–324.
- Hildyard, Kathryn L. and David A. Wolfe. 2002. "Child Neglect: Developmental Issues and Outcomes." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 26(6–7):679–95.
- Holt, Stephanie, Helen Buckley, and Sadhbh Whelan. 2008. "The Impact of Exposure to Domestic Violence on Children and Young People: A Review of the Literature." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 32(8):797–810.
- Killewald, Alexandra, Fabian T. Pfeffer, and Jared N. Schachner. 2017. "Wealth Inequality and Accumulation." *Annual Review of Sociology* (0). Retrieved (<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053331>).
- Kreider, Rose M. and Daphne A. Lofquist. 2014. *Adopted Children and Stepchildren: 2010 Population Characteristics*. U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Lindsey, Duncan. 1991. "Factors Affecting the Foster Care Placement Decision: An Analysis of National Survey Data." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 61(2):272–81.

- Lloyd, E.Christopher and Richard P. Barth. 2011. "Developmental Outcomes after Five Years for Foster Children Returned Home, Remaining in Care, or Adopted." *Children and Youth Services Review* 33(8):1383–91.
- McLanahan, Sara and Christine Percheski. 2008. "Family Structure and the Reproduction of Inequalities." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:257–276.
- Monaghan, David. 2017. "Does College Enrollment and Bachelor's Completion by Mothers Impact Children's Educational Outcomes?" *Sociology of Education* 90(1):3–24.
- Pecora, Peter J. et al. 2006. "Educational and Employment Outcomes of Adults Formerly Placed in Foster Care: Results from the Northwest Foster Care Alumni Study." *Children and Youth Services Review* 28(12):1459–81.
- Pilowsky, Daniel J. and Li-Tzy Wu. 2006. "Psychiatric Symptoms and Substance Use Disorders in a Nationally Representative Sample of American Adolescents Involved with Foster Care." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 38(4):351–58.
- Plug, Erik and Wim Vijverberg. 2005. "Does Family Income Matter for Schooling Outcomes? Using Adoptees as a Natural Experiment." *The Economic Journal* 115(506):879–906.
- Roberts, Dorothy E. 2012. "Prison, Foster Care, and the Systemic Punishment of Black Mothers." Retrieved April 12, 2017 ([https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2184329](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2184329)).
- Sacerdote, Bruce. 2000. *The Nature and Nurture of Economic Outcomes*. National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved April 13, 2017 (<http://www.nber.org/papers/w7949>).
- Sacerdote, Bruce. 2007. "How Large Are the Effects from Changes in Family Environment? A Study of Korean American Adoptees." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122(1):119–157.
- Sandefur, Gary D., Ann M. Meier, and Mary E. Campbell. 2006. "Family Resources, Social Capital, and College Attendance." *Social Science Research* 35(2):525–553.
- Schofield, Gillian and Mary Beek. 2005. "Providing a Secure Base: Parenting Children in Long-Term Foster Family Care." *Attachment & Human Development* 7(1):3–26.
- Sedlak, Andrea J. et al. 2010. "Fourth National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect (NIS-4)." *Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services*. Retrieved on July 9:2010.
- Sharkey, Patrick. 2008. "The Intergenerational Transmission of Context." *American Journal of Sociology* 113(4):931–969.
- Snowden, Jessica, Scott Leon, and Jeffrey Sieracki. 2008. "Predictors of Children in Foster Care Being Adopted: A Classification Tree Analysis." *Children and Youth Services Review* 30(11):1318–1327.

- Steele, Julie S. and Karen F. Buchi. 2008. "Medical and Mental Health of Children Entering the Utah Foster Care System." *Pediatrics* 122(3):e703–9.
- Taussig, Heather N., Robert B. Clyman, and John Landsverk. 2001. "Children Who Return Home From Foster Care: A 6-Year Prospective Study of Behavioral Health Outcomes in Adolescence." *Pediatrics* 108(1):e10–e10.
- Trout, Alexandra L., Jessica Hagaman, Kathryn Casey, Robert Reid, and Michael H. Epstein. 2008. "The Academic Status of Children and Youth in out-of-Home Care: A Review of the Literature." *Children and Youth Services Review* 30(9):979–94.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2016. *The AFCARS Report: Preliminary FY 2015 Estimates as of June 2016*. Washington, DC: Author, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau.
- Whiting, Jason B. and Robert E. Lee. 2003. "Voices from the System: A Qualitative Study of Foster Children's Stories." *Family Relations* 52(3):288–295.
- Widom, Cathy Spatz, Sally J. Czaja, and Kimberly A. DuMont. 2015. "Intergenerational Transmission of Child Abuse and Neglect: Real or Detection Bias?" *Science* 347(6229):1480–85.
- Wildeman, Christopher, and Natalia Emanuel. 2014. "Cumulative risks of foster care placement by age 18 for U.S. children, 2000–2011." *PLoS ONE* 9 (3): e92785.
- Wulczyn, Fred. 2004. "Family Reunification." *The Future of Children* 14(1):95–113.
- Zuravin, Susan J. and Diane DePanfilis. 1997. "Factors Affecting Foster Care Placement of Children Receiving Child Protective Services." *Social Work Research* 21(1):34–42.