



### SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE A TO BRIEF No. 66

Housing (In)Stability in Child Welfare

#### Characteristics of Child Welfare-involved Families

	All families (n=25,595)	Received intensive housing stability intervention (n=5,461)	Received intensive child welfare intervention (n=5,619)	Received both intensive housing stability and child welfare intervention (n=2,114)
Age of Family Members				
Family has a caregiver under age 18	2.3%	4.1%	3.6%	5.8%
Family has a child under the age of 1	18.5%	24.3%	25.3%	29.1%
Family has a child aged 5 or younger	54.8%	65.1%	64.0%	69.8%
Family has a child aged 12 or younger	82.1%	87.3%	87.6%	89.7%
Gender				
Family has a caregiver who identifies as female	90.5%	93.5%	92.1%	93.9%
Family has a caregiver who identifies as male	72.0%	75.4%	82.5%	85.7%
Race/Ethnicity				
One or more caregivers identify as White	54.5%	47.0%	61.2%	56.7%
One or more caregivers identify as Black	44.8%	69.1%	52.1%	65.6%
One or more caregivers identify as Asian	8.6%	3.8%	6.4%	4.7%
One or more caregivers identify as American Indian	11.1%	21.9%	21.9%	31.2%
One or more caregivers identify as Pacific Islander	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	1.0%
One or more caregivers identify as Hispanic	15.0%	14.7%	18.0%	18.9%
Disability Status				
One or more family members have a high-level disability	47.8%	71.2%	74.0%	87.3%
Type of Disability				
Chemical dependency (drugs or alcohol)	21.7%	43.2%	46.1%	62.9%
Child emotional disturbance	17.5%	26.9%	29.4%	36.5%
Adult mental illness	16.6%	32.9%	31.6%	44.9%
Developmental disability	7.7%	11.3%	11.6%	14.2%
Hearing, speech, or vision impairment	3.5%	5.3%	6.0%	7.5%
Learning disability	3.5%	6.9%	6.7%	10.0%
Physical disability	3.0%	5.1%	5.6%	7.7%
Other condition	15.9%	24.9%	26.1%	33.3%





## SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE B TO BRIEF No. 66

Housing (In)Stability in Child Welfare

### Child Welfare Service Interventions by Race/Ethnicity

One or more caregivers identify as...

	All families	<b>White</b> (n=13,942)	<b>Black</b> (n=11,469)	<b>Asian</b> (n=2,211)	American Indian (n=2,853)	Pacific Islander (n=130)	<b>Hispanic</b> (n=3,835)
Type of Child Welfare Involvement	All fullilles	(11 13,542)	(11 11,403)	(11 2,211)	(11 2,033)	(11 130)	(11 3,033)
PSOP only	19.0%	12.8%	15.6%	26.2%	8.1%	10.8%	12.0%
CP assessment/ investigation only	55.9%	59.4%	54.6%	53.3%	46.8%	58.5%	57.9%
CP assessment/ investigation and CP case management only	18.0%	20.4%	20.8%	14.0%	34.8%	23.8%	22.4%
PSOP + CP assessment/ investigation	5.3%	5.1%	6.6%	5.2%	5.9%	5.4%	5.3%
PSOP + CP assessment/ investigation and CP case management	1.9%	2.3%	2.3%	1.2%	4.3%	1.5%	2.3%
Any PSOP Involvement	26.1%	20.2%	24.5%	32.7%	18.4%	17.7%	19.7%
Any CP Case Management	19.9%	22.7%	23.1%	15.2%	39.1%	25.4%	24.7%
Out-of-home Care	11.1%	12.7%	13.4%	7.7%	26.2%	13.1%	13.2%





# SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE C TO BRIEF No. 66 Housing (In)Stability in Child Welfare

### Family Housing Stability by Race/Ethnicity

One or more caregivers identify as...

	All families	<b>White</b> (n=13,942)	<b>Black</b> (n=11,469)	<b>Asian</b> (n=2,211)	American Indian (n=2,853)	Pacific Islander (n=130)	<b>Hispanic</b> (n=3,835)
Housing Stability Prior to Child W	elfare Involveme		· · ·			· , , ,	· · ·
Homeless	29.6%	26.9%	41.4%	18.4%	48.4%	32.3%	26.9%
Unstably housed	10.2%	10.8%	10.9%	8.2%	12.0%	11.5%	11.4%
Permanent housing (with or without services)	5.6%	4.6%	9.0%	1.4%	11.4%	6.2%	5.3%
Stably housing, economic support only	23.1%	19.9%	25.4%	36.7%	16.3%	21.5%	17.9%
Stably housed, no economic or housing support	31.6%	37.9%	13.4%	35.4%	11.8%	28.5%	38.4%
Stably housed, with or without economic support	54.7%	57.7%	38.7%	72.1%	28.1%	50.0%	56.3%
<b>Housing Stability During Child We</b>	elfare Involveme	nt					
Homeless	25.2%	24.6%	33.4%	16.5%	45.9%	31.5%	25.9%
Unstably housed	13.4%	13.9%	14.6%	13.8%	12.4%	11.5%	16.1%
Permanent housing (with or without services)	5.0%	4.2%	8.0%	1.9%	10.9%	5.4%	4.9%
Stably housing, economic support only	17.3%	13.2%	21.6%	23.9%	13.3%	12.3%	11.7%
Stably housed, no economic or housing support	39.1%	44.1%	22.3%	44.0%	17.6%	39.2%	41.4%
Stably housed, with or without economic support	56.4%	57.3%	43.9%	67.8%	30.8%	51.5%	53.1%
Housing Stability After Child Welf	are Involvement						
Homeless	27.9%	27.1%	37.5%	18.2%	47.5%	35.4%	28.0%
Unstably housed	5.8%	6.5%	6.0%	4.5%	6.8%	6.2%	6.8%
Permanent housing (with or without services)	5.9%	4.8%	9.3%	2.7%	11.8%	6.9%	5.6%
Stably housing, economic support only	22.9%	18.5%	27.1%	31.8%	16.9%	15.4%	16.6%
Stably housed, no economic or housing support	37.6%	43.0%	20.0%	42.8%	16.9%	36.2%	43.0%
Stably housed, with or without economic support	60.5%	61.2%	47.1%	74.7%	33.8%	51.5%	59.6%

The Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare (CASCW) is a resource for child welfare professionals, students, faculty, policy-makers, and other key stakeholders concerned about child welfare in Minnesota. Minn-LInK is a unique collaborative, university-based research environment with the express purpose of studying child and family well being in Minnesota using state administrative data from multiple agencies.






### SUPPLEMENTAL FIGURE A TO BRIEF No. 66

Housing (In)Stability in Child Welfare

### Housing Stability Pathways



The Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare (CASCW) is a resource for child welfare professionals, students, faculty, policy-makers, and other key stakeholders concerned about child welfare in Minnesota. Minn-LInK is a unique collaborative, university-based research environment with the express purpose of studying child and family well being in Minnesota using state administrative data from multiple agencies.