

Improving CASA Advocacy for Native American Children In California

By: The California CASA Association Author: Christine Williams J.D.



CASA

Court Appointed Special Advocates
FOR CALIFORNIA CHILDREN

California CASA Association wishes to thank CalEMA, the Stuart Foundation, the Zellerbach Family Foundation, the San Francisco Foundation, and the Van Löben Sels/Rembe Rock Foundation for their ongoing support.

This project/publication was supported by funding awarded by the Children's Justice Act, grant no. YD08031805 through the California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA).

The opinions, findings, and conclusions in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of CalEMA. CalEMA reserves a royaltyfree, nonexclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish, and use these materials and to authorize others to do so.

© 2010 California CASA Association. All rights reserved

CONTENTS

- Executive Summary** 1
- Background** 2
 - The Need 2
- The Tribal County CASA Collaboration Project: A Summary**..... 4
 - Respecting Tribal Sovereignty..... 4
 - Making a Plan, Revising a Plan – One Plan Does Not Fit All 5
 - Implementation: The Tricky Part 6
- Solution** 7
 - Strategic Planning for Collaboration: Establishing Relationships and Raising Awareness 7
 - Statewide Level Recommendations 8
 - County/Tribal Level Solutions 8
 - Advocacy Improvement 9
 - Statewide Level Recommendations 10
 - County/Tribal Level Solutions 10
 - Sustainability and Fund Development 11
 - Statewide Level Recommendations 11
 - County/Tribal Level Solutions 11
- Conclusion** 12
- References** 13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper provides practical ways for CASA programs to improve their advocacy specifically to Native American Children in foster care and provides recommendations for improving advocacy to all populations of children who are over-represented or under-served in the child welfare system. The California CASA Association, a non-profit organization dedicated to giving abused and neglected children both a voice and the services they need for a stable future, developed the recommendations in this paper as an outcome of their Tribal County CASA Collaboration Project.

The California CASA Association (CalCASA) has worked in the far Northern region of California to develop an understanding of how the CASA model can serve Native Children. In 2007, CalCASA launched the Tribal/CASA Collaboration Project in a response to the current policies toward Native American children in the foster care/juvenile dependency system.

Unfortunately, for organizations serving children and youth, the most common policy is either to ignore the Native American population all together or group the Native American community in with other minority groups (ethnic minorities e.g. African American and/or social minorities e.g. LGBTQ). However, as more tribes in California develop tribal courts and tribal justice systems that serve Native American children and families we must consider the implications of such a limited policy of serving the Native community. It is our belief that programs must adopt a different approach if we ever hope to improve outcomes for Native American children and families involved in child welfare.

In California, the Native Population is small in numbers. There are fewer Native American children in out-of-home care than any other ethnic group (for whom data is collected). It is important to note, however, that Native American children are the second most overrepresented group of children in the child welfare system in California, and nationwide. African American children and Native American children are the two populations that are overrepresented in the child welfare system in California. Still, to many, the Native American community remains unnoticed, and has been referred to as the “invisible minority” in terms of the focus of most child welfare programs and funding. This problem of invisibility prevents organizations like CalCASA from providing effective services to the Native American community.

Based on CalCASA’s work in Northern California, we are recommending changes at the statewide CASA level and the Local CASA program level. The recommendations for statewide change include: targeted funding for Tribal CASA programs, increased collaboration with Tribes and Tribal programs, and providing improved training and recruiting tools for local CASA programs. The recommendations for Local CASA program change include: increased collaboration and communication with tribes and tribal community, collaborative, responsive training and recruiting, and coordinated fundraising campaigns.

BACKGROUND

The Need

Each year the Federal Government¹ identifies key indicators characterizing an aspect of well-being or influence on well-being in children's lives in its "America's Children" report.² This report is one of the most comprehensive statistical reports produced about children's well being in the U.S. Unfortunately for most areas of the report there is no information given for Native American children. The majority of the statistics highlight trends among, "white", "black", and "Hispanic" children. This is not the only report that overlooks the Native American population. Many government agencies frequently overlook the Native American community which explains the sentiment behind the label sometimes given to this community, the "invisible minority."³

Consider how much you know about the Native American community in your county. Are there any tribes in your county? Do they have a court or justice system that serves their children or do they rely on the California courts? How many Native American people live in your county, your city, attend your neighborhood school? Are Native American children over-represented in the child welfare system in your county? Does your county have a CASA program to serve these children? How many CASA volunteers in your county are Native American? Are there any Native Americans on the CASA program's board or staff?

The low numbers of Native Americans in the overall U.S. population might be the reason why data on the Native American community is often unavailable. Some researchers might consider the numbers too small to prove statistically significant. However, excluding Native Americans from studies and reports does not allow human services organizations to target services to those children in need. As racial and ethnic diversity continues to grow in the U.S. so does the Nation's attention to inclusiveness.

Although the data do not always include Native Americans, some does. Here are some statistics relating to the Native American Community in the U.S. as reported in some of the areas identified by the 2009 "America's Children" report as indicators of well-being:

- **Family and Social Environment**

The majority of all families in the U.S. including Native American families are headed by married couples.⁴

- **Economic Circumstances**

Native Americans have the highest rate of poverty in the U.S. with 25.3% of the total Native American community living below the Federal poverty guideline.⁵ Compare this to the overall US poverty rate of 13.1%.⁶

- **Health Care**

72% percent of Native Americans do not have private health insurance through an employer.⁷ Native Americans make fewer visits to physicians' offices (excluding emergency room visits) than any other racial or ethnic group.⁸

- **Physical Environment and Safety**

Approximately 90,000 Indian families are homeless or under-housed.⁹ Additionally, nearly 16% of Native American homes are without telephones, compared to only 6% of non-Native households.¹⁰

- **Behavior**

Native American students are more likely than students in any other community to use Marijuana at a rate of 16% compared to 9% or lower for all other students.¹¹ Native American high school students are more likely than any other group of students to: be threatened or injured with a weapon, engage in a physical fight, or carry a weapon to school.¹²

- **Education**

Native Americans have a 15% drop out rate, about the same as the African American community, higher than the white and Asian community and lower than the Hispanic community with a dropout rate of 24%.¹³ However, Native American students are the least likely to complete the core academic track compared to all other students.¹⁴

- **Health Issues**

Native Americans have a lower life expectancy by almost 6 years and approximately 13 percent of Native American deaths occur among those under the age of 25, a rate three times more than that of the total U.S. population. Native American youth are more than twice as likely as youth overall to commit suicide.¹⁵

Also, while the “America’s Children” report did not focus on the indicators of “Safety” and “Justice”, they are nonetheless major influences on Native American children and families.

- **Safety**

Native Americans are the victims of crime at more than twice the rate of the overall population.¹⁶ Native American women are victimized at a rate 50% higher than the next highest group, African American males.¹⁷ Native Americans are more likely than any other community to be victimized by someone outside of their racial group.¹⁸

- **Criminal Justice**

Native Americans are also overrepresented in jails and prisons.¹⁹ The number of Native American youth in the federal prison system has increased 50% since 1994.²⁰

These statistics demonstrate the crisis that Native American children and families are facing. Often, good policy calls us to focus the majority of our resources to the communities in need with the largest numbers. However, this approach will almost always exclude the Native American community.

THE TRIBAL COUNTY CASA COLLABORATION PROJECT: A Summary

In 2007, California CASA Association launched a three year project designed to improved advocacy to Native American children in care in California; The Tribal/CASA Collaboration Project. The goal of this project was to create and implement sustainable plans for “Local” CASA programs serving children in California courts to collaborate with emerging “Tribal” CASA programs serving children in tribal courts within the same county borders. Initially the goal was narrow, to ensure that both local and tribal programs had a plan for collaboration that addressed overlapping resources such as funding and volunteer recruiting and training. Along the way, what the project produced was much more.

Building Relationships - Respecting Tribal Sovereignty

Year one was a learning year for CalCASA. It quickly became obvious that while in some ways Tribal CASA programs are no different from Local CASA Programs, in other ways they are. The funding, standards and governance, and management can all be very different for Local CASA programs versus Tribal CASA programs. This creates a need for new approaches to working with Tribal CASA Programs.

One difference between Tribal and Local CASA Programs is the lack of an inherent relationship with CalCASA or the California Administrative Office of the Courts (“AOC”). Pursuant to California law, Local CASA Programs receive funding from the AOC each year. The AOC also contracts with CalCASA to assist in the assessment, regulation, and provision of technical support to Local programs serving California Superior courts. CalCASA and the AOC also conduct joint site visits by traveling to Local CASA programs where they work to ensure compliance with National and State CASA program standards. Thus, there is an automatic relationship between all Local CASA programs, CalCASA, and the AOC.

Tribal CASA programs, however, do not receive this annual funding from the AOC. Currently, California law limits the ability of the AOC to fund more than one CASA program per county.²¹ Therefore, if a Tribal CASA program is developed in a county where another CASA program exists, it is per se ineligible for the usual CASA grant. This builds in an automatic barrier to having the usual relationship between Tribal CASA programs and either CalCASA or the AOC. Thus one needed to be built.

Initially there were four Tribal CASA programs identified to work with CalCASA on this project along with four corresponding Local CASA programs. In the first year one Tribal CASA program decided not to continue to develop their program and one Local CASA program decided not to continue to participate in the project. This left six participating programs: Tribal Court Programs: Hoopa Valley Tribal Court CASA, Karuk Tribal CASA, and Yurok Tribe CASA; Local: CASA for Del Norte, CASA for Riverside County and CASA of Siskiyou County.

The first lesson was that understanding tribal governments and courts in California and even the broader history of tribes and Native American people in California *is essential* to working with Tribal Court CASA programs and the Native Community.

Everyone agrees that the “rescuer” approach doesn’t work for advocating for children, and it likewise doesn’t work for building relationships with Tribes. The very long standing traumatic history between the Native American community in California and government and non-Indian agencies requires a different approach. An organization like CalCASA would need to take a different approach than it would in providing technical assistance to a new or existing Local CASA program. The implied hierarchy that exists between the statewide CASA agency and Local CASA programs in California does not exist with Tribal Court CASA programs. A new dynamic was needed, a partnership, where both sides could help each other grow into better programs. It took a year to get this partnership off the ground. The lesson was clear: building lasting relationships cannot be rushed, forced or dictated, but rather fostered and encouraged through demonstrations of respect.

Making a Plan, Revising a Plan – One Plan Does Not Fit All

Year two was a planning year for the Tribal/CASA Collaboration Project. With no pre-existing models that fit the program needs in California, the six participating programs were starting from scratch. The plans were laid out and revisions were needed as practical realities arose. This process of collaborative planning was an opportunity for learning that CalCASA realized. By staying in communication with each program via in person meetings, e-mails and telephone calls, the plans evolved over time along with CalCASA’s understanding of the bigger picture; better advocacy for Native American Children in care in California.

The plan in the North was to collaborate, and have the Hoopa Valley Tribal Court CASA, Karuk Tribal CASA, Yurok Tribe CASA and the Smith River Tribal Court join together to create one Northern California Intertribal CASA Program. This one CASA program would be able to serve in each of the respective tribal courts and the children under their jurisdiction.

One assumption that must be quickly debunked is the notion that the term “Native American” (as it is often used) represents a homogenous category. Perhaps even more than other ethnic groups, each Native American Tribe enjoys a great deal of diversity from other tribes. Local CASA programs, CalCASA, and others hoping to help Indian children would benefit from recognizing this fact. And as much diversity as there is between the Hoopa Valley Tribal Court, the Karuk Tribal Court, the Yurok Tribal Court and the Smith River Tribal Court, all of which are located in Northern California that belong to an Intertribal Court coalition, there is even more diversity between these three tribal courts and the Native American population in Riverside County. As we discovered, an intertribal CASA program model did not work for Southern California.

Riverside County is home to 10 federally recognized tribes. While some of the Tribes have tribal courts, none has a CASA program (as of the time of this writing). Still the need to improve CASA advocacy to Native children in Riverside County was evident to the CASA for Riverside County Program and CalCASA. A very different model had to be created. No other program had a tangible plan for working with or serving the local Native Community and the Northern plans that were developing were addressing very different needs so new paths to relationships again had to be built.

The plan for Riverside was to use the existing Local CASA program to serve Native American children. Instead of creating a Tribal Program, Riverside went onto develop training, recruitment, and marketing strategies to increase its ability to serve Native children in the community.

In year two, the planning year everyone participating in the project learned that this could work; that collaboration was not only possible but that it does produce the best outcomes for children.

Implementation: The Tricky Part

By year three the plans created in year two of the Tribal County CASA Collaboration Project were already being implemented (and revised). At some times the work that was being done was so organic and moved so fast that the actual planning lagged behind. Other times it seemed like one obstacle after another came up and that we were making no progress in implementing the plans and reaching the program goals.

The tribal court based CASA programs had revised their entire model to be a non-profit intertribal CASA program serving four tribal courts rather than separate CASA programs each operating under the specific tribe's government. The new program became the Northern California Intertribal CASA program and continued to participate in the Tribal/CASA Collaboration Project building on the work that had been done with each program individually.

In Riverside the lesson came in discovering the benefits of utilizing a "cultural broker" as a way to begin gaining trust in the community. What CalCASA discovered was that the Local CASA program, under a previous administration, had badly damaged the CASA reputation with the local native community. Therefore, the existing conceptions in the Native community about what CASA is, what CASA does, the role of a CASA volunteer were negative, and not inline with what CASA is supposed to be. Because of this, reaching out to the entire community at once was not effective. Instead, building one-on-one relationships with key partners in the local Native American community proved to be the key. This one-on-one relationship building resulted in access to larger and larger networks of resources. Flexibility and building new expectations, rather than building on what we knew about each other, became the foundation for collaboration.

The fruit, after three years of perseverance by everyone involved, was the development of practical models and tools that we feel can improve not only the approach to advocating for Native American Children but the actual advocacy.

SOLUTION

Arguably the largest problem that Native American children and families face is this “invisibility” mentioned earlier. If no one is aware of, or reporting on, outcomes for Native American children and families then we must first address the challenge highlighting the need and focusing efforts on including the Native American community in our program planning and policy. It is not enough to simply say that we will improve our program’s “diversity” or have a plan for “inclusiveness” if we do not specifically and strategically plan to serve Native American children in a culturally appropriate way – that is also responsive to the needs of that individual tribal community. This requires collaboration with the Native American Community locally and statewide in a way that honors tribal sovereignty and the urban population of Native Americans in California.

The recommendations below are broken into three main categories;

1. Strategic Planning for Collaboration;
2. Advocacy Improvement; and
3. Sustainability and Fund Development.

1) Strategic Planning for Collaboration: Establishing Relationships and Raising Awareness

Based on experience gained from the Tribal/CASA Collaboration Project, there is a *cycle* of “invisibility.” The notion that the Native Community is invisible to child welfare also goes the other way. We found that CASA programs are also “invisible” to the Native American community. Generally speaking, the Native American community is unaware of what CASA is, and what CASA does for children and families. For a number of reasons, the true mission and benefits of community advocacy for children in the child welfare system has not been either heard or accepted in the Native American community.

One reason might be Local CASA programs association with the county. CASA of _____ County sounds like a county-run program. Thus, where there is history of resentment or fear of federal state and local government, a county-based program is likely to be glossed over. CASA programs can do a better job of marketing their non-profit, independent, grassroots origins to the Native community.

Overall, however, we have learned that culturally appropriate service starts with relationships. Because Indian country in California is so diverse, the approaches to developing the relationships needed to improve service to Native children, must to be equally diverse. Fortunately the Tribal/CASA Collaboration Project allowed us to create two very different models for collaboration based on the very different composition of the Native communities the participating programs were serving. Additionally we were able to observe other models across the nation via National CASA Association tribal program meetings. These models will become increasingly relevant as more tribes in California develop tribal courts.

So what can be done to reverse this cycle of invisibility? An ideological commitment to improving outcomes for Native American children or “all” children, is not going to produce a change in actual service. We think it better to have targeted strategic planning for collaboration with tribes to build relationships and raise awareness. Actual goals, with measurable outcomes must be incorporated into every program plan.

Statewide Level Recommendations

- **Participate in the Native American Child Welfare Community in California and Nationally**

In order to build relationships, statewide agencies should participate in stakeholder meetings, trainings and conferences including; the statewide ICWA workgroup, the National CASA Tribal Program calls and meetings; National Indian Child Welfare Association Events; and Tribal Court Meetings and Conferences. All of these events provide an opportunity for statewide agencies to learn about the needs of the Native Community and for Tribes and representatives in the Native American community to learn about the benefits of CASA.

- **Negotiation of Collaboration Agreements**

Negotiated agreements are needed to ensure the best outcomes for Native American Children. These can address issues such as the transfer of cases to and from State court to Tribal court, funding for foster care placements, and priorities of CASA appointment. Without agreements, hearings and funding can be delayed – and ultimately jeopardize the safety and permanency for children. CalCASA may not always have the opportunity to be at the negotiation table for these types of agreements but it can offer support for agreements that promote the best outcomes for Native American children in the child welfare system between tribes and other state agencies. When possible CalCASA should provide technical assistance to local programs interested in securing collaborative agreements with tribes and Tribal CASA programs.

- **Consider the Native Community Specifically in the Strategic Planning Process**

CalCASA should develop and implement a sustainable plan for serving disproportionately represented populations and for providing culturally appropriate service models for all populations including Native Americans. CalCASA should examine the needs of the Native American community as identified and then implement a plan to address those needs or when needed facilitate local programs to address those needs.

County/Tribal Level Solutions

- **Participate in the Local Native American Child Welfare Community**

Many counties have some kind of Indian child welfare group or roundtable that meets to discuss concerns surrounding the local Native American community relating to child welfare. If your county does not have such a group, seek out tribes directly. Find out if the tribes in the area have a child welfare service department or program and then make contact.

It became evident in working with the local/county CASA programs that the Native American community often assumes that CASA programs are the same as or affiliated with local child protective services departments (CPS). Due to the longstanding negative history it is always important for CASA programs to respectfully distinguish themselves from CPS as a separate, non-profit organization.

- **Incorporate the Native Community at the Program Policy Level**

It is critical to incorporate the community you are attempting to serve into the program planning/policy level. Through the Tribal/CASA Collaboration Project two strong examples emerged as effective methods for incorporating Native American Community input into a local program's plans/policies. One way to incorporate input from the Native American Community at the local program policy level is to recruit board members from the Native American community. For example, the founding director for the Northern California Intertribal CASA Program (and former director of the Karuk Tribal CASA program) served as a member of the CASA of Siskiyou County Board. Also, CASA of Del Norte employed a staff member who is a member of a local tribe and who serves on a board for the Tribe's early college program.

Forming a committee specifically for the purpose of advising the program on Native American advocacy for children is another effective way to encourage tribal collaboration. CASA for Riverside County is in the process of forming an advisory committee made up of members from the local community and headed by a member of their board who has been active in the Native American community prior to joining the CASA program board. The model of using an advisory committee to help shape policies at the program level was inspired by CASA for Riverside County's LGBTQ committee. CASA for Riverside County is an example of a program that is using the overall goal of inclusiveness to inform their work with the Native American community without continuing the cycle of invisibility by substituting what works in one community (LGBTQ Community) for what works in another community (Native American Community). They are using the committee as a model rather than having one committee's recommendations drive the policies for all the communities they serve

2) Advocacy Improvement

According to the Center for Families, Children and the Courts California CASA 2007 Report, CASA volunteers continued to be primarily non-Hispanic white, women over 40 years old.²¹ As many as 86% of all CASA volunteers in California are non-Hispanic white.²² Further, the majority of CASA program staff are non-Hispanic white (64%).²³ Meanwhile Native American volunteers comprise only 1 % of the total number of volunteers in California.²⁴ However, it is somewhat promising that the report reflects that Native American children are proportionally represented in CASA programs.²⁵ However the report also reflects that there is only half the number of Native volunteers as there are Native children appointed CASAs.²⁶ With this in mind the primary focus of the programs in the Tribal County CASA Collaboration Project was on recruiting and training volunteers specifically to better serve the Native American Community. It is important to recruit volunteers from the communities we serve and to train all of our volunteers to be able to effectively advocate for children who are not from their own community.

Statewide Level Solutions

- **Curriculum improvement**

Local CASA programs will need training curriculum and tools that are responsive to the Native American Community if they are to provide culturally appropriate service to the Native American children and families they serve. Through the Tribal/CASA Collaboration Project, CalCASA, at the request of the programs involved, has updated their training curriculum piece on the Indian Child Welfare Act. CalCASA will provide this updated training curriculum to CASA programs so that they can use it as part of their new volunteer training and/or as a standalone training for interested advocates.

- **Training & recruiting tools**

In addition to the Native Children Curriculum, CalCASA has recently redesigned their website and specifically included a section intended to house additional information for Local CASA programs to use in recruiting and training volunteers to serve the Native American population.

County/Tribal Level Solutions

- **Recruiting Advocates from the Native Community**

The Local CASA programs all identified recruiting volunteers from the local Native American Community as a priority for improving service to their Native American caseload. The most effective way to go about recruiting volunteers from the Native community is to work with the Native American community to do so. Examples include: CASA for Riverside County conducted phone meetings and in person conversations with local tribal social service departments to help create a plan for recruiting volunteers from the Native American community. In addition, they were invited to have an information booth at a local tribally hosted Indian Child Welfare Act Conference. CASA of Siskiyou County created joint volunteer applications with the nearby Tribal CASA program. T

- **Training Advocates to Serve the Native Community**

Since recruiting advocates from the Native American community is a process and there are Native American children in State court now who need a CASA, it is imperative that all advocates who are appointed to cases involving a Native American child have proper training on how to best advocate for that child. CASA for Riverside County introduced the new CalCASA ICWA piece at a new volunteer training and had a representative from the tribal community provide information about the Indian Child Welfare Act live at the training. CASA of Del Norte worked with local tribes to have tribal members participate in joint trainings with the local tribes wherein volunteers, upon completing the new volunteer training that included a specific portion on ICWA from the tribal perspective were sworn into both jurisdictions as CASA volunteers. What these approaches have in common is that *they involve the Native American community in the training beyond just using a certain curriculum.*

Finally, Both CASA of Siskiyou County and CASA of Del Norte worked with CalCASA and the Northern California Intertribal CASA program to begin the process of drafting an agreement that, once finalized will govern the appointment of CASAs when cases transfer from state court to tribal court and vice versa. The agreement will ideally cover training requirements for volunteers and have both programs agree to make their trainings available to the other programs volunteers whenever possible.

3) Sustainability and Fund Development

Statewide Level Solutions

The Tribal CASA programs have made it very clear that they would like to receive funding for Tribal CASA Programs from the AOC the same way that Local CASA programs do. While this matter is not within the direct control of CalCASA, other sources of state funding should be identified and provided. Local CASA programs who are committed to working with their Tribal CASA program partners. CalCASA will continue to collaborate with the AOC to provide technical assistance to these programs when possible. Further CalCASA will support Tribal CASA programs in securing sustainable funding to serve children in tribal courts.

County/Tribal Level Solutions

- **Fundraising Protocols**

Fundraising in small communities can be difficult, not only due to scarcity of resources but also because of the risk of competing with other non-profit organizations for the same funding. To ensure that the Tribal and local programs respect each other in the fundraising process, CASA of Siskiyou County and the Northern California Intertribal CASA programs developed a protocol to reduce overlap in their fundraising plans. This protocol was a product of the two programs sitting down with a CalCASA representative and discussing what should be included. Protocols like this should be developed whenever possible to engender ongoing collaboration.

- **Calendar of Events**

The Northern California Intertribal CASA program is planning on creating a calendar of events that will have not only fundraising events for the Tribal CASA program but also any Local CASA program that would like to have their events listed. In addition to helping bring attention to each program's events the goal is to decrease/eliminate any conflicts between the programs.

CONCLUSION

CASA programs in California still have work ahead of them in order to serve Native American children in culturally appropriate way. The Tribal/CASA Collaboration Project gave CalCASA models and tools that can be used to advance the culturally appropriate service to the Native American community. The improved understanding of the needs of the Native Community will continue to grow as CalCASA fosters their relationships with the Native American Community. This project illustrates that, while our work may never be done, we continue to move closer to accomplishing our mission of giving ALL abused and neglected children both a voice and the services they need for a stable future.



REFERENCES

- ¹ The Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics is an interagency forum made up of several federal agencies designed to collect and improve data regarding children and families in the U.S.
- ² Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being*, 2009. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. p. iii.
- ³ The United States Commission on Civil Rights. *A Quiet Crisis: Federal Funding and Unmet Needs in Indian Country*. P ix.
- ⁴ National Center for Education Statistics. *Status and Trends in the Education of American Indians and Alaskan Natives*. Indicator 1.5. Family Structure.
- ⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2008 American Community Survey.
- ⁶ Id.
- ⁷ The United States Commission on Civil Rights. *A Quiet Crisis: Federal Funding and Unmet Needs in Indian Country*. P 35.
- ⁸ Id.
- ⁹ The United States Commission on Civil Rights. *A Quiet Crisis: Federal Funding and Unmet Needs in Indian Country*. P 51.
- ¹⁰ Id.
- ¹¹ National Center for Education Statistics. *Status and Trends in the Education of American Indians and Alaskan Natives*. Indicator 6.2. Alcohol, Tobacco and Drug Use.
- ¹² National Center for Education Statistics. *Status and Trends in the Education of American Indians and Alaskan Natives*. Indicator 6.3. Violence on School Grounds.
- ¹³ National Center for Education Statistics. *Status and Trends in the Education of American Indians and Alaskan Natives*. Figure 3.3. Percentage of 16- to 24-year-olds who were high school dropouts, by race/ ethnicity: Selected years, 1990 to 2003
- ¹⁴ Figure 4.6. Percentage of public high school graduates who had completed the core academic track, by race/ethnicity: Various years, 1982 to 2000
- ¹⁵ The United States Commission on Civil Rights. *A Quiet Crisis: Federal Funding and Unmet Needs in Indian Country*. P 35.
- ¹⁶ The United States Commission on Civil Rights. *A Quiet Crisis: Federal Funding and Unmet Needs in Indian Country*. p 68.
- ¹⁷ Id.
- ¹⁸ Ibid at p. 69.
- ¹⁹ Id.
- ²⁰ Id.
- ²¹ CFCC California CASA Programs 2007 Report, December 2008, page 5.
- ²² CFCC California CASA Programs 2007 Report, December 2008, page 5 (two different methodologies show different results, one shows 68% of volunteers are non-Hispanic white the other shows 86%).
- ²³ CFCC California CASA Programs 2007 Report, December 2008, page 5.
- ²⁴ CFCC California CASA Programs 2007 Report, December 2008, page 5.
- ²⁵ It is important to note that the statistics in the CFCC California CASA Programs 2007 Report had significant numbers of children in categories that could overlap with Native American: Multiracial, Other and Unknown. These overlaps could skew data in either the direction of Native children being over or under represented in CASA programs.
- ²⁶ CFCC California CASA Programs 2007 Report, December 2008, page 5.