There are few decisions more colossal than the decision of whether or not to remove a child from their home. From the perspective of psychology, the difficulty in making decisions such as this lies in large part with the basic fact that it is very difficult to predict human behavior at the individual level. While we know that parents who abuse their children once are likely to re-abuse them in the future, it is difficult to predict which parents will re-abuse. While we know that youth, as a whole, have higher rates of mental illness when they are exposed to violence, it is difficult to predict how any individual child will respond emotionally and behaviorally to this stressor, or to removal from their home for that matter. As with any decision of similar magnitude, there are differing opinions regarding the criteria on which the choice to remove a child from his or her home should be made. What constitutes true danger to the child? What is the quantity and quality of evidence on which we are basing that judgment? What is our balance of intuition to scientific evidence? The purpose of this brief article is to generate critical thought about what it means to say that something in the environment, such as exposure to violence, causes childhood emotional and behavior problems, and to encourage more careful, clear, scientific thinking about these issues when making critical, life-altering decisions regarding children. It is also to demonstrate how psychology, just one of many fields invested in the study of childhood violence, thinks about these issues.

There is a significant amount of debate regarding whether children who witness domestic violence, but who are not themselves victimized, are at a high enough level of risk to warrant removal from their homes. This issue serves as a useful example from which to launch our discussion of the science of risk. When psychologists seek to understand a risk factor, they start with an assessment of the magnitude of the problem. Rates of domestic violence in the United States are alarmingly high. One respected series of studies suggests that partner-against-partner assault has occurred in at least one out of every six American romantic relationships, and that approximately 10 million American children witness some form of family violence in any given year.1 In other words, we’re talking about a lot of children. Given the reality of an already under-funded, under-staffed child protective services system, it is clearly important to understand as much as possible exactly what effects witnessing violence has on children’s development, at least at the population pattern level, in order to inform empirically-grounded risk assessment and eventual intervention.

When considering any complex and multi-faceted question such as the extent to which a specific environmental stressor affects children, it is tempting to turn to intuition and emotion, which of course simplifies things to an unacceptable degree. Of course watching Daddy beat up Mommy is going to negatively affect little Suzie, right? How couldn’t it? When the answer to the question of how

continued on page three
LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO REESTABLISH A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

A bipartisan effort is underway on Capitol Hill to raise the level of awareness regarding the basic needs of children. Congressman Chaka Fattah (D-PA) and Congressman Jon Porter (R-NV) have introduced legislation to reestablish a White House Conference on Children and Youth.

The conference was established almost 90 years ago by President Theodore Roosevelt to highlight the struggles as well as the strides of the nation’s youth. Despite reauthorization and funding, the conference has not been held since 1970.

Legislation introduced by Fattah and Porter would authorize a conference to be held in 2010 to focus on child welfare issues. The lawmakers are confident that just as previous conferences have lead to major policy improvements on behalf of children this conference will do the same.

Congressman Fattah said, “It’s time to renew America’s commitment to our children, our national treasure. The nation’s future is dependent on preparing them to face the myriad challenges that lie ahead. “As leaders,” Fattah said, “it’s our job to make sure their basic needs are met and the promise of their possibility is advanced.”

“I am proud to support this bipartisan legislation to reestablish a White House Conference on Children and Youth,” Porter said. “By connecting state and local officials, service providers, tribal communities, families, courts, physical and mental health experts and academic researchers, this comprehensive summit will shape policy in Washington and improve the lives of children throughout the country.”

Leading up to the conference, nationwide events would be held focusing on the critical issues facing children. The Field Center has joined with 30 other national organizations and the Child Welfare League of America in support of this effort.

FIELD CENTER FACULTY DIRECTORS RECEIVE APPOINTMENTS BY MAYOR NUTTER


The new board will be chaired by Carol Wilson Spigner, formerly chair of Mayor John Street’s Child Welfare Review panel and Faculty Director of the Field Center. Faculty Director Cindy Christian, MD, who also served on the Child Welfare Review Panel, was appointed to the new Community Oversight Board by Mayor Nutter as well. The Community Oversight Board will continue to monitor DHS progress in implementing current reforms laid out in the Child Welfare Review Panel Report of May 31, 2007 and will have authority to determine whether additional reform is necessary to protect children, including the ability to review any fatalities of children under DHS control.

“The high quality and experience of the individuals appointed to this Community Oversight Board is a demonstration of this administration’s commitment to ensuring high quality care for the children of Philadelphia,” said Mayor Nutter.

To avoid a conflict of interest, Dr. Spigner stepped down as a Faculty Director of the Field Center. Dr. Spigner’s expertise on child welfare policy was a valued perspective within the Center and her contributions will be missed. The Field Center’s faculty, staff, and students wish Dr. Spigner well and are grateful that the City of Philadelphia will benefit from her expertise.
and the degree to which Suzie is likely to be affected by this violence, however, becomes evidence on which the decision about whether to remove her from her mother’s care is partially based, it becomes clear that more than intuition and emotion is needed. Thus enters the need for good researchers, whose job it is to carefully and critically examine how and why witnessing violence matters.

The existing research literature base does provide some evidence that witnessing violence is harmful for children’s mental health. For example, one study compared a group of abused boys to boys who had witnessed domestic violence and found that they had similar adjustment problems. Several other studies have found that children who both witness domestic violence and are abused have higher levels of emotional and behavioral problems than children who experience only one form of violence. It is critical to note, however, that most of these types of studies show correlation but not causation. In other words, while they show that children who witness violence have higher rates of problems than children who don’t witness violence, they don’t necessarily prove that it was the violence that caused the problems. There are hundreds of potential reasons why kids who experience family violence have higher levels of mental health problems that have nothing at all to do with the violence. Abuse and domestic violence typically don’t travel alone as childhood stressors. They are often (but certainly not always) accompanied by poverty, community violence, poor schools, and the gamut of other childhood stressors. Thus, it can be difficult to isolate the effects of abuse or witnessing violence from these other stressors, all of which predict childhood mental health problems by themselves. Thus, it is extremely important to understand the difference between correlation and causation, and to dig deeper into the specific mechanisms through which violence is associated with children’s problems in order to truly be able to make the claim that it is the violence per se that is responsible for the child’s symptoms, and in order to design the most appropriately targeted interventions.

Studies that have begun to examine linking mechanisms between violence and children’s mental health problems have primarily focused on child maltreatment. These studies suggest that there are both direct and indirect links between family violence and poor childhood mental health outcomes. An example of a direct link is that abused children appear to have deficient attention self-regulatory abilities and subsequently over-attend to anger cues. Children who are physically abused are also much more likely to perceive violence as an acceptable and appropriate form of human interaction. Studies are also quite clear that there are a plethora of indirect links between abuse and poor psychological outcome. For example, abusive parents engage in other poor parenting practices that in and of themselves predict children’s emotional and behavioral problems. They interact less with their children, are less likely to use reasoning and simple commands, and are less likely to choose disciplinary punishments that match the significance of the child misdeed.

Certainly the caregivers’ own levels of emotional problems matter too. Adult victims of family violence have higher-than-average rates of stress and mental health problems, and at least one study has found that the relationship between family and community violence and children’s depression was partly explained by maternal depression. Another study found that the behavior problems of battered women’s children were primarily predicted by maternal stress and paternal irritability, not the violence itself. In short, caregivers who are depressed or stressed are less consistently available as supportive, reliable, warm parents, parenting characteristics associated with childhood problems. Finally, studies suggest that adults with histories of mental illness are more likely to form physically and psychologically abusive relationships in the first place, suggesting that family violence may be in part a marker for genetic risk for psychopathology that parents transmit to children.

Thus, a whirlwind tour of the literature suggests that it is not necessarily as simple as one might think to make a strong case that one specific form of violence, like witnessing domestic violence, causes childhood problems. We must be more committed to going beyond identifying associations and correlations; we must seek to demonstrate causation by ruling out other hypotheses about what else may be explaining the association. Much more research is needed in this area, because the social workers and clinicians making critical choices that change children’s lives need to be able to make educated, empirically-supported decisions and not have to rely on intuition, emotion, and guesswork. The purpose of this article was not to provide answers or guidelines, but rather to suggest that these issues are extremely complex. This complexity cannot be ignored for the sake of convenience.

FOOTNOTES

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) assumes that foster care keeping children safe, as well as supporting and preserving families, under Title IV-B is discretionary funding. This money assists states in paying for training and administrative costs. “Child Welfare Services” operation and development of the data system, the Statewide Auto payments, the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and the finance payments), adoption assistance payments, adoption incentive programs, funded under the open-ended entitlement stream, are un discretionary programs (subject to yearly appropriations). Mandatory programs (where the federal government is obligated to provide services or make payments to eligible persons entitled to receive these benefits by meeting the eligibility standard established under law) and discretionary programs (subject to yearly appropriations). Mandatory programs make up an overwhelming 71% of the FY09 budget. These programs, funded under the open-ended entitlement stream, are under Title IV-E and include, in part, foster care room and board (maintenance payments), adoption assistance payments, adoption incentive payments, the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and the operation and development of the data system, the Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS). Title IV-E also pays for training and administrative costs. “Child Welfare Services” under Title IV-B is discretionary funding. This money assists states in keeping children safe, as well as supporting and preserving families. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) assumes that foster care caseloads will continue to decline while the adoption assistance programs will increase. This assumption is reflected in the FY09 budget estimates for Title IV-E that put the payments for foster care at $188 million less than the FY08 enacted level, while the adoption assistance payments are expected to increase by $130 million over the FY08 enacted level. Child welfare services under Title IV-B are level funded under the FY09 budget.

Funding for child welfare services and programs is not limited to Title IV-B. Both the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) and the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) provide a broad range of services including but not limited to: protecting children from abuse and neglect, supporting and preserving families, promoting self-sufficiency and decreasing dependency. Both of these block grants are viewed as the “glue” that allows states to piece services together. However, these block grants were evaluated by the federal evaluation tool, the Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART) where deficiencies were found and are reflected in the President’s FY09 request. For SSBG, the FY09 request is $1.2 billion, a decrease of $500 million from the FY08 enacted level with a goal of eliminating this program in 2010. For CSBG, the President requested this program be eliminated because its PART concluded that “results were not demonstrated” and some of its services were duplicative.

This budget is not likely to be used as a blueprint for spending. It is an indicator of the President’s priorities but these priorities are not shared by the majority party in Congress. Budget battles are fought every year with this year expected to be especially contentious.

**Must Pass Legislation**

There are two “must pass” provisions that will expire without Congressional action this session. The first are the adoption incentive payments established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997. The adoption incentive payments were given to states that increased their adoptions out of foster care over the previous year. This discretionary funding was authorized to pay $4,000 for finalized adoptions and $6,000 for “special needs” adoptions. The adoption incentive program has been reauthorized once since its inception, state baselines have been updated, eligibility for the additional $2,000 “special needs” payments has been limited to children under age nine at the time the adoption was finalized and a third adoption incentive of $4,000 for the adoption of children age nine and older has been established.

In the FY09 budget the President is requesting some modifications of the incentive structure and a $15 million plus up for the adoption incentive program above the FY08 enacted level. With a $20 million adoption incentive program the reauthorization will continue the commitment to increase the number of adoptions of children out of foster care.

The second “must pass” legislation is reauthorization of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA). This discretionary program has two parts: the “State Grant” program that provides grants to states to, among other things, improve its intake, assessment, screening and investigation of child abuse and neglect reports, devise risk assessment tools, and provide for referrals of newborns born drug-exposed. The FY09 budget calls for level funding for the “State Grant” provision despite the fact that the PART rating for CY04 was “Results Not Demonstrated.”

The second part of CAPTA are the “Child Abuse Discretionary Activities” that support over 50 grants for, among other things, research and demonstration contracts, research on the prevention, causes, and treatment of child maltreatment. In addition, these funds are used to provide for a national clearinghouse and a national resource center.
as well as to provide of the continuation of a national incidence study of child abuse and neglect. The request calls for a Home Visitation initiative and funding to conduct a feasibility study of a national child abuse and neglect offender registry. The FY09 budget calls for level funding of the “Child Abuse Discretionary Activities”

Low Hanging Fruit Legislation

It is possible that in addition to securing passage of the “must pass” legislation, that the powerful Ways and Means Committee (with jurisdiction over all of foster care and adoption but not the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act) will address some low ticket provisions. Raising the training match for both public and private agencies to 75% is one such item. Under current law public agencies receive foster care and adoption assistance training with a 75% match by the federal government under IV-E entitlement funding. However, private agencies receive only a 50% federal match for training under IV-E. The states and private agencies do not see the rationale for this difference since private agencies as well as public agencies need training to provide services.

A second provision is the bipartisan legislation (H.R. 5461) in the House of Representatives calling for a White House Conference on Children and Youth. The legislation sponsored by Mr. Fattah (D-PA) and Mr. Porter (R-NV) would require the next President to sponsor a White House Conference in 2010. The bill was referred to the Education and Labor Committee. The White House Conference would bring the child welfare experts, advocates and policymakers together to make recommendations on promoting the welfare of children. The authorization of appropriations in the bill is $10 million but since this is only an authorization it does not receive a cost from the Congressional Budget Office. Moving this bill through the House would be a relatively easy way to appeal to advocacy organizations mobilizing their base to secure passage.

Laying a Legislative Marker Down

The final indicator useful in predicting congressional interest in child welfare policy is the “laying down of a marker” by a Subcommittee Chairman. On February 14, 2008, Subcommittee Chairman McDermott (D-WA) introduced a comprehensive child welfare bill dubbed “Invest in KIDS Act.” The bill is designed to improve foster care services, provide accountability and help foster children secure safe, stable and permanent families. It is likely that the bill will be the subject of congressional hearings as early as March. The bulk of the bill increases entitlement spending and is unlikely to get out of the committee. However, there are some important, no cost provisions that could be viewed as “low hanging fruit” and as such garner some action. Under the bill states are required to: (1) make reasonable efforts to place siblings together; (2) develop a health oversight and coordination plan for children in foster care; and, (3) develop an educational stability plan for children in foster care. These are clearly necessary provisions with no costs where there could be bipartisan and bicameral consensus.

Conclusion

In sum, it remains to be seen how much political will exists to move child protection legislation beyond the reauthorization of CAPTA and the adoption incentive program.

With the entire House of Representatives up for re-election, one-third of the Senate and the race to the White House, the legislative session will end early to allow Members to go home and campaign. There is also the sense that the Democrats fragile hold on the Senate will be strengthened in this election and that seats will be picked up in the House of Representatives. At this point, it is still unclear who the parties’ nominees will be, let alone who will take the White House. All of these factors impact not only the child protection legislation we will see in FY09 but in the next Congress as well. Stay tuned.

---

CASSIE STATUTO BEVAN, EDD

Dr. Cassie Statuto Bevan has had an extensive career in child advocacy and has played a critical role in drafting legislation to protect the rights and ensure the safety of children.

Dr. Bevan earned both a Master of the Arts and a Master of Education from Columbia University. While serving as a professor at Marymount Manhattan College, Dr. Bevan became extremely interested in the crisis in foster care. She began teaching courses in child abuse and juvenile justice, eventually developing the first child advocacy program at Marymount. In 1981, she received a doctorate in Child Development from Columbia University. Dr. Bevan then completed a post-doctoral fellowship in the Bush Program for Child Development in Social Policy at the University of Michigan, where she focused on translating evidence-based research into effective policy.

After completing her post-doctoral fellowship, Dr. Bevan began working in Washington, D.C., on a Congressional Science Fellowship with the Society for Research in Child Development. In 1984, she was appointed Staff Director on the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families of the U.S. House of Representatives. In 1993, Dr. Bevan began working with the National Council for Adoption and became the principal investigator of the Child Protection Project. In 1994, she received a grant from the Smith Richardson Foundation to examine some of the problems with foster care and child welfare policies. At this point, Dr. Bevans stated, it became clear that “children’s needs were not considered paramount, even in legislation that designed to help them.” In 1995, Dr. Bevan became the professional staff member and majority staff director for the Committee on Ways and Means, and in 2001, began working as the senior policy advisor to the Majority Leader. She currently serves as a consultant for the Pew Commission on Children in Foster Care’s Kids are Waiting Project in Washington, D.C. Dr. Bevan is also an adjunct professor at the University of Maryland Graduate School of Social Work.

Dr. Bevan has been critical in the drafting and enactment of leading child advocacy legislation, including the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) of 1997 and the Foster Care Independence Act of 1999. She has received many awards for her leadership in child advocacy from the National Council for Adoption, the National Committee to Prevent Child Abuse, the National Association of Psychiatric Treatment Centers for Children, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
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FIELD CENTER ADVISORY BOARD PROFILE: REPRESENTATIVE MIKE GERBER

Field Center Advisory Board member Mike Gerber has a long-standing commitment to children and families. Representing the 148th legislative district (Montgomery County) in the Pennsylvania State House since 2004, he was named “Rookie of the Year” as a freshman legislator and was more recently elected Chairman of the Southeast Delegation by his colleagues.

Rep. Gerber serves on the Children and Youth Committee and has been a strong advocate for children in Harrisburg. A proponent of Head Start, Rep. Gerber worked to increase the program’s funding from $15 million to $40 million over a three-year period.

A graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, Rep. Gerber was a Dean’s List student and a defensive back on Penn’s championship football team. He graduated cum laude from Villanova University School of Law, where he received a scholarship award for his contributions to community legal services.

Rep. Gerber has a long history of community involvement. As an undergraduate at Penn, he tutored Philadelphia school children and co-founded a nonprofit organization called Urban Artists, Inc., which developed after-school programs in Philadelphia community centers and provided art programs for children in detention. While in law school, Rep. Gerber served as an intern in the U.S. Attorney’s Office and worked for Delaware County Legal Aid, where he represented people living in public housing. In private practice at the Philadelphia law firm of Wolf Block, Rep. Gerber handled primarily commercial litigation matters but spent over a year working on a child welfare class action case. He was recognized as one of the top 35 lawyers under the age of 40 in the state of Pennsylvania by American Lawyer Media and the Legal Intelligencer.

Married with three children, Rep. Gerber served on his township’s park and recreation board and coached youth football and high school baseball before being elected. He is a valued member of the Field Center’s Advisory Board, supporting the Center’s efforts to improve the lives of at-risk children.

FIELD CENTER STUDENT PROFILE: ANDREA MAIKOVICH, PHD CANDIDATE

As a PhD candidate in clinical psychology at the University of Pennsylvania, Andrea Maikovich has conducted much of her research on issues related to child maltreatment. Andrea was raised in Colorado and attended Yale University, where she received her bachelor’s degree in psychology in 2005.

Andrea’s interest in child welfare piqued during her junior semester abroad at Oxford University, where she took classes in child development and maltreatment. Upon returning to Yale, Andrea began working at a child abuse and maltreatment center. Through this experience, she realized that she was interested in child development and welfare at both an intellectual and clinical level.

Currently, Andrea’s research focuses on the relationship between sexual abuse and mental illness in children, and on gender differences in the experiences and consequences of sexual abuse. This is an arena that has often been understudied, especially as incidences of male sexual abuse are frequently underreported. Andrea is also interested in research and clinical work related to other childhood traumas.

Andrea is extremely excited to work for the Field Center, particularly due to her interest in how research can be translated into changes at the policy level. She strongly believes in the interplay between policy, research, and clinical work in order to maximize the number of positive outcomes for children. Andrea’s other hobbies and interests include hiking, animal welfare, and environmental conservation.

THE FIELD CENTER ANNOUNCES ITS SPRING 2008 COMMUNITY SYMPOSIUM

Wednesday April 9, 2008 from 8:30 to 10:30 AM
Penn Law School - Levy Conference Center, 3400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia

Bang for Your Buck: Public Child Welfare and the Pursuit of Accountability

Fred Wulczyn, PhD
Research Fellow, Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago

For a variety of reasons, public agencies at all levels of government are increasingly interested in the return on their investment. Nationally, expenditures for child welfare programs exceed $20 billion. The return on investment question simply asks—are children better off as a result of what we spend on their behalf? In his presentation, Dr. Wulczyn will explore accountability within the child welfare system from various perspectives including the practical and the political.

Preregister by email or phone: fieldctr@sp2.upenn.edu 215.573.9779
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE &amp; LOCATION</th>
<th>EVENT &amp; SPONSOR</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 17 – 30, 2008</td>
<td>National Children’s Advocacy Center&lt;br&gt;24th National Symposium on Child Abuse</td>
<td>Phone: (256) 533-5437&lt;br&gt;www.nationalcac.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville, AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1 – 5, 2008</td>
<td>National Association of Black Social Workers (NABSW)&lt;br&gt;40th National Annual Conference&lt;br&gt;Family Centered Practice</td>
<td>Phone: (202) 678-4570&lt;br&gt;www.nabsw.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 2008</td>
<td>The Field Center at the University of Pennsylvania&lt;br&gt;Community Symposium&lt;br&gt;Bang for Your Buck: Public Child Welfare and the Pursuit of Accountability</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:fieldctr@sp2.upenn.edu">fieldctr@sp2.upenn.edu</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: 215.573.9779&lt;br&gt;www.fieldcenteratpenn.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20 – 23, 2008</td>
<td>National Indian Child Welfare Association (NICWA)&lt;br&gt;26th Annual “Protecting Our Children” National American Indian Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:isla@nicwa.org">isla@nicwa.org</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: (503) 222-4044&lt;br&gt;www.nicwa.org/conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24 – 27, 2008</td>
<td>APSAC Child Forensic Interview Clinic</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:apsacclinic@verizon.net">apsacclinic@verizon.net</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: (425) 483-8250&lt;br&gt;www.apsac.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30 – June 1, 2008</td>
<td>The Vincent J. Fontana Center for Child Protection&lt;br&gt;2nd Annual William Randolph Hearst National Conference&lt;br&gt;Preparing Leaders, Protecting Children, Supporting Families</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:maribel@nyfoundling.org">maribel@nyfoundling.org</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: (212) 660-1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20 – May 2, 2008</td>
<td>National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ)&lt;br&gt;National Forum on Children, Families and the Courts</td>
<td>Phone: (775)784-6012&lt;br&gt;www.ncjc.org/content/view/285/378/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19 – 23, 2008</td>
<td>National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ)&lt;br&gt;Evidence in Juvenile and Family Court</td>
<td>Phone: (775) 784-6012&lt;br&gt;www.ncjc.org/content/view/285/378/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28 – June 1, 2008</td>
<td>National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect&lt;br&gt;National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect Summer Research Institute 2008</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:NDACAN@cornell.edu">NDACAN@cornell.edu</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: (607) 255-7799&lt;br&gt;www.ndacan.cornell.edu/NDACAN/Summer_Institute/SRI2008.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3 – 6, 2008</td>
<td>American Humane Association&lt;br&gt;American Humane’s 2008 Conference on Family Group Decision Making</td>
<td>Phone: (303) 792-9900&lt;br&gt;www.americanhumane.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18 – 21, 2008</td>
<td>American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children (APSAC)&lt;br&gt;16th Annual APSAC Colloquium</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:apsac@apsac.org">apsac@apsac.org</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: (877) 402-7722&lt;br&gt;www.apsac.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13 – 16, 2008</td>
<td>Foster Family-based Treatment Association (FTTA)&lt;br&gt;FFTA 22nd Annual Conference on Treatment Foster Care</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:shorowitz@ftta.org">shorowitz@ftta.org</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: (800) 414-3382&lt;br&gt;www.ftta.org/conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Woodlands, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16 – 20, 2008</td>
<td>National Technical Assistance Center for Children’s Mental Health/Georgetown University Center for Child and Human Development&lt;br&gt;Training Institutes 2008: Developing Local Systems of Care for Children and Adolescents with Mental Health Needs and Their Families</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Institutes2008@aol.com">Institutes2008@aol.com</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: (202) 687-5000&lt;br&gt;guccd.georgetown.edu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27 – July 29, 2008</td>
<td>University of New Hampshire/Family Research Laboratory&lt;br&gt;International Family Violence and Child Victimization Research Conference</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:frl.conference@unh.edu">frl.conference@unh.edu</a>&lt;br&gt;Phone: (603) 862-0767&lt;br&gt;www.unh.edu/frl/conferences/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth, NH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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