I. UNADDRESSED PROBLEMS OF LGBT YOUTH IN FOSTER CARE

A foster care teenager in a group home is beaten bloody by eight residents because he is gay, while staff ignore his screams and then show him the door. A lesbian teen is sexually assaulted in a group facility by a staff member, who tells her she is supposed to be with men, not women; after she is attacked again at another group home, she runs away and refuses to return to care. Another teenager, taunted by foster parents, staff, and peers for being a “dyke” and a “homo,” is shuttled among foster families, group homes, and shelters because she “doesn’t fit in.” A gay youth is forced by his foster family to undergo “conversion therapy” designed to change him to a heterosexual by coercing him to believe that his same-sex attraction is repulsive and deviant. A teenager adopted years earlier by foster parents is thrown out and returned to foster care when his adoptive parents learn he is gay; the parents accuse the child services agency of having “tricked” them. These are not isolated incidents of bias, but rather standard treatment for many LGBT adolescents in foster care. Other LGBT youth, fearful of similar abuses, attempt to hide their sexual orientation or gender identity and weather in silence and isolation the homophobia of child welfare workers, foster families, and group home peers. While some foster care professionals recognize the plight of LGBT foster youth and the need for reforms in their child welfare systems, these well-meaning individuals typically lack the training, resources, and institutional support to make a systemic difference on their own. Pushed far into the margins of society by indifference, discrimination, and harassment, LGBT youth in foster care face an array of problems too often ignored — or worsened — by the child welfare agencies responsible for their safety and care.

The Mission of Child Welfare Services

The basic mission of child welfare services is to safeguard children from harm and to act in their best interests. Through foster care, the state “provide[s] a temporary, safe haven for children whose parents are unable to care for them.” The state thus steps in where parents cannot to help foster and protect youth through their crucial developmental years. Federal law requires as a condition of federal funding that states develop for
every child in their charge a plan to assure “safe and proper care” consistent with the child’s “best interest and special needs.” Still, states are also required by federal law to establish standards to protect foster children’s civil rights. Fundamental federal and state constitutional guarantees of equal protection require that in fulfilling their pares patriae role, states give all youth in their care, including those who are LGBT, access to supportive services and protection.

Nonetheless, states uniformly fail to acknowledge and address the unique needs of and hazards faced by LGBT youth in foster care. A few locales and individual child welfare workers have taken important first steps to help their LGBT foster care youth, but many child welfare professionals remain oblivious to the very existence of suffering LGBT adolescents in their care. Still others are outright hostile and abusive towards the LGBT adolescents they are charged to protect. As a result, state and private foster care agencies have so far been unable or unwilling to serve these adolescents appropriately.

Earlier Calls for Reform

We are not the first coalition of advocates to call attention to the plight of LGBT youth in foster care. For example, a decade ago the Child Welfare League of America with other youth advocates reported that, “Child welfare agencies and their staff members have often been handicapped in their ability to properly meet the needs of this client group due to societal stigmatization, a lack of information, misinformation, and fear, and a consequent lack of understanding.” In 1994, a joint task force of New York City’s Child Welfare Administration and the Council of Family and Child Caring Agencies published a report finding that “lesbian and gay adolescents have often been misunderstood, neglected and in some cases discriminated against by the child welfare system,” and calling for services for lesbian and gay youth. Yet in the intervening years, while a generation of LGBT foster care youth have suffered through adolescence, little has been done anywhere in the nation to remedy these problems. Although there are individual professionals in child welfare systems around the country distressed by the needless abuse and neglect of LGBT youth in their midst, these individuals cannot cure systemic problems singlehandedly. There is a dire need for child welfare agencies nationwide to take basic remedial steps throughout their programs, without further delay, to acknowledge and care for neglected LGBT adolescents.
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LGBT Youth Are In The Foster Care System In Significant Numbers

Serving these marginalized youth must begin by acknowledging that they are present in the foster care system, and in significant numbers. Whether child welfare professionals recognize it or not, if they work with adolescents, they work with LGBT youth. The core feelings and attractions that form the basis for adult sexual orientation typically emerge by early adolescence,\(^\text{10}\) and gender non-conforming behavior often manifests earlier in childhood.\(^\text{11}\) Approximately 5-10% of the general population is estimated to be gay or lesbian.\(^\text{12}\) Given that the nation’s total out-of-home care population of youth ages 11 and older is estimated at 244,000,\(^\text{13}\) it can be assumed that at a minimum 12,000-24,000 lesbian and gay adolescents are in out-of-home care, or that one of every ten to twenty adolescents in care is lesbian or gay.

But even these figures do not adequately reflect the numbers of LGBT youth in the foster care population, for LGBT adolescents make up a disproportionate part of the foster care pool. Because gay, lesbian, and gender-nonconforming adolescents commonly find themselves disapproved of and overtly rejected by their own families, they are more likely to be forced from their homes to become part of the foster care, runaway, and “throwaway” populations. For example, research on gay adolescent males found that 50% reported negative reactions from their parents when they disclosed their sexual identity, and that 26% were forced to leave home as a result.\(^\text{14}\) In another survey, 33% of gay men and 34% of lesbians reported suffering physical violence at the hands of a family member as the result of their sexual orientation.\(^\text{15}\) The National Network of Runaway and Youth Services has estimated that 20-40% of youths who become homeless each year are lesbian, gay or bisexual,\(^\text{16}\) and reports from urban centers serving runaway and “throwaway” adolescents likewise have shown similar percentages of LGBT youth among their clients.\(^\text{17}\) These LGBT youth often cycle through foster homes, group homes, and the streets.

Child Welfare Systems Neglect Their LGBT Youth

Despite the significant numbers of LGBT adolescents in the foster care system, many child welfare workers are unable or unwilling even to recognize that there are LGBT youth in their care. Child welfare professionals are the product of our heterosexist culture, in which heterosexuality and traditional gender-conforming behavior is assumed to be universal.\(^\text{18}\) Furthermore, most LGBT adolescents have been socialized to fear revealing their sexual orientation; unless assured that they will be accepted and protected, many LGBT youth in the foster care system will continue to hide this aspect of their identity from the agencies that should provide them support. Indeed, one child welfare official reported to Lambda Legal Defense that her state had no need for policies, training, and
programs to protect LGBT youth because there simply were none in the state’s foster care system. This blindness and indifference translates into closeted and isolated, or abused and unprotected, LGBT adolescents.

As is apparent from the overview of the policies and practices of fourteen representative states that follows, little institutional attention has been paid to the needs of LGBT foster care youth. For example, not a single surveyed state foster care agency currently maintains formal policies prohibiting discrimination against LGBT foster care youth. This is true even in those states — California, Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York — that have state laws prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination in the provision of state services.

Likewise, not a single surveyed state mandates training for foster care parents and professionals on non-discrimination principles and sensitivity to the sexual orientation of foster youth. In just California, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Ohio was limited optional training on LGBT concerns reported available, and in only scattered locales in those states. On the positive side, several states have begun to acknowledge deficiencies in their programs for LGBT youth. Florida and Illinois reported plans to incorporate LGBT foster parent and staff training into their curricula, and Connecticut, in part because our queries in connection with this Report caused it to focus on the wide gaps in its policies, now plans to broaden its LGBT sensitivity training.

There is also a serious paucity of such basic programs and services for LGBT youth as safe group homes, counseling, and resource guides. For example, in only Los Angeles and New York City can LGBT youth find group homes — whose capacity are far exceeded by demand — dedicated to their care. Moreover, none of the states has a program to identify and train foster parents, including lesbian and gay adults, to care for LGBT youth. Ironically, although all the states have some provision for access to HIV testing, none require the meaningful sexual health education and services that would significantly safeguard foster care youth from risk of infection in the first place.

Individual child welfare workers may try to make a difference for the LGBT youth in their care, and undoubtedly have helped blunt the effects of inadequate policies, training, and systemic responses. But the fate of an LGBT adolescent, already struggling with the loss of parents and other hardships, should not depend on luck in reaching one of these individuals. He or she could as easily fall into the caseload or home of a homophobic adult. Even committed social service providers who see the needs of LGBT youth often do not have all the information and resources necessary to care appropriately for these especially vulnerable adolescents.
Anti-Gay Views Have No Place In The Child Welfare System

Crucial to remedying neglect and abuse of LGBT adolescents in foster care is recognizing that anti-gay attitudes are the product of prejudices with no place in the child welfare system. The American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Association of Social Workers (“NASW”) have long recognized that homosexuality is not a mental or physical disorder. Homosexuality is as biologically based as heterosexuality, and is not susceptible to alteration through medical or psychological intervention. A same-sex sexual orientation is a core part of a gay person’s identity, just as a heterosexual orientation is for heterosexuals, and mainstream health care professionals concur that gay persons should not be undermined in this aspect of their identity. The American Psychiatric and Psychological Associations, the NASW, the American Medical Association (“AMA”), the American Academy of Pediatrics (“AAP”), the American Counseling Association (“ACA”), and the American School Health Association have all adopted policies against sexual orientation discrimination. Moreover, the American Psychiatric and Psychological Associations, the NASW, and the ACA have also raised serious ethical concerns at efforts by mental health professionals to alter a person’s sexual orientation — i.e., through “reparative” or “conversion” therapy. Such unprofessional efforts undermine self-esteem without effectively changing sexual orientation. The best interests of LGBT youth are instead served by protection against discrimination and harassment, and support for them to develop to their fullest potential. Yet profound prejudice and stigma against LGBT individuals persist throughout our society, including within child welfare systems charged to protect the youth in their care.

Support, Not Stigma, Is Critical For LGBT Adolescents

Regardless of sexual orientation, adolescence can be a confusing and difficult phase of sexual awakening and pressure to conform to peer norms. For LGBT youth, this already trying phase can be enormously more difficult. LGBT adolescents struggle to come to terms with their same-sex sexual attraction or gender identity in the face of strong internalized and societal expectations of heterosexuality and rigid gender roles. At the point in life when the pressure to fit in is strongest, LGBT youth are recognizing that they belong to stigmatized minorities. While heterosexuality is assumed, anticipated, and supported by parents and the wider culture for the heterosexual child, homosexuality or gender non-conformity are commonly discouraged and condemned in the LGBT child. Hostility towards a non-heterosexual orientation or non-traditional gender identity are often internalized and can lead to a serious loss of self-esteem in the LGBT adolescent. Unlike other minority children, moreover, LGBT youth generally do not grow up in
families and cultural communities sharing their minority status that can act as buffers against stigmatization and present affirming role models. As they struggle with feelings of worthlessness and confront prejudice against their sexual orientations, these youth often cannot turn to their families for support. Instead, many LGBT youth who “come out” to their families face parental disappointment, disapproval, and even the outright rejection that leads to their disproportionate membership in the foster care population. Such hostile reactions unfortunately are often replicated within foster care.

**Added Challenges for LGBT Racial and Ethnic Minority Youth**

The problems of LGBT youth who belong to racial and ethnic minorities may be further compounded by cultural responses to homosexuality. This is particularly important to consider in the foster care context, given that nationwide approximately 43% of all children in foster care are African-American and 15% are Latino; these percentages may be higher in urban centers like New York and Los Angeles. For LGBT youth belonging to these racial and ethnic minorities, in which extended families play a key role and are a focal point of ethnic identity, “coming out” may cause ostracism not only from the nuclear family but also from the extended family group. These youth risk separation from their cultural communities and the loss of support for their racial and ethnic identities. Moreover, racial and ethnic groups holding strong religious and cultural beliefs condemning homosexuality can be less accepting of their LGBT members. For example, “[a]lthough emotional and physical closeness among women is encouraged by Latino culture, overt acknowledgment of lesbianism is even more restricted than in mainstream USA society... This pattern is also very similar within the African-American community.”

**Harassment in School**

Isolation and abuse arise not only at home and in cultural communities. Schools can also be particularly trying environments for LGBT youth, who confront invisibility, verbal harassment, and physical attacks there. LGBT youth commonly lose friends as the result of disclosure of their sexual orientation, and often attempt to remain closeted to their peers to avoid ridicule and violence. In a survey of 496 LGBT students from 32 states, more than 90% reported that they sometimes or frequently heard homophobic comments in school, and 61% reported outright verbal harassment. Nearly one out of three LGBT students in this survey also reported hearing homophobic comments by school faculty or staff. In a 1995 study, 22% of gay and bisexual males and 29% of lesbian and bisexual females reported having been physically hurt by another student because of their sexual orientation, and 7% of the youths reported having been hurt by a teacher. This victimization often
leads to poor academic performance, truancy, and dropping out, which in turn place LGBT youth at higher risk of entering the foster care and runaway populations.\textsuperscript{36}

**High Risk of Suicide**

The gravity of these stresses for LGBT youth is reflected in their high rates of suicide and suicide attempts. For example, a survey of students in grades 7 through 12 found that 28.1\% of bisexual and gay males and 20.5\% of bisexual and lesbian females had reported attempting suicide.\textsuperscript{37} Other data suggests that gay youths account for approximately 30\% of all completed adolescent suicides.\textsuperscript{38}

**Discrimination Compounds the Daily Struggles of Foster Care**

LGBT youth in out-of-home care, already coping with shattering family problems and displacement, bear the often overwhelming added burden of hostility toward their sexual orientation or gender identity. They suffer disapproval by caseworkers, rejection by foster families, harassment and violence at the hands of foster care peers, and prejudice and neglect by group home staff.\textsuperscript{39} From their first encounters with the child welfare system, they frequently face, at a minimum, subtle discrimination from a caseworker who, through heterosexist assumptions and terminology, signals discomfort with homosexuality and that it is not safe to be LGBT and out. LGBT youth who choose to and can remain closeted in foster care suffer isolation, shame, and a sense of peril from being privy to the homophobic slights directed at openly gay individuals. Those LGBT adolescents courageous enough or with no choice but to be open about their identity are routinely mistreated. Often the response of child care workers when an LGBT foster youth is harassed or hurt by peers or foster care staff is to punish or expel the victim rather than the perpetrators.\textsuperscript{40} The child care workers who are sensitive to the problems of LGBT youth lack the resources and support to shield these young people from discrimination. Moreover, LGBT adolescents are high on child welfare agencies’ lists of “hard-to-place” children, unwanted by sectarian and other placement agencies that disapprove of homosexuality,\textsuperscript{41} and subject to multiple and unstable placements because of negative reactions to their sexual orientations.\textsuperscript{42}

**Unaddressed Health Risks of LGBT Foster Youth**

In the midst of these challenges, LGBT youth are reluctant to seek services for preventing, testing for or counseling about, HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases (“STDs”). Child welfare systems have not taken the initiative to offer these vital services in a nonjudgmental and confidential manner. Furthermore, cultural discomfort about the sexuality of all youth, not just LGBT adolescents, has hindered foster care systems in providing adequate education about sexuality, birth control, and STD prevention.\textsuperscript{43} There
are insufficient programs and requirements in place in these systems to ensure that youth in the state’s care are taught about and protected against grave threats to their health.

This is particularly alarming, and demands a swift response, in light of very recent studies showing dramatically high rates of HIV infection among young African-American and Latino gay men. A study published in 2000 of gay men aged 23 to 29 in six major cities found that 30% of the African-Americans surveyed had contracted HIV, as had 15% of the Latinos. Many of these men were believed to have become infected during adolescence. In fact, it is estimated that one in five Americans with AIDS was infected during adolescence. Another recent study of males aged 15 to 22 found that more than 23% of those reporting having had male sex partners were HIV-positive. In the same study, 9% of the males testing HIV-positive had been runaways or removed from home. LGBT youth who flee abusive foster and group homes, preferring to take their chances living on the streets, are at even higher risk of engaging in unsafe sexual conduct.

Conclusion

LGBT youth have too long been neglected and stigmatized in foster care. To meet the needs of these adolescents, state foster care systems should acknowledge the LGBT youth in their midst and implement the basic, yet vital, reforms called for in this Report.
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