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United States Social Protection Programs (selection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Work requirements</th>
<th>Means tested</th>
<th>Age or disability requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TANF</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care subsidy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stamps</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
United States Social Protection Programs

- Each program has unique eligibility requirements
- Each program has a different process for obtaining benefits
- Emphasis on work present in many
- No single program is sufficient to bring a family out of poverty permanently
TANF

- Work-requirements (at least 30 hours per week)
- Sanctions
- Time-limited (60 months lifetime limit)
- State flexibility
  - Shorter time limits (1/3 of states have shorter)
- Full family sanctions
- Family caps
Poverty & parenting in the US
Child abuse and neglect in the US

- Approximately 3.4 million referrals involving 6 million children annually
- 700,000 child victims per year
- Child welfare/child protective services
Evidence

• Low-income families have increased probability of actual child abuse and involvement in the child welfare system\(^1\)
• Other correlates of low income (single parenthood, unemployment, residence in low-income neighborhoods) also associated with child abuse and other measures of substandard parenting\(^2\)
• Among low-income populations, economic hardships (e.g. welfare sanctions, loss of employment) associated with increased child welfare involvement\(^3\)

Source: Berger & Waldgodel, 2010
Social protection & child abuse in the US
Evidence

- Higher welfare and food stamp benefit levels associated with decreased likelihood of out of home care placement\(^4\)
- Sanctions (loss of benefits for failing to follow rules) related to increased likelihood of abuse\(^5\)
Evidence

• Family caps (denying additional benefits for additional children while using TANF) related to more physical abuse\(^6\)

• Lifetime limits of fewer than 60 months associated with higher rates of abuse\(^6\)
Child Support Income and Maltreatment

- Tested whether random increase in income via full child support pass-through was associated with decreased CPS involvement
- All TANF entering mothers of nonmarital children (N=13,652) assigned to T or C groups, with the T group receiving full pass-through of child support payments and the C group receiving the greater of $50 or 41% of child support payments
- Experimental group families were 10-11 percent less likely to have a screened-in report (p<.05)

Source: Cancian, Yang, Slack, 2013
Project GAIN
(Getting Access to Income Now)

Principal Investigators:
Kristen Slack & Lawrence Berger, University of Wisconsin - Madison
Question of interest

How much child maltreatment prevention can we “buy” with economic support interventions alone?
Project GAIN Model

Population target: Families whose CPS case closed after an investigation

Referrals for other “non-economic” needs

Linking to benefits and economic or material resources

Financial decision-making assistance

One-time emergency assistance with economic needs

Economic support for families at risk for maltreatment
Menu of services

• Employment – job search, licenses, resume building, practice interviews
• Housing – eviction prevention, homelessness, referrals for foreclosure prevention, home-ownership
• Benefit Advocacy – W2, Social Security, FoodShare, landlords
• Education – GED, CNA, MATC, UWM
• Financial Decision Making – taxes, credit repair, bill paying, reducing financial fees, debt and bankruptcy, banking, budgeting, legal issues, financial goal-setting
Evaluation parameters

• Approximately 4,200 families have been randomized into T and C groups since mid-2012
• Approximately 40% of families cannot be located at the point of case closure following an investigation
• Preliminary analyses followed families through December 2013
  • ITT effects null
  • TOT effects not finalized
  • Large subgroup effect: Families with a prior history of CPS involvement
Preliminary Findings for Families with History of CPS Involvement (~15%)
US in Global Context
“Family violence is common, consequential, and changeable.”

- Kenny Steinman
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Figure 4.2 Coverage of the poor differs greatly by different types of safety nets and income groups

Coverage of the poor (poorest quintile)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level/Type of Transfer</th>
<th>Percent of the Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-middle-income (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-middle-income (36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: ASPIRE; see appendix G. Coverage rates are derived from household survey data, for the most recent year available per country. Note: Coverage rates refer to the percent of poor receiving any social safety net transfer. Poor households are defined as those in the poorest quintile of countries’ respective consumption/income distribution. The number of countries with available survey data for at least one program category in each income group is indicated in parentheses. CCT = conditional cash transfer; SSN = social safety net; UCT = unconditional cash transfer.

Source: World Bank Group, 2015; Original Source: ASPIRE
Figure 2.8 Lower-income countries devote a higher share of their social safety net budgets to targeted programs

Source: ASPIRE.
Note: Targeted programs refer to programs that by design select beneficiaries using means-tested, proxy-means-tested, community-based, geographical targeting, and self-targeting approaches. Nontargeted programs refer to universal and categorical programs. The number of countries for which data are available is indicated in parentheses.

Source: World Bank Group, 2015; Original Source: ASPIRE
Public social expenditure by broad social policy area, as a percent of GDP, in 2012 or latest year available

- **Cash benefits**
  - Pensions (old age and survivors)
  - Income support to the working age population

- **Services**
  - Health
  - All social services except health

Source: OECD Social Expenditure Update, Nov 2014