

The Case Against CASA

HOW THE MOST SACRED COW IN CHILD WELFARE HURTS THE CHILDREN IT IS MEANT TO HELP

January, 2010, updated November, 2015, May, 2017, February, 2018, November, 2019

To see the first of the actual studies discussed below, [click here](#).

The trade journal *Youth Today* [aptly summed up the appeal](#) of the Court-Appointed Special Advocates Program, noting that CASA

“couldn’t sound more apple pie, more thousand points of light. CASAs are a cadre of 74,000 volunteers trained for dozens of hours, then dispatched to conduct independent investigations of child abuse and to represent the children’s interests in courts around the nation. What could be wrong with that?”

Plenty, it turns out; much of it revealed by the two most comprehensive evaluations of CASA ever done. One, [published in 2004](#), was an evaluation commissioned by the National CASA Association itself, the other, [published in 2019](#), was commissioned and paid for by Texas CASA. The results in both cases are devastating.

The 2004 study:

[As *Youth Today* noted](#), the 2004 study “delivers some surprisingly damning numbers.”

- The study found that CASA's only real accomplishments were to prolong the time children languished in foster care and reduce the chance that a child will be placed with relatives.
- The study found no evidence that having a CASA on the case does anything to improve child safety – so all that extra foster care is for nothing. (The study *specifically controlled* for CASA's all-purpose excuse for this – the claim that CASAs handle the most difficult cases.)
- The study also found that when a CASA is assigned to a child who is Black, the CASA spends, on average, significantly less time on the case. (The study also found that CASAs don't spend as much time on cases in general as the organization's p.r. might lead one to believe. CASA volunteers reported spending an average of only 4.3 hours per month on cases involving white children, and only 2.67 hours per month on cases involving Black children).

A *Youth Today* columnist [summed up the findings](#) this way:

“The more rigorous evaluation ... not only challenged the effectiveness of the court volunteers' services, but suggested that they spend little time on cases, particularly those of black children, and are associated with more removals from the home and fewer efforts to reunite children with parents or relatives.”

The 2019 study:

As far as we know, National CASA never commissioned another comprehensive study. But Texas CASA did. Those results were released at the end of 2019. And, if anything, they're even worse. According to that study:

“Overall, children appointed a CASA have significantly LOWER odds than children without a CASA of achieving permanency.” [Emphasis added]

Compared to children not burdened with a CASA on the case, foster children with CASAs were:

- **Less** likely to be reunified with their own parents.
- **Less** likely to find permanence in the form of guardianship by a relative.
- **More** likely to “age out” of foster care with no home at all.
- Once again, the results are NOT due to the fact that CASAs are said to be assigned to “the toughest cases.” These researchers took even more extraordinary steps to account for that than their counterparts in 2004.

You can read all about the 2019 study, and find a link to the full study here.

None of this should come as a surprise. Like most people in child welfare, almost all CASA volunteers and the paid staff who support them at the local and national level mean well; they really want to do what's best for vulnerable children. (Although sometimes their cruelty can be mind-boggling.) And a few CASA chapters have avoided the problems discussed here. But children suffer enormously from CASA's well-meaning blunders.

The problems are built into the CASA model. Who has time to spend even 4.3 hours a month on a case? Certainly not a poor person holding down two jobs. So it's no wonder CASA programs sometimes are pet projects of the local Junior League and the demographics of CASAs tend to be vastly different from the demographics of the families they judge.

All over America, CASA volunteers, amateurs whose only actual “qualification” is being mostly middle class and overwhelmingly white, march into the homes of people who are overwhelmingly poor and disproportionately of color. Then, these amateurs pass judgment on the families. They even recommend whether the children ever should be allowed to live in their own homes again. And make no mistake, the CASA is the *de-facto* judge, since the real judges almost always rubber-stamp their recommendations.

Rather than respond to the findings of its own study by cleaning up its act, CASA tried first to spin the results and then to bury them. *Youth Today* concluded that CASA's spin “can border on duplicity.” The study was consigned to an obscure corner of a website meant primarily for CASAs themselves, then removed entirely. That's why NCCPR has made it available here: <http://bit.ly/2p9oVSn> In 2019, Texas CASA came up with a litany of excuses for its failure, including what should properly be called, the Doctrine of CASA Infallibility. (And, by the way, in between these two studies a third, smaller study came up with similar results.)

The studies aren't the only evidence of the bias that permeates CASA:

THE CASE AGAINST CASA/3

- Although a CASA is supposed to help a judge objectively evaluate conditions in a child's home, the website for the Indianapolis CASA program declares every family from whom a child is taken is guilty. According to the website, all of the children "have been victims of life-threatening abuse or neglect." [emphasis added]. One Indiana CASA's attempt to defend the program was anything but reassuring.
- A law review article makes a persuasive case that racial bias is the only logical explanation for the existence of CASA. The article calls CASA "an exercise of white supremacy" – prompting a hyper-defensive response that is revealing in itself. The article helps explain what happened ...

• ... In Arkansas City, Kansas, in 2009. In that community, the big annual fundraiser for CASA is a drag queen contest. The winner of the talent competition and the "Miss CASA" title was the local mayor. He dressed up as a woman to whom he gave a surname described as "graphic slang for a female private part." So is the name the mayor chose for his back up dancers. Oh, and one more thing: The mayor did his act made up in blackface.

The local CASA director said she was mortified when someone explained what the surname meant. Other than that though, she thought the whole thing was great, telling a local news website: "The part of his act I felt was excellent was the dancing. It was good dancing. The back-up singers were gorgeous and could probably back up any professional. ... We may change some things. We may not. We certainly don't want to offend anybody."

As for the blackface, the CASA director said she didn't think the mayor was trying to portray a different race: "It wasn't black black," she said. "It was all really just tan." It was not until after the National CASA Association went into damage control mode and set up a conference call with the local chapter, the state chapter and the local NAACP that the local chapter apologized.

- In Marin County, California, a simple request that CASA try to be more diverse caused the entire program to collapse.
- CASA chapters behaved reprehensibly in high-profile cases in Texas, Florida and, especially, Snohomish County, Washington where the entire program is enmeshed in scandal, and a longtime volunteer made comments about families that are so vile they might make Steve Bannon blush.
- Throughout the country, local CASA chapters continue to state or imply that they are "a child's voice" in court. They are not. A CASA advocates for whatever the CASA thinks is best for the child. So if the child desperately wants to go home, but the CASA thinks that's a bad idea, the CASA pushes as hard as she can *against* what the child wants; the child effectively is silenced. (And while it is much less likely to happen, if a child wants to stay in foster care and the CASA wants the child to return home, again, the child is silenced – and that is equally wrong.)

Children do need a voice in court – a real one. From the age a child is old enough to express a rational preference she or he should get a lawyer to fight for that preference. That doesn't mean the child always should get what he or she wants. But the best way to find out what truly is best for a child is if everyone has an articulate advocate making his or her case. Deciding what is best is what we pay judges for. It's time we stopped ceding that role to amateurs.

For more about CASA see these posts to the NCCPR Child Welfare Blog.