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Session learning outcomes

1. Describe the link between childhood economic hardships and subsequent pregnancy-related health.

2. Understand the benefits of using the California Poverty Measure to assess poverty.

3. Identify and use available data resources to assess the economic well-being of pregnant women and families in California counties.
Mission:
To develop a common agenda across multiple agencies and stakeholders and align activities, programs, policies and funding so that all California children, youth and their families have safe, stable, nurturing relationships and environments.

Guiding principle 3:
Accomplishing safe, stable, nurturing relationships and environments requires changes in multiple systems with a focus on broad social and economic determinants, social norms, and governmental and institutional policies, as well as individual family change.
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• Adverse Childhood Events (ACEs) studies revealed high prevalence of child abuse and other childhood psychosocial traumas and their enduring health effects.

• The field of maternal and child health has embraced both ACEs and social determinants of health in efforts to understand the root causes of health inequities across the life course.

• Classic ACEs studies did not include economic hardship.
Impact of economic hardships during childhood (EHC):

- Toxic stress from any source impacts health.
- EHC is linked to many adult adverse health outcomes and socioeconomic conditions.
- Economic hardships increase the risk of child abuse and family disruption/dysfunction.
Are economic hardships in childhood associated with women’s subsequent hardships and health-risk behaviors around the time of pregnancy?
Data Source: Maternal and Infant Health Assessment

• Annual population-based survey of California women with a recent live birth
• Maternal and infant experiences before, during and shortly after pregnancy
• Mail survey with telephone follow up to English- and Spanish-speaking women ages 15 and older
• Collaboration between California Department of Public Health, Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health Division and University of California, San Francisco Center on Social Disparities in Health
• Supported by California Department of Public Health: Title V Block Grant and WIC funds
Sample

- MIHA data from years 2011-2014
- Stratified random sample from California birth certificate
- Weighted to represent California women with a live birth
- Overall sample 27,626
- 27,102 women completed all questions on economic hardship in childhood
Economic hardship in childhood

• Events or circumstances that happened “from the time you were born through age 13:”
  – Respondent or someone in her family went hungry (hunger)
  – Her family had to move because of problems paying rent or mortgage (rent/mortgage problems)
  – Her family had difficulty paying for basic needs like food or housing
Economic hardship in childhood: summary measure definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of EHC</th>
<th>Hunger or rent/mortgage problems</th>
<th>Frequency of difficulty paying for basic needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Yes to one or both</td>
<td>Very or somewhat often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Yes to one or both</td>
<td>Not very often or never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>No to both</td>
<td>Very or somewhat often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>No to both</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome indicators: Maternal hardships and health-risk behaviors

• Indicators of economic and social hardship
  – Poverty in the year before birth
  – Food insecurity during pregnancy
  – Homelessness or no regular place to sleep during pregnancy
  – Intimate partner violence during pregnancy

• Health-risk behaviors
  – Smoking, 3 months before pregnancy
  – Binge drinking, 3 months before pregnancy
Analysis

Estimated associations between EHC and 6 outcomes:

• Is there a relationship between EHC and maternal outcome?

• Is the relationship explained by other childhood characteristics and resources?

• Is the relationship explained by characteristics and resources around the time of pregnancy?

• Were the effects of EHC independent of effects of other childhood hardships (family disruption or dysfunction)?
Individual EHC Measures

% of women with recent live birth with individual EHC measures

- Hunger: 10%
- Rent/mortgage problems: 14%
- Difficulty paying for basic needs:
  - Often: 21%
  - Not very often: 28%
  - Never: 50%
Level of EHC

PERCENT OF WOMEN WITH EACH LEVEL OF ECONOMIC HARDSHIP IN CHILDHOOD

- None: 49%
- Lower: 23%
- Intermediate: 16%
- Highest: 12%
Disparities in intermediate or higher level of EHC: Race/ethnicity and educational attainment

- **Race/ethnicity**
  - Latina: 35% vs. AI/AN: 35% vs. Black: 33%
  - White: 22% vs. API: 14%

- **Educational attainment**
  - <HS grad: 44% vs. HS grad/GED: 36% vs. Some college: 30% vs. College grad: 14%
Disparities in intermediate or higher level of EHC: Family disruption/dysfunction and adult support

Family disruption/dysfunction experiences include parental divorce/separation, jail, drinking/drug problem, or child placement in foster care.
Disparities in intermediate or higher level of EHC: 20 CA counties with the most births

- San Joaquin: 35%
- Stanislaus: 35%
- Ventura: 30%
- Fresno: 25%
- Tulare: 20%
- Kern: 15%
- Monterey: 10%
- San Bernardino: 5%
- Riverside: 0%
- Santa Barbara: 0%
- Contra Costa: 5%
- Orange: 10%
- Sacramento: 15%
- Los Angeles: 20%
- Sonoma: 25%
- Alameda: 30%
- Santa Clara: 35%
- San Mateo: 35%
- San Francisco: 35%
Maternal outcome indicators: maternal hardships and health-risk behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of women with maternal hardships or risk behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless/No regular place to sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate partner violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking 3 mo before pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge drinking 3 mo before pregnancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty, Food insecurity, Intimate partner violence, and Binge drinking are health-risk behaviors.
Final association of EHC with maternal indicators

• Intermediate or higher level of EHC is associated with:
  – Maternal poverty, food insecurity, homelessness/no regular place to sleep, IPV during pregnancy, binge drinking before pregnancy

• Relationships persisted after controlling for childhood and maternal characteristics/resources, and family dysfunction in childhood

• Maternal smoking was not associated with EHC after adjustment.

• Higher levels of EHC appeared to be associated with higher maternal risks.
Summary

• EHC is common.
• EHC is more common among women who:
  – Are American Indian, Black, Latina
  – Are younger, less educated
  – Experienced more family disruption/dysfunction and lacked adult support during childhood
• Intermediate/higher EHC levels associated with five indicators of maternal hardships and health risk-behaviors, but not smoking
• Family disruption/dysfunction does not explain results
• EHC appears to have dose-response relationship with maternal outcome indicators
Implications

- EHC are linked to threats to maternal health, particularly in the long-term.

- Discussion of ACEs and policy responses to them should include economic hardships during childhood, and their negative consequences later in life.

- Today in California, nearly 20% of children live in poverty.
  - Possible impact in terms of negative adult health and lack of economic mobility are staggering.
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Outline

- California Poverty Measure (CPM) overview
- Protective role of social safety net programs
- How could the social safety net do more?
How poverty is calculated

Resources
Earnings
Cash benefits

Expenses

Poverty threshold
Family size
How CPM poverty is calculated

**Resources**
- Earnings
- Cash benefits
- Taxes
- In-kind benefits

**Expenses**
- Work-related child care
- Other work related
- Medical

**Poverty threshold**
- Family size
- Region
- Homeownership status
The CPM includes an expanded set of family resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family resource</th>
<th>Official poverty</th>
<th>California Poverty Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash income</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes paid, tax credits received</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Security Income</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANF/CalWORKs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAP/CalFresh</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School breakfast and lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal rental assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resources from the social safety net can be substantial

- CalWORKs, GA
- Rental housing assistance
- CalFresh, WIC, and school meals
- SSI
- EITC/CTC
- After-tax work and retirement income

Share of Comprehensive Income (Average)

Decile

- 1st: 66%
- 2nd: 73%
- 3rd: 81%
- 4th: 91%
- 5th: 96%
CPM poverty thresholds are generally well above FPL

Federal poverty line: $24,036

CPM poverty line, family of four

- Tulare County
- Riverside County
- San Francisco County
- Statewide
The result: more Californians in poverty
...But fewer children in deep poverty

![Bar chart showing](chart.png)

- People 0-64: CPM 6%, Official 6%
- All Children: CPM 5%, Official 6%
- Children 0-5: CPM 5%, Official 9%
Outline

- California Poverty Measure (CPM) overview
- Protective role of social safety net programs
- How could the social safety net do more?
Without the social safety net, child poverty would be far higher.
CalFresh and state/federal EITCs lower poverty rates the most, followed by CalWORKs.
Outline

- California Poverty Measure (CPM) overview
- Protective role of social safety net programs
- How could the social safety net do more?
The programs that mitigate poverty do focus funds on families with children.
Programs currently assist varying shares of children in need—this could be increased.

- EITCs: 31% (Deep poverty) vs. 49% (Poverty)
- CalFresh: 68% (Deep poverty) vs. 69% (Poverty)
- CalWORKs: 24% (Deep poverty) vs. 28% (Poverty)
Many program participants remain in poverty—could consider targeted benefit increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percent of children with resources from program living in deep poverty</th>
<th>Percent of children with resources from program living in poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EITCs</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalFresh</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New programs could also be considered

- Lowest-income workers: EITC
- Lowest-income families: Child credit
- Lowest-income rent burdened: Renter's credit

% pt reduction

- Deep poverty
- Poverty

0.3
0.3
0.9
0.5
1.5
1.4

Deep poverty
Poverty
Notes on the use of these slides

These slides were created to accompany a presentation. They do not include full documentation of sources, data samples, methods, and interpretations. To avoid misinterpretations, please contact:

Caroline Danielson (danielson@ppic.org; 415-291-4462)

Thank you for your interest in this work.
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Childhood poverty among mothers who recently gave birth

Hunger

Rent/mortgage problems

Basic needs not met
Childhood poverty

CPM

Deep poverty

Poverty without social net
Poverty as a foundational part of childhood adversity

Data as a powerful tool
Regarding your issue or population of concern,

1. What role does poverty have?

2. What data are most compelling to address it?

Bonus points: Develop a concise message that clearly identifies and addresses poverty’s role
Kidsdata.org

High-quality, wide-ranging, local data

- 55+ Topics
- 600+ Indicators
- 50+ Data Sources
- By Regions
- By Demographics
- Context & Recommendations
Find data about the health and well being of children in communities across California:

Enter a location and/or a topic, e.g. "Los Angeles foster care"

Over 35 Years of Ozone Data Now Available

Kidsdata now has ozone data going back to 1960. See your county's progress and learn more about how air quality affects children's health.

Receive Kidsdata News

Your email address

SIGN UP

Regular emails featuring notable data findings and new features. Visit our Kidsdata News archive for examples.
Sign up
kidsdata.org/SignUp

Questions?
Regarding your issue or population of concern,

1. What role does poverty have?

2. What data are most compelling to address it?

Bonus points: Develop a concise message that clearly identifies and addresses poverty’s role
Contact

Christine Rinki
christine.rinki@cdph.ca.gov

Caroline Danielson
danielson@ppic.org

Lori Turk-Bicakci
lori.turk@lpfch.org